

Project Information

Project Title: Sun Ocean West Manufactured Home Park Expansion

Lead Agency

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

Property Owner

Ocean West Holdings Llc Co
27777 Franklin Road
Southfield MI 48034

Project Applicant

Same as owner

Project Location

The project is located in Humboldt County, in the McKinleyville area, on the south side of Murray Road, approximately 790 feet west from the intersection of McKinleyville Avenue and Murray Road, on the property known as 1000 and 1010 Murray Road and the property know to be in the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 31, Township 07 North, Range 01 East.

General Plan Designation

(CS,AP) Commercial Services (CS), Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone (AP), Density: N/A; (RL1-7,AP) Residential/Low Density (RL1-7), Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone (AP), Density: 1 to 7 dwelling units per acre; (RM,AP) Residential/Medium Density (RM), Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone (AP), Density: 7 to 30 dwelling units per acre; Slope Stability: Relatively Stable (0)

Zoning

(C-1-AP-N-WR) Neighborhood Commercial (C-1), Airport Safety Review (AP), Noise Impact (N), Streamside Management Areas and Wetlands (WR); (R-3-D-AP-N-WR) Residential Multiple Family (R-3), Design Control (D), Airport Safety Review (AP), Noise Impact (N), Streamside Management Areas and Wetlands (WR); (R-1-N) Residential One-Family (R-1), Noise Impact (N).

Project Description

Proposed expansion of Ocean West Manufactured Home Park.

REQUIRED PERMITS: Conditional Use Permit, Special Permit and previously approved Lot Merger for expansion of Ocean West Manufactured Home Park (hereafter referred to as. The Lot Merger portion of the proposed project consists of the merging of two vacant 4.5 acre and 0.57-acre parcels into the 25.33 acre developed manufactured home park for a total of 30.4 acres. The merger would allow for the expansion of 35 spaces for a total of 160 units. The Conditional Use Permit is required to operate a manufactured home park in the C-1 Neighborhood Commercial zoning district. There is a previously approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP-37-77) for the existing 25.33-acre portion of Ocean West. The Special Permit is required for development within the Streamside Management Area (SMA) protective buffer of Widow White Creek, resulting in temporary and permanent impacts to the riparian habitat and associated wetlands.

INTERNAL CIRCULATION: A new access road into the expansion area and streets inside the expansion areas are privately owned and would be paved with a permeable surface. A maintenance plan will be required.

TREE REMOVAL: A total of 29 trees are proposed for removal along Widow White Creek. Eleven trees proposed for removal are due to the new access road, and 18 trees proposed for removal are for implementing restoration and enhancement of the riparian habitat. Twenty-eight of the trees are non-native and unhealthy. The one native proposed for removal (red alder) is also in an unhealthy state of condition.

GRADING/EXCAVATING: The project proposes approximately 10,500 cubic yards grading for the internal circulation of the expansion area which includes a new access road and streets. MS4/LID requirements will involve stormwater retention basins. Manufactured homes will be placed on 30 new pads. A final erosion/sediment control plan, hydrology and drainage plan will be required before grading permit is issued.

UTILITIES: Domestic use water and sanitation is provided to the property from the McKinleyville Community Services District.

EMERGENCY ACCESS: Emergency vehicle ingress and egress is through the main entrance of the park off of Murray Road and a new point of ingress/egress will be established off of McKinleyville Avenue at the intersection of Creekside Drive.

Baseline Conditions: Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The proposed expansion comprises two areas: 1) a 4.5-acre parcel located in between State Highway 101 and the western boundary of the established portion of the Manufactured Home Park with Murray Road boarding on the north; 2) the second area is a 0.57-acre parcel located in between the eastern boundary and McKinleyville Avenue.

Land uses adjacent to the 4.5-acre parcel consist of a mix of Neighborhood Commercial (C-1) and Residential Multiple Family (R-3). C-1 zoning comprises uses that provide convenient sales and service facilities to residential neighborhoods. The R-3 zoning is intended for low density apartment development with a density range of 1-7 units per acre and a maximum floor area ratio of 1.0. The 4.5-acre expansion area is situated at a 97-foot elevation above mean sea level in the Widow White Creek drainage system. The 0.57-acre expansion area is zoned Neighborhood Commercial (C-1) and manufactured home parks require a Conditional Use Permit. Adjacent zoning and land uses include Residential Multiple Family (R-3), Neighborhood Commercial (C-1), and Single Family Residential (R-1). The terrain is flat and is approximately 97-feet above sea level. This portion of the expansion has no environmental constraints.

