Attachment 3

Draft Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration

Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program

Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration

Note: Pursuant to Section 15162 of the California Environmental Quality Act, this document is a Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration. The previous document *Negative Declaration* is available and can be reviewed at the Humboldt County Community Development Services, Planning Division, 3015 H Street, Eureka, California.

1. **Project title**: **Humboldt County Department of Public Works – Charles Bar**
   Renewal and Modification of Surface Mining/Conditional Use Permits/Approval of Reclamation Plan and Review of Financial Assurance Cost Estimate Application
   APN **217-053-04 and -05** (Blocksburg area)
   Case No: CUP-23-92XM/SMR-03-92XM

2. **Lead agency name and address**: Humboldt County Community Development Services, 3015 H Street, Eureka, CA 95501-4484; Phone: (707) 445-7541; Fax (707) 445-7446

3. **Contact person and phone number**: Anita Punla, Senior Planner (707) 268-3727

4. **Project location**: The project is located in Humboldt County, in the Blocksburg area, on the north side of Alderpoint Road, approximately 14.6 miles south from the intersection of State Highway 36 and Alderpoint Road, on the properties known to be in Section 36 Township 1 South Range 4 East.

5. **Project sponsor's name and address**: Humboldt County Department of Public Works, c/o Ann Glubczynski, 1106 Second Street, Eureka CA 95501-0579.

6. **General plan designation**: Agriculture Grazing (AG), Timber Production (T); Framework Plan (FRWK)

7. **Zoning**: Agriculture Exclusive (AE); Timberland Production Zone (TPZ).

8. **Description of project**: Renewal and Modification of Conditional Use Surface Mining Permits, approval of Reclamation Plan and review of Financial Cost Estimates for the existing Charles Bar in-stream mining operation on Larabee Creek off Alderpoint Road. The project proposes extraction and processing of up to 25,000 cubic yards of gravel as frequently as annually. The permit term will expire in 2023.

The mining operation was originally permitted in 1993 for the extraction and crushing of up to 25,000 cubic yards of gravel every 3 to 5 years for County road maintenance. The Humboldt County Department of Public Works has performed four extractions at the site. The volume, location and extraction method will be consistent with the recommendations of CHERT and other responsible agencies. Equipment includes a bulldozer or excavator, front-end loader, a haul truck and/or dump trucks and portable crusher. Crushed material will be stockpiled at designated permanent areas. When no crushing is done, extracted material will be transported to a job site. The bar will be accessed via the designated haul road on the bar directly off of Alderpoint Road. Gravel extraction will be intermittent.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting**: The gravel bar is located on Larabee Creek. The surrounding area consists of heavily forested hillsides and pastures. Land uses near the gravel bar are livestock grazing and timber production.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required** (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Air Quality Management District, California Department of Conservation, Office of Mine and Reclamation (Reclamation Plan and Financial Assurance Approval), California Department of Fish and Game, National Marine Fisheries Service, Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, County of Humboldt Extraction Review Team.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☑ Aesthetics	☑ Agriculture Resources	☑ Air Quality
☑ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☑ Geology / Soils
☑ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☑ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning
☑ Mineral Resources	☑ Noise	☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☑Transportation / Traffic
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☑ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☑ I find that although the proposed project COULD have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A SUBSEQUENT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project COULD have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Anita Punla. 3.5.09

Signature Date

Anita Punla, Senior Planner Humboldt County Community Development Services

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including off-site was well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addresses. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyze in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,:" describe the mitigation measures which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plan, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

   a.) Reclamation Plan for Quarry

   b.) Plan of Operations for Quarry

c) Project maps and figures

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats, however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue identifies:

a) The significant criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

CHECKLIST, DISCUSSION OF CHECKLIST RESPONSES, PROPOSED MITIGATION

1. **AESTHETICS** . Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion: There are no designated vistas or scenic highways in the project area. The site is not visible from Alderpoint Road. There are no residential communities in the area; the closest residence is located approximately 1.5 miles to the south. The project is intermittent and limited to daylight hours. Reclamation includes re-grading the bar smooth and removal of haul roads, stockpile areas and equipment to return the site to its natural condition.

