Humboldt County General Plan Update process

Presentation format –
- What is the proposed Project?
- CEQA review obligations (Counsel)
- DEIR Process review recommendations
- Overview of DEIR format (Chapters 1 & 2)
- Discussion on Impacts, General Plan response and proposed mitigation measures (Chapter 3)
- Introduction to the Climate Action Plan
- Comparison of Plan Alternatives (Chapter 4)
- Other CEQA consideration (Chapter 5)
Proposed Project –

- Planning Commission Approved Draft Plan -
- Changes from the Planning Commission Hearing Draft Plan posted November, 2008
- Posted March 19, 2012
- Records the Commission recommended changes (additions, deletions and split votes)
- Analyzed in the DEIR
Where to find the documents?

- County Website – plan update.org
- CDS office (3015 H Street, Eureka)
  - Digital copies
- Pigment Press, Redway
- Kinko’s in Eureka
- County Libraries
  - Main Eureka library
  - Garberville library
  - Willow Creek library
Welcome

Welcome to the Humboldt County General Plan Update web site. If this is your first visit, you might be interested to know what types of information you can find here:

- The Planning Commission has finished their review of the Draft General Plan and will be meeting to review the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Look here for their current agenda.
- The proposed staff reports and meeting materials are captured not only in the public meetings sector but the final recommendations on the draft General Plan can be found in the Tenative Planning Commission Comparison charts. Other related materials can be found in the documents section.
- The public meetings section provides schedules and information about Hearings before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as well as community workshops.
- The plan overview section contains an explanation of the General Plan, the update process, public participation guidelines, and a timeline which estimates the remaining phases of the update process.

What's New!

- The Draft Environmental Impact Report is now available for review!
- The Planning Commission Approved General Plan is now available for review!
- Revisions to the Housing Element were adopted August 29, 2010. Keep track of the County’s progress on its implementation through the Housing Element home page.
- You can now view past Planning Commission and Board meetings online! To check if the meeting
DEIR

- County Counsel presentation on CEQA review obligations
DEIR

Planning Commission
- Review, Consider and Comment
- Standards of Significance and Impact Findings

Board of Supervisors
- Certify:
  - Review and Consider
  - Final EIR is Adequate
  - Findings are made for significant effects
DEIR Process

Planning Commission
■ Review, Consider and Comment
Board of Supervisors
■ Review DEIR Comments
■ Vote on Policy, Standards and Implementation Measures
■ Evaluate Need for Recirculation
■ Prepare Final EIR
■ Certify
DEIR

DEIR review timeline:
- April 19, 2012  
  PC Workshop
- May 10, 2012  
  PC Public Hearing
- May 17, 2012  
  PC Public Hearing
- June 12, 2012  
  Board of Supervisors Introductory meeting
- June 15, 2012  
  Public Comments Due
- June 18, 2012  
  Board of Supervisors GP Policy Hearing
DEIR – Document Format

- Chapter 1 – Introduction
- Chapter 2 – Project Description
- Chapter 3 – Environmental Setting & Impacts
  - Impact Analysis
  - General Plan Response
  - Proposed Mitigation
- Chapter 4 – Evaluation of the Alternatives
- Chapter 5 – Other CEQA Considerations
- Appendices
Chapter 1 – Introduction to DEIR

- Describes the purpose of the DEIR, where to submit comments, timeline
- Describes “impact” determination terminology
- Describes what an EIR is, the scoping process, how the documented is organized
- Summary of the project, location and areas of known controversy
- Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measure
  - Table 1-2
Chapter 2 – Project Description

- Describes the General Plan Update, and the purpose and objectives of the project
- Expanded description of the project setting
  - Guiding Principles
- State Requirements
  - Required and Optional Elements
- Background on the existing Plan and the GPU review process
- Description of the Proposed Project
Chapter 2 – Proposed Project

- Chapter by Chapter description of the organization of the Plan
- Description of the Plan Buildout Potential
  - Maximum Development Scenario
  - Expected Buildout
  - Potential Buildout in Table 2-1
- Summary of countywide mapping changes
- Required project approvals (who and how)
Chapter 3 – Environmental Impacts

Overview of Chapter presentation:
- Environmental Setting
- Required CEQA Impacts Analysis
- General Plan Response
- Proposed Mitigation Measures
Section 3.1 Land Use, Housing and Population - Setting

