

## Project Information

**Project Title:** Deim new Single-family residence and detached Garage/Shop

### Lead Agency

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

### Property Owner

John Deim  
P.O. Box 85  
Garberville, CA 95542

### Project Applicant

Same as owner

### Project Location

The project is located in Humboldt County, in the Briceland area, on the south side of Briceland-Thorne Road, approximately 0.31 miles east from the intersection of Ferren Road and Briceland-Thorne Road, on the property known as 5400 Briceland -Thorne Road.

### General Plan Designation

Residential Agriculture (RA5-20) Density: One dwelling unit per 20 acres to one dwelling unit per 5 acres; Slope Stability: Moderate Instability (2)

### Zoning

Unclassified (U).

### Project Description

A Special Permit to correct a violation related to past unpermitted development activities performed within the Streamside Management Area (SMA) of Redwood Creek, a perennial watercourse which forms the northern and western boundaries of the subject property. In 2007, it was discovered that a number of new structures had recently been constructed on the approximately 3.8-acre parcel without the benefit of county review. New Development includes: tree removal, grading, and construction of an approximately 2,400 square foot shop/garage and 6,120 square foot house, as well as lengthening and improvements to an existing driveway providing access to the new homesite. Earlier development on the parcel includes: a 616 square foot cabin (now proposed to be converted to storage) and an approximately 1,400 square foot 2-story shop building. An existing driveway provides access to the property from Briceland-Thorne road, and crosses Redwood Creek using a flatcar bridge. The remaining development on the property includes: a 120 square foot gazebo, 16 square foot pumphouse, nine (9) 5,000 gallon water tanks, over 250 feet of retaining walls, and approximately 1,200 square feet of concrete. Water is provided to the property from an existing well. A new on-site sewage disposal system is proposed to be installed to service the recent unpermitted development. In 2010, a revised Riparian and Stream Assessment report was prepared by Keith Hess of DRW Environmental Consulting. The report notes that Redwood Creek has been historically impacted by past timber harvests, agricultural practices, and rural residential water withdrawal. Recommendations from the report combined with input from the Department of Fish & Wildlife have been incorporated as mitigation measures and include: establishing a crown along the entire length of the driveway using 6 inches of crushed rock, retention of vegetation within driveway inside ditch to inhibit sediment transport in runoff, the

removal of a small garbage shed within the SMA, the eradication of all scotch broom from the riparian zone, and the planting of Douglas-fir trees within several targeted areas. 45,000 gallons of water stored in on-site tanks will be used to enable forbearance of water withdrawals and diversion during low flow periods (typically July 15 thru November). Survey work performed in 2011 resulted in the discovery of a boundary line issue causing septic system setback complications and revealed issues with the existing access to the upper building site of the new unpermitted home and garage. Processing of the Special Permit resumed following the resolution of these matters with the affected neighboring property owner.

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

To the west and north, the parcel is surrounded by rural parcels (mainly ranging from 1-20 acres in size), primarily zoned "Unclassified". Larger size parcels zoned for agriculture and timber uses are located east and south of the property. The area is served by well water and on-site wastewater treatment systems.

**Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is or May Be Required** (permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Department of Environmental Health, California Department of Fish & Wildlife, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Building Inspection Division of Humboldt County, Humboldt County Public Works Department, Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

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

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

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

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources    | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials        |
| <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service       | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

**Determination:** On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Steven Lazar, Senior Planner  
Printed Name

Humboldt Planning & Building Dept.  
For

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except No Impact answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A No Impact answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A No Impact answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. Potentially Significant Impact is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more Potentially Significant Impact entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from Potentially Significant Impact to a Less Than Significant Impact. The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, Earlier Analyses may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures describe the mitigation measures which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plan, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats, however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue identify:
  - a) The significant criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

## Environmental Checklist

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

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

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

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

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

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>1. AESTHETICS.</b> Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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) In non-urbanized areas, Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). 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"/>

**1: AESTHETICS: NO IMPACT**

Finding: The project will not: substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; have a significant impact with regards to a scenic vista; nor create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Discussion: The unpermitted grading work that is the subject of this permit occurred within 100 feet of a Redwood Creek, a perennial watercourse and tributary to the South Fork of the Eel River. There is not evidence to suggest that any of these activities resulted in aesthetic impacts detectable beyond the boundaries of the property. While the activities undoubtedly resulted in some short term disturbance to the natural landscape, the work is becoming 'naturalized' over time as natural vegetation re-establishes itself within areas of disturbance. Given the rather remote/rural location, the project activities can be considered compatible with the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings. There is no evidence that the proposal will result in significant impacts to scenic resources or the visual character of the area.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest and (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**2: AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: NO IMPACT**

**Finding:** The project will not significantly impact or 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; nor will it significantly conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; nor will it conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest and timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; nor will it significantly involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use.

