

**INITIAL STUDY**

<b>PROJECT TITLE</b>	<b>WALTERS MAJOR SUBDIVISION</b>		
<b>PROJECT SPONSOR:</b>	Ontiveros & Associates, Inc., 167 S. Fortuna Blvd., Fortuna, CA 95540		
<b>PROJECT APPLICANT:</b>	David Walters	<b>CASE NO (S):</b>	SD07-12-18
<b>PROJECT LOCATION:</b>	The project site is located in Humboldt County, in the City of Ferndale, on the east side of Jacobsen Way. The APN numbers of the property are 031-171-13 and 031-231-04.		
<b>ZONING &amp; GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION</b>	RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY, SPECIAL BUILDING SITE 10,000 SQUARE FOOT LOTS (R1-B2)		
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<p>The project consists of a major subdivision of an approximately 165,528 square foot (sf) (3.8 acre) residential parcel into eight new parcels ranging in size from approximately 17,000sf to 36,000sf.</p> <p>The existing parcel (Remainder as shown on Parcel Map No. 2741) is comprised of Assessors' Parcel Numbers 031-171-13 &amp; 031-231-04 located in the City of Ferndale east of Jacobsen Way. There is currently one residence on the parcel and one barn. The parcel is on the eastern boundary of the City Limits adjacent to existing residential lots approximately 10,000sf in size (see Location Map).</p> <p>The entire parcel slopes gently to the north with a slope of approximately 1 – 2%. The proposed lot boundaries are rectangular shaped and are situated to provide building sites on the gently sloping portion of the property. Jacobsen Way runs adjacent to the western property line in a North-South direction.</p> <p>Sewer services are to be provided to the parcels by the City of Ferndale along with telephone by Frontier Communications, water by Del Oro Water Company, Cable by Sudden Link Communications and electricity by P.G. &amp; E. Currently there are 10 water laterals supplied by Del Oro Water Co. and three (3) sewer laterals supplied by the City of Ferndale serving the property.</p> <p>All of the access to the parcel is on public roads with existing rights-of-way. There is one existing utility (P G &amp; E) easement on this parcel</p>		

**LEAD AGENCY/CONTACT:** City of Ferndale; P.O. Box 1095; Ferndale, CA 95536; Nancy Kaytis-Slocum, City Clerk; Phone: 707.786.4224; Fax: 707.786.9314; email [cityclerk@ci.ferndale.ca.us](mailto:cityclerk@ci.ferndale.ca.us).

**SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:** The project site, zoned Residential, Single Family, special building site 10,000 sf minimum lots, is located in the City of Ferndale, on the east side of Jacobsen Way. The subject parcel is on the eastern boundary of the city limits area and is adjacent to residential lots to the south (R1 – 6000 sf lots); to the west (R1B1 – 8000 sf lots); also to the west (R1B2 – 10,000 sf lots). To the north and still within the city limit is an Agriculture-exclusive area. To the east and over the city limit is undeveloped agricultural land (AE-60, F/R).





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

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

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

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

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

<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X		

**DISCUSSION:** The project site is not located in, nor will it impact, a designated scenic vista; and it is not located on a state highway; however, views to the southeast include the Wildcat Mountains, and views to the south are of agricultural lands. The area surrounding the property is pastureland and residential development which preclude the possibility that the project or resulting development could adversely affect a scenic vista. The character of the subject parcel and surrounding area is such that the site itself is not part of a scenic vista.

The proposed project will not significantly damage scenic resources. There are no natural features that stand out as a scenic resource and the property is not visible from any nearby scenic viewpoints. The proposed project does not have the potential to significantly degrade the visual character or the quality of the area. The project site is currently adjacent to small parcels (10,000sf) with residential development and the project will result in similar residential development.

Because the subject project is surrounded by large lots, open space, no designated scenic vistas, is located off Main Street and creates no change in the development pattern in the area, staff concludes that the project will not result in a substantial degradation to the aesthetics of the area.

The subdivision itself would result in new residences with exterior lighting. When exterior lights are proposed, staff is recommending a mitigation measure be included that specifies that all exterior lights be located and shielded such that no light or glare extends beyond the property line. And, to assure that the illuminated portion of the light fixture/lens itself cannot be seen from off of the property, the mitigation should include a provision that no portion of the illuminated fixture/lens is to extend below the shield.

