

# Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

## Hidden Creek, Inc. Planned Community Use Permit Amendment

*February 2021*



*Prepared By*  
Del Norte County  
Community Development Department  
Planning Division  
981 H Street, Suite 110  
Crescent City, California 95531

[www.co.del-norte.ca.us](http://www.co.del-norte.ca.us)

This page intentionally left blank.

## Contents

Project Information Summary .....	4
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected .....	6
Determination .....	6
Environmental Checklist .....	7
1. Aesthetics .....	7
2. Agriculture and Forest Resources .....	7
3. Air Quality .....	8
4. Biological Resources .....	9
5. Cultural Resources .....	9
6. Energy .....	10
7. Geology and Soils .....	10
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	11
9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	12
10. Hydrology and Water Quality .....	13
11. Land Use and Planning .....	14
12. Mineral Resources .....	14
13. Noise .....	14
14. Population and Housing .....	15
15. Public Services .....	16
16. Recreation .....	16
17. Transportation .....	17
18. Tribal Cultural Resources .....	18
19. Utilities and Service Systems .....	18
20. Wildfire .....	19
21. Mandatory Findings of Significance .....	20
Mitigation Monitoring Plan .....	21

### Exhibits and Appendices Follow

## Project Information Summary

1. **Project Title:** Hidden Creek Planned Community Amendment Use Permit
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Del Norte County  
Planning Commission  
981 H Street, Suite 110  
Crescent City, CA 95531
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Taylor Carsley  
(707) 464-7254  
[tcarsley@co.del-norte.ca.us](mailto:tcarsley@co.del-norte.ca.us)
4. **Project Location and APN:** Hidden Creek Subdivision  
Crescent City, CA 95531  
APN 116-310-001, 002, 009, 010, 014, 015, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 025, 046, 030, 031, 032, 026, 036, 034, 035, 047, 058, 059, 060, 061, 051, 052, 027, 028 and 29
5. **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:** Stover Engineering  
Ward Stover, Principal  
PO Box 783, Crescent City, CA 95531
6. **County Land Use:** General Commercial, Multi-Family Residential
7. **County Zoning:** Planned Community
8. **Description of Project:**

The owner of the Hidden Creek Subdivision in Crescent City, Hidden Creek, Inc. proposes to increase the permitted density of its 9.95-acre planned community single-family residential subdivision to allow for multiple-family dwelling units. The current planned community entitlement is comprised of 56 single-family residential lots, with six of them currently developed with single-family units. The currently permitted density of the subdivision is 5.63 units per acre. The proposed project includes 44 new duplex units, 5 new three-plex units, and the existing 6 single-family units, creating a total gross density of 10.95 units per acre. The project also includes a small recreation center for tenants on one of the lots. Other standards normally established in a planned community, such as setbacks, lot coverage, building height, etc. are not proposed to change significantly. Residences would not be constructed above 35 feet in total height. As part of a previous approval, the property owner can make a series of minor lot line adjustments throughout the project site. This action better enables the applicant to carry out development of the larger units on each parcel. The smallest parcel in the subdivision would remain approximately 4,441 square feet.

The property is served by a private sewer system that connects to the County Service Area #1 (CSA). City water service is provided. Surface drainage is accounted for in the project proposal.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:**

The affected project area has residential apartment buildings to its immediate west, low density rural residential use to its immediate north and east, and vacant commercial land immediately to its south. Walmart is located approximately 200 feet south of the project area.

- 10. **Required Approvals:** Use Permit (Del Norte County Planning Commission)
- 11. **Other Approval (Public Agencies):** N/A
- 12. **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?**

Native American tribes, traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area have been notified of the project application completion and the beginning of the AB 52 consultation period pursuant to PRC §21080.3.1. No requests for consultation pursuant to PRC §21080.3.1 were not received.

### 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" without mitigation as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. All mitigation measures are provided in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils	<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"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population / Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities / Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wildfire	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance

### Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Taylor Carsley  
Planner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Environmental Checklist

### 1. Aesthetics

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publically accessible vantage points). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<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 of Impacts

- a. The project would have no impact on a scenic vista.
- b. The project would not damage scenic resources, as there are no scenic resources on-site.
- c. The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site. The potential to develop multi-family residences in lieu of single-family residences.