**Discussion:** The subject property is not within a Williamson Act contract. The closest lands under Williamson Act contract are located over a mile south of the subject property, and are in non-renewal, with the contract expiring in February 2019. The site is not designated as unique farmland or farmland of statewide significance. According to NRCS mapping, neither the project parcel or any others in the vicinity contain prime agricultural soils. The majority of the property contains rather severe slopes. The Department finds no evidence that the proposed project, which involves re-development of an existing parcel, is consistent with the planned build-out of the area and will therefore not result in a significant impact on agricultural or forestry resources.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Result in other emissions (such as those leading to				
<b>3. AIR QUALITY:</b> Where available, the significant criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
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 adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>3: AIR QUALITY: NO IMPACT</b>				
<b>Finding:</b> The project will <u>not</u> significantly conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; significantly 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); expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; nor will it create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.				
<b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project consists of after-the-fact permitting of grading and re-development of previously developed rural property. According to recent studies by the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD), the most significant contributors to PM-10 are residential wood burning stoves. Also, according to the NCUAQMD, all of Humboldt County is in non-attainment of the				

State's PM-10 (particulate matter of 10 microns in size) standard, but complies with all other State and Federal air quality standards. The area is characterized as mostly rural agricultural properties adjacent to forested slopes. The Department finds no evidence that the project that is consistent with the planned build-out of the area will have a significant adverse impact on air quality.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:</b> 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 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, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**4: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIF. IMPACT, POT. SIGNIF. UNLESS MIT. INCORP.**

Finding: The project is expected to have a less than significant impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, 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. The project is not expected to impact, either directly or through habitat modifications: species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the DFG or USFWS; biological resources by interfering with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. As proposed, the project will not conflict with any adopted Habitat



Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Without mitigation, the project has the potential to result in a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat through direct modifications, as well as federally protected wetlands. Additionally, without the included mitigation, the project could potentially conflict with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources (the Humboldt County Streamside Management Area (SMA) Ordinance and attendant General Plan policy).

Discussion: A revised Riparian and Stream Assessment report (prepared by Keith Hess of DRW Environmental Consulting) was circulated to the Department of Fish & Wildlife for comment. The report notes that Redwood Creek has been historically impacted by past timber harvests, agricultural practices, and rural residential water withdrawal. The report recommends a number of mitigation measures including: establishing a crown along the entire length of the driveway using 6 inches of crushed rock, armoring an inside ditch flanking the driveway, the removal of a small garbage shed within the SMA, the eradication of all scotch broom from the riparian zone, and the planting of Douglas-fir trees within several targeted areas. The Department of Fish & Wildlife have requested that vegetation growing within the inboard ditch of the driveway be retained, to provide for slowing of sediment during runoff events. The majority of the tree planting (identified in the riparian and stream assessment prepared by DRW) has already been completed. According to the applicant, the property was visited by staff from the California Department of Fish & Wildlife in recent years, and during their visit expressed support for the species and locations chosen. A review of 2012 Satellite imagery shows a significant change in vegetation within the riparian corridor near the northeast corner of the property. A Mitigation Measure has been included which requires that trees and other riparian vegetation be re-established within this area. This area is identified on a recently revised site plan received on December 10, 2018. The revised site plan also shows the potential location for 4 additional water storage tanks. The property is currently developed with nine (9) 5,000 gallon water tanks. Historically, residential and agricultural use of the property depended on year-round withdrawals of water from an existing well located near the southwest corner of the property, approximately 40 feet east of Redwood Creek. Given the wells location and depth, there is a strong likelihood that water from the well is hydrologically connected to water found in Redwood Creek, which is prone to periods of low flow during certain months (typically July 15 – November 1st). Summer base flow during this period can be as little as 0.53 cubic feet per second. 45,000 gallons of water stored in on-site tanks are proposed to be used to enable forbearance of water withdrawals and diversion during these periods of low or reduced flows. This volume of storage would provide sufficient water for use of approximately 300 gallons/day during a typical 5-month forbearance period. The project includes pre-approval of additional water storage locations west of the garage/shop (within the streamside management area). This will enable development of additional water storage capacity should the current tanked storage prove insufficient.

There is no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan for the project location, thus, the project will not conflict with any such plans. The Department does not have any evidence the project will result in adverse impact either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species; riparian habitat or sensitive natural community; interfere with the movement of fish and wildlife species. Based on the above, the Department finds that the project will have no environmental impact with respect to the above biological resources issues.

These project-specific mitigation measures are all consistent with the provisions of the Humboldt County Streamside Management Area Ordinance (SMAO), which governs development within riparian buffers, subject to mitigation. They will be included in the Conditions of Approval and Mitigation and Monitoring Plan for the project.

**Mitigation Measure #1 – To reduce the potential for erosion, the project will put down six inches of crushed rock with a crowned running surface along the length of the driveway and small driveway**

leading to the existing pump station.

**Mitigation Measure #2** – To reduce potential for suspended sediment entering Redwood Creek during surface water runoff events, all non-woody vegetation within the inboard ditch of the driveway shall be retained. Grading of this area or removal of non-wood vegetation is prohibited.

**Mitigation Measure #3** – Geo-fabric and a well sorted matrix of crushed angular rock shall be placed and maintained at the inlet and outlet of the established 8" driveway culvert.

