

# **INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

**FOR**

## **PROPOSED HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS REENTRY RESOURCE CENTER AND NEW COUNTY OFFICE FACILITY**

**April 13, 2015**

**California Environmental Quality Act**

**Lead Agency:  
County of Humboldt**



**Lead Agency Contact:  
Hank Seemann, Deputy Director Environmental Services  
County of Humboldt  
Department of Public Works  
1106 Second Street  
Eureka, California 95501  
(707) 445-7741**

**Prepared by:  
LACO Associates  
21 W. 4<sup>th</sup> Street  
Eureka, California 95501  
(707) 443-5054**

**LACO Project No. 6869.03**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PROJECT SUMMARY .....	3
II.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	5
III.	PROJECT SETTING AND LOCATION.....	8
IV.	ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED .....	9
V.	REFERENCES.....	54

## FIGURES AND APPENDICES

Figure 1:	Project Location Map
Figure 2:	Site Plan Phase 1, Option A
Figure 3:	Site Plan Phase 1, Option B
Figure 4:	Site Plan Phase 2, Option A
Figure 5:	Site Plan Phase 2, Option B
Figure 6:	Transportation Impact Analysis Area

Appendix A:	CalEEmod Analysis
Appendix B:	EnviroStor Query Results
Appendix C:	RWQCB Site Correspondence
Appendix D:	Tsunami Inundation Map
Appendix E:	Parking Study (LACO, 2015)
Appendix F:	Transportation Impact Analysis (Kittelson & Associates, Inc., April 2015)
Appendix G:	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

## I. PROJECT SUMMARY

**Date:** April 13, 2015

**Project Title:** Proposed Humboldt Community Corrections Reentry Resource Center and New County Office Facility

**Lead Agency:** County of Humboldt

### **Lead Agency**

**Contact:** Hank Seemann  
Deputy Director Environmental Services  
Department of Public Works  
1106 Second Street  
Eureka, CA 95501  
(707) 445-7741 / [hseemann@co.humboldt.ca.us](mailto:hseemann@co.humboldt.ca.us)

**Report Authors:** Elizabeth Burks, AICP, Senior Planner, LACO Associates  
Stephen Umbertis, Assistant Planner, LACO Associates

**Contact:** LACO Associates  
21 W. 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Eureka, CA 95501  
(707) 443-5054

**Location:** 826 4th Street, Eureka, California, Humboldt County  
Latitude: 40.802480°N, Longitude: -124.1499°W  
See Figure 1: Location Map and Figure 2: Humboldt Community Corrections Reentry Resource Center Site Plan

**Coastal Zone:** Site is not located within the Coastal Zone

**Affected Parcels:** Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 001-191-005

### **General Plan**

**Designation:** City of Eureka  
Civic Government Center (CGC)  
(City of Eureka General Plan, 1997)  
See Figure 3: Land Use Map

**Zoning:** City of Eureka  
Public District (P)  
See Figure 4: Zoning Map

### **Anticipated Permits and Approvals:**

- 1) County adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND)
- 2) City of Eureka Encroachment Permit
- 3) Caltrans Encroachment Permit

**CEQA Requirement:**

The proposed Humboldt Community Corrections Reentry Resource Center and New County Office Facility Project (proposed project) is subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA encourages lead agencies and applicants to modify their projects to avoid potentially significant adverse impacts (CEQA Section 20180[c] [2] and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15070[b] [2]).

The Lead Agency for the proposed project is the County of Humboldt, per CEQA Guidelines Section 21067. Compliance with CEQA is being implemented through the Department of Public Works. The purpose of this Initial Study (IS) is to provide a basis for determining whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Negative Declaration, or Mitigated Negative Declaration. This IS is intended to satisfy the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code, Div 13, Sec 21000-21177) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sec 15000-15387).

Section 15063(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that an IS shall contain the following information in brief form:

- 1) A description of the project including the project location
- 2) Identification of the environmental setting
- 3) Identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix, or other method, provided that entries on a checklist or other form are briefly explained to provide evidence to support the entries
- 4) Discussion of means to mitigate identified significant effects
- 5) Examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls
- 6) The name of the person or persons who prepared and/or participated in the IS

## II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Name:	Humboldt Community Corrections Reentry Resource Center (HCCRRC) and New County Office Facility
Project Summary	Humboldt County (County) proposes to develop Assessor's Parcel Number 001-191-005 in two phases. The first phase would consist of an approximately 26,000 square feet building to be used for the Humboldt County Community Corrections Reentry Resource Center (HCCRRC). The second phase would consist of a building addition to house various county government offices of approximately 54,000 square feet (80,000 square feet total). Structured (sub-grade) parking would be provided. The County is considering a range of structured parking options and building heights, all of which will be evaluated in the Initial Study.
APN:	001-191-005
Location:	The approximately 0.79-acre site is located at 826 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, Eureka, California (hereinafter Site). The Site is bordered on the north by 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, on the south by 5 <sup>th</sup> Street, and on the east by K Street. The County Courthouse and Humboldt County Correctional Facility (jail) are immediately west of the Site. (See Figure 1: Project Location Map)
Current Setting:	The Site is within the Eureka city limits, in the downtown corridor. The Site is surrounded by urban-level development including retail, parking and professional office uses.
Ownership:	County of Humboldt

### **Background**

Humboldt County owns the approximately 0.79 acre (34,200 square feet) Site located immediately adjacent to the existing county courthouse and jail complex. The Site is currently used as a temporary parking lot with access from K Street. The lot is unpaved except for a small paved area (2,679 square feet) in the southwest corner reserved for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible parking sufficient to accommodate six vehicles. The remainder of the lot is unimproved with no parking stall striping or access aisle designations. The site is surrounded by sidewalks to the north, east, and south. Landscaping between the sidewalk and gravel parking area is limited to approximately five small trees and shrubs. The western property line is bordered by the existing county courthouse and jail complex.

The design of the proposed project is based on considerations of current and future facility needs and a desire to develop the parcel to its highest and best use. The Site's location within the City of Eureka downtown area and adjacent to the county courthouse and jail complex makes it a desirable location to consider co-locating County offices.

The Project Site was originally intended to be part of the Humboldt County Justice Facilities/Civic Center Project for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was approved in February 1993 (County of Humboldt, 1993). The proposed Humboldt County Justice Facilities/Civic Center Project encompassed a total of six phases of development based on the recommendations of a 1990 Facility Master Plan. The Humboldt County Correctional Facility was constructed in 1996 and 1997

as an expansion of the County Courthouse, but other phases including a new Justice Facility, County Services Building, and Civic Center were not completed. The overall project concept included build out of the current Project Site with a four-story Justice Facility. The new County Services Building and Civic Center were proposed to occupy the block to the south, across 5<sup>th</sup> Street between I and K Streets. The EIR analyzed the aforementioned phases programmatically and identified that completion of these phases was uncertain and contingent upon available financing. The currently proposed project modifies the previously evaluated design, but is consistent with the level of construction and use contemplated with the adoption of the EIR in 1993.

The County is considering development of the Site in two phases (referred to as Phase One and Phase Two throughout this report) to achieve full build-out conditions. The County anticipates applying to the Board of State and Community Corrections in 2015 for funding to construct the Humboldt Community Corrections Reentry Resource Center (HCCRRC) through the funding program established by Senate Bill 863 for adult local criminal justice facilities. If funding is secured, construction of the HCCRRC is expected to be complete by approximately 2019. The second phase would be a building addition of approximately 54,000 square feet of program area to house various County government offices, or new courtroom space. Funding or financing for the second phase has not been secured and there is no current projected timeframe. The County desires to maintain flexibility regarding final design of both phases as funding has not yet been secured for either phase. In order to retain this flexibility and provide adequate environmental review, this Initial Study includes analysis of the two phases and multiple options for parking, building heights, and footprint within each phase.

### **Phase One**

Phase One includes a 26,000 square foot building that would house the proposed HCCRRC and structured parking. The HCCRRC would consolidate the county's resources for assisting offenders (services dealing with mental health, drug counseling, employment assistance, life skills training) into one centralized location. The HCCRRC would serve both in- and out-of-custody offenders. The facility would include a new 40-bed transitional reentry inmate housing unit with dedicated programming spaces. The programming spaces will include the following:

- Sheriff's Office Reentry Housing and Inmate Program
- Humboldt County Probation Department Day Reporting Center
- Sheriff's Work Alternative's Program (SWAP) and Jail Alternative Programs

A primary objective of the proposed project is to increase the utilization and overall effectiveness of these resources.

The structural design of the building will result in more clearly defined public and secure areas surrounding the jail. This will simplify the overall management of the site and improve security in and around the jail. The design of the existing jail includes a corridor that was built to allow for a connection to a future facility. This corridor provides a link to the center of the existing jail where food, medical, and laundry services are located. There is also a central bank of elevators with access to all floors. The new structure will connect to this corridor linking the two buildings together. This will allow food, laundry, and other services to be delivered to the in-custody offenders housed at the HCCRRC.

Phase One of the HCCRRC is expected to accommodate 37 full-time staff. Of these, 25 staff will be re-located from the existing Community Corrections Resources Center located at 404 H Street, Eureka, approximately two blocks west of the project site. The additional 12 staff currently work at the existing jail and will begin reporting to the HCCRRC. There will be no new hires as a result of the HCCRRC.

The program area and structured (sub-grade) parking included in Phase One may be constructed over approximately half the lot and be three to four stories high (Figure 2), or constructed over the entirety of the lot and be two to three stories high (Figure 3). The maximum height for Phase One would be approximately 50 feet.

The Phase One structured parking would be located on the ground floor and include either 25 spaces (Option A) or 68 spaces (Option B) (Figure 2). If Option A is selected, the remainder of the lot reserved for Phase Two construction would be used as a parking lot on an interim basis with room for approximately 44 parking spaces.