2. **AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model *(1997)* prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The gravel bar is located on Larabee Creek. The surrounding area consists of heavily forested hillsides and pastures. Land uses near the gravel bar are livestock grazing and timber production. Portions of the ranch land surrounding the bar are under the Williamson Act. The extraction operation will not be conducted on designated prime, unique or important agricultural lands. Work will be confined to the gravel bar, existing access roads and stockpile areas. The gravel bar consists of river wash which is unsuitable for agriculture because of the lack of topsoil and high percolation rates. The mining operation was originally permitted in 1993. Reclamation includes re-grading the bar smooth and removal of haul roads, as required, stockpile areas and equipment to return the site to its natural condition. There is no evidence that the project will impact agricultural resources.

3. **AIR QUALITY.** Where available, the significant criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☑	☐
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The gravel bar is located in Larabee Creek. The mining operation was originally permitted in 1993. There are no residential communities in the area; the closest residence is located approximately 1.5 miles to the south.

In 2002, the California Air Resources Board approved an Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations that applies to any operations in a geographic ultramafic rock unit. An exemption exists for sand and gravel operations if the operation processes materials from an alluvial deposit, e.g. river gravel bar. There are no known geographic ultramafic rock units in the vicinity of the Charles Bar.

The site is located in the North Coast Air Basin which is in non-attainment for Particulate Matter smaller than 10 microns in diameter (PM10). The areas of Humboldt County that are in non-attainment for PM10 are in the urban areas along the coast, e.g. Eureka and Arcata. Air pollutants could result from the project. Emissions from extraction and processing equipment and from trucks used for transporting material off-site will not result in significant contributions to PM10 levels in the area due to the location, scale and intermittent nature of the project. Mining operations will be done infrequently and for limited duration. Gravel crushing will be done by a portable crusher assembly that will be set up on the bar and will crush gravel for stockpiling. Crushing will take place concurrently with excavation. The applicant will obtain, as required, a "Permit to Operate" from the Northern California Air Quality Management District, which will regulate air emissions from that operation. Heavy equipment is generally subject to emission standards, and exceeding those standards may constitute a "nuisance" condition, and can be mitigated by proper vehicle maintenance.

Dust from operations, i.e. processing and transport activities, would be created during the time the site is active. Dust suppression measures, e.g. periodic watering, will be utilized to control dust. Dust associated with truck traffic would be reduced due to the speed at which the trucks could travel on the access road.

Mitigation M-1:

1. The project shall meet the requirements of the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District, including consistency with the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations.
2. Dust suppression measures shall be utilized to control dust.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US 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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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: Mining operations were originally permitted in 1993. The project site is the Charles Bar in Larabee Creek. Surrounding areas consist of heavily forested hillsides and pastures.

The California Natural Diversity Database contains records for one rare or sensitive plant species, *Howell's montia. Howell's montia* is "fairly threatened" in California, common elsewhere. It can be found in meadows, North Coast coniferous forest, vernal pools and vernally wet sites. Mining activities include removal of small, annual vegetation from the gravel bar during excavation of gravel, and removal of grass and shrubs to establish the new stockpile location north of the bar. Neither the gravel bar or stockpile areas contain habitat for *Howell's montia* and it is not likely to be found in the project site. The gravel bar access road runs through riparian habitat, but it will not be necessary to widen the road or remove vegetation along the road.

Several species of wildlife are listed by the US Fish & Wildlife Service as threatened or are candidates for listing for the Blocksburg area. Some species were listed or critical habitat designated after the 1993 adoption of the Negative Declaration. The project site does not contain habitat for the western yellow-billed cuckoo or fishers.