**Mitigation Measure #4** – Douglas-fir shall be planted in 10 foot by 10 foot spacing within all areas delineated on the map included with the Riparian and Stream Assessment report prepared by Keith Hess of DRW Environmental Consulting. To provide immediate stabilization of the topsoil layer in and around riparian zones, native grass seed mix shall be applied in any areas that are, or have been disturbed. The landowner will be responsible for monitoring and maintaining the establishment of the Douglas-fir within delineated areas. A survival rate of 80% shall be necessary for planted trees. Annual photographs shall be taken and submitted to the Planning Division and California Department of Fish & Wildlife prior to July 15, each year, for a 5-year period.

**Mitigation Measure #5** – Work shall be performed to re-establish vegetative cover and appropriate riparian species within the open area located northeast of the garage/shop near the northeast corner of the property. This area is also identified as "additional mitigation (e) clearing" on the revised plot plan submitted on December 10, 2018.

**Mitigation Measure #6** – During any future construction activities, a temporary sediment fence shall be constructed around the construction site. The fence should be constructed of certified weed free or rice straw bales and landscape fabric, and should be in place before the initiation of any ground moving activities. The fence shall be maintained throughout the construction period and may only be removed after the exposed soils on the site are stabilized with vegetation.

**Mitigation Measure #7** – To help promote the recovery and re-colonization by native plant species, all Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*) shall be removed from the defined riparian zone. Removal will be monitored for a 5-year period. Re-sprouts shall be removed annually to insure the long-term success of this eradication effort.

**Mitigation Measure #8** – The small (garbage shed) structure location within the Streamside Management Area (SMA) will be removed as depicted on the site map.

**Mitigation Measure #9** – Each year, between July 15th and November 1st, the property owner and/or occupants of the property shall cease use of the well or withdrawal of water from Redwood Creek. Only previously stored water or water from captured rainfall may be used during this period. A water meter or other type of gauge shall be installed where tanked water enters the home's plumbing system.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to 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) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>5: CULTURAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT</b> <p><u>Finding:</u> The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Sec. 15064.5; will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Sec. 15064.5; and with mitigation will less than significantly disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> The project was referred to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) as well as the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria. The property has been host to prior residential development prior to the recent unpermitted construction of new residential and accessory structures. The property may also have been subject to some disturbance during past timber harvest activities. The County's standard "inadvertent discovery" condition regarding the applicant's responsibility should remains or artifacts be unearthed during any development has been included with Conditions of Approval as an on-going requirement. This is consistent with the recommendations made by the Bear River Tribe.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>6. ENERGY.</b> Would the project:				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>6: ENERGY: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b> <p><u>Finding:</u> The project will not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation; nor will the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> The baseline condition for the project includes a new residence that was constructed without building permits or land use approval. The property has a history of prior residential occupancy. The project will likely result in short-term energy consumption during the remaining construction activities to occur, and long-term energy consumption associated with the ongoing occupancy of the new home. The applicant has applied for an after-the-fact building permit which will require that it be</p>				

demonstrated that the home is or can be made compliant with the energy requirements of Title 24 of the Building Code. Therefore, it is expected that project-related energy use will result in a less than significant impact. Electrical service was removed from the residence in 2007 in conjunction with discovery of the unpermitted nature of the structure and illegal cannabis cultivation activities being conducted on the property. Loss of the electrical service subsequently resulted in regular use of a generator and photovoltaic (PV) system for domestic power needs. Consequently, re-electrifying the home upon issuance of the building permit will eliminate regular use of a generator at the project site, and the wasteful/inefficient consumption of energy associated with this condition. Re-establishing electrical service will enable grid-intertie of the PV system / improving renewable energy use at the site.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b> Would the project:				
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 Publication 42?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

**7: GEOLOGY AND SOILS: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIF. IMPACT, POT. SIGNIF. UNLESS MIT. INCORP.**

Finding: The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides; will not be located on expansive soil, as defined in

Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code (2010), creating substantial risks to life or property; and will not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water. The project is located on soil that has the potential to become unstable as a result of the project, without appropriate mitigation. The project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

**Discussion:** A Preliminary Geologic Engineering Soils Report (dated November 1, 2010) and Grading & Erosion Control Plan (dated January 22, 2007) were prepared for this project by Baird Engineering & Surveying. The Soils Report was reviewed and approved by the Building Inspector on November 15, 2010. These reports address the geology and soils of the proposed project and are used as the basis of these responses. According to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map and General Plan Geologic Hazards map, the project site is not located on or near a known fault. The nearest Alquist-Priolo zone is located approximately 10 miles west of the property. The site is not mapped in an area considered potentially liquefiable and, therefore, the potential for liquefaction to occur is low. A large retaining wall was constructed in association with the unpermitted residence and garage. Adherence to the approved Soils Report and Grading & Erosion Control Plan prepared by Baird Engineering will be required as part of the Building Permit and Conditions of Approval for the requested Special Permit. This should insure that potential for erosion and instability will be minimized. No significant erosion appears to be occurring at this time. Provided the Soils Report recommendations are adhered to, surface drainage is not anticipated to pose a significant hazard to the proposed structure. According to the General Plan Geologic Hazards map, the project site has a very low to moderate potential for slope instability. However, onsite investigation by the geologist did not observe any evidence of historic slope movements that would affect the building site. There were no areas identified in the Soils report that included expansive soils. The proposed development will be served by on-site water and on-site sewage disposal systems. The Dept. of Environmental Health (DEH) recommends approval. The Department finds no evidence that the project will have a significant adverse impact with regards to geology and soils. There are no known unique paleontological resources, sites, or unique geologic features within the vicinity of the project site. Minimal additional ground disturbance is proposed to occur beyond the baseline environmental conditions.