## **Phase Two**

Phase Two includes an additional 54,000 square feet of program area that would house county government offices and facilities. Although it has not been determined which county offices will be housed within this building, it is anticipated that approximately 75% of the floor area will be used for employee and public areas while the remaining 25% would be available for file and records storage. Phase Two (total build out) is expected to accommodate approximately 77 additional employees. Construction of the additional program area included in Phase Two would allow several county departments and functions to be located within a single office complex. This consolidation would increase the efficiency of coordination between departments, improve accessibility for the public, and save county funds by eliminating the need to lease different offices spaces. The additional office space could also accommodate the expansion of offices already located in the existing county courthouse and jail complex, such as the Sheriff's Office or Office of Emergency Services.

Depending on the option selected for Phase One, Phase Two may include additional structured parking. Phase Two construction may reach five to six stories in height for a total maximum building height of approximately 85 feet.

At the completion of both phases, the entire building footprint would be approximately 26,500 square feet. The entire floor area would be approximately 80,000 square feet. There would be structured (sub-grade) parking for approximately 60 to 68 parking stalls. Covered parking for up to 20 bicycles would be provided.

The building facades will be designed to be compatible with and complementary to the existing courthouse and jail structures.

Areas between the building and sidewalk will be planted with landscaping comprised of locally appropriate, drought tolerant, non- invasive species. The sizing of plantings will be appropriate to maintain visibility at intersections.

### III. PROJECT SETTING AND LOCATION

#### Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses

The approximately 0.79 acre (34,276.23 square feet) site is located at 826 4<sup>th</sup> Street in Eureka, California (hereinafter Site). The Site is bordered on the north by 4<sup>th</sup> Street, on the south by 5<sup>th</sup> Street, and on the east by K Street. The existing courthouse and jail facilities are located immediately to the west of the Site (See Figure 1, Project Location Map). The Site is located within Eureka City limits, in the downtown corridor. The Site is surrounded by urban development.

4<sup>th</sup> Street is also southbound Highway 101. 5<sup>th</sup> Street is northbound Highway 101. The Site, situated between these two highways, is located on the main transportation corridor through Eureka.

There are predominately commercial uses north of the Site across 4<sup>th</sup> Street. South of the Site across 5<sup>th</sup> Street are Humboldt County offices, County parking facilities, Eureka City Hall, and commercial uses. West of the Site are commercial uses. East of the Site there is the Employment Development Department, The Job Market, and associated parking owned by the State of California.

The Site is currently a gravel parking lot within the same block as the county courthouse and jail. Access is from K Street. There are six paved parking spaces in the southwest corner that are marked as ADA accessible. There are approximately 78 spaces available in the gravel parking lot. Six of these spaces are reserved for sheriff's vehicles. The others are open to the general public and are not time restricted.

Combined, the county courthouse and jail occupies approximately 2.25 acres excluding the project Site. The existing building ranges from two stories to five stories in height. There is a single level of underground parking located beneath the courthouse that consists of approximately 50 spaces and is restricted to county and sheriff vehicle use.

The existing jail has two distinct units, both attached to the east side of the courthouse. The unit fronting 5<sup>th</sup> Street is five stories tall. The structure has design features including a projected bay, and cornices which extend above the roof line. The jail unit fronting 4<sup>th</sup> Street is four stories tall and has a turret as the predominant design feature.

Existing facilities in the courthouse include offices of the County Counsel, Administrator, Assessor, Recorder, Sheriff, District Attorney, Board of Supervisors, Risk Management and Office of Emergency Services, as well as the law library, courts, and human resources. As part of the proposed project, the existing jail and the HCCRRC buildings would be connected by an interior corridor that would allow for food, medical, and laundry services from the main jail to be securely delivered to the inmates at the HCCRRC.

On-street public parking is available in the blocks surrounding the courthouse. Much of the parking in the immediate vicinity is limited to two hours.

There is minimal landscaping along 5<sup>th</sup> Street and a single landscape shrub at the corner of 4<sup>th</sup> Street and K Street. There is currently no interior landscaping in the parking lot.

Drainage from the site currently enters Caltrans maintained drop inlets then travels to the City of Eureka municipal storm drain system.

**Land Use and Zoning**

The Site is a 0.79 acre vacant gravel lot adjacent to the existing county courthouse and is currently used for daily parking for county employees and visitors to the courthouse and jail. The land is zoned and planned for public facilities which are the predominant use in the area immediately surrounding the Site.

Although the site of the proposed Project is located within the City of Eureka, it is owned by Humboldt County. Therefore, development activities at the Site are exempt from the city's zoning and land use regulations (Lawler v. City of Redding, 1992).

**IV. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the proposed project, and would involve at least one impact that is determined to be a **"Potentially Significant Impact"** as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology and Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology and Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use and Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Population and Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities and Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance

A detailed explanation of all checklist responses follows in Chapter 4 of this Report. 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 a less than significant level. 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 project, or clearly will not impact nor be impacted by the project.

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency on the basis of this initial evaluation)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p>

*Hank Selman*

April 13, 2015

Signature

Date

I. <b>AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; (b) substantially damage scenic resources including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; (c) substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; or (d) create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

**DISCUSSION:** The Site is adjacent to the existing five story county courthouse, completed in 1959 (City of Eureka, 2006), and the county jail buildings, built in 1996 and 1997. The Site is surrounded by the urban core of Eureka, with other county buildings, hotels, and offices located on all sides. The Site is a vacant gravel lot used as a parking area for county employees and visitors to the existing county courthouse and jail located immediately adjacent to the Site on the west side. North of the Site is 4<sup>th</sup> Street, which is also southbound Highway 101. The south side of the Site is 5<sup>th</sup> Street, which is also northbound Highway 101. The east side of the Site is K Street. Across K Street is the two story “Job Market” building and a paved parking lot surrounded by vegetated landscaping.

The Courthouse is a dominant feature of Eureka’s skyline, taller than most of the other buildings in the city and taller than any buildings immediately around the project Site. The Courthouse is approximately 88 feet tall while the jail is 106 feet tall. The Site is undeveloped, which leaves the east elevation of the existing county jail exposed. Visually, this results in a large bare wall facing southbound Highway 101 that is considerably taller and more massive than the surrounding buildings and cityscape.

The proposed project would completely cover the existing vacant lot and would be between four and six stories tall, depending on the final design. The maximum height would be approximately 50 to 85 feet, depending on the final design.

I.a,b) The Project is not located within a city- or county-mapped, or designated, scenic vista; within a scenic resources area; or along a state scenic highway (Caltrans, 2013). There are no rock outcroppings at the Site or any historic buildings. No impact would occur.

I.c) The Site is currently a vacant gravel lot used as a parking area for county employees and others using the existing county courthouse and jail complex immediately adjacent to the Site on the west side. The courthouse is a dominant feature of Eureka’s skyline, taller than most of the other buildings in the city and any that are immediately adjacent to the project Site. The proposed

project would help to create a visual transition from the existing courthouse to K Street by creating a “step-down” from the existing building to the proposed building to street level (See Figures 2 through 5). This would increase compatibility of both the proposed and existing buildings with adjacent buildings. Design elements of the proposed building would be similar to those of the existing courthouse and jail. Regardless of the phasing, the proposed buildings would not degrade the character of the surrounding area they would be designed to match the existing jail and help provide a visual transition to the neighboring facilities. The existing Site would not be degraded by construction as it is a vacant gravel lot. There would be a less than significant impact.

I.d) The existing use of the site as a parking lot creates reflection and glare from parked vehicles during the day. Parking for the proposed building would be covered, muting the daytime glare generated from parked vehicles and providing an opportunity for vegetation and other landscaping around the perimeter to further reduce daytime glare from the lower story of the proposed building.

The new buildings may have windows that could increase glare at the Site. Mitigation Measure AES-1 requires that any new windows located in areas that could cause glare be treated to reduce these effects. Generally this will be windows on the south and east sides of the building, which receives the most sunlight.

Nighttime views would be generally unaffected by the proposed project. The existing courthouse and jail includes nighttime lighting at the entrances to the building. Street lighting along both 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Streets limits views of the night sky as is typical of city streets. The addition of the proposed HCCCRCC and New County Office Facility would change the placement of nighttime lighting as compared to current conditions, but would not increase the amount or intensity of lighting on the Site or spill-over into surrounding areas. Mitigation Measure AES-2 requires that new outdoor lighting be directed downward to prevent illumination of adjacent parcels.

With mitigation incorporated, the proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. A less than significant impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** No mitigation required.

AES-1: If the final building design includes windows that have the potential to produce glare onto vehicle traffic, these windows shall be treated or tinted to reduce glare.

AES-2: All outdoor lighting shall be directed downward on the Site to prevent illumination of adjacent parcels.

**FINDINGS:** **With mitigation incorporated,** the Project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Aesthetics.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by PRC section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (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; (b) conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; (c) conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220[g]), timberland (as defined by PRC Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104[g]); (d) result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or (e) involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

**DISCUSSION:** The HCCRRC and New County Office Facility would be constructed on an undeveloped area that is not currently used for agriculture, nor is appropriate for agricultural use. The footprint of the HCCRCC would cover a 0.79 acre area that is currently gravel and used for parking. There are no agricultural or forestry resources on or near the Project site that would be impacted by the Project.

II.a-e) Per the Humboldt County Web GIS, no portion of the proposed Project Site has been designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The Site is urban and not used for agriculture. The property is not under a Williamson Act contract or zoned for agricultural, forestry, or timber use, and no farming activities currently occur on the Site. The Project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or result in the conversion of forestland to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** No mitigation required.

**FINDINGS:** The Project would have **No Impact** on Agriculture and Forestry Resources.

<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; (b) violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; (c) result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); (d) expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or (e) create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

**DISCUSSION:** The Project is located within the North Coast Air Basin (NCAB) and is subject to North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD) requirements. The NCUAQMD is responsible for monitoring and enforcing local, state, and federal air quality standards in the County of Humboldt. Air quality standards are set for emissions that may include, but are not limited to, visible emission, particulate matter, and fugitive dust. The Humboldt County portion of the NCAB is currently designated as a "non-attainment" area for breathable particulate matter of 10 microns or less (PM<sub>10</sub>) and as an "attainment" area with respect to the balance of the criteria pollutants. Because the NCAB is "non-attainment" for PM<sub>10</sub>, or is in excess of allowable 24-hour limits established by the state, the NCUAQMD has prepared a draft PM<sub>10</sub> Attainment Plan identifying cost effective control measures that can be implemented to bring ambient PM<sub>10</sub> levels within allowable limits (North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District, 1995). More information on California standards and the draft PM<sub>10</sub> Attainment Plan can be found on NCUAQMD's website (<http://www.ncuaqmd.org/files/NCUAQMD%20Attainment%20Plan%205-95.pdf>).