- Existing and future land use and demographic information presented by planning watershed, CPA, and utility service provider
- Population Growth: approximately 12,500 between 2010 to 2030
- Population trends; Proportion of population in unincorporated area will likely increase – 53% to 54% or more. Growth expected to be focused in the greater Humboldt Bay area
- Housing: Growth in housing has been higher than population due to overall reduction in persons per household
Section 3.1 Land Use, Housing and Population - Standards of Significance

- Divide an Established Community
- Conflict with Applicable Land Use Plans
- Induce Population Growth
- Displace Existing Housing or People
Section 3.1 Land Use, Housing and Population - Policy response

- Urban Lands policies preserving existing community character and identity (UL-P5, UL-9 through 15)
- Circulation policies maintaining neighborhood integrity and connectivity (C-P1, C-P14, C-24 through 37)
- Housing Element policies maintaining an adequate supply of residential land (H-P18)
Section 3.1 Land Use, Housing and Population - Impact findings

- Divide an Established Community: less than significant
- Conflict with Applicable Land Use Plans: after mitigation (MM3.1.2.1), less than significant
- Induce Population Growth: less than significant
- Displace Existing Housing or People: less than significant
Section 3.2 Agriculture and Timber Resources - Setting

- Productive Agricultural Land
  - Total acreage approximately 0.5 million acres including bottom and rangelands
  - "prime" agricultural soils found in Eel and Mad River bottoms, Humboldt Bay and Redwood Creek contain most productive soils

- Agricultural land conversion and conservation

- Timberlands comprise 1.7 million acres
  - Forest types – mixed conifer and redwood

- Forest land conversion and conversion
Section 3.2 Agriculture and Timber Resources - Standards of Significance

- Convert Farmland or Forestland
- Conflict with Agricultural Zoning, Williamson Act Contracts, or Timberland Production Zoning
Section 3.2 Agriculture and Timber Resources - Policy response

- Conservation of Ag lands through stable zoning boundaries and buffer areas, support for Williamson Act Contracts and land trusts
- No net loss of prime agricultural soils
- Reduced subdivision potential
- Forestland-residential interface overlays
- Incentives to maintain large-scale timber holdings
Section 3.2 Agriculture and Timber Resources - Impact findings

- Convert Farmland or Forestland: after mitigation (MM3.2.3.1a-c), **significant and unavoidable**

- Conflict with Agricultural Zoning, Williamson Act Contracts, or Timberland Production Zoning: less than significant
Section 3.3 Utilities and Service Systems
- Setting

- Water, Wastewater, and Solid Waste service
  - HBMWD provides water to 65% of County (58% of unincorporated area and has sufficient capacity for next 20 years
  - Many small providers have limited water supply or require significant treatment, storage, or distribution upgrades
  - Many wastewater systems are limited by I&I, permitted wet weather treatment capacity, and treated effluent disposal requirements
  - Over 50% of homes have on-site wastewater systems and 40% have individual water systems
  - All solid waste is transported to the Central Valley or Oregon
Section 3.3 Utilities and Service Systems - Standards of Significance

- Wastewater Services
- Water Supply
- New Storm Drainage Facilities
- Solid Waste Disposal
Section 3.3 Utilities and Service Systems - Policy response

- Infrastructure policies require coordination with service providers and the monitoring of system capacity, coordinate land use decisions with capacity, flood and drainage planning.

- Water Resources policies require cumulative water supply impact analysis, and critical watershed designation minimize peak stormwater runoff, low impact development standards.

- General Plan is consistent with Integrated Waste Management Plan and maintains recycling and waste diversion programs.
Section 3.3 Utilities and Service Systems - Impact findings

- Wastewater Services: after mitigation (MM3.3.3.1.a), less than significant
- Water Supply: after mitigation (MM3.3.3.2.a-b), significant and unavoidable
- New Storm Drainage Facilities: less than significant
- Solid Waste Disposal: less than significant
Section 3.4 Public Services
- Setting

- Fire Protection: Significant portions of County outside boundaries of tax-supported fire district – dependable ongoing funding sources critical to fire service providers

- Law Enforcement: Sheriff's facilities needs and extended response times in outlying areas

- Schools: Declining enrollment has resulted in school closures in recent years and slight increase in enrollment projected by 2020
Section 3.4 Public Services
- Standards of Significance

- Require new services or adversely affect existing services:
  - Schools
  - Fire Protection
  - Law Enforcement
Section 3.4 Public Services

- Policy response

- Infrastructure policies require coordination with service providers, the monitoring of capacity and proactively identify areas of the County with service inadequacies and establish appropriate funding mechanisms to ensure adequate facilities are available for new development.