**Mitigation Measure #6 – During any future construction activities, a temporary sediment fence shall be constructed around the construction site. The fence should be constructed of certified weed free or rice straw bales and landscape fabric, and should be in place before the initiation of any ground moving activities. The fence shall be maintained throughout the construction period and may only be removed after the exposed soils on the site are stabilized with vegetation.**

**Mitigation Measure #10 – The applicant shall follow all of the recommendations included in the Preliminary Geologic Engineering Soils Report (dated November 1, 2010) and Grading & Erosion Control Plan (dated January 22, 2007) prepared for this project by Baird Engineering & Surveying.**

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**8: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIF. IMPACT**

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

Discussion: The proposed project is limited to the after-the-fact permitting of an unpermitted single-family residence, garage, and associated grading and improvements to an existing access road. The property was previously developed with an existing single-family residence and accessory structures prior to the recent unpermitted development. The improvements that are the subject of the Special Permit request are therefore not anticipated to generate a significant amount of greenhouse gases, nor conflict with any plan or policy regulating such emissions. Power service was removed from the parcel in 2006/2007, following discovery of the unpermitted development. Since that time, the property has relied exclusively use of solar panels and generators for electricity. Electrical service can be re-established following project approval and permitting. Elimination of regular generator use should result in a dramatic reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**9: HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIF. IMPACT**

Finding: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; will not 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; will not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area; or impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. 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, the project will not significantly result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The project will not create a significant exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Discussion: The project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites, nor does the proposed residence involve routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The project site is approximately 4 miles northwest of the nearest airport, located near Garberville. There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site. The site is not within an area governed by an Airport/Land Use Compatibility matrix. Development consistent with the County's adopted Airport land use plan will not result in unanticipated risk to the occupants of the site. The Department finds no evidence that the construction of a new residence created, or exposed people or property to, hazardous materials, or impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan. The site is within the State Responsibility Area (SRA) for fire protection. Development of the site will require compliance with the Humboldt County Fire-Safe Regulations. According to the Fire Hazard map, the parcel is located within a moderate fire hazard area. CALFIRE approved the proposed project subject to the standard conditions for development in the State Responsibility Area for Fire Protection. These include proper emergency water supply storage and a turnaround along the driveway and locating all structures more than 30 feet from any property line. The applicant has secured an easement from a neighboring property owner to provide for the use of the existing driveway and access route to the unpermitted residence. As these areas are under the use and control of the applicant, they meet the requirements for consideration as "defensible space", and provide for an appropriate buffer between the residence, garage, and areas which may be developed by the neighboring landowner. For these reasons, the Planning Division expects that the project will not result in significant impacts in terms of hazardous materials.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**10: HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT, POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED.**

Finding: The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor degrade water quality. The project will not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on/off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on/off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flood flows.

Discussion: The project may require permits from the Department of Fish & Wildlife as well as a 401 Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The parcel currently abuts Redwood Creek, a year-round tributary to the South Fork of the Eel River. The prior unpermitted construction involved grading and disturbance within the 100-foot riparian buffer (SMA) of Redwood Creek and



therefore has the potential to contribute to violations of waste discharge requirements or degradation of water quality. However, the mitigation measures designed for the project as part of the Riparian and Stream Assessment prepared by DRW Consulting, have been included within the Conditions of Approval for the project and should insure that impacts to water quality are avoided or mitigated to less than significant levels. These include: the placement of six inches of crushed rock with a crowned running surface along the length of the driveway (Mitigation Measure #1), installation of geo-fabric and a well-sorted matrix of crushed angular rock within the inboard ditch and inlet and outlet of the existing culvert (Mitigation Measure #2), as well as use of a temporary sediment fence during all future construction activities involving ground disturbance (Mitigation Measure #4). Implementation of several Best Management Practices include: performing all grading during the dry season, placement of rice straw and reseedling to promote re-vegetation in areas of disturbance, and following a grading and erosion control plan prepared by Baird Engineering (Mitigation Measure #5) are also required. According to Department mapping, the parcel lies outside any dam or levee inundation area, and outside the areas subject to tsunami run-up. According to the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (Panel 950 C), the lower portions of the property are located in Flood Zone A, within the 100-year floodplain of Redwood Creek. A review of the mapping shows that the majority of the new unpermitted development that is the subject of this Special Permit, appears to be located within Flood Zone C (outside of the 100-year floodplain), areas of minimal flooding.