Chinook salmon and steelhead trout are known to inhabit Larabee Creek, and Chinook have been observed in Larabee Creek as far upstream as Smith Creek. Above Smith Creek is a one-mile long gorge which is a barrier to passage, and Chinook are unlikely to be found in the vicinity of Charles Bar. Steelhead, however, can pass the barrier and are known to inhabit Larabee Creek both upstream and downstream of the gravel bar. Little vegetation exists on the bar that could provide shade to low flow channels. Because of the severe aggradation and low gradient, stream flow goes subsurface during the summer months, producing a complete barrier to fish passage, approximately half mile in length.

Northern spotted owls prefer old-growth or mixed-age stands of mature and old-growth trees. Owls nest in large trees with broken tops or cavities. Foraging activities can take place in a wider array of forest types, including more open forests. While owls forage in dense forests, they also forage along the edges of dense forests and in more open forests for different prey. Nesting season is from February 1 through July 31. The project area does not contain habitat for the northern spotted owl. However, they are known to inhabit the project vicinity, with three records of owl occurrences within three miles of the project area. Designated critical habitat for the northern spotted owl can be found approximately 3.5 miles east-northeast from the Charles Bar. The nearest potential habitat is 500 feet west of the bar, west side of Alderpoint Road.

Marbled murrelets are long-lived seabirds that spend most of their lives in the marine environment, but fly inward to nest. Nesting generally occurs in old-growth forests characterized by large trees, Douglas fir and coastal redwood. Nesting season is March 24 through September 15. The project area does not contain habitat for marbled murrelets, and the July 2008 CNDDB does not contain any recorded occurrences of murrelets in the project vicinity. However, designated critical habitat can be found approximately 2.3 miles southwest of the bar, and potential habitat may be found west of Alderpoint Road.

Review of occurrences of rare and sensitive wildlife species recorded in the July 2008 CNDDB revealed one species of bird, osprey, for which there is no habitat and no recorded occurrences in the project area or vicinity.

The project may temporarily affect movement of wildlife through the disturbed area, but extraction activities are intermittent and temporary, occurring during daylight hours only. The project may affect movement of steelhead,

but because flow from the creek goes subsurface during the summer months, steelhead will not be found in the area during extraction activities. The project may modify habitat for steelhead. Gravel extraction methods and volumes will be consistent with CHERT, DF&G and other regulatory agencies to produce an optimal extraction design to improve early winter migratory habitat for steelhead.

Mitigation M-2:

1. Extraction methods and volumes shall be consistent with the requirements of CHERT, DF&G, ACE, RWQCB and other regulating resource agencies.
2. The project shall employ Best Management Practices (BMP's) for Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) and Contractor Activities (CA) as identified in the California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbook for Construction Activity.
3. The project shall be consistent with the County's General Plan policies re: sensitive and critical habitats and with the County's Streamside Management Area Ordinance.
4. Gravel mining activities will be restricted to summer months (June through October), primarily when the gravel bar is dry, to avoid impacts to federally listed steelhead trout.

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

Discussion: The gravel bar is located in Larabee Creek. Mining operations were originally permitted in 1993. No historical resources as defined in §15064.5 exist. The Division of Natural Resources of the Humboldt County Department of Public Works has indicated that their database contains no recorded archaeological sites within the project area. The geology at the project site is not unique to the area nor is it a paleontological resource or site. There is no evidence that the project would impact archaeological resources.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☐	☑	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☑	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☑	☐
iv) 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?

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?	☐	☐	☑	☐
e) 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 waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: Charles Bar on Larabee Creek is located approximately 5.5 miles north of Blocksburg and 15 miles south of Bridgeville. The project area consists of rock and river wash material. The geologic formation of the area is the Franciscan formation which consists of massive greywacke and minor amounts of shale, chert, geenstone and schist.

The area surrounding the gravel bar has high slope instability, but the bar itself has low slope instability. The north coast of California is one of the most seismically active regions in the United States. Humboldt County in general is at risk from strong ground-shaking. The nearest earthquake fault is the potentially active Freshwater Fault located approximately four miles west of the gravel bar. The active fault, Falor-Korbel Fault Zone, is located approximately seven miles northeast of the bar.