### 2. Agriculture and Forest Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact 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?	<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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
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"/>

**Discussion of Impacts**

- a. No prime farmland exists on-site.
- b. No agricultural zoning exists on-site.
- c. No Timber Production zones exist on-site or adjacent to the property
- d. The project would not result in the loss of forestland.
- e. The project does not involve any other changes in the existing environment that could adversely affect farmland or timberlands.

**3. Air Quality**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion of Impacts**

a-d. This project would have no foreseeable impacts on the implementation of an air quality plan, on increasing criteria pollutants in the region, on exposing sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations, nor would it substantially increase emissions beyond that assessed for the original Planned Community approval for single family residences. While there will be increased residential density in the project area as a result of implementation, the number of residential structures being developed will decrease and not create impacts to air quality above that assessed for in the original approval.



#### 4. Biological Resources

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

#### Discussion of Impacts

a-f. The project involves the increase in density of a Planned Community from single family residential use to multiple family residential use. The project site is developed with a circulation system and graded as was approved for the Planned Community. No habitat would be modified as a result of this amendment to the Planned Community. Riparian habitat does not exist on site and the amendment of the existing use permit would not affect the migratory patterns of wildlife. The project would not be in conflict with local ordinances or habitat conservation plans.

#### 5. Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?				
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion of Impacts**

a-c. No cultural resources are known to exist on-site. The County records were searched for known cultural sites in the general project vicinity, and none were identified. The project is located on a previously heavily disturbed site. Notice was provided to the two tribes traditionally culturally affiliated with the project area and no comment was given with regard to cultural resources. Additionally, cultural staff from the Tolowa-Dee-ni’ Nation is a voting member of the County Environmental Review Committee which reviews projects and makes CEQA recommendations. While resources are not known to exist on-site, the possibility of an inadvertent discovery is always possible during construction or other implementation activities associated with the project. The project approval will include an inadvertent discovery condition on the use permit in case cultural resources are discovered.

**6. Energy**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion of Impacts**

- a. The project would have no foreseeable impacts on increasing wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy use since no development is proposed as part of this application. The project will use minimal amounts of fuel and energy. The increase in density from single family to multiple family units will increase energy efficiency and consume less land per residential unit.
- b. This project does not conflict with nor obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

**7. Geology and Soils**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) 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"/>

### Discussion of Impacts

a-f. The project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts including the risk of loss, injury, or death related to soils impacts. The site is flat and has no potential for landslides, mass wasting, or other slope-related impacts. Seismic ground shaking and liquefaction could occur in any region of coastal California, however the potential impacts would be considered less than significant as structural development will be engineered and constructed to current building code. The site is not located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B and soils will not be utilized for sewage disposal; the project will connect each unit to a private sewer system already developed in the project area. No known paleontological resources or unique geologic features are known to exist on site.

## 8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion of Impacts

a-b. In 2002, the California legislature declared that global climate change was a matter of increasing concern for the state’s public health and environment, and enacted a law requiring the state Air Resource Board (ARB) to control GHG emission from motor vehicles (Health and Safety Code §32018.5 et seq.). CEQA Guidelines define GHG to include carbon dioxide (CO2), nitrous oxide (N2O), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride.

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) definitively established the state’s climate change policy and set GHG reduction targets (Health and Safety Code §38500 et seq.). The state has set its target at reducing greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

Construction of the project may generate GHG emissions as a result of combustion of fossil fuels used in construction equipment. Use of variety of construction materials would contribute indirectly to GHG emissions because of the emissions associated with their manufacture. The construction-related GHG emissions would be minor and short-term and would not constitute a significant impact based on established thresholds.

After construction of the units, it is anticipated that GHG impacts as a result of this Planned Community amendment will actually decrease net emissions. The higher density housing with less unit per acre use will decrease GHG emissions per acre. The project works toward accomplishing statewide climate action goals by developing higher density housing in locations close in proximity to retail, medical, and service markets.

## 9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion of Impacts

a-g. The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The residential use of the project would limit transportation and use of hazardous

materials to and in the site. The project is not within one quarter mile of a school and is not located on a hazardous materials site identified by the state. The increase in density of the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise due to proximity to an airport. According the 2017 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the project area is outside of any sensitive noise contour. This development would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan and is within the Local Responsibility Area for fire response with a low fire hazard severity rating due to surrounding urban and residential uses.