The County Division of Environmental Health has already reviewed and approved the proposed project. Historically, prior residential development on the property relied upon use of a private well for year-round domestic water needs. Given the wells depth and proximity to Redwood Creek, it is suspected that the water source is hydrologically connected to neighboring surface water features (Redwood Creek). The project proposes continued use of the well, and has been designed to include the installation of sufficient water storage to enable forbearance of water withdrawals from the well during the summertime dry weather period (July 15<sup>th</sup> thru November 1<sup>st</sup>). Impacts to local groundwater supplies and recharge are not expected given the nature of the water source. As mentioned above, the Department finds no evidence indicating that the project will violate any water quality or waste discharge standards, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

**Mitigation Measure #1 – To reduce the potential for erosion, the project will put down six inches of crushed rock with a crowned running surface along the length of the driveway and small driveway leading to the existing pump station.**

**Mitigation Measure #2 – To reduce potential for suspended sediment entering Redwood Creek during surface water runoff events, all non-woody vegetation within the inboard ditch of the driveway shall be retained. Grading of this area or removal of non-wood vegetation is prohibited.**

**Mitigation Measure #3 – Geo-fabric and a well sorted matrix of crushed angular rock shall be placed and maintained at the inlet and outlet of the established 8" driveway culvert.**

**Mitigation Measure #6 – During any future construction activities, a temporary sediment fence shall be constructed around the construction site. The fence should be constructed of certified weed free or rice straw bales and landscape fabric, and should be in place before the initiation of any ground moving activities. The fence shall be maintained throughout the construction period and may only be removed after the exposed soils on the site are stabilized with vegetation.**

**Mitigation Measure #9 – Each year, between July 15<sup>th</sup> and November 1<sup>st</sup>, the property owner and/or occupants of the property shall cease use of the well or withdrawal of water from Redwood Creek. Only previously stored water or water from captured rainfall may be used during this period. A water meter or other type of gauge shall be installed where tanked water enters the home's plumbing system.**

**Mitigation Measure #10 – The applicant shall follow all of the recommendations included in the Preliminary Geologic Engineering Soils Report (dated November 1, 2010) and Grading & Erosion Control Plan (dated January 22, 2007) prepared for this project by Baird Engineering & Surveying.**

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>11. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
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 adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>11: LAND USE AND PLANNING: NO IMPACT</b> <p><u>Finding:</u> The project will not divide an existing established community; nor will it conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> The zoning of the parcel (Unclassified) supports the development of a single-family residence as a principally permitted use. The proposed residence is compatible with the planned build-out of the area and is consistent with the policies and regulations specified in the General Plan. The County's Stream Side Management Area Ordinance allows for reductions in riparian and wetland buffers with a Special Permit, provided potential impacts are mitigated. Project-related mitigation is discussed in the Riparian and Stream Assessment prepared by DRW Environmental Consulting. Mitigation implementation shall be governed by a project-specific mitigation and monitoring plan. The proposed project is consistent with a comprehensive view of the General Plan, as they concern land use, circulation, hazards and resources, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, public facilities and development timing. The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will result in significant adverse impact with regard to land use and planning.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>12. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> 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 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"/>

**12: MINERAL RESOURCES: NO IMPACT**

Finding: The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; and will not 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.

Discussion: The project does not involve extraction of mineral resources. The project site is not, nor is it adjacent to, a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on mineral resources.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>13. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

**13: NOISE: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

Finding: The project will not significantly result in 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; nor will it significantly result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an area governed by 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, the project will not significantly expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Discussion: The site is located along Briceland Thorne Road, approximately ¾ of a mile east of the Briceland area. This area is composed of rural parcels (mainly ranging from 1-20 acres in size), primarily zoned "Unclassified". Larger size parcels zoned for agriculture and timber uses are located east and south of the property. The proposed project is limited to the construction of a single-family residence and garage (which have already been completed), implementation of biological and water quality mitigation measures such as improvements to the existing driveway access, water storage tanks, and riparian corridor enhancement, and septic system upgrades. The project site is outside the areas of concern for the Garberville airport located on Sprowel Creek Road approximately 4 miles to the southeast. It is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The project will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of established standards. The project does not result in a

substantial permanent increase in ambient noise. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse noise impact. There was likely a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project during the construction associated with the new residence and access road improvements, and may be additional noise during installation of the new septic system, though this is not anticipated to exceed the levels authorized under the General Plan, as these increases would be short term, lasting only the length of time required to complete the work. No other development is proposed as part of this project.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14: POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
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"/>

