

Meeting with Humboldt County Community Development Services and Public Works Staff and  
Department of Fish and Game, and North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Staff.  
Humboldt County Community Development Conference Room  
**November 7, 2008, 9am -12Noon**

Notes by Adona White, modified by Gordon Leppig

**Staff Present:**

DFG: Gordon Leppig, Bill Condon, Scott Bauer, Jane Arnold, Michael van Hattem

Regional Water Board: Adona White, Mark Neely, Mona Dougherty

Humboldt County: Andrew Bundschuh, Hank Seamann, Tom Mattson, Michael Wheeler, Michael Richardson (first part), Bob Bronkall, Tom Hofweber (second part)

**Visions for meeting:**

- Mutual understanding of issues
- Optimize DFG /County cooperation and coordination to expedite project review and permitting
- Help in figuring appropriate mitigation measures for GPU. Could include policy, implementation programs, or standards (via zoning ordinance or public works)
- Identify opportunities coincident in TMDLs, Phase II stormwater, and GPU

**Status Report on GPU (Michael Richardson)**

- Completed the water resources element, received some planning commission comments, some limited comments
- November 20 Planning Commission meeting:
  - Staff will provide 1) revised GP incorporating comments received, 2) description of changes based on comments, 3) a decision making guide.
  - This meeting will begin a 60 comment period ending in January
- EIR will be released on the draft 1-2 months later. Studies are still ongoing, (including transportation). Iteration between EIR/GPU – as policies are identified, may need more measures to reduce impacts. The county is relying on this group to identify feasible mitigation measures.
- Public Works is commenting on GPU in the context of cost to the public, policies that may be in conflict (e.g. traffic circulation in wetland and coastal areas), and necessary mitigations.

**Cumulatively Considerable Impacts CEQA 15065(a)(3) (Gordon Leppig)**

- DFG believes if future development occurs under the GPU without major improvements to water quality and riparian protections, there may be substantial evidence that in certain watersheds, such as Martin and Ryan Creeks, cumulatively considerable impacts to aquatic resources and listed species will result.

**Water Rights (Jane Arnold)**

- Many streams do not have enough water to meet current uses and protect aquatic species
- 1600 agreements are needed before building permits are issued.
- In rural homes with surface water usage, summer water storage is needed
- Need water availability analyses to avoid take of listed species
- **County requests help with techniques to develop water budgets (Tom Hofweber)**
- **DFG will submit water budget ideas and suggestions**

**TPZ issues**

- CDF just issued letter saying that 2<sup>nd</sup> units are not allowed
- County could require “ranch plans” to address timber, resources, water, and NPS considerations

- County could use comments of support

### **Phase II Stormwater (Mona Dougherty)**

1. Urbanized areas outside Eureka meet criteria for phase II designation
  - a. No SWMP prepared – RB1 will designate. Rapidly urbanizing is defined in the census and the stormwater permit. RB has discretion.
  - b. Post-construction BMPs needed on all new development
  - c. LID and hydromodification BMPs
  - d. Flooding protection
  - e. Look for opportunities to retrofit – possibly as offset projects
2. Humboldt Hill and other areas in Hum Co undergoing development
  - a. Constructing and maintaining post-construction BMPs and LID may keep these areas out of phase II designation in the future
3. LID resolutions from State Water Board and Ocean Protection Commission
4. New Phase II permit in 2009
  - a. LID and hydromodification analyses and BMPs will be included in new permit
  - b. More rigorous post-construction program
  - c. Tracking and maintenance program for post-construction BMPs – consider public-private partnerships and fee structures.
  - d. Regional Water Board may designate additional areas of Hum Co
5. RB assistance can include grants, SEPs, trainings.

Discussion: It would be helpful to the county to have quantitative detention standards for intensity, duration, time period. LID encourages small distributed systems and mimicking the shape of the hydrograph, not just the peak. RB may expect a Cutten program to be in place in 3-6 months. If crafted right, the Phase II program for Martin Slough and Ryan Slough could meet TMDL implementation requirements.

### **Wetland and Riparian Setbacks**

- Streamside Management Area (SMA) specifications are insufficient to protect aquatic resources.
- DFG believes current SMA buffers will result in further habitat loss and degradation and are an impediment to timely and efficient permitting and project review.
- DFG has provided recommendations regarding SMA setbacks that would be protective of listed species and aquatic habitats. DFG SMA Recommendations are not included in current GPU draft.
- County staff requests further clarification for basis for DFG recommendations and more scientific references.
- Mapping of existing riparian areas in the urban zones maintains degraded conditions.
- County concerned over taking of property.
- DFG believes current wetland setbacks are unclear and ambiguous.
- Are wetland setbacks equal in distance to SMA setbacks? Appears to be so.
- **Mark Neely will send language for Sonoma County wetland set-backs to Hum Co staff.**

### **RB and DFG comments to the County**

- **County staff will schedule a DFG/RB study session with the Planning Commission to convey our comments and concerns in person.**
- **DFG will submit informal comments on Water Resources Draft Chapter as soon as possible.**
- **RB and DFG will submit comments on draft GPU during the 60-day comment period.**

### **Greenbelts, Community Forests, Regional and Watershed Planning Approaches**

DFG (and many stakeholders) has a strong interest in supporting the County in these endeavors.