The project does not involve the disturbance or loss of any soil since extraction will be limited to the alluvial gravel bar. There is no topsoil on the bar, which is made up of fine to coarse gravel and cobble. Loss of gravel at the site will not be permanent as the bar is inundated and the gravel replenished during high flows in winters with normal rainfall. The amount of gravel extraction in any given year will be based on the amount of replenishment as determined by monitoring cross sections. Extraction volume and method are subject to annual review by the County, DFG and COE. These standards have been designed to maintain channel capacity and adjacent bar morphology, reduce bank erosion, create deep-water habitat and reduce impacts to the environment.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☐	☑	☐
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 it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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?

Discussion: Charles Bar is located on Larabee Creek, approximately 5.5 miles north of Blocksburg and 15 miles south of Bridgeville. Mining operations were originally permitted in 1993.

The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The project does not involve the handling or emissions of acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; there are no known private airstrips within the vicinity of the site. There are no residential communities in the area; the closest residence is approximately 1.5 miles to the south. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile of the site. The project is located off a private road off the public road, Alderpoint Road.

Standards of operation minimize any potential impacts from the project. The potential for contaminants is limited to operation-related activities such as equipment leaks or spills. Such contaminants from equipment shall be controlled through proper equipment operation and maintenance. Major equipment maintenance work, i.e. repairs and changing of fluids or lubricants, will be conducted off-site. Any materials contaminated by equipment leaks will be properly disposed.

The project site is located in an area subject to risk from wildland fires. The site is within a State Responsibility Area and fire jurisdiction is by Cal Fire. Extraction activity will occur at the gravel bar, away from vegetation, and heavy equipment shall be fire-safe, i.e. operating under a fire safety plan and equipped with spark arrestors. The access road shall be maintained free of vegetation during times of activity. There will be no "abandoned" equipment, structures, refuse, etc. associated with operations to remain on the reclaimed site after extraction has been discontinued.

In 2002, the California Air Resources Board approved an Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations that applies to any operations in a geographic ultramafic rock unit. An exemption exists for sand and gravel operations if the operation processes materials from an alluvial deposit, e.g. river gravel bar. There are no known geographic ultramafic rock units in the vicinity of the Charles Bar.

Mitigation M-3:

1. The project shall meet the requirements of the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District, including consistency with the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations.
2. The project shall be consistent with the standards in the Mining and Reclamation Plan, as well as standards and requirements of other regulating resource agencies.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☑	☐	☐
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?

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 federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☑
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☑
l)	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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The Lower Eel River and tributaries, including Larabee Creek, were listed on the California Clean Water Action Section 303(d) list in 1992 as water-quality impaired due to elevated sediment and temperature. Larabee Creek at the Charles Bar is heavily aggraded due to mass wasting of unstable slopes which has occurred since at least 1969 in the Thurman and Boulder Flat Creek watersheds. With the establishment of permanent monitoring cross sections on the Charles Bar, the bar and streambed have been surveyed annually from 1997 to 2005, and again in 2008. Review of the cross sections indicates that the gravel volume estimates in the Charles Bar has remained about the same even with intermittent extractions of gravel.

The project has potential to increase sedimentation input to the stream below the bar. No work will be done in the water. However, gravel extraction includes excavation that will disturb the bar surface; gravel with a finer sediment component can enter the river when higher flows inundate the bar. Excavation will also alter gravel bar drainage patterns by concentrating surface flow to one deeper low-flow channel than the current bar configuration of multiple, shallow, braided channels. This drainage change is temporary as each excavation will fill in when winter flows become great enough to mobilize the remaining gravel on the bar. Extraction methods and volumes are reviewed annually by the County of Humboldt Extraction Review Team, the Department of Fish and Game and other regulating agencies. Standards have been designed to maintain channel capacity and adjacent bar morphology, reduce bank erosion, create deep-water habitat and reduce impacts to the environment. Regular monitoring through the use of pre-extraction, post-extraction and permanent monitoring cross sections provide information on stream bed changes in relation to extraction activities, and future extraction plans will be designed and approved based on the monitoring data. Consistency with the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, Water Code section 13000 et seq., and the Federal Clean Water Act 301 et seq., the Regional Water Quality Control Board or the State Water Resources Control Board and requirements of permitting agencies will ensure that water quality is not degraded.