With the mitigation described below, staff concludes that the proposed project will not result in creation of a new source of substantial light or glare.

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 1. Any and all exterior lighting shall be located and shielded such that no light or glare extends beyond the property line. In addition, no portion of the illuminated portion of the fixture/lens shall extend below the shield. The location of all exterior lights shall be shown on the site plan submitted to and approved by the Design Review Committee. In addition, the property owners shall submit to the Design Review Committee for review and approval the specifications for the exterior lights, including a picture or diagram showing the cross section of the light that illustrates that the illuminated portion of the fixture/lens does not extend below the shield. Exterior lighting specifications shall be part of the building permit process and be reviewed by City Planning prior to approval.**

<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

**DISCUSSION:** The project site has no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, and no Williamson Act contract lands. The surrounding properties within the city limits are residential, with agricultural land outside the city limits, with no planned change in use. The proposed subdivision is of property that has been zoned residential; the City’s General Plan has designated the subject property for residential use. Although the proposal is to subdivide the mostly undeveloped property, the designated use is not changing. Staff concludes that there is No Impact to Agricultural Resources.

III. AIR QUALITY. 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 Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
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)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

**DISCUSSION:** The North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD) is responsible for monitoring and enforcing local and state air quality standards. Air quality standards are set for emissions that may include, but are not limited to: visible emissions, particulate matter, and, fugitive dust. Pursuant to Air Quality Regulation 1, Chapter IV, Rule 400 – *General Limitations*, a person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public or which cause or have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property.

With regard to particulate matter, all of Humboldt County has been designated by the California State Air Quality Board as being in “non-attainment” for PM<sub>10</sub> air emissions. PM<sub>10</sub> air emissions include chemical emissions and other inhalable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 10 microns. PM<sub>10</sub> emissions include smoke from wood stoves and airborne salts and other particulate matter naturally generated by ocean surf. Because, in part, of the large number of wood stoves in Humboldt County and because of the generally heavy surf and high winds common to this area, Humboldt County has exceeded the state standard for PM<sub>10</sub> air emissions. Therefore, any use or activity that generates unnecessary airborne particulate matter may be of concern to the NCUAQMD.

The following construction management measures for dust control will be adhered to throughout the project and placed on the final development plan in order to reduce project related impacts to air quality to less than significant levels:

- a. Water all active construction areas twice per day and use erosion control measures to prevent water runoff containing silt and debris from entering the storm drain system.
- b. Cover trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose material.
- c. Pave, water, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on unpaved access roads and parking areas.
- d. Sweep paved access roads and parking areas daily.
- e. Sweep streets daily if visible material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

The measures above will control dust emissions and reduce project related sources of air pollution.

Approval of the subdivision in and of itself will not result in air borne emissions. However, the subdivision will allow for the development of new and/or additional buildings, new roads/driveways, etc. which could yield air emissions. However, none of these indirect activities will result in significant or substantial levels of emissions that would result in an adverse impact, or add substantially to the PM<sub>10</sub> non-attainment.

Regarding sensitive receptors being impacted by pollutant concentrations, as discussed above, the project will not result in such levels of concentrations of pollutants so as to have an adverse impact on the surrounding area or to substantially increase existing air quality impacts. Therefore, the project will not result in substantial air quality impacts on or to sensitive receptors.

The proposed project does not include design elements that would create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact that would result in objectionable odors.

Based on the conclusions above, Staff finds that that the project will not result in adverse air quality impacts, nor result in a cumulatively considerable increase in the PM<sub>10</sub> emissions.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
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?		X		
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?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
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?				X

**DISCUSSION:** The project site is located adjacent to undeveloped agricultural land and near residential development. The project site is not located near the vicinity of creeks or sensitive habitat areas and there are no known special status species. The proposed project is expected to have no impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Future development will not conflict with the Ferndale General Plan. There are no other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance that the project conflicts with. The project site is located more than 2000 feet from Francis Creek, which is the largest biological resource within the city limits; other closer resources could include natural drainage courses within the City. There are no known or expected migratory corridors in this part of the City, or any listed or critical plant or animal species.