The proposed project involves the expansion of a manufactured park constrained by the Streamside Management Area (SMA) of Widow White Creek, a class 1 perennial stream that flows into Norton Creek which flows into the Mad River near its confluence with the Pacific Ocean. Widow White Creek has been impacted by surrounding development and the natural conditions along the stream course have been completely altered or eliminated. Historically, Widow White Creek has been habitat to the Federally Threatened Coast Cutthroat Trout but due to impacts of surrounding development, their presence in Widow White Creek has not been documented within the last 40 years (CNDDDB).

Figure 5 of the McKinleyville Community Plan (MCCP) identifies the project location to be within the Urban Development Area and defines the Streamside Management Area (SMA) within the Urban Development Areas as the outer boundaries for streams comprising 50 feet measured as a horizontal distance from the stream transition line on either side of perennial streams (MCCP p. 47). Further, MCCP page 49 defines Wetland Areas as one parameter and Wetland Buffers as the area around a wetland where restrictions on development are required to protect the wetland from significant impact, as mapped or as identified through the Open Space Implementation Standards, or as identified through the CEQA process. For the purposes of this project, the wetland protective buffer has been identified as 50 feet.

Within the expansion area, both west and east sides of Widow White Creek are associated with approximately one (1) acre of riparian vegetation and conifers, also known as the Streamside Management Area (SMA). The SMA is dominated by non-native planted trees and shrubs, non-native herbaceous species with low cover reflecting past disturbance and shaded conditions. The west side of the creek has approximately 4,228 square feet of one (1) and three (3) parameter wetland located within the SMA. The wetland and riparian habitat on the west side of the creek has been degraded due to the adjacent development of Ocean West and the installation of landscaping that stretches to the stream transition line. The McKinleyville Community Plan defines the Stream Transition Line as that line closest to a stream where riparian vegetation is permanently established. This area has been either eliminated or altered significantly with landscaping and walking paths.

The vacant 0.57-acre parcel comprises grassland and bounded on the north by a recently constructed commercial retail establishment and the western and southern boundaries of this parcel are adjacent to the developed Ocean West Park. Adjacent to the east is McKinleyville Avenue, a two-lane collector street and McKinleyville High School

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is or May Be Required (permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Humboldt County Public Works, Building Inspection Division, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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

Tricia Shortridge, Planner II
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. **N/A**
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addresses. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyze in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis. **N/A**
 - 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. **N/A**
- 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 identifies:
 - 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 Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion</p> <p>(a-d) Less Than Significant Impact: The project parcels are both located within an urbanized area and not located within a mapped or designated scenic highway, corridor, or viewshed. The proposed expansion infills a parcel planned and zoned for the proposed use. There are 29 trees slated for removal for construction of the access road, but many are either diseased or dying or are a non-native species. New trees will be planted as part of the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan discussed in the Biological Resources section of this document. During grading and construction activities there may be temporary impacts on aesthetics due to the presence of construction activities and equipment on the project site. Other than the temporary negligible impacts discussed, there is no evidence to suggest that the expansion of the manufactured home park will result in permanent aesthetic impacts detectable beyond the boundaries of the property.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conservation of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>(a-e) No Impact: The project involves redevelopment and infill of an existing parcel zoned Neighborhood Commercial (C-1). General Agriculture is not a permitted use within C-1 zoning. The site is not or never has been designated as unique farmland or farmland of statewide significance, nor are there any intensive agricultural uses in the immediate vicinity. According to NRCS mapping, neither the project parcel or any others in the vicinity contain prime agricultural soils. The entire property is surrounded by urban environment and is zoned for commercial uses (Manufactured home parks are allowed with a conditional use permit). The Department finds no evidence that the proposed project, will result in a significant impact on agricultural or forestry resources.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significant criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>(a-e) Less than Significant: The project site is located within the North Coast Air Basin and the jurisdiction of the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD). The North Coast Air Basin (NCAB) currently meets all federal air quality standards; however, the entire air basin is currently designated as non-attainment for the State 24-hour and annual average particulate matter smaller than 10 microns in size (PM10) standards. Both natural and anthropogenic sources of particulate matter (including vehicle emissions, dust, wildfire and residential wood burning stoves) in the NCAB have led to the PM10 non-attainment designation. To address this, the NCUAQMD adopted a Particulate Matter Attainment Plan in 1995. This plan presents available information about the nature and causes of PM10 standard exceedance, and identifies cost-effective control measures to reduce PM10 emissions, to levels necessary to meet California Ambient Air Quality Standards. These include transportation measures (e.g., public transit, ridesharing, vehicle buy-back programs, traffic flow improvements, bicycle incentives, etc.), land use measures (infill development, concentration of higher density adjacent to highways, etc.), and combustion measures (open burning limitations, hearth/wood burning stove limitations; NCUAQMD 1995).</p> <p>The project would generate a minor amount of particulate emissions during construction and project operations, mainly in the form of vehicle emissions. The project would not substantially add to the level of PM10 or other emissions such that it would cause a cumulatively considerable net increase of pollutant emissions in the area. The proposed project is consistent with the planned build-out of the area and 30 space expansion would not: (1) obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; (2) violate air quality standards; (3) contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; (4) expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or (5) create objectionable odors.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