## 10. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional source of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable ground water management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion of Impacts

a-e. The project amends a Planned Community to entitle each remaining undeveloped lot in the subdivision to construct a multiple-family dwelling unit instead of a single family dwelling unit. This action will not have any impacts on water quality violations, altering drainage patterns, increasing erosion or siltation, or contribute to significant increases in runoff above that which was already permitted. The Drainage Study dated 20 June 2006, prepared for the subdivision and original approval of the Planned Community. This study designed the storm drainage system for high-density single-family units. In an addendum letter prepared by Stover Engineering, the Rational Method for calculation of developed stormwater flows in the subdivision adequately applies to the proposed multi-family unit development, with no further analysis being required since ground conditions are not substantially changing. The amendment of the Planned Community to increase housing types would not increase runoff water which would exceed the capacity of stormwater

drainage systems. The Planned Community will be supplied by public water from the City of Crescent City, making groundwater depletion a non-issue. The project is not in any Special Flood Hazard Area and would not affect flood waters.

## 11. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion of Impacts

a-b. This project does not divide an established community nor does it cause a conflict with any land use plan in the County. The proposed project substantially will substantially conform to the General Plan as well as other applicable ordinances and code.

## 12. Mineral Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion of Impacts

a-b. No mineral resources are known to exist on site.

## 13. Noise

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion of Impacts**

a-b. The project does not have the potential to generate a significant temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project above that approved in the original use permit. The Planned Community already has an entitlement for the development of 56 single family residences and this project would increase the density to allow for six single family and 103 multi-family units. The increase in density would not be expected to contribute to a greater generation of temporary or permanent noise. Temporary noise and vibration will be generated as a result of construction activities, however this is not considered significant nor will it exceed any applicable thresholds.

c. The project is located within two miles of McNamara Field and is within its Airport Influence Area as mapped in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The project does not fall within any noise contours that would indicate the exposure of the residential use to excessive noise levels generated by the airport.

**14. Population and Housing**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion of Impacts**

- a. The project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in this area. The current density of the Planned Community is 5.63 units per acre and the proposed density is 10.95 units per acre. The General Plan land use designation in this area is General Commercial and Multi Family Residential which allow for up to 12 and 15 residential units per acre, respectively, when community sewer and water are utilized. No impact would occur as a result of unplanned population growth.
- b. The project would not displace any number of existing people or housing. The project would allow an additional 47 residential units to be constructed above that permitted in the current Planned Community use permit.

## 15. Public Services

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

### Discussion of Impacts

- a. The project would not result in substantial adverse impacts associated with the need for new or altered governmental facilities and/or public services. Increased population levels could utilize greater amounts of fire and police resources, however the General Plan acknowledges the potential for this area to be developed at an even higher density. Any impacts to service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of these public services are expected to be less than significant. School impacts will be less than significant due to construction mitigation fees that would be paid unrelated to mitigation imposed by this project approval. The amendment to the Planned Community proposes a recreation center that would act toward offsetting any impacts on parks as a result of increased population in the area.

## 16. Recreation

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion of Impacts



a-b. The project provides alternative recreational facilities for the Planned Community and does not impact existing recreational areas nor does it increase the need for additional recreational facilities.

## 17. Transportation

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

### Discussion of Impacts

- a. The project does not conflict with any program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. The Planned Community maintains a private circulation system, maintained by the homeowners association.
- b. The project is expected to increase the amount of Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) above the accepted threshold in the Del Norte region. The Del Norte Region SB 743 Implementation Plan provides for VMT thresholds and potential mitigation to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. According to the Transportation Impact and Mitigation Calculations submitted by the applicant, the addition of 105 multi-family units (31 single family home equivalent) will add approximately 297 average daily trips (ADT), exceeding the threshold of 110 ADT. The SB 743 Implementation Plan provides for a VMT mitigation cost of 0.5 curb ramps, 15 feet of sidewalk, or 7.5 feet of sidewalk with curb and gutter per single family home equivalent. According to these costs, the applicant could reduce the impact of creating 187 ADT by installing 236 feet of sidewalk. See Mitigation Measure TRANS-1.