The project will not draw groundwater and will not cause any change in current groundwater recharge processes. No withdrawals are proposed. No housing or structures are being proposed. No levee or dam construction is associated with the project. The site is not located within a tsunami hazard zone. The site is not a part of an existing or planned stormwater drainage system.

Mitigation M-4:

1. Operations shall be consistent with the standards and requirements of CHERT, DF&G, ACE, RWQCB and other regulating resource agencies.
2. The project shall employ Best Management Practices (BMP's) for Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) and Contractor Activities (CA) as identified in the California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbook for Construction Activity.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: Charles Bar is located in Larabee Creek approximately 5.5 miles north of Blocksburg and 15 miles south of Bridgeville. Mining operations were originally permitted in 1993. The site is planned Agriculture Grazing and zoned Agriculture Exclusive and Timberland Production Zone. Surrounding areas consist of heavily forested hillsides and pastures. Portions of the ranch land surrounding the bar are under the Williamson Act. The extraction operation will not be conducted on designated prime, unique or important agricultural lands. Work will be confined to the gravel bar, existing access roads and stockpile areas. The gravel bar consists of river wash which is unsuitable for agriculture. There are no residential communities in the area; the closest residence is approximately 1.5 miles to the south. Reclamation includes re-grading the bar smooth and removal of haul roads, as required, stockpile areas and equipment to return the site to its natural condition. There is no evidence that the project would result in land use and planning impacts.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☐	☐	☑
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: The project proposes extraction and processing of up to 25,000 cubic yards of gravel as frequently as annually. Sand and gravel are a needed resource for local residential, commercial, industrial and public facility development. The project allows for the continued, sustainable utilization of an important mineral resource. The mineral resources available on the site are not unique to the area and are subject to annual replenishment during high flows in winters with normal rainfall. The amount of gravel extraction in any given year will be based on the amount of replenishment as determined by monitoring cross sections. Extraction volume and method are subject to annual review by the County, DFG and COE. These standards have been designed to maintain channel capacity and adjacent bar morphology, reduce bank erosion, create deep-water habitat and reduce impacts to the environment. The project will have no effect on future mining opportunities in this area. There is no evidence that the project would impact mineral resources.

11. NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☑	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☑
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☑	☐
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?

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?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The site is located approximately 5.5 miles north of Blocksburg and 15 miles south of Bridgeville. Mining operations were originally permitted in 1993. Surrounding areas consist of heavily forested hillsides and pastures. There are no residential communities in the area; the closest residence is approximately 1.5 miles to the south.

Mining activities that will produce noise include extraction, processing, loading and transporting rock material. Bulldozers, loaders, trucks, portable crusher and other similar type equipment will be used to extract, crush and transport the material. Workers will take safety measures during blasting to minimize effects to workers.

Ambient noise levels have historically been associated with timber harvesting and quarry activities. The mine will operate on an intermittent basis with the bulk of activity to occur in the drier months. There will be long periods of time when no sounds will be generated. Increased noise levels occur only during periods of operation. When the mining operation occurs, the period of activity will usually be three to four weeks. Operations including extraction, crushing, and transport may impact wildlife behavior. However, disruption to wildlife will be temporary and short term. The nearest potential northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet habitat is on the west side of Alderpoint Road, over 500 feet from the gravel bar. This distance is greater than the estimated noise harassment distance due to project noise.