DISCUSSION:

(a, b, c, d, e) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Although suitable habitat exists within the project area for botanical species that are rare but not State or Federally listed, none were detected. The animal species survey revealed that there is moderate or high potential for occurrence within the project area. Birds with a moderate or high potential for occurrence within the project area are the sharp-shinned hawk, the Osprey, and the black-capped chickadee. None of these species are listed under the FESA or CESA and only the black-capped chickadee was observed in the project area. In terms of amphibians, the project area contains habitat for the northern red-legged frog (species of special concern, CDFW) although the potential for occurrence is low. The nearest Critical Habitat identified by USFWS is the Mad River in which is connected upstream. The County's GIS layer for the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) shows Widow White Creek as being habitat for Coast Cutthroat Trout (species of special concern, CDFW) although the potential for occurrence is low. The CNDDDB also lists the Western Snowy Plover a federally threatened and state species of special concern

as occurring nearby. However, the Natural Resources Assessment Report indicates that the site is located over 3,000 feet from the dunes adjacent to the Mad River and the potential for occurrence at the project site is none.

The proposed location of the access road to serve the park expansion requires conversion of approximately 3,231 sq. ft. of Streamside Management Area (SMA) which would involve permanent impacts to 82 sq. ft. of wetland, 3,006 sq. ft. of wetland buffer (50 ft. buffer). Most of the SMA is degraded with non-native invasive species, well maintained lawn, ornamental landscaping and gravel walking paths. The proposed location of the road would require placement of fill within a wetland resulting in 82 sq. ft. of permanent impacts to the wetland and conversion of 3,006 sq. ft. of wetland buffer.

The applicant provided a draft Riparian and Wetland Mitigation Plan, Revision 1 (January 2020) that indicates the impacts on the wetlands and SMA can be mitigated with appropriate design and construction techniques. The implementation of a Mitigation and Monitoring Plan which will involve 350 square feet of wetland restoration (equivalent to 4:1 mitigation), and 15,000 sq. ft. of riparian habitat restoration equivalent to almost 5:1 mitigation. Any adverse impacts to, or loss of, natural or constructed wetlands and their beneficial uses due to development and construction activities must be fully mitigated and permitted by the Regional Water Board.

(f) No Impact: 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.

In addition to mitigation measures in the Riparian and Wetland Mitigation Plan – Revision 1 prepared by SHN dated January 2020 (Mitigation Measure #10 below and included as Attachment 1), the McKinleyville Community Plan and Humboldt County Land Use and Development Code Chapter 4, Section 314-61.1 Streamside Management Area and Wetland Ordinance requires mitigations for development within the SMA and the protective wetland buffer zone, some of which are already included in the applicant's mitigation and monitoring plan. The following mitigations will be included in the Conditions of Approval and a revised Mitigation and Monitoring Plan for the project:

Mitigation Measure #1 – Retaining snags unless felling is required by CAL-OSHA, or by California Department of Forestry forest and fire protection regulations, or for public health and safety reasons, approved by the Planning and Building Director. Felled snags shall be left on the ground if consistent with fire protection regulations and the required treatment of slash or fuels.