- Infrastructure and Safety Element policies aim to build fire protection funding and capacity.

- Building permits would be referred to all fire protection service providers and the recommendations of fire service providers would be utilized as feasible mitigations to reduce fire service impacts of discretionary permits.
Section 3.4 Public Services
- Impact findings

- Schools: after mitigation (MM3.4.3.1.a), less than significant
- Fire Protection: after mitigation (MM3.4.3.2.a), less than significant
- Law Enforcement: less than significant
Section 3.5 Transportation
- Setting

- Road System: The County contains approx. 1,400 miles of roads and 85 percent of County residents commute to work in cars (alone or in carpools)
- Roadway Condition & Capacity: Over $100 in deferred maintenance and lower population densities/long travel distances result in fewer $$ on a per-mile basis for roadway maintenance compared to urban areas
- Humboldt County roadways with the most significant capacity constraints are located in the Eureka and McKinleyville areas
- Non-Motorized Transportation: Pedestrian and bike facilities primarily located in urban areas
Section 3.5 Transportation
- Standards of Significance

- Vehicle Miles Traveled
- Unacceptable LOS on Roadways within the County
- Regional Level of Service Standard
- Air Traffic
- Road Safety
- Inadequate Emergency Access
- Conflict with Multi-Modal Policies, Plans, or Programs
Section 3.5 Transportation
- Policy response

- Level of Service Criteria, strive to maintain a LOS “C” on all roadways, segments, except U.S. 101
- Efficiency and Capacity, first make investments in multi-modal use and demand management before roadway widening or new road construction
- Road system that supports an orderly pattern of growth with more intense development near collectors and arterials and connectivity between neighborhoods and destinations
- Conditions of approval on new development to address proportional transportation impacts
Section 3.5 Transportation
- Impact findings

- Vehicle Miles Traveled
- Unacceptable LOS on Roadways within the County, after mitigation (MM3.5.1a-f), **significant and unavoidable**
- Regional Level of Service Standard, after mitigation (MM3.5.3.3.a), **significant and unavoidable**
- Air Traffic: less than significant
- Road Safety: less than significant
- Inadequate Emergency Access: less than significant: less than significant
- Conflict with Multi-Modal Policies, Plans, or Programs: less than significant
Section 3.6 Noise

- Setting

- Major sources: highways, airports, stationary sources: Hwy 101, Arcata-Eureka Airport, gravel quarries, lumber mills
- Ground-borne vibration: heavy trucks, rail
- Nuisance-type noises: barking dogs, amplified music, heavy equipment operation
- Noise sensitive land uses: schools, hospitals, parks, residential areas
Section 3.6 Noise

- Standards of Significance

- Exposure to noise exceeding standards
- Exposure to ground-borne vibration and short-term noise
- The project would expose people to excess airport or airfield noise
Section 3.6 Noise
-Policy response

- Table 13-D – Land Use/Noise Compatibility Matrix
- Noise Impact Combining Zones
- Short-term Noise Performance Standards
Section 3.6 Noise
- Impact findings

- General noise exposure: less than significant
- Ground-borne vibrations: after mitigation (MM3.6.3.2.a), less than significant
- Airport noise exposure: after mitigation (MM3.6.3.3.a), less than significant
Section 3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Setting

- Hazardous materials: underground fuel tanks
- Industrial hazards: sewage treatment plants, power plants
- Airport safety: land use compatibility
- Wildland fire: Significant risk in most rural areas, particularly eastern area
Section 3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Standards of Significance

- Risk of exposure to hazardous materials
- Exposure to airport hazards
- Conflict with EMS plans
- Exposure to wildland fire
Section 3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Policy response

- Hazardous industrial development standards (S-P25)
- Hazardous waste elimination (S-P26)
- Hazardous materials handling (S-S15, 16)
- Airport land use compatibility standards
- Coordination w/ emergency mgt (S-P29)
- Integration of master fire protection plan policies and standards
Hazardous materials: after mitigation (MM3.7.3.1.a), less than significant
Exposure to airport hazards: after mitigation (MM3.7.3.2.a,b), less than significant
Conflicts with EMS plans: less than significant

Exposure to wildland fire: Significant and unavoidable after mitigation (MM3.7.3.5.a)
Section 3.8 Geology and Soils