#### 14: POPULATION AND HOUSING: NO IMPACT

Finding: The project will less than significantly 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); will not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Discussion: The project will create a new residence on a parcel that was previously host to prior residential development. As the earlier residence is proposed to be converted to storage in conjunction with the permitting of the new home, no increase in density will result. While the resulting density (1 dwelling on 3.8 acres) exceeds the density allowed by the parcels General Plan designation, the prior residential development predates the adoption of the current General Plan. Additionally, Section 314-107.2.1.1 of the Zoning Regulations allows for the development of "substandard lots" when lawfully created. Therefore, residential development of the substandard parcel (not meeting the 1 unit / 5-20 acres density of the RA designation) is authorized and will not result in an increase in non-conformance. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on population and housing.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>15. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b>				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>15: PUBLIC SERVICES: NO IMPACT</b>				
<p><u>Finding:</u> The project will not result in a substantial adverse physical impact with regards to the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities; and will not result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> The project involves the after-the-fact permitting of new structures on a parcel that has historically hosted residential development accessed via an existing private driveway. Neither CAL-Fire nor the Briceland Volunteer Fire District identified any fire protection issues. The property does not receive public water or wastewater service. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on public services.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>16. RECREATION.</b>				
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"/>

**16: RECREATION: NO IMPACT**

Finding: The project will not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial adverse physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; nor does it include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Discussion: The project does not include recreational facilities. The Department finds no evidence that the project will require construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>17. TRANSPORTATION.</b> Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**17: TRANSPORTATION: NO IMPACT**

Finding: The project will **not** conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; nor will it exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; nor will the project result in transportation impacts due to conflict or inconsistency with the criteria found within section 15064.3, subdivision (b) of the CEQA Guidelines. The project will also **not** substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses, or result in inadequate emergency access.

Discussion: The residential dwelling is accessed from a private driveway which leads from Briceland-Thorne Road, a County maintained road. The Land Use Division of Public Works has recommended standard conditions of approval concerning the improvement of the driveway intersections with a County maintained road. Cal-FIRE did not identify any fire protection issues or concerns regarding the adequacy of emergency access to the property. Near the top of the driveway, there is ample room for the turnaround of fire protection vehicles and equipment. The Land Use Division of Public Works has noted that "driveway apron improvements were completed per encroachment permit #10152". Since the property has been host to a single-family residence for decades and no change in density is proposed or would result, the Department finds there is no evidence that the project would result in a change in vehicle miles traveled above the environmental baseline.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:</b> Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resource Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resource Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>18: TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b> <u>Finding:</u> The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resource Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resource Code section 5020.1(k), or a resource determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria in subdivision (c) of section 5024.1 of the Public Resources Code? <u>Discussion:</u> The project was referred to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) as well as the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria. The property has been host to earlier residential development prior to the more recent unpermitted construction of new residential and accessory structures. The property may also have been subject to some disturbance during past timber harvest activities. In response to the project referral, and following review of databases maintained by the Bear River Tribe, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer did not find any evidence of previously recorded sites on the parcel, or reason to believe the property to be particularly sensitive. Recent archaeological surveys have been conducted on nearby parcels (appearing more sensitive) and have not discovered cultural or tribal cultural resources. The County's standard "inadvertent discovery" condition describing the applicant's responsibility (where remains or artifacts are unearthed during future development activities) has been included with Conditions of Approval as an on-going requirement. This is consistent with the recommendations made by the Bear River Tribe.				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water 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, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 provider's 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**19: UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**Finding:** The project **will not** require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects. The project **will** have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years. No additional demand on local wastewater treatment will result from the project. The project **will** comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste and **will not** 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.

**Discussion:** The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will be inconsistent with the planned build-out of the area or will result in a significant adverse effect to utilities and service systems. The parcel is not zoned for commercial or industrial uses. The project site will be served by an on-site sewage disposal system; the County Division of Environmental Health recommends approval. The site is served by an existing private water system. Conditions of Approval require installation and utilization of 45,000 gallons of tanked water storage to enable exclusive use of stored water for domestic use and forbearance from surface water diversion during dry months. Implementation of this mitigation measure will also insure the resiliency of the water source and water availability during dry months with low flows. The property drains towards Redwood Creek, which feeds the South Fork of the Eel River. The project includes mitigation measures to prevent impacts from pre and post-construction stormwater runoff. A transfer station in Redway is located approximately 7 miles east of the property and serves as hub for collection of solid waste from Southern Humboldt residents. The property has a history of residential development and occupancy. Given this, permitting of a new home to replace the earlier residence is not expected to result in a substantial increase in solid waste generation in excess of local infrastructure, or impair attainment of solid waste reduction goals.

**Mitigation Measure #1 – To reduce the potential for erosion, the project will put down six inches of crushed rock with a crowned running surface along the length of the driveway and small driveway leading to the existing pump station.**

**Mitigation Measure #2 – To reduce potential for suspended sediment entering Redwood Creek during surface water runoff events, all non-woody vegetation within the inboard ditch of the driveway shall be retained. Grading of this area or removal of non-wood vegetation is prohibited.**

**Mitigation Measure #3 – Geo-fabric and a well sorted matrix of crushed angular rock shall be placed and maintained at the inlet and outlet of the established 8" driveway culvert.**

**Mitigation Measure #6 – During any future construction activities, a temporary sediment fence shall be constructed around the construction site. The fence should be constructed of certified weed free or rice straw bales and landscape fabric, and should be in place before the initiation of any ground moving activities. The fence shall be maintained throughout the construction period and may only be removed after the exposed soils on the site are stabilized with vegetation.**

**Mitigation Measure #10 – The applicant shall follow all of the recommendations included in the Preliminary Geologic Engineering Soils Report (dated November 1, 2010) and Grading & Erosion Control Plan (dated January 22, 2007) prepared for this project by Baird Engineering & Surveying.**

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>20. WILDFIRE.</b> If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**20: WILDFIRE: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**Finding:** The project **will not** substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; nor will the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors. The project **will not** 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 result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment that are significant. The project **will not** 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.