Mitigation Measure #2 – Retain live trees with visible evidence of current or historical use as nesting sites by hawks, owls, eagles, osprey, herons, kites or egrets.

Mitigation Measure #3 – Any brush clearing or tree removal must be conducted outside of the bird breeding season (March 1 – August 15) in order to avoid a “take” as defined and prohibited by Fish and Game Code (FGC) §3503, 3503.5, 3513, and by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S. Code 703 *et seq.*). If any brush or trees must be removed within the breeding season, the Project proponent shall consult with CDFW prior to removal in order to assess the potential for take of active bird nests.

Mitigation Measure #4 - Replanting of disturbed areas with riparian vegetation (including alders, cottonwoods, willows, sitka spruce, etc.) if natural regeneration does not occur within two years of the completion of the development project.

Mitigation Measure #5 - Performing erosion control measures contained in the Sensitive and Critical Habitat Standards of the General Plan (Chapter 10 Standard BR-S9- Erosion Control).

Mitigation Measure #6 - Maximum feasible retention of overstory canopy in riparian corridors.

Mitigation Measure #7 – Project related noise levels should be minimized so that sound levels are below 50 decibels at a distance of 100 feet from the source.

Mitigation Measure #8 – High visibility construction fencing shall demarcate the boundaries of all Environmentally Sensitive Habitat prohibiting encroachment of construction work and equipment. Grading and development plans shall show the location of this fencing.

Mitigation Measure #9 – A second seasonally appropriate botanical and wildlife survey and impact analysis shall be conducted prior to finalization of project design. The project design shall be modified first to avoid special status species or second minimize impacts to special status species if avoidance is not possible. Should impacts occur to special status species, the applicant shall develop a mitigation and monitoring plan to be approved by the Department in consultation with CDFW.

Mitigation Measure #10 – Post development, implementation the approved Wetland and Riparian Mitigation Plan prepared by SHN dated January 2020. The plan proposes to restore 350 square feet of wetland habitat and 15,000 square feet of riparian woodland. Eighty-five percent (85%) survival rate of plantings and wild recruitment in both the restored wetland and the streamside management area. The plan includes annual monitoring reports with photo documentation submitted to the Planning Division and California Department of Fish & Wildlife prior to December 31, each year, for a 5-year period.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

(a) No Impact: No historical resources have been documented on site. The site is currently vacant but was previously developed and used as a mobilehome sales lot. Therefore, the project will have no impact on historical resources defined in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5.

(b and c) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The project was referred to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), the Blue Lake Rancheria, the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe. Although the response from the NWIC recommended a study, further consultation with the Blue Lake Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe recommended approval with no further study provided a note regarding inadvertent discovery is included in the project. If archaeological resources are encountered during construction activities, the contractor will execute Mitigation Measure No. 11. by halting construction and coordinating with a professional archaeologist, who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines and appropriate tribes so resources can be evaluated so that there is not a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. The project is not expected to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure No. 11 has been included in the event that human remains are accidentally discovered during construction.

Mitigation Measure #11- The following note shall be placed on the Grading or Development Plan and carried out through project implementation: "If suspected archaeological resources are encountered during the project: 1. Stop work within 100 feet of the find; 2. Call a professional archaeologist, the representatives from the Blue Lake Rancheria, Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe, the Calfire project representative (if applicable) and the County Planning and Building Department; 3. The professional historic resource consultant, Tribes and Calfire officials will coordinate and provide an assessment of the find and determine the significance and recommend next steps. "If human remains are encountered: 1. All work shall stop and per CA Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5: 2. Call the Humboldt County Coroner at (707) 445-7242; 3. The Coroner will determine if the remains are of prehistoric/historic Native American origin. If the remains are Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. 5. The NAHC is responsible under CA PRC 5097.98. (a) for identifying the most likely descendent (MLD) immediately and providing contact information. The MLD may, with the permission of the owner of the land, or his or her authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American human remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site."