According to the Wetland Delineation Report by Timberland Resource Consultants, the proposed lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 located on the northeast corner of the subject parcels were the only lots that were considered to fall within a wetland. These lots exhibited obligate vegetation as well as being well inundated during the February 16, 2004 site visit. This wetland appeared to be in a more natural state with no influence from the adjacently placed fill. Adjacent plots, vegetative continuity, elevation, inundation, and soil probing determined the boundaries of this wetland. The wetland measures 130 ft (north/south) by 16 ft (east/west). This equates to approximately 1,950 sq. ft. The wetland can be classified as a Palustrine Emergent Wetland.

Though the wetland on the property is common to much of Humboldt County, it provides minimal biological diversity and is of little wildlife value. This wetland is not a significant feature, and is not adjacent to and does not form hydrologic connectivity with well-developed, high quality wetlands. To maintain the integrity of this wetland, the mitigation measures listed below should be implemented.

The project has no component that would result in significant impacts to biologic resources. Therefore, with the mitigations listed below, the project will have less than significant impact on biological resources.

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 2: The individual residences shall be designed such that the wetland not be filled or otherwise impacted with development or future land use. A minimum setback of 25 feet, measured westward from the westernmost wetland boundary, shall be maintained (on lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8). The 25-foot buffer shall be incorporated into the backyard of each lot. No earthmoving or building construction shall take place within this 25-ft buffer zone. The wetland is undisturbed and should not require any additional planting of hydrophytic species.**

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 3: A temporary sediment fence shall be constructed at the 25 ft buffer line of the wetland area. The fence shall be constructed of certified weed free or rice straw bales and landscape fabric and shall be constructed prior to any ground moving activities associated with individual lot development. This fence shall be maintained throughout the construction period and shall only be removed after the exposed soils on the site are stabilized with vegetation.**

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 4: Storm runoff from structures and roads shall be drained away from the wetland site.**

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

**DISCUSSION:** No Known archaeological sites are known to exist in the project area. Redmond & Associates conducted a Geotechnical Investigation Report of the project site that was published on March 28, 2003 and during the field investigation, which consisted of an assessment of the soil by excavating 3 backhoe test pits, no cultural resources were discovered.

Based on the above, Staff concludes that the project will not have a substantial impact on cultural resources.

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 5: If buried archaeological or historical resources are encountered during construction activities, the contractor on-site shall call all work in the immediate area to a halt temporarily, and a qualified archaeologist is to be contacted to evaluate the materials. Prehistoric materials may include obsidian or chert flakes, tools, locally darkened midden soils, groundstone artifacts, dietary bone, and human burials. If human burial is found during construction, state law requires that the County Coroner be contacted immediately. If the remains are found to be those of Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission will then be contacted by the Coroner to determine the appropriate treatment of the remains.**

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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.			x	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			x	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			x	
iv) Landslides?			x	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			x	
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?			x	
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?			x	
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?				x

**DISCUSSION:** All of Humboldt County is subject to a moderately high seismic ground shaking level. The proposed project is located within the City of Ferndale, which was affected on April 25, 1992 by a magnitude 7.1 (Mw) earthquake that occurred near Cape Mendocino in Humboldt County. The location and orientation of rupture suggested an origin on or near the Cascadia subduction zone (CSZ) confirming the capability of the CSZ to produce strong earthquakes and local tsunamis. However, the subject property is not located nor is affected by active faults, tsunamis, landslides, erosion, subsidence, expansive soils, nor does it include unique geologic or physical features.

All property within the City of Ferndale is located in 'Seismic Zone 4' as prescribed by the Uniform Building Code. Therefore, all new construction must comply with the construction standards for Seismic Zone 4. Because all construction must comply with the Seismic Zone 4 standards of the Uniform Building Code, and because construction that conforms to the Uniform Building Code is presumed to meet the building safety standard, the potential impacts from seismic ground shaking and seismic ground failure, including liquefaction are considered less than significant.

The proposed project will not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. According to the Geologic Hazards maps of the Ferndale General Plan, the project is located in an area that is geologically stable. Additionally, the project site is not located in a special studies zone or mapped in a potentially active fault zone according to the Special Study Maps prepared by the State of California. The project will not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from a fault rupture.