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The project will not produce any significant growth inducing impacts. Aggregate extraction is normally driven by growth, not vice versa. Growth inducing impacts are generally caused by projects that have a direct or indirect affect on economic or population growth, or when the project taxes community service facilities which require upgrades beyond the existing remaining capacity. No services or utilities are required to be extended to the site. The project will employ only a few people for a limited amount of time. The project will not displace existing housing or people. There are no residential communities in the area. There is no evidence that the project would impact population and housing.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES.

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i. Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☑

ii. Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☑
iii. Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☑
iv. Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☑
v. Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: Charles Bar is located approximately 5.5 miles north of Blocksburg and 15 miles south of Bridgeville. Mining operations were originally permitted in 1993. Surrounding areas consist of heavily forested hillsides and pastures. There are no residential communities in the area; the closest residence is approximately 1.5 miles to the south. No additional facilities or extension of existing facilities or increased demand for services are required for the project.

14. RECREATION.	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The site is located approximately 5.5 miles north of Blocksburg and 15 miles south of Bridgeville. Mining operations were originally permitted in 1993. Surrounding areas consist of heavily forested hillsides and pastures. There are no residential communities in the area; the closest residence is approximately 1.5 miles to the south. No recreational facilities or development requiring the need for recreational facilities is proposed. There is no evidence that the project results in impacts associated with recreation.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic that 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)?	☐	☐	☑	☐
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard 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 a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☑
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The site is located approximately 5.5 miles north of Blocksburg and 15 miles south of Bridgeville. Mining operations were originally permitted in 1993. Surrounding areas consist of heavily forested hillsides and pastures. There are no residential communities in the area; the closest residence is approximately 1.5 miles to the south. The site is accessed via the existing private road off Alderpoint Road. The roads have been used

intermittently for quarry operations and timber harvesting activities. Truck traffic generated by the project will vary with seasonal and market conditions. There will be long periods with little or no project-generated traffic. Traffic increase on Alderpoint Road from the operations will constitute a minimal increase of 2% of the average daily traffic levels.

The project will not affect any other emergency access route. Ample parking and room for equipment staging currently exists at the site. There is no evidence that the project will result in impacts to policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 treatment 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 are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☑
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☑
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☑
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The site is located approximately 5.5 miles north of Blocksburg and 15 miles south of Bridgeville. Mining operations were originally permitted in 1993. Surrounding areas consist of heavily forested hillsides and pastures. There are no residential communities in the area; the closest residence is approximately 1.5 miles to the south. Portable chemical toilets will be provided, as required, and maintained by a licensed pumper. The use and maintenance of the portable sanitary facility will comply with all state and county regulations. No wastewater is produced. No solid waste will be generated. There is no evidence that the project will adversely impact utilities and service systems.

17): Mandatory Findings of Significance

Findings: The proposal will not 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; potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals; impacts which 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 environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Discussion:

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	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 major periods of California history/prehistory?	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion: The project proposes continuation of operations originally permitted in 1993. Ground-disturbing activities occur on the gravel bars, subject to alluvial processes during high flows. The project, including extraction volume, location and method, is subject to regulatory oversight by numerous agencies, including County of Humboldt Extraction Review Team, DFG and ACE. Monitoring and adaptive management are part of the project. Potential project impacts have been mitigated during the planning stage of the proposal. See further discussion under Section 4. *Biological Resources.*

Important examples of California history or prehistory do not exist on the site.

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)?	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion: The surface mining activities and final reclamation of the site have no collective impact greater than any individual component. The proposed development does not include any short-term impacts that are to the detriment of long-term environmental goals. Potential project impacts have been mitigated during the planning stage of the proposal. The project is designed and mitigated with these long-term goals in mind. The project, including extraction volume, location and method, is subject to regulatory oversight by numerous agencies, including County of Humboldt Extraction Review Team, DFG and ACE. Monitoring and adaptive management are part of the project. The ultimate reclamation of the site, to return the site to its natural condition, will be beneficial in all cases when viewed in a context with past, present, and future projects. The proposed project is consistent with the general or community plan developed for the area.