**Discussion:** The project involves permitting of a new residence on a property with a history of residential development and occupancy. Access to the property is provided via Briceland-Thorne Road, a public county maintained road meeting state and local requirements for emergency access. An existing driveway provides access to interior portions of the property, including the site of the new unpermitted home. According to the Fire Hazard map, the parcel is located within a moderate fire hazard area. CALFIRE recommended approval of the proposed project subject to the standard conditions for development in the State Responsibility Area for Fire Protection (SRA). These include proper emergency water supply storage and a turnaround along the driveway and locating all structures more than 30 feet from any property line. The applicant has secured an easement from a neighboring property owner to provide for the use of the existing driveway and access route to the unpermitted residence. As these areas are under the use and control of the applicant, they meet the requirements for consideration as "defensible space", and provide for an appropriate buffer between the residence, garage, and areas which may be developed by the neighboring landowner. For these reasons, the Planning Division expects that the project will not result in significant impacts in terms of hazardous materials.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 21: MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: NO IMPACT, LESS THAN SIGNIF. IMPACT

**Finding:** The mitigation measures proposed for the project will help insure that it has a less than significant 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. Nor will it 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). The project does not have the potential to have significant environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

**Discussion:** The new single-family residence, garage/shop, and driveway extension are situated within an "Unclassified"-zoned parcel which is planned for Agricultural and associated residential development. The property has been host to prior residential development since approximately 1959. As proposed and subject to the Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures identified, staff finds no evidence that the proposed project will significantly degrade the quality of the environment, nor will it have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Based on the project as described in the administrative record, comments from reviewing agencies, a review of the applicable regulations, and discussed herein, the Department finds there is no substantial evidence to indicate the proposed project (as mitigated) will result in significant impacts.

## 22. DISCUSSION OF MITIGATION MEASURES, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM

### ***Mitigation Measures, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP)***

**All mitigation measures are required to mitigate impacts from the proposed reduction of the streamside management area setback.**

**Mitigation Measure 1.** To reduce the potential for erosion, the project will put down six inches of crushed rock with a crowned running surface along the length of the driveway and small driveway leading to the existing pump station.

**Timing for Implementation/Compliance:** prior to occupancy of dwelling

**Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:** Applicant / Humboldt County Planning & Building Department (HCP&BD)

**Monitoring Frequency:** One time.

**Evidence of Compliance:** Inspection by Building Inspector / DFW (if 1600 permit required)

**Mitigation Measure 2.** To reduce potential for suspended sediment entering Redwood Creek during surface water runoff events, all non-woody vegetation within the inboard ditch of the driveway shall be retained. Grading of this area or removal of non-wood vegetation is prohibited.

**Timing for Implementation/Compliance:** prior to occupancy of dwelling

**Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:** Applicant / Humboldt County Planning & Building Department (HCP&BD)

**Monitoring Frequency:** One time.

**Evidence of Compliance:** Inspection by Building Inspector / DFW (if 1600 permit required)

**Mitigation Measure 3.** Geo-fabric and a well sorted matrix of crushed angular rock shall be placed and maintained at the inlet and outlet of the established 8" driveway culvert.

**Timing for Implementation/Compliance:** prior to occupancy of dwelling

**Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:** Applicant / Humboldt County Planning & Building Department (HCP&BD)

**Monitoring Frequency:** One time.

**Evidence of Compliance:** Observation of installation of rock armoring at culvert inlet/outlet during construction inspections.

**Mitigation Measure 4.** Douglas-fir shall be planted in 10 foot by 10 foot spacing within all areas delineated on the map included with the Riparian and Stream Assessment report prepared by Keith Hess of DRW Environmental Consulting. To provide immediate stabilization of the topsoil layer in and around riparian zones, native grass seed mix shall be applied in any areas that are, or have been disturbed.

**Timing for Implementation/Compliance:** 5-years

**Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:** Applicant / Humboldt County Planning & Building Department (HCP&BD)

**Monitoring Frequency:** Annually.

**Evidence of Compliance:** The landowner will be responsible for monitoring and maintaining the establishment of the Douglas-fir within delineated areas. A survival rate of 80% shall be necessary for planted trees. Annual photographs shall be taken and submitted to the Planning Division and California Department of Fish & Wildlife prior to July 15, each year, for a 5-year period.

**Mitigation Measure 5.** Work shall be performed to re-establish vegetative cover and appropriate riparian species within the open area located northeast of the garage/shop near the northeast corner of the property. This area is also identified as "additional mitigation (e) clearing" on the revised plot plan submitted on December 10, 2018.