According to the Geotechnical Investigation by Redmond & Associates, the site is presently stable and free of any geologic hazards. The project site is located in Seismic Zone 4, with a seismic Zone factor of 0.4, per Figure 16-2 and Table 16-I of the 1998 Uniform Building Code (UBC).

The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving seismic-related ground failure and liquefaction. The soils at the site are not conducive to liquefaction and subsidence. In addition, the site is not located in an area identified with the potential for liquefaction.

The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving landslides. Future residential development on the project site will be located on a relatively flat site (1-2%). With the combination of a mild slope and the relatively stable soils at the project site there is no significant risk of landslides as a result of the project. The future development will be on parts of the site with mild slope which has little potential for erosion. No new roads will be constructed. Residential activities will not increase the soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

The project will not 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. The only known soil related geologic hazard identified is the shallow slope on the site. The slope is vegetated and all proposed building sites are located outside of the area with a shallow slope.

The project would not 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. There are no known expansive soils in the project area, and none are expected on this site. See soils report by Redmond & Associates.

The project does not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. Sewer services will be provided by the City of Ferndale Treatment Plant.

Based on the above discussion, Staff concludes that the project will not have a substantial impact on Geology & Soils.

<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?				X
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?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
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?				X
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?			X	
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?				X
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
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?				X

**DISCUSSION:** The proposed project does not include any feature that results in the creation of significant hazards. The proposed project does not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and will not emit hazardous emissions. The site is not listed as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

The project is not located within an airport land use plan, public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The Humboldt County Fairgrounds, located within 3000 ft. of this project site, provides landing facilities in the form of a heliport for emergency services in times of flood, earthquake, medical evacuations, etc. The project will not impact normal operations of the fairground's heliport, and use of the heliport will not impact the proposed residential development. Therefore, the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area due to the proximity of the fairground's heliport.

The proposed project will not affect any emergency response plans. All on-site emergency access and circulation will be designed consistent with the Fire Protection District standards. The project site is located within City Limits of Ferndale; there are no "wildlands" near the project site. Therefore, there will be no impact as a result of wildland fires. Based on the discussion above staff concludes that the project will not result in any substantial impacts with regards to hazards and hazardous materials.

<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
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)?				X
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?			X	
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?			X	
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?		X		
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
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?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	
<p><b>DISCUSSION:</b> The project is not shown on official maps as being subject to flooding. To address the drainage issues in the city of Ferndale, the applicant has proposed a detention facility so that there will be no net increase in the existing surface runoff on the properties created by this subdivision. Surface runoff from Lots 1 and 2 will flow towards the existing drainage swale on Lot 3. Surface runoff from Lots 4-8 will be directed to the proposed new stormwater detention facility.</p> <p>The project does not include development that would impact the quality or quantity, rate or flow, and removal, recharge or addition to groundwater supplies.</p> <p>Based on review of the Flood Insurance Rate Map prepared by the Federal Emergency Agency, the subject property is outside the 100-year flood plain. Therefore, the proposed project will not impede or redirect flood flows nor expose people or structures to flooding.</p> <p>Due to the known seismic activity in the Pacific Rim, a tsunami could impact the outlying areas of Ferndale. The project site is three to four miles south of the Eel River, as well as five to six miles from the mouth of the Eel. Any tsunami that has the potential to reach the “shores” of Ferndale would also run up the Eel River. Staff concludes that the potential for a tsunami to travel this far inland is low.</p>				

Based on the discussion above, staff concludes that the project will not substantially impact water quality, nor exceed the capacity of storm water drainage systems. The amount of surface water could increase as a result of future development that over-covers native ground, specifically development that increases the non-permeable surface area. In order to assure that a no-net gain in the amount of surface runoff occurs, staff recommends mitigation as listed below.

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 6. Future development shall not increase runoff above existing levels. A detention facility and associated drainage improvements shall be a part of this subdivision and shall be approved by the City Engineer and shown on the Final Map.**

<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
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?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

**DISCUSSION:** The area in which the proposed subdivision is located is a residential neighborhood on an existing parcel of land that has historically been developed with residential uses. The proposed use is also residential; as such it will not divide the established community. Ferndale’s General Plan requires a density range of 0-7 dwellings per acre; the proposed subdivision will have a density of approximately .42 dwelling units per acre. The proposed project is located on Jacobsen Way, which City Plans show a connection to Rose Avenue.