NCUAQMD's Rule 110, New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration, establishes preconstruction review requirements for new and modified stationary sources of air pollution and provides mechanisms, including emission offsets, by which Authorities to Construct for such sources may be granted without interfering with the attainment or maintenance of ambient air quality standards. This rule requires no net increases in emissions from new or modified stationary sources which emit, or have the potential to emit, 25 tons per year or more of any non-attainment pollutant or precursors. In the case of the Rule 110 review, an emissions unit is an identifiable operation or piece of process equipment which emits, may emit, or results in the emission of any affected pollutant directly or as fugitive emissions. Rule 110 applies significance thresholds for twelve pollutants. A subset of those pollutants most likely to be emitted by the proposed project and their associated significance threshold are listed below. For a full list of these pollutants refer to Rule 110 (<http://www.ncuaqmd.org/files/rules/reg%201/New%20Rule%20110.pdf>):

**Table 1. NCUAQMD Rule 110 Best Available Control Technology Significance Thresholds**

Pollutant	Significance Thresholds	
	Daily (lbs./day)	Annual (tons/year)
Carbon monoxide (CO)	500.0	100
Nitrogen oxides (NOx)	50.0	40.0
Particulate matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	80.0	15.0
Particulate matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	50.0	10.0
Reactive organic gases (ROG)	50.0	40.0
Sulfur oxides (SO <sub>2</sub> )	80.0	40.0

Source: North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District Rule 110. December 9, 2010

In cases where a new or modified emissions unit generates a pollutant in excess of the significance threshold, Rule 110 requires the application of Best Available Control Technology (BACT), which is the most effective emission control device, emission limit, or technique which has been required for the equipment or operation.

The NCUAQMD has not formally adopted significance thresholds for impacts analysis, but rather utilizes the BACT emission rates for stationary sources, as shown in Table 1. In general, an activity that individually complies with state and local standards for air quality emissions, and projects that are consistent with applicable NCUAQMD regional growth forecasts, will not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in the countywide PM<sub>10</sub> levels.

III. a-c) Typical sources of emissions for public facilities include heating, cooking, solvent/paint use, and lawn and yard care equipment and vehicular traffic. No wood or pellet burning stoves or natural gas burning fireplaces are proposed within the facility. Heating is expected to be provided by efficient electric or natural gas furnaces. While construction would generate temporary emissions, operation of the proposed Project would not include any source of visible emissions, such as intentional fire/burning or manufacturing.

The NCUAQMD has established air quality regulations, including regulations for fugitive dust, which apply to all development projects. These regulations include minimizing airborne particulate matter during handling, transporting, or open storage. To reduce the impact of fugitive dust on air quality during the construction phase of the proposed Project, NCUAQMD Rule 430, Fugitive Dust

Emissions, will be followed. To ensure minimization of fugitive dust during project construction, and support compliance with NCUAQMD regulations, Mitigation Measure AIR-1 will be implemented.

Air quality impacts for the proposed facility were calculated using the CalEEMod 2013.2.2 software. The program uses widely accepted emissions estimates to model emissions from construction and operation of new stationary sources (California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, 2013). The facility was analyzed as two parts – the 26,000 sq. ft. Phase One building and the 54,000 sq. ft. Phase Two building. The emissions shown in Table 2 are the total emissions calculated using the CalEEMod model for the project based on the specific square footage for each phase, applying the site acreage to the model (0.79 acres), and using default values for the other inputs. The complete model report is included as Appendix A.

**Table 2. Unmitigated Emissions of the Proposed HCCRRC Facility**

Pollutant	Annual Emissions (tons/yr)	
	Construction	Operation
Carbon monoxide (CO)	2.2560	22.3283
Nitrogen oxides (NOx)	2.7364	5.4208
Particulate matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	.2645	1.6181
Particulate matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	.2081	.4794
Reactive organic gases (ROG)	1.3703	2.9286
Sulfur oxides (SO <sub>2</sub> )	3.0400e-003	5.4208

Source: CalEEMod Model Report Run, Appendix A

Based on the CalEEMod results shown in Table 2 above, emissions from construction and operation of the proposed Project would not have a negative impact on air quality beyond the thresholds of significance as shown in Table 1. With mitigation incorporated during construction, a less than significant impact would occur.

Based on the CalEEMod analysis results, the Project would have a less than significant impact on increases of any criteria pollutants, and would not result in cumulatively considerable net increases of any criteria pollutants. The Project would be consistent with the NCUAQMD PM<sub>10</sub> Attainment Plan as the Project is located in an urbanized area, does not include the operation of woodstoves or hearths, and would not emit PM<sub>10</sub> at levels that would exceed the NCUAQMD’s cumulative threshold of 15 tons per year. Additionally, the Project fosters alternative transportation by incorporating bicycle parking and by being located along established bus routes. The project will be designed consistent with Humboldt County’s standard design criteria and the California Green Building Code. Numerous energy-efficient and emission-reducing elements will be incorporated, including the following:

- Extensive daylighting through tubular daylighting devices
- Exterior glazing in public areas
- High-efficiency hydronic HVAC system with programmed control systems
- Single-ply membrane roof to reduce heat gain in the low-slope areas
- Low-flow, automatic-controlled plumbing fixtures
- Other standard CBC Cal-Green design features

III.d) Sensitive receptors will not be subject to substantial pollutant concentrations due to the temporary nature of construction activities and would be in compliance with NCUAQMD regulations. Emissions from the ongoing operation of the facility would be considerably less than the thresholds of significance shown in Table 1. A less than significant impact would occur.

III.e) Any potential objectionable odors that would be produced by the Project would be temporary odors from construction equipment. During construction, the contractor will likely use machinery such as a backhoe, trencher, and large trucks. Odors from machinery will be limited in duration and extent and are typical in a developed environment. Operation of the proposed HCCRCC and New County Office Facility would not produce objectionable odors. A less than significant impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

AIR-1: During construction of the HCCRRC and New County Office Facility and associated site improvements the contractor will comply with NCUAQMD fugitive dust rules by implementing the following measures:

- Spray exposed soils with water during grading on a daily basis
- Suspend earthmoving and trenching activities when winds exceed 20 mph
- Cover haul-truck loads
- Immediately after grading, plant ground cover in disturbed areas or otherwise cover exposed disturbed areas in a manner preventing windblown dust from leaving the project site.

**FINDINGS:** With mitigation, the Project would have a **Less than Significant Impact** on Air Quality.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; (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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; (c) have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; (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; (e) conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or, (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.

**DISCUSSION:** The site of the proposed HCCRRC and New County Office Facility is a vacant gravel lot, approximately 0.79 acres in size, located in downtown Eureka. There are no riparian areas or other areas that could provide habitat on or near the Site. There is no established major vegetation on the Site.

IV.a-f) The Project site is not located on a known wildlife corridor or native wildlife nursery site. The proposed Project would not interfere 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. There are no wetlands on site or nearby. No local ordinances or policies protecting biological resources would be violated as there are no biological resources located on the Site.

The proposed Project would not affect species located outside the Site. Based on expected standard construction noise levels, and the site's close proximity to existing high-use public roadways and commercial development, no impact would occur to biological resources as a result of the proposed project.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

No mitigation is required.

**FINDINGS:** The Project would have **No Impact** on Biological Resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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) 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"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA, Title 14; Chapter 3; Article 5; Section 15064.5; (b) cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; (c) directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or (d) disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

**DISCUSSION:** The North Coast is home to a number of Native American tribes, with the Wiyot Tribe having occupied territory in the Humboldt Bay region most recently prior to the arrival of Europeans. The site is within the historic territory of the Wiyot Tribe (Wiyot Tribe, 2014), but in an area that has seen extensive development over the last century.

V.a, d) The proposed Project Site is a gravel lot adjacent to existing buildings and bordered by three large streets. The proposed Project would not result in ground disturbance in areas where the ground has not already been heavily disturbed previously. The Northwest Information Center (NWIC) was consulted regarding the proposed project. Their response indicated that a study (#14529) by Kirk and Roscoe covered approximately 100% of the proposed project area and identified no cultural resources. However, because the proposed Project area was covered with asphalt or imported gravel, only those areas where the original ground surface was visible were surveyed for cultural resources as part of that study. The NWIC recommendations included contacting the local Native American tribes regarding traditional, cultural, and religious heritage values. The Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO) of the Wiyot Tribe, Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria and the Blue Lake Rancheria were contacted regarding the NWIC recommendations. None of the THPOs indicated that they were aware of cultural resources within the project vicinity. All requested that mitigation measures be in place for inadvertent discovery of cultural resources. Mitigation Measures CULT-1 and CULT-2 have been included to address their concerns. With mitigation a less than significant impact would occur.

V.b) The NWIC response indicated that the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps from the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> Century depict significant development in the proposed project area and that may be historic era resources at the Site. However, the Site has been previously disturbed, compacted and is currently maintained as a gravel surface with continual use by vehicles and it is unlikely that undisturbed resources would be present. In order to minimize impacts to any potential historic era resources that may be present, mitigation measure CULT-3 will be implemented requiring archival research to be conducted to determine the appropriate locations for monitoring during the

removal of gravel, asphalt, concrete or fill. Following the exposure of original soils, if any historic era resources are observed it is recommended that a field inspection be conducted and a report containing "next-steps" recommendations are provided. With mitigation a less than significant impact would occur.