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

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. ENERGY. 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"/>
Discussion:				
(a-b) Less Than Significant Impact: The project will result in short-term energy consumption during the construction phase, with long-term energy consumption associated with the ongoing occupancy of the 30 new manufactured home sites. The construction phase is not anticipated to utilize excessive energy and the homes will be manufactured off site to federal standards and installed in accordance with state and local requirements. Therefore, a less than significant impact will occur.				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a)i)-iv) and c) through f) No Impact. Based on the Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard maps from the California Department of Conservation, the project site is situated neither in an Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard special studies zone or any other potentially active fault zone. According to the County's Hazard Mitigation Map the property is shown not to be subject to liquefaction and of in an area of low instability. The site was previously graded for used as a manufactured home sales lot and is relatively flat, does not contain expansive soils and will be served by community waste water systems.

b) Less Than Significant Impact Only minimal grading will be required to develop the access roads and manufactured home pads. All grading work will be done in accordance with the Humboldt County Grading Ordinance and applicable Best Management Practices, including watering to control fugitive dust. The project is conditioned to comply with NCUAQMD fugitive dust emission standards.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>(a-b) Less Than Significant Impact: In 2002 the California legislature declared that global climate change was a matter of increasing concern for the state's public health and environment, and enacted law requiring the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to control GHG emissions from motor vehicles (Health & Safety Code §32018.5 et seq.). In 2006, the California Global Warming Solutions Act (Assembly Bill 32) definitively established the state's climate change policy and set GHG reduction targets (health & Safety Code §38500 et sec.), including setting a target of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 requires local governments to take an active role in addressing climate change and reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. While methodologies to inventory and quantify local GHG emissions are still being developed, recommendations to reduce residential GHG emissions include promoting energy efficiency in new development.</p> <p>The proposed project involves infill development of a 4.5-acre parcel and on 0.57-acre parcel to create 30 pads for future installation of manufactured homes. The eventual installation of premanufactured housing units on the home sites would contribute temporary, short-term increases in air pollution from equipment usage. Because of the temporary nature of the greenhouse gas contributions, coupled with the modest quantity of emission, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with applicable plan, policy, or regulation for the purposes of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Future residential use would emit limited greenhouse gases.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

(a-d, f and g) No Impact: The project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites, nor does the proposed manufactured home park expansion require or involve transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The Department of Environmental Health has recommended approval of the project. The site is within the Arcata Fire Protection District. Future development of the site will require compliance with the Uniform Fire Code and UBC. According to the Fire Hazard map, the parcel is located in a low fire hazard area. Arcata Fire Protection District approved the proposed project.

(e) Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is approximately 1 mile from the nearest airport and located within airport compatibility zone D, an area identified as having negligible risk and potential annoyance from overflights (Humboldt County General Plan table 14-A). A Deed Notice is required in addition to disclosure to prospective about the potential noise impacts related to overflight. In addition, conditions of approval for this project require that new manufactured homes shall be certified to limit interior noise levels to 45 dB CNEL-Ldn in all habitable rooms.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

(a, c, and e) Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated: Because the Ocean West Project would create and/or replace more than 5,000 square feet of impervious surface, this Project is required by the County's Storm Water Permit to implement site design measures to control the quality and volume of storm water runoff from the Project site. Before the County can issue a grading permit, the project is required to implement site design and stormwater treatment measures in accordance with the Humboldt County Low Impact Development Stormwater Manual and consistent with the County of Humboldt Stormwater Permit issued by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map, the new access road for the 4.5-acre expansion is partially located within the mapped 100-year flood plain (Flood Zone A). This means this portion of the property is expected to flood once every 100 years on average. The area of development within the flood zone is the access road where it intersects with Ocean West Drive. The remaining area is upland and this is where manufactured homes will be placed – this area is located in Zone X, which is defined as "areas of minimal flooding".

Prior to issuance of grading permits and approval of the development plan, the project will be required to submit a 401 Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. A preliminary drainage report was prepared and reviewed by Public Works and they recommended as a condition of approval that the applicant submit a complete hydraulic report and drainage plan for their approval. The applicant has proposed Low Impact Development techniques to comply with the State Water Board's Phase II Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Program. In addition, the project will comply with Section 3310.5 of the McKinleyville Community Plan which states: "Development shall only be allowed in such a manner that the downstream peak flows will not be increased." No streams, creeks or other waterways will be altered as a result of this subdivision. With Mitigation incorporated into the project design, the Department finds no evidence that the proposed project will result in significant hydrologic or water quality impacts.