- Setting

- High seismic risk area
- Ground-shaking, liquefaction, landsliding, surface fault rupture
- Near-source tsunami risk
- Unstable and erosive soils
Section 3.8 Geology and Soils
- Standards of Significance

- Risk of exposure to seismic-related hazards
- Risk of soil erosion or loss of topsoil
- Soil instabilities
- Soils incapable of supporting wastewater disposal in unsewered areas
Section 3.8 Geology and Soils
-Policy response

- Geologic report (and mitigation) requirements (S-S1)
- Use of landslide maps for hazard I.D. (S-S2)
- Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Zones (S-S3)
- Tsunami emergency response plan (S-S4)
- Water Resource erosion and sediment control policies (WR-P8, P36, Px2)
- Septic and alternative disposal policies ((WR-Px6, IS-P20, WR-P20, WR-IM5))
Section 3.8 Geology and Soils
– Impact findings

- Seismic-related risks: **significant and unavoidable**
- Soils erosion: after mitigation (MM3.8.3.2.a), less than significant
- Soil stability: less than significant
- Septic suitability: less than significant
Section 3.9 Mineral and Energy Resources - Setting

- Mineral resources – rock, sand and gravel
- Energy resources – natural gas, biomass, hydro, wind, solar, wave
Section 3.9 Mineral and Energy Resources - Standards of Significance

- Loss of known mineral resources
- Mineral extraction and land use compatibility
- Loss of known energy production sites
Section 3.9 Mineral and Energy Resources - Policy response

- Identification, production, and conservation of mineral resources (MR-P1, P3, P4, P5)
- Mineral extraction and land use compatibility (MR-P2, P8, P9, P11)
- Energy Element (E-P1, P2, P15, E-S5, S7, IM7)
Section 3.9 Mineral and Energy Resources – Impact findings

- Loss of known mineral resources: after mitigation (MM3.9.3.1.a), less than significant
- Mineral extraction and land use compatibility: after mitigation (MM3.9.3.2.a), less than significant
- Loss of known energy production sites: less than significant
Section 3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality - Setting

- 12 planning watersheds
- Heavy seasonal precipitation, steep slopes, unstable soils lead to high natural sediment volumes and tendency to be easily disturbed
- Primarily TMDL sediment, silt and temperature impairment; additionally Klamath is impaired by nutrient enrichment and low dissolved oxygen
- Susceptibility to flooding
Section 3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality - Standards of Significance

- Exceed water quality standards
- Deplete groundwater
- Alter drainage patterns or exceed stormwater systems
- Exposure to flood risk
Section 3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality - Policy response

- Protection of beneficial uses, water supplies and watersheds (WR-P2, P3, P4, P5, Px2, P8, P14, P15)
- Protection of groundwater uses (WR-P2, P12, Px4, Px5, P13)
- Stormwater drainage management (WR-P30 through P40)
- Floodplain management, tsunami response (S-P10, P11, Px2, Px3, Px4, P8, P9, P27-P30)
Section 3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality – Impact findings

- Exceed water quality standards: after mitigation (MM3.10.3.1.a,b), less than significant
- Depletion of groundwater: after mitigation (sic - MM3.10.3.2.a), less than significant
- Alter drainage patterns or exceed stormwater systems: after mitigation (MM3.10.3.1.a,b), less than significant
- Exposure to flood risk: after mitigation (MM3.10.3.4.a), less than significant
Section 3.11 Biological Resources - Setting

- Diverse forests and grasslands
- Extensive riparian and wetland areas
- Diverse fish and wildlife
- Species of special concern
- Sensitive habitats
Section 3.11 Biological Resources
- Standards of Significance

- Impact sensitive species or habitats
- Impact wetlands
- Wildlife corridors and nursery sites
- Conflict with local biological resource protection policies or ordinances
- Conflict with an HCP
Section 3.11 Biological Resources
- Policy response

- Require land uses to be compatible with habitat (BR-P1)
- Identify and protect sensitive habitats (P2, P3, P7, P10)
- Utilize Streamside Management Areas (SMAs) (P4, P5, P6)
- Protect oak woodlands and help control invasive species
Section 3.11 Biological Resources – Impact findings

- Sensitive species or habitats: after mitigation (MM3.11.3.1.a,b,c), less than significant
- Wetlands: after mitigation (MM3.11.3.2.a), less than significant
- Wildlife corridors and nursery sites: less than significant
- Conflicts with local biological resource protection policies or ordinances: less than significant
- Conflicts with an HCP: after mitigation (MM3.11.3.5.a), less than significant
3.13 Cultural Resources