V.c) The Site does not contain any unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features. No impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

CULT-1: If cultural materials (e.g., chipped or ground stone, historic debris, building foundations, or bone) are discovered during ground-disturbance activities, work within 20 meters (66 feet) of the discovery shall be stopped, per the requirements of CEQA (Title 14 CCR 15064.5 [f]). Work near the archaeological find(s) shall not resume until a professional archaeologist, who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, has evaluated the materials and offered recommendations for further action. Any identified cultural resources will be recorded on DPR 523 historic resource recordation forms, from the Office of Historic Preservation. If Native American archaeological remains are inadvertently encountered, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) of the three recognized Wiyot-area tribes (Blue Lake Rancheria, Bear River Band of Rohnerville Rancheria, and Wiyot Tribe) will be immediately notified, permitted to observe the findings in the field, and afforded the opportunity to make recommendations for avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating impacts from the proposed development.

CULT-2: If human remains are discovered during project construction, work within 20 meters (66 feet) of the discovery location, and within any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie human remains, will cease (Public Resources Code, Section 7050.5). The Humboldt County Coroner will be contacted to determine if the cause of death must be investigated. If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, it is necessary to comply with state laws regarding the disposition of Native American burials, which fall within the jurisdiction of the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Public Resources Code, Section 5097). In this case, the coroner will contact NAHC. The descendants or most likely descendants of the deceased will be contacted, and work will not resume until they have made a recommendation to the landowner or person responsible for excavation work with direction regarding appropriate means of treatment and disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods, as provided in Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98.

CULT-3: A qualified historical resource professional shall conduct Archival research to determine if monitoring for historic era resources is necessary. If deemed necessary, the appropriate locations for monitoring during the removal of gravel, asphalt, concrete or fill shall be determined. The purpose of this monitoring will be to allow a qualified professional to observe any artifacts or evidence of historical settlement, activity, or burials within the project footprint prior to construction activities that may destroy them or result in an inadvertent discovery. If the pre-construction monitoring does not yield any artifacts or evidence of historical settlement, activity, or burials, as determined by a qualified professional, construction may commence without further oversight. If artifacts or evidence of historical settlement, activity, or burials are discovered during the pre-construction monitoring, then appropriate actions shall be taken as described in Mitigation Measures CULT-1 and CULT-2.

**FINDINGS:** With mitigation, the Project would have a **Less than Significant Impact** on Cultural Resources.

VI. <b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction or landslides; (b) result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; (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; or (e) have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

**DISCUSSION:** The North Coast is a seismically active area located near a triple junction of tectonic plates that increase the likelihood of regionally significant earthquakes. There are no mapped faults or fault hazard zones underlying the project site, but large earthquakes have shaken the region in the past and have caused damage throughout the City of Eureka.

VI.a)

a) i) There are no fault lines or zones, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, located at or near the proposed Project site (California, 2012). No impact would occur.

a) ii). The Site is situated within a seismically-active area and multiple seismic sources capable of producing moderate to strong ground motions exist in the vicinity of the Site. Given the proximity of significant active faults including the offshore Cascadia Subduction Zone and other active faults within northern California, the Site will likely experience strong seismic ground shaking during the economic life span of development on the property. Buildings will be designed to meet the most current building code standards for seismic safety (specifically, ASCE 7, Site Class D standards). A less than significant impact would occur.

a) iii). The Site is relatively flat. Humboldt Bay is located four blocks to the north. There is no evidence that the existing site would be subject to liquefaction or other seismic related ground-failure as these effects have not been seen in the past during earthquakes or other seismic activity. According to Humboldt County's WebGIS, the area is considered "Relatively Stable" in terms of seismic safety. There would be a less than significant impact.

a) iv) The Site is relatively flat and is situated more than 100 feet from significant sloping ground, therefore the potential for slope instability to adversely affect the Site is low. No impact would occur.

VI.b) The footprint of the proposed Project consists of compressed gravel surrounded by city streets and sidewalks. The Site is currently used as a parking lot. Therefore, development of the proposed Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. A less than significant impact would occur.

VI.c,d) The Site is level and is in an area of low geologic instability (Humboldt County, 2014) and is not prone to liquefaction. The Project would not result in increased potential for on- or off-site landslides. No impact would occur.

VI.e) Wastewater associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project would be disposed of via a connection to the City of Eureka municipal sewage disposal system. The Project will not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** No mitigation required.

**FINDINGS:** The Project would have a **Less Than Significant** impact on Geology and Soils.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), 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 GHG?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) generate greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, or (b) conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

**DISCUSSION:** Over the past decade, California has been developing legislation and implementing regulations to mitigate and reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. A summary of these regulations follows:

Executive Order S-3-05 (GHG Emissions Reductions) was executed on June 1, 2005, and calls for a reduction in GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the Year 2020 and an 80 percent reduction in GHG emissions to below 1990 levels by the Year 2050 (State of California, 2005)

The California Climate Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) was executed in September 2006 and directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to do the following:

- On or before June 30, 2007, publicly make available a list of discrete early action GHG emission reduction measures that can be implemented preceding the adoption of the statewide GHG limit and the measures required to achieve compliance with the statewide limit;
- By January 1, 2008, determine the statewide levels of GHG emissions in 1990 and adopt a statewide GHG emissions limit that is equivalent to the 1990 level, which equates to an approximate twenty-five (25) percent reduction in existing statewide GHG emissions;
- Adopt regulations to implement the early action of GHG emission reduction measures by January 1, 2010;
- Prior to January 1, 2011, adopt quantifiable, verifiable, and enforceable emission reduction measures by regulations that will achieve the statewide GHG emissions limit by 2020, which are to become operative on January 1, 2012. The emission reduction measure may include direct emission reduction measures, alternative compliance mechanisms, and potential monetary and non-monetary incentives that reduce GHG emissions from any sources or categories of sources as CARB deems necessary to achieve the statewide GHG emissions limit; and
- Monitor compliance and enforce any emission reduction measures that are adopted pursuant to AB 32.

Executive Order S-01-07 (Low Carbon Fuel Standard): Implemented on January 18, 2007, and establishes a statewide goal to reduce the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels by at

least ten (10) percent by the Year 2020 through establishment of a Low Carbon Fuel Standard (CEPA, Air Resources Board 2007). Carbon Intensity is the amount of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per unit of fuel energy emitted from each stage of producing, transporting, and using the fuel in a motor vehicle. On April 23, 2009, CARB adopted a regulation to implement the standard (CARB, 2009).

Senate Bill 97: Executed on August 24, 2007, requires the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to prepare, develop, and transmit to the Resources Agency guidelines for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions, or the effects of GHG emissions, as required by CEQA, which include, but are not limited to, effects associated with transportation or energy consumption, by July 1, 2009 (State of California Office of Planning and Research 2007). On April 13, 2009, OPR submitted to the Secretary for Natural Resources its proposed amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines for greenhouse gas emissions. The Resources Agency adopted those guidelines on December 30, 2009, and the guidelines became effective on March 18, 2010. The amendments treat GHG emissions as a separate category of impacts in which they are not to be addressed as part of the air quality impact analysis.

Climate Change Scoping Plan: On December 11, 2008, CARB approved the Climate Change Scoping Plan (CEPA, Air Resources Board 2008), pursuant to AB 32. The Climate Change Scoping Plan recommends a wide range of measures to reduce GHG emissions that include, but are not limited to:

- Expanding and strengthening existing energy efficiency programs
- Achieving a statewide renewable energy mix of 33 percent
- Developing a GHG emissions cap-and-trade program
- Establishing targets for transportation-related GHG emissions for regions throughout the State in addition to pursuing policies and incentives to meet those targets
- Implementing existing State laws and policies that include California's clean car standards, goods movement measures, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard
- Targeted fees to fund the State's long-term commitment to administering AB 32

Section 15064.4 was added to the CEQA guidelines and specifies how the significance of impacts from GHG's is to be determined. The Lead Agency is to make a good faith effort to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of GHG emissions that will result from a project. The Lead Agency is also to consider the following factors when accessing the impacts of the GHG emissions on the environment:

1. Extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions, relative to the existing environmental setting
2. Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the Lead Agency determines applies to the project
3. Extent to which the project complies with regulations adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions

In December 2014, LACO conducted a CalEEMod (Version 2013.2.2) analysis of greenhouse gases (GHG) that would be emitted as a result of construction and operation of the proposed project, including vehicle trips generated. CalEEMod is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant and GHG emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. This program is the

standard for Air Quality and GHG analysis within the NCUAQMD jurisdiction. The project will generate additional vehicular traffic, a known contributor of GHG emissions. Additional vehicle trips were estimated at 20 AM and 23 PM peak hour trips for Phase One, and 67 AM and 84 PM peak hour trips in Phase Two (Kittelsohn & Associates, Inc, 2015).

The following results were generated from the CalEEMod reports based on full build out of Phase two of the proposed project:

Table 3. HCRRC Facility CalEEMod GHG pollutants results

Pollutant	Annual Emissions (metric tons/yr)	
	Construction	Operation
Total carbon dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> )	260.3162	2,397.4422
Methane (CH <sub>4</sub> )	.0524	4.6328
Nitrous oxide (N <sub>2</sub> O)	0.00	.0169

Source: CalEEMod Model Run Report, Appendix A

VII.a) According to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), in 2011, 458.7 million tons of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (measured in CO<sub>2</sub>e) were emitted in California (CARB, California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2012;

[http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/misc/ghg\\_inventory\\_trends\\_00-12\\_2014-05-13.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/misc/ghg_inventory_trends_00-12_2014-05-13.pdf)).

Based on the CalEEMod analysis of GHG emissions from the Project (Appendix A), the Project is expected to emit approximately 2,397.44 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year. This equates to approximately 0.000005 percent of statewide emissions.