The parcel is zoned as Residential Low Density with a 10,000sf minimum parcel size in the Ferndale General Plan. The existing 160,323sf lot would be subdivided to create 8 parcels, ranging in size from 17,000sf to 36,000sf. The parcels created by the proposed subdivision are consistent with zoning in the Ferndale General Plan. The project is not in the Coastal Zone. There are no specific plans or local coastal programs within Ferndale City Limits. The proposed project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, as the project is not in areas affected by such plans. Based on the above, staff concludes that the project will result in no impact to land use and planning.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?				X
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?				X
<p><b>DISCUSSION:</b> There are no known mineral resources on the site. Construction of the proposed project would not affect the availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region, nor would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource, nor would the project conflict with mineral resource recovery site delineated on a specific, general plan or other land use plan; therefore, the project will have no impact to mineral resources.</p>				

XI. NOISE. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?			X	
b) Expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?			X	
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
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?				X
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?				X
<p><b>DISCUSSION:</b> The City's adopted General Plan notes at least three different ambience conditions in Ferndale: Peak morning and late afternoon traffic. The second ambience level is during the remaining daylight hours of the day. This is when field measurements of ambience were taken, and it was found that the ambient level on Main Street was about 52 dBA, which is at least 20 dBA lower than during the peak traffic flow. At Fifth and Shaw Streets, the reading was 45 dBA, about 15 dBA lower than the peak traffic period ambience level. In outlying areas the peak traffic and normal daytime levels differ very little. Developing contours of the usual daytime ambience would be difficult since the lowest and highest readings were 45 and 52 decibels respectively, which is very quiet for a community during the day. The third ambience level is during the night when ambience levels are approximately 10 dBA lower than the usual daytime levels.</p>				

Construction activities could result in short-term increase in ambient noise levels. Construction related noise may be disruptive to adjacent residences. The proposed subdivision would allow for 7 additional residences to be built. The actual subdivision will not generate noise; noise levels would occur during site grading and preparation, and construction. Under the Noise Element of the adopted General Plan, general construction noise is considered acceptable because such noise is of limited duration and intensity. Therefore, the project will not generate noise in excess of established standards. The only ground-borne noise that may be associated with the project would occur during construction. However, any such noises can be considered “normal” and not “excessive.”

The project site is not within an area subject to an airport comprehensive land use plan nor is it within two miles of a public or private airport. Although the project is not located within two miles a public airport, as noted above it is within 3000 ft. from an emergency heliport at the Humboldt County Fairgrounds. Because of the rare and intermittent use of the Fairgrounds heliport, the noise resulting from use of the heliport will have no discernable impact to the development, and visa versa. The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Based on the above, staff concludes that the project will not result in any substantial adverse impacts with regard to noise.

<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

**DISCUSSION:** The project is for the creation of 8 residential parcels where one currently exists. The project site is currently developed with one single-family residence. If the proposed project is approved it is likely that 7 new single-family residences will be constructed on the project site. The project is consistent with the residential density allowed by the community plan and therefore does not exceed population projections. The project will not induce further growth, and will not displace existing housing. There is no evidence indicating that the project will cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections, induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly, or displace existing housing.

<b>XIII. 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 Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?			X	
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?			X	
e) Other public facilities?		X		
<p><b>DISCUSSION:</b> The project site is currently served by full levels of public services. The project will eventually require an incremental increase in the need for public services because of the increase in the number of dwelling units from one to eight; however, the project will not require new or physically altered governmental services. With Mitigation Measure No. 6 listed below, staff concludes that the project will not result in an adverse impact on public services.</p>				

<b>XIV. RECREATION.</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?				X
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
<p><b>DISCUSSION:</b> The City of Ferndale currently maintains two City owned parks within the city limits. The increased residential density by seven new residences will not require the construction of new parks. The project would not result in an increase in 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. The maximum density of housing units that may result from the proposed subdivision will be similar to that without the subdivision and consistent with the R-1-B-2 zoning designation. The minimal housing increase does not have the potential to significantly increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that it could lead to their deterioration.</p> <p>The project will not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The project does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Based on the above, staff concludes that the project will not result in substantial adverse impacts regarding recreation.</p>				