### Mitigation Measure TRANS-1

The applicant shall mitigate the VMT producing impacts of 31.42 equivalent single family residences prior to final buildout of the Planned Community consistent with the Del Norte Region SB 743 Implementation Plan. Mitigation could consist of 16 curb ramps, 471 feet of sidewalk, or 236 feet of sidewalk with curb and gutter, or a combination deemed appropriate by the Community Development Department (CDD). An increase of up to 25% in the area of the improvement may be required by the CDD to assist with gap closures at the mitigation site. Equivalent mitigation shall be fully constructed for each dwelling unit prior to each dwelling unit being issued a Certificate of Occupancy. Prior to issuance of the use permit, the applicant shall submit engineered improvement plans to mitigate the total VMT impacts created by 31.42 equivalent single family residences. The applicant must work with the CDD to identify a public mitigation site(s). The County of Del Norte is unwilling to accept a payment in lieu of the construction of the physical improvements required to mitigate VMT.

*Timing/Implementation: Condition on use permit.*

*Enforcement: County Community Development Department.*

Monitoring: Annually up to final buildout of Planned Community.

- c. The project would not change any design features or introduce incompatible usage to an existing design feature.
- d. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The Planned Community has a circulation system that includes 40-foot private right-of-ways which opens up to Summer Lane, a 60-foot wide County-maintained right-of-way.

## 18. Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources 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 Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion of Impacts

No cultural resources are known to exist on-site. The County records were searched for known cultural sites in the general project vicinity, and none were identified. The project is located on a previously heavily disturbed site. Notice was provided to the two tribes traditionally culturally affiliated with the project area and no comment was given with regard to cultural resources. Additionally, cultural staff from the Tolowa-Dee-ni' Nation is a voting member of the County Environmental Review Committee which reviews projects and makes CEQA recommendations. While resources are not known to exist on-site, the possibility of an inadvertent discovery is always possible during construction or other implementation activities associated with the project. In this case, an inadvertent discovery condition will be added to the use permit to address any

## 19. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

dry and multiple dry years?				
c) 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 providers existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion of Impacts**

a-e. The project would not have any impact on utilities and service systems. The applicant has submitted materials showing that no significant impacts would occur as a result of public services needed at the project site. The project would utilize a private sewer system that connects to the CSA. The sewer system would be capable of handling increased loading from a higher density development. The peak flow rate of the Planned Community would be approximately 80 gallons per minute. The sewer pipe will be able to carry approximately 250 gallons per minute. Water is supplied by the City of Crescent City. Domestic water is carried through 12-inch main lines and no shortages or lack of water pressure is anticipated. The increase in residential density will create a higher solid waste generation rate, however not in excess of established thresholds.

**20. Wildfire**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion of Impacts**

a-d. The project site is located in a Local Responsibility Area for fire management and in a Moderate Fire Hazard Area. The Planned Community would increase growth in an area has planned for it through the General Plan land use

designation, however it is not in a wildland area. The topography of the site is flat with a lack of wildland vegetation which would require mitigation for issues associated with rapid wildfire movement or an excess of fuels. No other significant wildfire risk exists as a result of this project.

## 21. Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

The project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife species 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. Additionally, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable and does not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings directly nor indirectly.

## Mitigation Monitoring Plan

### Transportation

#### Mitigation Measure TRANS-1

The applicant shall mitigate the VMT producing impacts of 31.42 equivalent single family residences prior to final buildout of the Planned Community consistent with the Del Norte Region SB 743 Implementation Plan. Mitigation could consist of 16 curb ramps, 471 feet of sidewalk, or 236 feet of sidewalk with curb and gutter, or a combination deemed appropriate by the Community Development Department (CDD). An increase of up to 25% in the area of the improvement may be required by the CDD to assist with gap closures at the mitigation site. Equivalent mitigation shall be fully constructed for each dwelling unit prior to each dwelling unit being issued a Certificate of Occupancy. Prior to issuance of the use permit, the applicant shall submit engineered improvement plans to mitigate the total VMT impacts created by 31.42 equivalent single family residences. The applicant must work with the CDD to identify a public mitigation site(s). The County of Del Norte is unwilling to accept a payment in lieu of the construction of the physical improvements required to mitigate VMT.

*Timing/Implementation: Condition on use permit.*

*Enforcement: County Community Development Department.*

*Monitoring: Annually up to final buildout of Planned Community.*