The project will be designed consistent with Humboldt County's standard design criteria and the California Green Building Code. Consistent with these standards, numerous energy-efficient and emission-reducing elements that result in reduced GHG emissions will be incorporated, including the following:

- Extensive daylighting through tubular daylighting devices
- Exterior glazing in public areas
- High-efficiency hydronic HVAC system with programmed control systems
- Single-ply membrane roof to reduce heat gain in the low-slope areas
- Other standard CBC Cal-Green design features

Based on the very small percentage of overall GHG emissions that would result from construction and operation of the proposed Project, considered with the incorporation of the GHG reduction measures listed above, the Project would not generate GHGs that would have a significant impact on the environment. A less than significant impact would occur.

VII.b) There is currently no adopted plan or policy for the City of Eureka or County of Humboldt specifically related to greenhouse gas emissions. The Project would not pose any conflict with the recent list of CARB early action strategies. Additionally, because the Project is not classified as a major source of GHG emissions and would produce minimal levels of GHG emissions, the GHG emissions would not conflict with the State's ability to meet its AB 32 goals. The GHG emissions will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. A less than significant impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** No mitigation required.

**FINDINGS:** The Project would have a **Less than Significant Impact** on Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

<b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) 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"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; (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; (c) emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; (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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; (e) result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area (only applicable if the Proposed Project is 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); (f) result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area (only applicable if the Proposed Project is located within the vicinity of a private

airstrip); (g) impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or (h) expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized area or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

The State of California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor website was reviewed on October 13, 2014 (<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/>). No concerns were identified for the Site. The nearest identified site is an inactive Pacific Gas & Electric site on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street between H and I streets, approximately .2 miles to the northwest. Similar sites are located further down 2<sup>nd</sup> street between H and G Streets, and on 1<sup>st</sup> and F streets (see Appendix B EnviroStor Cleanup Sites Map). These sites still require evaluation but are listed in the database as containing lead.

There is an open Regional Water Quality Control Board case (Case No. 1NHU483, David Parsons Case Manager) on the project site. As a result, the site is on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. After reviewing documentation from the open case (Order Nos. R1-2000-78 and R1-2003-0053) it appears that chlorinated solvents are present in the soils within and or adjacent to the Project Site. The chlorinated solvents appear to be a result of a past owner's dry cleaning operation conducted from 1973 to 1978.

The Courthouse site historically housed a service station and a dry cleaner from the 1940s through the 1990s. Two underground storage tanks associated with the service station that were used to store gasoline on the site were removed in 1971 during the construction of an office building. This office building was subsequently removed when the Humboldt County Jail was built on the site in 1994. During the construction of the Jail, contaminated soils were encountered that were associated with the tanks removed in 1971. Approximately 60 cubic yards of contaminated soil were removed in 1994 prior to the construction of the jail.

The former dry cleaner on the site operated between 1948 and 1973, and reportedly discharged Tetrachloroethene (PCE) into the ground on the south end of the facility. From 1992 to 1994 geotechnical monitoring was conducted on the site in preparation for the construction of the county jail facility to measure the concentration of PCE in the soil and groundwater. No PCE was encountered in the soil during these investigations but the compound was detected in groundwater samples. In February of 1994 approximately 270 cubic yards of soil was removed from the suspected release site.

PCE is commonly used in the dry-cleaning industry as a cleaning solvent. The approximate location of the former dry cleaning business appears to be in the northwest corner of the project site. PCE discharges reportedly occurred at this site from a dry-cleaning machine condensate pipe that emptied directly into a dry well at the rear of the facility (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2000).

Four push borings were installed in April 1999 on the site. The highest concentrations of PCE were found near the surface of all four borings, which also revealed a layer of clay at 40 feet below ground surface which prevents contaminated groundwater from moving deeper into the soil profile. Because this clay layer effectively blocks downward movement of contaminants, a series of groundwater monitoring wells were installed in 2000 at depths from 10 feet to 40 feet to monitor

contaminants in the shallow groundwater table. The wells were monitored quarterly from 2000 until 2009, when monitoring schedules were changed to twice annually.

The PCE contamination associated with the former dry cleaner (No. 1THU483) is comingled with the fuel constituents from other sites. There have not been documented cleanup activities since 2004. The former owner had been providing some financial support for the cleanup but had stopped by 2004. Several other funding sources had been used on the project, including the State Water Resources Control Board Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Fund.

A Notice of Violation was sent to the property owner and the County in 2007 outlining the remaining tasks to be completed in the active Cleanup and Abatement Order (CAO) R1-2003-0053. No notices have been sent by the NCRWQCB since 2007. At this time no actions are being taken to monitor or clean the site. This ongoing CAO will need to be addressed prior to construction.

In February 2015, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved funding under its Targeted Brownfields Assessment Program to assist the County in assessing and characterizing the potential presence of residual on-site contamination. This work is expected to begin in mid-2015.

VIII.a,b) Once operational, the Project will not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The Project will not generate reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. However, to address the open case with the RWQCB, special construction practices to contain or dispose of contaminated soil and or groundwater may be required. Cleanup and disposal of contaminated materials, if warranted, will be carried out in a matter consistent with RWQCB standards outlined in the California Code of Regulations Title 23, Section 2655 and are not likely to create any increased threat over the existing baseline.

The Project will not emit hazardous emissions or involve handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste during operation of the facility.

During Project construction, possibly hazardous materials such as sealants and coatings may be used on the Site; however, the use of those substances will be localized and temporary in duration, and will occur consistent with applicable regulations and manufacturer instructions. Quantities of these substances will also be less than state threshold quantities specified in Section 25532(j) of the Health and Safety Code. In addition, contractors will be required to maintain a Materials Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) for each hazardous material handled as part of the Project. A less than significant impact would occur.

VIII.c) The Project is located more than one-quarter mile from the nearest schools:

1. Alder Grove Charter School, located .3 miles southwest of the site at 714 F Street
2. Mistwood Montessori School (for children, ages 3 to 6, approximately) located .5 miles southeast of the Site at 1801 10th Street.
3. Educational Resource Center, located .45 miles east of the site at 1820 6th Street.

A less than significant impact would occur.

VIII.d) The Site has been identified on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As mentioned in the discussion section there is an ongoing

RWQCB CAO on the project site. In order to mitigate and potential impacts associated with the ongoing CAO on the project site mitigation measure HAZ-1 will be implemented to require soil remediation.

With Mitigation Incorporated, a less than significant effect would occur.

VIII.e,f) The nearest airport to the Site is Murray Field. Located 2.25 miles to the east of the Site, Murray Field is a county-owned, public-use, general aviation airport. The project Site is located beyond any of the airport compatibility zones that require special restrictions. Therefore the Project will not conflict with the air space routinely used by airplanes arriving and departing Murray Field. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity. No impact would occur.

VIII.g) According to the Traffic Impact Study (Kittelson & Associates, Inc, 2015), the Project will cause minor increases in delay at the 4<sup>th</sup> and K, 4<sup>th</sup> and L, and 5<sup>th</sup> and K Street intersections, which currently perform at a level of service (LOS) C. Impacts were found to significant at the 5<sup>th</sup> and K Street intersection for Phase One traffic, and for both 5<sup>th</sup> and K and 4<sup>th</sup> and K Street for Phase Two conditions. However, with the application of operational mitigation measures (see Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic), the impacts to traffic at these intersections would be reduced to a less than significant level. Refer to Section XVI for more details. The project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; therefore there would be a less than significant impact as a result of the proposed project.

VIII.h) The Project is located in the City of Eureka, in an urbanized setting. According to the General Plan Hazard Mapping the area has a low fire hazard rating and is not subject to wildland fires. No impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

HAZ-1: Prior to construction the County shall resolve the CAO or otherwise secure construction approval from the RWQCB. Construction approval is expected to require additional site-specific sampling for PCE. If PCE is detected above actionable levels at the project site, the County will develop an appropriate remediation program in consultation with the RWQCB. The soil remediation process ultimately selected will comply with methods approved by the State Water Resources Control Board and the RWQCB.

**FINDINGS:** With Mitigation, the Project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, (e.g. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; (b) substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted); (c) substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on-site or off-site erosion or siltation; (d) substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or

amount of surface runoff, in a manner which would result in on-site or off-site flooding; (e) 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; (f) otherwise substantially degrade water quality; (g) place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map; (h) place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, thereby impeding or redirecting flood flows; (i) expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or (j) result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

**DISCUSSION:** The City's storm drain system consists of gutter flow, cross street culverts, a small number of valley gutters, storm drain inlets and piping, and open channels. The storm drain piping consists primarily of reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) with diameters ranging from 8 to 42 inches. The City's storm water flows by gravity and is discharged at 17 points on Humboldt Bay and the sloughs surrounding the City. Much of the City's existing storm drainage network is old and undersized. During the rainy season, street flooding is a frequent problem. The drainage along State Highway 101, which traverses the City as Broadway, 4th Street, and 5th Street, is maintained by CalTrans. The remainder of the system is maintained by the City Public Works Department (Winzler & Kelly 2005, City of Eureka SWMP).

To comply with the Federal Clean Water Act and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, construction contractors must implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent the discharge of construction waste, debris, or contaminants from entering the storm water system.

IX.a) The Project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Wastewater disposal will be provided by the City of Eureka municipal sewer system. Because the project is less than one acre, coverage under the state Construction General Permit and preparation of a formal Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is not required. However, an Erosion Control Plan (ECP) will be prepared for the Project to provide guidelines for construction practices that minimize the potential for erosion and siltation, and detain potential sediment runoff during the construction phases as well as during the life of the Project (HYDRO-1 and HYDRO-2). During construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) described in the ECP will be employed to limit the amount of erosion, siltation, runoff, or flooding on- or off-site. With mitigation incorporated, a less than significant impact would occur.

IX.b) The Project does not require the use of groundwater supplies; the Project will be served by City of Eureka municipal water. Because the Site is already largely developed with nearly impervious gravel surfaces, the Project would not increase the impervious surface area which would result in substantial interference with groundwater recharge. A less than significant impact would occur.