- Setting

- Cultural Resources - Native American and Archaeological Sites
- Culturally Sensitive Areas
- Historic Districts, Sites, Structures and Landmarks
3.13 Cultural Resources
- Standards of Significance

- Cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource
- Cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource
- Destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.
3.13 Cultural Resources
- Policy response

- Requires identification of cultural resources and mitigation of impacts (P1, P2, P5 S4, S5)
- Calls for review and updating of existing implementing ordinances and guidelines to ensure appropriate protection (IM-1,2 CU-P2)
- Provides standards on conditioning, designing and/or mitigating projects to avoid the loss of cultural resource (CU-P4 and S4)
- Requires the assessment and treatment of impacts to significant Historic Structures and Districts (CU-S5)
- Requires the County to map resource areas (IMx),
- Requires establishing a cultural resources ordinance and advisory committee (IM1)
3.13 Cultural Resources
– Impact findings

- Impacts to historic resources: after mitigation (MM3.13.3.1), significant and unavoidable
- Impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources: less than significant
- Disruption of human remains: after mitigation (MM3.13.3.1), less than significant
Section 3.14 Parks and Recreation
- Setting

- Park and Recreation Facilities: 0.5 million acres of federal, state and local parks - most parkland is regional in scope as opposed to local
- Humboldt County operates 16 regional parks
- Local Parks: Cities, four special districts, and several non-profits operate community and local parks
- Coastal Access: Access points identified through local coastal plans
Section 3.14 Parks and Recreation
- Standards of Significance

- Deterioration of Parks and Recreation Facilities
- Construction of new Recreation Facilities
Section 3.14 Parks and Recreation
- Policy response

- Infrastructure policies require planning for parks in coordination with service providers, the monitoring of capacity and identify areas of the County with service
- Encourage special districts to provide local park services
- Parkland dedication requirements
- Develop park standards for urban and rural areas
Section 3.14 Parks and Recreation
- Impact findings

- Deterioration of Parks and Recreation Facilities, after mitigation (MM3.14.3.1.a), less than significant
- Construction of new Recreation Facilities: after mitigation (MM3.14.3.2.a), less than significant
3.15 Scenic Resources
- Setting

- Scenic Resources in Humboldt County
  - Coastal Views
  - Forests
  - Open Space and Agricultural Lands
  - Scenic Roads
  - Wild, Scenic, and Recreational Rivers
  - Heritage Landscapes
3.15 Scenic Resources
- Standards of Significance

- Adverse effect on a scenic vista
- Damage to scenic resources
- Degradation of visual character or quality of the site
- New source of light and glare
Identifies heritage landscapes and scenic areas and protects them through a public process of selection, mapping and standards development. (SR-P1 and P2, SR-S1, S2, and SR-IM1).

Identifies and maps community separators (SR-IM2) and contains policies, standards to protect the scenic quality (SR-P4, P5).

Develops a program for the identification and protection of scenic roads consistent w/ established standards (SR- P3, S3 and SR-IM3).

Limits the terms of new billboards by ordinance and prohibit billboards in scenic areas and sensitive habitat (SR-P6, P7).

Requires that new outdoor lighting be compatible with the existing setting (SR-SX).
3.15 Scenic Resources
– Impact findings

- Impacts to Scenic Vistas: **significant and unavoidable**
- Impacts to Visual Character: **significant and unavoidable**
- Impacts from Light and Glare: **significant and unavoidable**
Section 3.12 – Air Quality and Climate Action Plan presentation

Presenter - Michael Wheeler, Senior Planner
Summary of Impacts – Significant and Unavoidable

- Conversion of Farmland or Forestland
- Water Supply
- Unacceptable Level of Service of Roadways
- Wildland Fire Risk
- Exposure to Seismic Hazards
- Air Quality Standards
- Historic Resources (Cultural)
- Scenic Vistas
- Visual Character
- Light and Glare
DEIR

- DEIR review timeline:
  - April 19, 2012
    PC Workshop
  - May 10, 2012
    PC Public Hearing
  - May 17, 2012
    PC Public Hearing
  - June 12, 2012
    Board of Supervisors Introductory meeting
  - June 15, 2012
    Public Comments Due
  - June 18, 2012
    Board of Supervisors GP Policy Hearing
Humboldt County General Plan

Martha Spencer
268-3704
mspencer@co.humboldt.ca.us