(b and d) Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites, nor does the proposed manufactured home park expansion require or involve transport, use of or disposal of hazardous materials. There is minimal potential for impacts to parked automobiles to get caught up in a flood and leak gasoline because the manufactured homes will be placed outside the 100-year flood zone.

The project site is an area served by community water and sewer. The McKinleyville Community Services District (MCSD) has indicated that it is able to provide water and sewer service to the proposed manufactured home park expansion upon the payment of the appropriate fees. MCSD has not identified any concerns with regard to the project interfering with groundwater recharge.

Mitigation Measure #12- Grading Plans shall show optimization of the site layout in accordance with Stormwater Permit section. E 12.d and E.12.e. Source Control and Low Impact Development (LID) Design Standards pages 51-55 (attachment 2), and Humboldt County Low Impact Development Stormwater Manual Sections 5.0 and 6.0 (attachment 3)

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>(a-b) Less Than Significant Impact: Both expansion sites are located in General Plan land use designation Commercial Service (CS) and zoned Neighborhood Commercial (C-1). A Conditional Use Permit is required to operate a manufactured home park in the commercial zoning district. Both sites are surrounded by Neighborhood Commercial zoning and Residential Medium and Low-Density zoning. The neighborhood is characterized as urban residential. The proposed expansion of Ocean West infills an established development pattern, is consistent with the planned build-out of the area and is consistent with the policies and regulations specified in the McKinleyville Community Plan and the Humboldt County General Plan. There are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans proposed or adopted for this area. The creation of 30 spaces for the expansion of the manufactured home park is consistent with adjacent parcel's zoning and land use density. 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 Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

(a-b) No Impact: On-site soils and geologic resources are not suitable as commodity materials that would be of value to the region or the state. The site is not designated as an important mineral resource recovery site by a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. NOISE. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

(a-c) Less Than Significant Impact: This parcel is located within the Noise Impact combining zone due to the proximity to Highway 101. The parcel begins approximately 125 feet from Highway 101 and the EIR for the McKinleyville Community Plan established a distance of 525 feet from the noise source to be outside the area of concern. Given the proximity to the highway, the McKinleyville Community Plan requires barriers to be installed between the site and prominent noise sources to make the outdoor environment tolerable. A sound wall along the western boundary of the property has been incorporated into the project design. Noises generated by the proposed project will result in a temporary increase during construction because the proposed project may require the use of heavy equipment (excavator, grader, loader and backhoe). The construction does not include equipment that would result in ground borne vibration. The project area is approximately 1 mile from the California Redwood Coast – Humboldt County Airport and located within compatibility Zone D. Noise impacts associated with the airport are not anticipated to be excessive, however, a condition of approval will require the property owner to disclose to all prospective park tenants that there is potential for some overflight noise.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14: POPULATION AND HOUSING. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: (a, b) Less Than Significant Impact. Medium Density single-family residential uses is a compatible use within the plan designation, zoning district and surrounding land uses and zones. 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 Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: (a-e) Less Than Significant: Ingress and egress from Ocean West is from two locations off of Murray Road and McKinleyville Avenue. The individual manufactured homes will be accessed via private road network inside Ocean West. The Arcata Fire Protection District did not identify any fire protection issues – both entrances/exits are adequate for emergency response. The Department finds no evidence that the project will result in a significant adverse impact on public services.				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>(a-b) Less Than Significant Impact: The project is required to provide onsite recreation areas. Humboldt County Zoning Ordinance section 314-107 requires a minimum of 1,500 square feet of recreation area per acre of manufactured home park. The previously approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP-37-77) required the construction of a rec building. The Department finds no evidence that the project will require construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. TRANSPORTATION. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

(a-d) Less Than Significant Impact: The Ocean West property is accessed by Murray Road and McKinleyville Avenue. Conditions of approval for the final project design will require that both permanent points of ingress and egress meet the requirements of the Humboldt County Zoning Ordinance Section 314-107.1 for ingress/egress and internal circulation of the Park's private road system.