IX.c-f) The proposed building site is an undeveloped gravel area, currently used as a parking lot. There have been no reports of on-site flooding or excessive stormwater runoff from the site. The construction of the HCCRRC and New County Office Facility and associated site improvements will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or result in flooding on- or off-site. No water courses will be altered by the Project. The Site is currently graveled and is within an urbanized area.. The existing drainage inlets will continue to be used for stormwater and site drainage management. Based on the foregoing,

there will not be significant drainage impacts resulting in on- or off-site erosion, siltation, or flooding. The Project will not significantly degrade water quality. A less than significant impact would occur.

IX.g-i) The Project does not involve housing. The Project will not place any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. The Site is not within the inundation area of any upstream dams. According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel Number 060062 0005C, dated June 17, 1986 the Site is located within an area designated as Zone C, indicating an area of minimal flooding (FEMA, 1986). No impact would occur.

IX.j) The Site is not subject to seiche or mudflow. According to the Tsunami Inundation Map dated June 1, 2009 (See Appendix D), the proposed facility is completely outside the Tsunami Inundation Area. No impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

HYDRO-1: Prior to the start of grading on the Site, the Project proponent shall require the construction contractor to prepare and implement an Erosion Control Plan (ECP). The ECP shall identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) in accordance with the California Stormwater Best Management Practices Handbook, such as the use of silt fences, straw mats, and other techniques as appropriate, to be used during grading and construction activities to control erosion, sedimentation, and deposition of pollutants.

HYDRO-2: If surplus soils are stockpiled from site excavations and utility trenching, the piles shall be covered if rains or strong winds are forecasted. This requirement shall be included in the construction plans and specifications, and the construction contractor(s) shall comply with the requirement.

**FINDINGS:** With mitigation incorporated, the Project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Hydrology and Water Quality.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) physically divide an established community; (b) conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or (c) conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

**DISCUSSION:** The proposed facility is an infill development utilizing an existing vacant lot within an urban area to provide additional capacity for related public uses on an adjacent parcel. The project has been proposed by the County of Humboldt in order to consolidate existing County services into a single location and expand program offerings. Phase 1 will result in 25 employees re-locating from a facility located two blocks from the Site and 12 employees shifting over from the existing jail. Phase 1 is expected to be constructed within the next three to four years. Phase 2 will provide capacity for approximately 77 employees. Details regarding funding, timeline, and the specific staffing to be located within the Phase 2 building are yet to be determined.

Although County owned property within City limits is exempt from the City's zoning and general plan requirements, the Site has a General Plan designation of Civic Government Center and is zoned for public facilities. The Site is not within the Coastal Zone.

X.a) The Project will not physically divide an established community. It is located on an already developed site adjacent to another county facility and will not alter circulation patterns of the adjacent roadways. No impact would occur.

X.b) Although the property is within the City of Eureka, because it is a County-owned property, the City does not have jurisdiction over planning and zoning of the Project Site (Lawler v. City of Redding, 1992). The county has submitted documentation of the location, purpose and extent of the proposed Project to the City as required by California Government Code Section 65402(b). This code section gives the City of Eureka the opportunity to comment on the Project's consistency with their General Plan, however it does not confer upon the city the ability to deny or condition the project. The project appears to be consistent with the uses allowed in the Civic Government Center designation and the public facilities zoning designation in the City of Eureka's General Plan. The City of Eureka has expressed concerns regarding the provision of adequate parking associated with the Project. A parking study (Attachment E: Parking Study, LACO, 2015) was completed to determine if there was sufficient available on-street parking to support the proposed

use. Based on the data gathered, it appears that there is adequate parking to support the proposed use within a four block radius around the project Site. The City of Eureka's zoning code specifies that parking should be provided on-site, rather than on-street. Although approximately 60 to 68 spaces are proposed on-site, these spaces will need to be supplemented with on-street parking to support the developments contemplated in Phase 2. Although the on-street location of the parking may differ from the on-site requirement in the City of Eureka code, the Parking Study demonstrates that sufficient parking is available in the areas immediately around the Site to serve the proposed use. A less than significant impact would occur.

X.c) There are no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservations plans that apply to the Site. The Site is already in a developed, urban area with adjacent buildings, and is currently in use as a graveled parking lot. The site is not within the Coastal Zone and does not contain wildlife habitat or other sensitive areas. No impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** No mitigation required.

**FINDINGS:** The Project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Land Use and Planning.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (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, or (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.

**DISCUSSION:** XI.a,b) The Site and surrounding areas do not contain mineral resources that are of value locally, to the region, or to residents (California Dept. of Conservation, 1980). The Site is not identified as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. The proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. No impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** No mitigation required.

**FINDINGS:** The Project would have **No Impact** on Mineral Resources.

XII. NOISE. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; (b) expose persons to, or generate, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels; (c) result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the Proposed Project; (d) result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the Proposed Project; (e) expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels (only applicable if the Proposed Project is 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); or (f) expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels (only applicable if the Proposed Project is located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.)

**DISCUSSION:** The Project is located along the Highway 101 corridor in downtown Eureka. Surrounding land uses are primarily commercial and professional offices. In the project area, noise impacts are generally associated with Highway 101 traffic. In Eureka, the 60 decibel contour, which is considered acceptable for residential areas, has been mapped and is generally no more than 305 feet from the Highway, or less than one city block (Humboldt County General Plan Background Report, Natural Resources and Hazards, 2004). The Humboldt County Association of Government's Regional Transportation Plan's 2013/14 Update Draft EIR states that sounds levels up to 70 decibels is an acceptable level for workers in offices and other commercial land uses. While it is unlikely that this project will generate noise impacts once construction is completed, the occupants of the finished building will be exposed to noise from Highway 101 throughout the day.

The Project consists of the development of a four to six story building of up to 26,500 square feet per floor and associated site improvements, including structured subgrade parking. The completed Project would maintain noise levels similar to existing conditions. Increases in noise levels at the Site will be limited to those generated during Project construction. The Project will not create a substantial long-term increase in noise levels. The site is located between the through-town portions of Highway 101. Because of the high volume of traffic throughout the day as compared to other parts of town, the noise associated with the long term operation of the facility will not be out of character with the surrounding area.

During construction, noise levels would vary with the level of construction activity and the types of on-site equipment operating at a particular time. Typical construction equipment noise emission levels range approximately 80-89 dBA 50 feet from Source. Pile drivers are the most significant source of noise and range between 96 to 101 dBA 50 feet from Source (Federal Transit Administration and Department of Transportation, 2006).

XII.a,b) During construction activities, the Project would temporarily and periodically expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of established standards. Construction activities will likely include the use of heavy equipment known to produce substantial noise, including concrete saws or jackhammers. Construction activities may result in moderate vibration from truck traffic and use of heavy equipment. It is possible that pile drivers will be used during construction. Pile drivers are one of the greatest sources of vibration during construction (Federal Transit Administration and Department of Transportation, 2006).

Construction of the proposed Project would be in phases. It is anticipated that construction activities would generate noise that exceeds 100 dBA during the heaviest periods. To mitigate the increase in noise and vibration levels, nearby sensitive receptors will be informed of anticipated noise and vibration impacts and duration. Additionally, construction hours will be limited.

To notify potentially impacted sensitive receptors of anticipated noise impacts, Mitigation Measure NOISE-1 will be applied prior to construction. To minimize noise levels and ground-borne vibrations for sensitive receptors, Mitigation Measures NOISE-2 and NOISE-3, will be applied during construction. With mitigation, a less than significant impact would occur.

Once completed, occupants of the new building will be exposed to noise from Highway 101 throughout the work day. The project is located between 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> streets, adjacent to Highway 101's north and south bound through-town routes. In order to reduce the impact to the workers and occupants of the finished building, Mitigation Measure Noise-4 will be applied to the design of the building. With mitigation incorporated, a less than significant impact will occur.

XII.c) Project construction activities could cause a short-term increase in ambient noise levels in the immediate vicinity of the Project. However, upon completion of construction activities, no significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels is expected as a result of the Project. A less than significant impact would occur.

XII.d) During construction activities, the proposed Project would temporarily and periodically expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of established standards. Construction activities will likely include the use of heavy equipment known to produce substantial noise. To

minimize the nuisance of noise levels on sensitive receptors, Mitigation Measures NOISE-1, NOISE 2 and NOISE-3 will be applied during construction. With mitigation, a less than significant impact would occur.

XII.e) The Project is not located in an airport land use plan area, but is located approximately 2.25 miles from Murray Field, a county-owned, public-use, general aviation airport. The Project is located a sufficient distance away from the airport and subject to ambient noise levels of a sufficient level such that the noise generated from the airport would have a negligible effect. No impact would occur.

XII.f) The Project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

NOISE-1: The County shall notify sensitive receptors (all property owners within 350 feet) of potential impacts from noise and vibration prior to initiating each construction phase. The notice shall describe construction activities and anticipated noise and/or vibrations from these activities, and the duration and operational hours of construction activities. The notice will also include a contact that sensitive receptors may call to report noise or vibration concerns. The notice will include a request that property owners share the notice with any employee or tenants working within 350 feet of the project site.

NOISE-2: To reduce the possibility of the construction noise and vibrations becoming an annoyance to sensitive receptors near the Project, exterior construction activity shall be confined to the weekday hours of 7:00 am to 7:00 pm or until sunset, whichever is later, and weekend hours of 8:00 am to 6:00 pm or until sunset, whichever is later. No heavy equipment related construction activities shall be allowed on Sundays or holidays.

NOISE-3: Construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise control devices, such as mufflers and shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.

NOISE-4: The new building will contain design elements, and be constructed with materials that will reduce the interior noise levels to acceptable levels as defined by the County of Humboldt's General Plan.

**FINDINGS:** With mitigation, the Project would have a **Less than Significant Impact** on Noise.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and/or businesses) or indirectly (e.g., 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 housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and/or businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure); (b) displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or (c) displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**DISCUSSION:** Approximately 114 people are expected to work in the HCCRRC and New County Office Facility. In Phase One, 37 employees are expected to be housed in the HCCRRC portion of the proposed project.

In Phase Two, the New County Office Facility is expected to house approximately 77 employees. The purpose of the facility is to consolidate multiple county departments and functions within a single office complex. It is unknown how many of the 77 employees would be new hires. The majority would be transferred from other locations in Eureka. Therefore, the increase in population associated with Phase Two of the proposed project would be minimal.