**Timing for Implementation/Compliance:** 5-years

**Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:** Applicant / Humboldt County Planning & Building Department (HCP&BD)

**Monitoring Frequency:** Annually.

**Evidence of Compliance:** The landowner will be responsible for monitoring and maintaining the establishment of riparian vegetation within the delineated area. A survival rate of 80% shall be necessary for planted trees. Annual photographs shall be taken and submitted to the Planning Division and California Department of Fish & Wildlife prior to July 15, each year, for a 5-year period.

**Mitigation Measure 6.** During any future construction activities, a temporary sediment fence shall be constructed around the construction site. The fence should be constructed of certified weed free or rice straw bales and landscape fabric, and should be in place before the initiation of any ground moving activities. The fence shall be maintained throughout the construction period and may only be removed after the exposed soils on the site are stabilized with vegetation.

**Timing for Implementation/Compliance:** During future construction activities

**Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:** Applicant / Building Inspector - Humboldt County Building Division

**Monitoring Frequency:** Verification to occur periodically during construction inspections

**Evidence of Compliance:** Observation of fence installation during construction inspections. The fence shall be maintained throughout the construction period and may only be removed after the exposed soils on the site are stabilized with vegetation.

**Mitigation Measure 7.** To help promote the recovery and re-colonization by native plant species, all Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*) shall be removed from the defined riparian zone.

**Timing for Implementation/Compliance:** During future construction activities

**Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:** Applicant / Humboldt County Planning & Building Department (HCP&BD)

**Monitoring Frequency:** Verification to occur periodically during construction inspections

**Evidence of Compliance:** Removal will be monitored for a 5-year period. Re-sprouts shall be removed annually to insure the long-term success of this eradication effort.

**Mitigation Measure 8.** The small (garbage shed) structure location within the Streamside Management Area (SMA) will be removed as depicted on the site map.

**Timing for Implementation/Compliance:** During or prior to issuance of the Building Permit

**Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:** Applicant / Building Inspector - Humboldt County Building Division

**Monitoring Frequency:** Verification to occur during construction inspections

**Evidence of Compliance:** Removal of the structure

**Mitigation Measure 9.** Each year, between July 15th and November 1st, the property owner and/or occupants of the property shall cease use of the well or withdrawal of water from Redwood Creek. Only previously stored water or water from captured rainfall may be used during this period. A water meter or other type of gauge shall be installed where tanked water enters the home's plumbing system.

**Timing for Implementation/Compliance:** prior to occupancy of dwelling

**Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:** Applicant / Humboldt County Planning & Building Department (HCP&BD)

**Monitoring Frequency:** 5-years

**Evidence of Compliance:** Following re-occupancy of the residence, prior to July 1<sup>st</sup> of each year, the applicant or owner shall provide a report detailing domestic water use during the forbearance period. The report shall include information from the home's water meter / gauge. If records demonstrate that the total volume of stored water was depleted by domestic use prior to the end of the forbearance period, additional water storage shall be installed in one or more of the pre-permitted additional tank locations identified on the revised plot plan submitted December 10, 2018. Reports shall be submitted for a minimum of 5 years or until there have been 5 consecutive years where stored water was sufficient to provide for domestic use during the forbearance period, whichever is longer.

**Mitigation Measure 10.** The applicant shall follow all of the recommendations included in the Preliminary Geologic Engineering Soils Report (dated November 1, 2010) and Grading & Erosion Control Plan (dated January 22, 2007) prepared for this project by Baird Engineering & Surveying.

**Timing for Implementation/Compliance:** During future construction activities

**Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:** Applicant / Building Inspector - Humboldt County Building Division

**Monitoring Frequency:** Verification to occur periodically during construction inspections

**Evidence of Compliance:** Implementation during after-the-fact Building Permit inspections.

### 23. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 16063(c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

a) Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

No earlier analysis used.

b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measure based on the earlier analysis.

See 23(a) above

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

See MMRP under 22 above

**SOURCE/REFERENCE LIST:** The following documents were used in the preparation of this Initial Study. The documents are available for review at the Humboldt County Planning & Building Department during regular business hours.

County of Humboldt, Planning & Building Department (December 2017). *Humboldt County General Plan*. HCPD.

DRW Environmental Consulting (July 2010). *Riparian & Stream Assessment for Wendy Fetzer*, Eureka:DRW.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (July 19, 1982). "FIRM Flood Insurance Rate Map: Humboldt County, California (Unincorporated Areas), Panel 825 of 1900, Community Panel Number 060060 0825 B." NR:FEMA, National Flood Insurance Program.

Baird Engineering & Surveying (November 2010). *R-2 Preliminary Geologic Engineering Soils Report*. Fortuna:Baird.

Baird Engineering & Surveying (January 2007). *Grading & Erosion Control Plan*, Fortuna:Baird.

Humboldt County Public Health - Environmental Health Division [DEH] (September 2013). *On-site Septic Suitability Test Results*. Eureka:DEH.