<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
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?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

**DISCUSSION:** Increases in traffic on the existing roadways will occur as a result of new housing units that may result from the proposed subdivision. The project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. A Traffic Impact Analysis was conducted in 2004 which found that the existing access roads are adequate to support the proposed project, and that the Level Of Service will not change for any of the observed movements. The Traffic Impact Analysis recommended that the City address future circulation as it involves the dead end sections of Dewey Avenue and Jacobsen Way (SHN, August 2004). The extension of Jacobsen Way to Rose Avenue is shown on City survey and mapping data. The Traffic study also acknowledges that both ends of Jacobsen Way appear to have been projected for future extension. Half of the right-of-way needed to extend Jacobsen Way is owned by the City, the other half is privately owned and would need to be obtained in order to move forward with the extension. Approximately 200 feet of roadway improvements would be needed to connect Jacobsen Way to Rose Avenue. The extension of Jacobsen Way would provide for direct access to the proposed project from Rose Avenue and is being considered as a condition of approval for this project.

The project would 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. Based on the project description, the proposed subdivision will not result in a change in air traffic patterns or locations, nor will it increase air traffic.

The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). All of the proposed parcels will utilize existing street and proposed driveway access, which will safely serve the existing residential use. Use of the existing access would increase slightly, but there are no risks or hazards associated with it.

The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The existing parcel has adequate emergency access; no decrease in emergency access will result from this project.

The project would not result in inadequate parking capacity. Parking for the future residential development that may be created by this subdivision would not result in inadequate parking capacity. Currently there is parking available on Jacobsen Way. Any new residential buildings on the proposed site would also be served by off-street parking.

The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts and bicycle racks). There is no proposed public usage of the site other than that involved in owners and guests accessing residential parcels. There would be a minor temporary increase in traffic during future construction operations as a consequence of construction.

Based on the above, staff concludes that the project will not have a significant adverse impact on transportation or traffic.

<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
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?			X	
d) Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources (i.e., new or expanded entitlements are needed)?			X	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
f) Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Violate any federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

**DISCUSSION:** The City of Ferndale's Wastewater Treatment Plant at 443 Port Kenyon Road provides wastewater services for the City of Ferndale. The City is currently in the process of finalizing plans for upgrading the wastewater treatment facility. The current wastewater treatment system capacity is 1 MGD (Million Gallons per Day). The dry weather flow is typically about 250,000 GPD (gallons per day). Peak wet weather flow can go as high as 2.5 MGD, which cannot be processed in a 24 hour period. The plant contains a seven-acre aeration pond, approximately 14 feet deep. The project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Future development of the proposed parcels would not result in the construction of additional systems to serve seven additional residences on Parcel 1 – Parcel 8. The existing residence on Parcel 3 is already served by the City of Ferndale sewage treatment plant. Because of the storage capacity available at the Wastewater Treatment Plant, and the fact that the City Council has earmarked funds for, and Public Works is actively pursuing correction of, the Inflow and Infiltration (I&I) of rainwater within the sewer system that affects the peak wet weather flow, staff concludes that the addition of seven buildable lots will not have significant impact upon the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Del Oro Water Company supplies water within the City of Ferndale. The City of Ferndale water supply system's maximum capacity is 518,000 GD. Current production average is 208,000 GD. Sixty-nine percent of the water is pulled from springs on the southern end of Ferndale. The springs run at full capacity, with back up production from the Van Ness Street Well. There are no plans to expand water services, as current operating levels of 40.3% of capacity are sufficient.

The project applicant shall be required to construct and pay for the maintenance of a stormwater detention facility. Future residential development will result in additional impermeable surfaces common to residential neighborhoods. These impermeable surfaces would include driveways and houses. See Mitigation 5.