XIII.a) Construction and operation of the HCCRRC and New County Office Facility will not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly as there will not be a significant number of new jobs created. The Project does not propose new homes and does not include the extension of roads or other infrastructure. A less than significant impact would occur.

XIII.b,c) The Project Site is currently used as a parking area and does not contain any residential units. The Project would not displace any housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Nor would the Project displace any people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** No mitigation required.

**FINDINGS:** The Project would have a **Less than Significant Impact** on Population and Housing.

<b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for (a) fire protection, (b) police protection, (c) schools, (d) parks, or (e) other public facilities.

**DISCUSSION:** Approximately 114 employees are expected to be based in the HCCRRRC and New County Office Facility, with most being transferred from existing nearby government facilities. The proposed Project would provide a single, larger facility to consolidate these employees and government services.

XIV.a,b) The Project is located in the jurisdiction of the Humboldt Bay Fire Department (HBF), and the City of Eureka Police Department (EPD). The proposed Project would primarily relocate existing employees. No uses are proposed which are not already serviced by these departments either in the existing jail and courthouse or in other locations in the city.

There is no evidence that the Project would result in the need for new fire facilities beyond planned on-site improvements (e.g., fire hydrants and fire main supply line).

The increase in maximum capacity is not expected to lead to a substantial overall increase in service needs. A less than significant impact would occur.

XIV.c-e) The Project does not involve significant growth inducing impacts such as new housing that would put significant additional pressures on area schools or parks, or other public facilities. A less than significant impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** No mitigation required.

**FINDINGS:** The Project would have a **Less than Significant Impact** on Public Services.

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

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) 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, or (b) include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

**DISCUSSION** The proposed Project would not involve substantial population growth as most of the employees that would work at the project site would be relocated from other government facilities in the City.

XV.a,b) The Project does not involve significant growth inducing impacts such as new housing that will put significant additional pressures on area parks or recreational facilities. No impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** No mitigation required.

**FINDINGS:** The Project would have **No Impact** on Recreation.

<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to, level of service (LOS) standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestions management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to design features (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"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; (b) conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; (c) result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; (d) substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); (e) result in inadequate emergency access; or (f) conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

**DISCUSSION:**

Kittelson & Associates, Inc. (KAI) were retained to complete a Transportation Impact Analysis for the HCCRRC and New County Office Facility (Appendix F). The Transportation Impact Analysis

(Kittelson & Associates, Inc, 2015) examines the Existing Conditions; Existing Plus Project Conditions; Cumulative Conditions; and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. Potential project impacts were analyzed separately for Phase One (26,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) and Phase Two (54,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) build out of the proposed 80,000 square foot expansion. According to the Transportation Impact Analysis (Kittelson & Associates, Inc, 2015), the proposed project would add 20 AM and 23 PM peak hour trips in Phase One, and 67 AM and 84 PM peak hour trips in Phase Two.

XVI.a) There are currently no applicable plans, ordinance or policies established measures of effectiveness, with the exception of LOS, for the performance of the circulation system. The project will include bicycle parking in the proposed sub-grade parking area in Phase Two. Bus stops along both 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Streets that serve the existing courthouse and jail facility would not be impacted by the project and would continue to provide adequate service at those locations.

There would be a less than significant impact as a result of the proposed project.

XVI.b) Kittelson & Associates (2015) utilized Level of Service (LOS) to evaluate operational conditions at potentially affected intersections within the vicinity of the Site. LOS was used to characterize the delay to be expected by a motorist due the presence of other vehicles. LOS is a basic traffic engineering concept and the traditional metric for analyzing transportation and traffic impacts under CEQA. However, the state Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is currently developing a revised framework in response to Senate Bill 743, which was signed in 2113. Traffic flow and delay at intersections do not necessarily represent environmental impacts, which are the focus of CEQA, and OPR's new framework is expected to focus on emissions and vehicle miles traveled rather than vehicle LOS.

The City of Eureka provided guidelines for the Transportation Impact Analysis to KAI. Although the proposed project is not subject to compliance with City standards as discussed in the Project Description, the City's guidelines were still consulted for purposes of evaluating traffic impacts under CEQA. The City's guidelines indicated that for un-signalized and signalized intersections, a project is considered to have a significant effect if it would:

- Degrade an intersection operating at an acceptable LOS (A, B, or C) to deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS (D,E, or F); or,
- If intersections affected by increased project traffic are already below LOS C and the added project traffic results in an additional delay of 5 seconds.

Caltrans targets LOS D as its standard for Highway 101 in urban areas such as the section adjacent to the project site (California Department of Transportation, 2002). Intersection delays are listed on Table 9:

Table 9: Intersection Delays and Level of Service Definitions

LOS	Signalized	Unsignalized
A	≤10 seconds	≤10 seconds
B	>10-20 seconds	>10-15 seconds
C	>20-35 seconds	>15-25 seconds
D	>35-55 seconds	>25-35 seconds
E	>55-80 seconds	>35-50 seconds
F	>80 seconds	>50 seconds

Source: (Kittelson & Associates, Inc, 2015)

Kittelson analyzed the following 14 intersections in the Transportation Impact Analysis (2015):

1. 4th Street (US 101) & H Street
2. 4th Street (US 101) & I Street
3. 4th Street (US 101) & J Street
4. 4th Street (US 101) & K Street
5. 4th Street (US 101) & L Street
6. 5th Street (US 101) & H Street
7. 5th Street (US 101) & I Street
8. 5th Street (US 101) & J Street
9. 5th Street (US 101) & K Street
10. 5th Street (US 101) & L Street
11. 6th Street & H Street
12. 6th Street & I Street
13. 7th Street & H Street
14. 7th Street & I Street

Traffic conditions were analyzed for weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic, which is typically between 7:00 and 9:00 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM, respectively.

The proposed Project Site is accessed from K Street between 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Streets, and is currently used as a parking area for County employees and visitors to the courthouse and jail. Neither Intersection 4 (4<sup>th</sup> and K Street) or Intersection 9 (5<sup>th</sup> and K Street) currently have signals. Caltrans is responsible for 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Streets which serve as Highway 101, while the City of Eureka is responsible for K Street and other cross streets throughout the study area.

Three intersections – 4<sup>th</sup> and K, 4<sup>th</sup> and L, and 5<sup>th</sup> and K – are projected to be impacted by Phase 2 of the project (Kittelson & Associates, Inc. 2015). These three intersections each have through-traffic moving east or west respectively (coinciding with Highway 101) and two-way stop controlled traffic moving north-south across Highway 101. Traffic generated from the Site would exit the Site on K Street and travel either northbound toward 4<sup>th</sup> Street or southbound toward 5<sup>th</sup> Street.

Table 10 shows the PM peak hour wait times at intersections 4, 5, and 9 under Existing Conditions (without project). Under Existing Conditions (without project), the un-signalized intersections of 4<sup>th</sup> and K and 4<sup>th</sup> and L perform below the City of Eureka's LOS C target and below the Caltrans LOS D target during PM peak.

Table 10: Year 2014 Existing Conditions PM LOS at Intersections 4, 5, 9

Intersection	Worst Movement	Delay (secs)	LOS
4 <sup>th</sup> and K	Southbound	67.9	F
4 <sup>th</sup> and L	Southbound	57.7	F
5 <sup>th</sup> and K	Southbound	19.0	C

Source: (Kittelson & Associates, Inc, 2015)

Table 11 shows the PM peak hour wait times at intersections 4, 5, and 9 under Existing Conditions Plus Project Phase 1. Under Existing Conditions Plus Project Phase 1, there are minor changes from Existing Conditions (without project).

Table 11: Year 2014 Existing Conditions Plus Project Phase 1 PM LOS at Intersections 4, 5, 9

Intersection	Worst Movement	Delay (secs)	LOS
4 <sup>th</sup> and K	Southbound	70.0	F
4 <sup>th</sup> and L	Southbound	57.7	F
5 <sup>th</sup> and K	Southbound	19.2	C

Source: (Kittelson & Associates, Inc, 2015)

Table 12 shows the PM peak hour wait times at intersections 4, 5, and 9 under Existing Conditions Plus Project Phase 2. Under Existing Conditions Plus Project Phase 2, there are minor changes from Existing Conditions (without project) for the intersections at 4<sup>th</sup> and L and 5<sup>th</sup> and K, but a significant change for the intersection at 4<sup>th</sup> and K. At the 4<sup>th</sup> and K intersection, the LOS remains at F but the worst movement changes from southbound to northbound and the delay is longer. This change is caused by traffic coming out of the Site waiting to cross or turn left onto 4<sup>th</sup> Street (Highway 101). LOS is reduced for a relatively small number of vehicles traveling northbound or southbound on K and L Streets.

Table 12: Year 2014 Existing Conditions Plus Project Phase 2 PM LOS at Intersections 4, 5, 9

Intersection	Worst Movement	Delay (secs)	LOS
4 <sup>th</sup> and K	Northbound	106.5	F
4 <sup>th</sup> and L	Southbound	60.0	F
5 <sup>th</sup> and K	Southbound	20.2	C

Source: (Kittelson & Associates, Inc, 2015)

Table 13 shows the PM peak hour wait times at intersections 4, 5, and 9 for the Year 2035 Cumulative Conditions (without project). Under Year 2035 Cumulative Conditions (without project), the three un-signalized intersections of 4<sup>th</sup> and K, 4<sup>th</sup> and L, and 5<sup>th</sup> and K all perform at LOS F.