The Department finds there is no evidence that the project will exceed the level of service standard, will result in a change in air traffic patterns, will result in vehicle miles traveled beyond that expected, will result in inadequate emergency access, inadequate access to nearby uses or inadequate parking capacity; or will conflict with adopted policies supporting transportation. The project site is approximately 1.5 miles south of the California Redwood Coast – Humboldt County Airport, the closest airport.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: 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"/>

Discussion:

(a-b) Less Than Significant Impact: The project was referred to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), the Blue Lake Rancheria, the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe. Although the response from the NWIC recommended a study, further consultation with the Blue Lake Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe recommended approval with no further study provided a note regarding inadvertent discovery is included in the project. The standard condition of inadvertent discovery has been included as Mitigation Measure No. 11.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. 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"/>
Discussion:				
<p>(a-e) Less than significant: 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 impact to utilities and service systems. The parcel is zoned for commercial uses where a manufactured home park is permitted with a Conditional Use Permit. The 30 additional manufactured homes will be individually served by community water and sewer provided by the McKinleyville Community Services District who has recommended approval of the project.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
20. WILDFIRE. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
(a-d) Less than significant: The project is located within the urbanized area of McKinleyville and the Local Responsibility Area (LRA) for fire protection and served by the Arcata Fire Protection District. State responsibility lands are located approximately one-half mile to the east in which a half mile of the SRA spanning eastward is located within the Urban Expansion Area. The Department finds the project impact to be less than significant.				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

(a -b) Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated: The mitigation measures proposed and required for the project will help ensure 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). Mitigation measures consistent with the County's Stormwater Permit and the Humboldt Low Impact Development Stormwater Manual will be included in the final project design grading and development plans. The outcome will result in compliance with the McKinleyville Community Plan of no increase of downstream flows and compliance with the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board MS4 Program. The Division of Public Works reviewed the Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan and determined that the applicant will be required to provide a complete hydraulic report and drainage plan. The Department finds the project impacts to be less than significant with the proposed mitigation.

(c) Less Than Significant Impact: 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.

Proposed Mitigation Measures, Monitoring, and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure #1 – Retaining snags unless felling is required by CAL-OSHA, or by California Department of Forestry forest and fire protection regulations, or for public health and safety reasons, approved by the Planning and Building Director. Felled snags shall be left on the ground if consistent with fire protection regulations and the required treatment of slash or fuels.

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Throughout project construction

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning and Building

Monitoring Frequency: Throughout construction

Evidence of Compliance: Visible evidence

Mitigation Measure #2 – Retain live trees with visible evidence of current or historical use as nesting sites by hawks, owls, eagles, osprey, herons, kites or egrets.

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Throughout project construction

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning and Building

Monitoring Frequency: Throughout construction

Evidence of Compliance: Visible evidence

Mitigation Measure #3 – Any brush clearing or tree removal must be conducted outside of the bird breeding season (March 1 – August 15) in order to avoid a “take” as defined and prohibited by Fish and Game Code (FGC) §3503, 3503.5, 3513, and by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S. Code 703 *et seq.*). If any brush or trees must be removed within the breeding season, the Project proponent shall consult with CDFW prior to removal in order to assess the potential for take of active bird nests. The Grading and Development Plan shall include the following language: “Tree removal and vegetation clearing associated with the Project should be conducted outside of the bird breeding season (the nesting season is generally considered to be March 1 – August 15) in order to avoid ‘take’ as defined and prohibited by Fish and Game Code (FGC) §3503, 3503.5, 3513, and by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S. Code 703 *et seq.*). If work must be conducted during the bird nesting season, a qualified ornithologist (someone who is able to identify Northern California birds, and who has experience in nest-searching for passerines and raptors) should thoroughly survey the area no more than seven days prior to tree/vegetation removal to determine whether active nests (nests containing eggs or nestlings) are present. If active nests are found, appropriate buffers should be developed in consultation with CDFW to avoid take.”

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Prior to tree removal or vegetation clearing

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning and Building/CDFW

Monitoring Frequency: Throughout construction

Evidence of Compliance: Visible evidence

Mitigation Measure #4 - Replanting of disturbed areas with riparian vegetation (including alders, cottonwoods, willows, sitka spruce, etc.) if natural regeneration does not occur within two years of the completion of the development project.

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Throughout project construction

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning and Building

Monitoring Frequency: Throughout construction

Evidence of Compliance: Visible evidence

Mitigation Measure #5 - Performing erosion control measures contained in the Sensitive and Critical Habitat Standards of the General Plan (Chapter 10 Standard BR-S9- Erosion Control).