The solid waste provider is the Humboldt Waste Management Authority (HWMA). The HWMA is a joint powers agreement between the County and most of the incorporated Cities within the County for the disposal of waste. HWMA has contracted with Eel River Disposal to ship solid waste produced in Ferndale to a state licensed landfill located outside of Humboldt County. Currently solid waste is trucked to State licensed Anderson landfill in Shasta County California, which has excessive capacity and can accept the minimal amount of waste which would be generated by the seven new single family residences. The proposed project will not be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

<b>XVII.MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?			X	
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).			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X
<p><b>DISCUSSION:</b> The project will not have the potential to significantly 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. The project site does not contain any sensitive or important habitat. The project is consistent with the Ferndale General Plan and is located on land that is currently being used for residential purposes.</p>				

The project will not have significant 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). As described herein no issues listed previously are above a recognized threshold of significance that this project may adversely contribute towards or exceed. Indiscriminate and unplanned residential developments do have the potential to have cumulative impacts. However, the subdivision and potential residential development that could result are consistent with the Ferndale General Plan and is allowed with the current zoning. Mitigations have been added based on City of Ferndale General Plan policies, ordinances and regulations, and the recommendations of subject area experts to reduce all impacts to a less than significant level. These impacts were determined to be less than significant individually as well as cumulatively. No items were determined to be potentially significant.

The project will not create environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The proposed subdivision and resulting residential development will not cause any adverse effects on humans directly or indirectly. No hazardous emissions or significant increases in light, noise, traffic, wastewater or solid waste will result from this project. This project increases housing opportunities in the area.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 1.** Any and all exterior lighting shall be located and shielded such that no light or glare extends beyond the property line. In addition, no portion of the illuminated portion of the fixture/lens shall extend below the shield. The location of all exterior lights shall be shown on the site plan submitted to and approved by the Design Review Committee. In addition, the property owner shall submit to the Design Review Committee for review and approval the specifications for the exterior lights, including a picture or diagram showing the cross section of the light that illustrates that the illuminated portion of the fixture/lens does not extend below the shield. Exterior lighting specifications shall be part of the building permit process and be reviewed by City Planning prior to approval.

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 2:** The individual residences shall be designed such that the wetland not be filled or otherwise impacted with development or future land use. A minimum setback of 25 feet, measured westward from the westernmost wetland boundary, shall be maintained (on lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8). The 25-foot buffer shall be incorporated into the backyard of each lot. No earthmoving or building construction shall take place within this 25-ft buffer zone. The wetland is undisturbed and should not require any additional planting of hydrophytic species.

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 3:** A temporary sediment fence shall be constructed at the 25 ft buffer line of the wetland area. The fence shall be constructed of certified weed free or rice straw bales and landscape fabric and shall be constructed prior to any ground moving activities associated with individual lot development. This fence shall be maintained throughout the construction period and shall only be removed after the exposed soils on the site are stabilized with vegetation.

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 4:** Storm runoff from structures and roads shall be drained away from the wetland site.

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 5: If buried archaeological or historical resources are encountered during construction activities, the contractor on-site shall call all work in the immediate area to a halt temporarily, and a qualified archaeologist is to be contacted to evaluate the materials. Prehistoric materials may include obsidian or chert flakes, tools, locally darkened midden soils, groundstone artifacts, dietary bone, and human burials. If human burial is found during construction, state law requires that the County Coroner be contacted immediately. If the remains are found to be those of Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission will then be contacted by the Coroner to determine the appropriate treatment of the remains.**

**MITIGATION MEASURE NO. 6. Future development shall not increase runoff above existing levels. A detention facility and associated drainage improvements shall be a part of this subdivision and shall be approved by the City Engineer and shown on the Final Map.**

**SOURCE/REFERENCE LIST:** The following documents were used in the preparation of this Initial Study. The documents are available for review at Ferndale City Hall, during regular business hours.

- a) Ferndale Municipal Code
- b) Ferndale General Plan as applicable
- c) Application Submittal Materials
- d) Humboldt County General Plan, Volume II, Ferndale Community Plan, Planning Commission Approved Draft, September, 2002 referenced as “Ferndale Community Plan”
- e) Humboldt County General Plan, Volume I, Framework Plan, January, 1996
- f) Soils Report, Redmond & Associates, April 3, 2003.
- g) Tentative Parcel Map prepared for Walters by Ontiveros & Associates, Inc., June, 2008.
- h) Sanborn Subdivision Wetland Delineation Report, May 13, 2004
- i) Traffic Impact Analysis, Proposed Major Subdivision Ferndale, CA, SHN, August 2004.