Table 13: Year 2035 Cumulative Conditions (without project) PM LOS at Intersections 4, 5, 9

Intersection	Worst Movement	Delay (secs)	LOS
4 <sup>th</sup> and K	Northbound	200.9	F
4 <sup>th</sup> and L	Southbound	265.1	F
5 <sup>th</sup> and K	Southbound	117.4	F

Source: (Kittelson & Associates, Inc, 2015)

Table 14 shows the PM peak hour wait times at intersections 4, 5, and 9 for the Year 2035 Cumulative Conditions (with project), which includes Phase 2. An annual growth rate of 1.4% is assumed. Under Year 2035 Cumulative Conditions (with project), the three un-signalized intersections of 4<sup>th</sup> and K, 4<sup>th</sup> and L, and 5<sup>th</sup> and K all perform at LOS F, with longer delays than without the project. These delays affect a relatively small number of vehicles traveling northbound or southbound on K and L Streets.

Table 14: Year 2035 Cumulative Conditions (with project) PM LOS at Intersections 4, 5, 9

Intersection	Worst Movement	Delay (secs)	LOS
4 <sup>th</sup> and K	Northbound	328.3	F
4 <sup>th</sup> and L	Southbound	310.7	F
5 <sup>th</sup> and K	Northbound	336.6	F

Source: (Kittelson & Associates, Inc, 2015)

Kittleson (2015) observed that LOS could be improved at the three two-way stop controlled intersections by converting them to signalized control. This is the standard mitigation measure for improving LOS at unsignalized intersections. However, Kittleson (2015) cautioned that a detailed warrant analysis in conformance with the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices should be conducted prior to installation of a signal. In particular, the effects of signalized control on through-traffic along Highway 101 would need to be carefully analyzed. Kittleson (2015) calculated mitigation share percentage for the Phase 2 project using the standard Caltrans equation.

With mitigation (described below) there would be a less than significant impact as a result of the proposed project.

XVI.c) The Project does not involve air traffic or transport of goods by air, and will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

No impact would occur.

XVI.d) There are no design features that would increase hazards over the existing conditions. Under the existing conditions, the Intersection Sight Distance, or the distance required for a driver entering the major roadway to safely determine when to enter, is below standard for both the 4<sup>th</sup> and K Street and 5<sup>th</sup> and K Street intersections (Kittelson & Associates, Inc, 2015). The addition of the Phase One and Phase Two building footprints would not further decrease this Intersection Sight Distance.

There would be a less than significant impact.

XVI.e) Humboldt Bay Fire Station 1 is located approximately seven blocks (.5 miles) to the west of the existing Humboldt County Courthouse. The Project will include the installation of interior fire suppression systems and will provide adequate access for emergency vehicles. A less than significant impact would occur.

XVI.f) The Project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. The existing bus stops at 4<sup>th</sup> and K and 5<sup>th</sup> and K may be temporarily affected during construction, though no long term impacts are expected. The Project will enhance ADA access to the facilities on the Site through improvement of walkways, ADA-rated ramps, and parking lot crossings. The Project includes a new bike rack that can accommodate at least 10 bicycles. No impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

Traffic-1: Prior to initiating Phase 2 of the project, a signal warrant analysis shall be conducted to determine if signalization is the appropriate method to mitigate delays experienced at the following:

- Intersection 4 (4<sup>th</sup> Street and K Street)
- Intersection 5 (4<sup>th</sup> Street and L Street); and,
- Intersection 9 (5<sup>th</sup> Street and K Street)

If, in consultation with the City of Eureka and Caltrans, signalization is determined to be the appropriate method to address increased vehicle delays, the project shall contribute the fair share contribution to these signals (estimated to range from 1.3% to 7.6%).

**FINDINGS:** With mitigation, the Project would have a **Less than Significant Impact** to Transportation/Traffic.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; (b) require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; (c) require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; (d) have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or need new or expanded entitlements; (e) result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; (f) be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or (g) comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**DISCUSSION:** Approximately 114 people are expected to work in the HCCRRC and New County Office Facility. In addition there will be capacity to house up to 40 inmates. At completion, the HCCRCC and New County Office Facility represent an additional 80,000 square feet of program area.

XVII.a,b,d,e) Wastewater from the proposed Project would be treated by the City of Eureka wastewater treatment plant (WWTP). According to the 2014 Municipal Services Review (MSR) for the City of Eureka, the WWTP was designed to treat an average dry weather flow up to 6.0 million

gallons per day (MGD), and is currently permitted to treat 5.24 MGD (City of Eureka, 2014). The WWTP was designed to treat peak dry weather flows up to 9.5 MGD, and is currently permitted to treat 8.6 MGD. Peak wet weather flow design and permitted capacity is 32.2 MGD.

The City estimated the WWTP had remaining available capacity to service 2,162 estimated dwelling units (EDU) (City of Eureka, 2014). The 2014 MSR projects a growth of approximately 1,298 EDUs by 2019. This leaves a remaining capacity of 864 EDUs, which would accommodate the increase in wastewater expected to be generated by the Project.

Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District (HBMWD) supplies water to the City of Eureka. According to the 2014 MSR for the City of Eureka, the City maintains water rights on the Mad River equivalent to 8.0 MGD. The City's average annual daily system demand is 4.0 MGD, and the average peak month daily demand is 5.23 MGD. The city's existing water allocations and supporting infrastructure will be able to accommodate the projected increase in water demand associated with the proposed Project.

A less than significant impact would occur.

XVII.c) The Site of the proposed Project is currently a heavily compacted gravel parking lot surrounded with streets and sidewalks and consists primarily of impervious surfaces. While the proposed Project would introduce roof area that did not previously exist, it would replace the existing compacted gravel area. The proposed Project will incorporate landscape improvements which will provide modest opportunities for on-site storm water infiltration. A less than significant impact would occur.

XVII.f,g) Humboldt Waste Management Authority (HWMA) is a Joint Powers Authority made up of the following municipalities: Arcata, Blue Lake, Eureka, Ferndale, Rio Dell, and Humboldt County. Because there are no active local landfills, HWMA manages the transport of solid waste for disposal at either the Anderson Landfill in Shasta County or the Dry Creek Landfill in Medford, Oregon. Neither of these landfills is approaching capacity, and the proposed Project would not generate solid waste in quantities that would exceed the capacity of either landfill. HWMA provides services consistent with California Code of Regulations requirements. There is no evidence that the proposed Project would not be in compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. A less than significant impact would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:** No mitigation required.

**FINDINGS:** The Project would have a **Less than Significant Impact** on Utilities and Service Systems.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the Proposed Project would (a) have the potential to 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, 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; (b) 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.); or (c) have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

**DISCUSSION:** The Mandatory Findings of Significance are presented here to provide readers with a summary section where the findings from the discussion in the body of the Initial Study can be found. CEQA requires that the magnitude of any identified environmental impacts be measured in terms of significance. A significant effect is defined in the CEQA guidelines as "...a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project".

XVIII.a) The proposed Project would not degrade the quality of the environment. There is no evidence that the Project would substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species or cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels. The Project Site is a graveled lot currently used for parking and lacks any vegetation or other habitat elements. Given the lack of habitat at the Site it can be assumed that it does not support any rare or endangered plant or animal species. Therefore, the proposed Project would not directly or indirectly threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. There is no evidence that the Project would eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. A less than significant impact would occur.

XVIII.b) As with any development or ongoing operation of a facility, the proposed Project could contribute incrementally to a variety of impacts. The mitigation measures proposed throughout this document are intended to reduce the potential of any effects from the project itself to have significant adverse impacts. No evidence was identified to indicate that the impacts identified in this Initial Study would combine with non-project impacts to create significant cumulative impacts.

XVIII.c) There is no evidence that the proposed Project would have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. A less than significant impact would occur.

**FINDINGS:** With mitigation, the Project would have a **Less than Significant Impact** on Mandatory Findings of Significance.

## V. REFERENCES

- California. (2012, September 21). *California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic Hazards and Mapping Program, Alquist Priolo*. Retrieved November 10, 2014, from California Department of Conservation: <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/>
- California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, C. (2013, July). *California Emissions Estimator Model Users Guide*.
- California Department of Transportation. (2011). *2011 Traffic Volumes*. Sacramento, CA, YSA.
- California Department of Transportation, C. D. (2002). *Route Concept Report, Route 101 Corridor*. Eureka: State of California.
- Caltrans, C. D. (2013, 12 19). *Scenic Highway Program Eligible and Designated Routes*. Retrieved 12 03, 2014, from California Department of Transportation: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm>
- City of Eureka. (1997). *General Plan*. Eureka, CA, USA.
- City of Eureka, C. o. (2014). *City of Eureka Municipal Services Review*. City of Eureka.
- County of Humboldt. (1993). *Humboldt County Justice Facility/ Civic Center Project EIR SCH No. 92093018*.
- Criminal Justice Research Foundation, & Vanir, Inc. . (2013). *Humboldt County Sheriff's Office Jail Needs Assessment Study*. Sacramento.
- Federal Transit Administration and Department of Transportation. (2006). *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*. Washington, DC: Office of Planning and Environment Federal Transit Administration.
- Humboldt County. (2014). *WEB GIS*. Retrieved November 10, 2014, from Humboldt GIS Portal Planning and Building: <http://gis.co.humboldt.ca.us/Freeance/Client/PublicAccess1/index.html?appconfig=podgis4>
- Kittelson & Associates, Inc. (2015). *Transportation Impact Analysis for the Humboldt County Community Corrections Reentry Resource Center*. Sacramento, CA.
- Lawler v. City of Redding, 778,783-784; 40 Ops. (Cal. App. 4th 1992).
- McLaughlin and Harradine. (1965, November). *Soils of Western Humboldt County, California*. University of California Davis Department o Soils and Plant Nutrition in Cooperation with County of Humboldt, California.
- National Weather Service. (2012, June 24). *TsunamiReady Guidelines*. Retrieved 2013, from TsunamiReady.
- North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District. (1995). *Particulate Matter (PM10) Attainment Plan Draft Report*. Eureka.
- State of California. (2005). *Executive Order S-3-05*. Retrieved January 23, 2014, from CA.GOV: <http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=1861>
- Waterboards. (2014). Retrieved 11 26, 2014, from GeoTracker: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=825+5th+Street+Eureka>
- Wiyot Tribe, W. (2014). *Home*. Retrieved 12 4, 2014, from Wiyot Website: <http://www.wiyot.us/>

# Figures