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Throughout project construction

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning and Building

Monitoring Frequency: Throughout construction

Evidence of Compliance: Visible evidence

Mitigation Measure #6 - Maximum feasible retention of overstory canopy in riparian corridors.

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Throughout project construction

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning and Building

Monitoring Frequency: Throughout construction

Evidence of Compliance: Visible evidence

Mitigation Measure #7 – Project construction related noise levels shall be minimized so that sound levels are below 50 decibels at 100 feet from the source.

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Throughout project construction

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning and Building

Monitoring Frequency: Throughout construction

Evidence of Compliance: Audible evidence

Mitigation Measure #8 – High visibility construction fencing shall demarcate the boundaries of all Environmentally Sensitive Habitat prohibiting encroachment of construction work and equipment. Grading and development plans shall show the location of this fencing.

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Throughout project construction

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning and Building

Monitoring Frequency: Throughout construction

Evidence of Compliance: Visible evidence

Mitigation Measure #9 – A second seasonally appropriate botanical and wildlife survey and impact analysis shall be conducted prior to finalization of project design, issuance of grading permit and approval of development plan. The project design shall be modified first to avoid special status species or second minimize impacts to special status species if avoidance is not possible. Should impacts occur to special status species, the applicant shall develop a mitigation and monitoring plan to be approved by the Department in consultation with CDFW.

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Prior to commencement of vegetation removal or grading

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning and Building/CDFW

Monitoring Frequency: Throughout construction

Evidence of Compliance: Letter report

Mitigation Measure #10 – Post development, implementation the approved Wetland and Riparian Mitigation Plan prepared by SHN dated January 2020. The plan proposes to restore 350 square feet of wetland habitat and 15,000 square feet of riparian woodland. Eighty-five percent (85%) survival rate of plantings and wild recruitment in both the restored wetland and the streamside management area. The plan includes annual monitoring reports with photo documentation submitted to the Planning Division and California Department of Fish & Wildlife prior to December 31, each year, for a 5-year period.

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Post-construction

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning and Building/CDFW

Monitoring Frequency: As per Wetland and Riparian Mitigation Plan

Evidence of Compliance: Annual monitoring reports

Mitigation Measure #11- The following note shall be placed on the Grading or Development Plan and carried out through project implementation: "If suspected archaeological resources are encountered during the project: 1. Stop work within 100 feet of the find; 2. Call a professional archaeologist, the representatives from the Blue Lake Rancheria, Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria and the Wiyot Tribe, the Calfire project representative (if applicable) and the County Planning and Building Department; 3. The professional historic resource consultant, Tribes and Calfire officials will coordinate and provide an assessment of the find and determine the significance and recommend next steps.

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

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

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Prior to initiation of grading or other ground disturbing activity

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning & Building Department in consultation with Native American tribes.

Monitoring Frequency: Throughout construction

Evidence of Compliance: Suspension of work and notification to County and Tribal representatives if cultural resources are encountered,

Mitigation Measure #12- Grading Plans shall show optimization of the site layout in accordance with Stormwater Permit section. E 12.d and E.12.e. Source Control and Low Impact Development (LID) Design Standards pages 51-55 (attachment 2), and Humboldt County Low Impact Development Stormwater Manual Sections 5.0 and 6.0 (attachment 3)

Timing for Implementation/Compliance: Prior to initiation of grading or other ground disturbing activity

Responsible Party for Implementation: Applicant and successors

Person/Agency Responsible for Enforcement: Humboldt County Planning and Building and Public Works Land Use Division

Monitoring Frequency: Throughout construction

Evidence of Compliance: Issued Grading and MS4 Permit

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*.

County of Humboldt, Planning and Building Department (up to date). *Humboldt County Land Use and Development Code, Division I*

State Water Resources Control Board (February 2013). *Water Quality Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ, Waste Discharge Requirements for Storm Water Discharges From Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (County of Humboldt Stormwater Permit)*

SHN (June 2018). *Natural Resources Assessment, for Sun Communities, Inc.*

SHN (July 2018). *Wetland and Other Waters Delineation Report, for Sun Communities, Inc.*

SHN (January 2019). *One-Parameter Wetland and Other Waters Delineation Report, for Sun Communities, Inc.*

SHN (January 2020). *Riparian and Wetland Mitigation Plan – Revision 1, for Sun Communities, Inc.*