The project has been reviewed in the context of all other recent discretionary approvals in the surrounding area, in the context of conformance with the applicable general plan or community plan policies and standards, and in the context of future developments which are known at the time of project review. As part of this review, the project has been determined to be consistent with the long term goals of the general plan by virtue of consistency with the provisions of the general plan designation and zoning. The project represents conditionally permitted development in the context of the general and/or community plans.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion: The proposed project will not cause cumulative adverse effects to human beings, either directly or indirectly. The proposed project is not expected to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. The project will not generate uses which would be expected to cause adverse effects on people.

18. DISCUSSION OF MITIGATION MEASURES, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The Department found that the project could result in potentially significant adverse impacts unless mitigation measures are required. A list of Mitigation that addresses and mitigates potentially significant

adverse impacts to a level of non-significance follows. Additional details regarding mitigation for reclamation of the site can be found in the Reclamation Plan.

Mitigation M-1:

1. The project shall meet the requirements of the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District, including consistency with the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations.
2. Dust suppression measures shall be utilized to control dust.

Mitigation M-2:

1. Extraction methods and volumes shall be consistent with the requirements of CHERT, DF&G, ACE, RWQCB and other regulating resource agencies.
2. The project shall employ Best Management Practices (BMP's) for Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) and Contractor Activities (CA) as identified in the California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbook for Construction Activity.
3. The project shall be consistent with the County's General Plan policies re: sensitive and critical habitats and with the County's Streamside Management Area Ordinance.
4. Gravel mining activities will be restricted to summer months (June through October), primarily when the gravel bar is dry, to avoid impacts to federally listed steelhead trout.

Mitigation M-3:

1. The project shall meet the requirements of the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District, including consistency with the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations.
2. The project shall be consistent with the standards in the Mining and Reclamation Plan, as well as standards and requirements of other regulating resource agencies.

Mitigation M-4:

1. Operations shall be consistent with the standards and requirements of CHERT, DF&G, ACE, RWQCB and other regulating resource agencies.
2. The project shall employ Best Management Practices (BMP's) for Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) and Contractor Activities (CA) as identified in the California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbook for Construction Activity.

19. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 16063(c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

a) Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

1. Humboldt County General Plan
2. Humboldt County Zoning Ordinance
3. Negative Declaration adopted with the 1993 approval of the original project

Items are available for review at Humboldt County Planning Division.

b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects ere addressed by mitigation measure based on a the earlier analysis.

See 19.a above

c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

See 19.a above

20. SOURCE/REFERENCE LIST

Humboldt County documents are available for review at the Humboldt County Community Development Services – Planning Division during regular business hours.

Berg, Alice, D. Halligan, K. Hess. 2002. *Biological Assessment for Southern Oregon/Northern California Coasts Coho Salmon, California Coastal Chinook Salmon, Northern California Steelhead that may be affected by LOP-02-1 Gravel Extraction Operations in Humboldt County of Humboldt*

Bosch, Ray. 1998. *Noise Monitoring of Humboldt County Crushing Operations near Founders Grove*

California Forest and Range Experiment Station. 1955. *Soil-Vegetation Maps of California*

California Department of Fish and Game. July 2008. *Biogeographic Information and Observation System*

Dyett and Bhatia, Urban and Regional Planners, 2002. *Humboldt 2025 General Plan Update, Natural Resources and Hazards Report*

Humboldt County Planning Division. 1979. *Seismic Safety Map*

Humboldt County. 1984. *Humboldt County General Plan, Volume 1, Framework Plan.*

Humboldt County. 1993. *Initial Study and Negative Declaration – Charles Bar*

Jensen, A. 2000. *Final Report, 1999 Fisheries Monitoring Program for Gravel Extraction Operations on the Mad, Eel, Van Duzen and Trinity Rivers*

Pacific Biodiversity Institute. 2007. www.pacificbio.org/ESIN/Mammals/PacificFisher/fisher page.html

Preston, Larry. 1988. *Larabee Creek Stream Survey*

Strand, Rudolph G. 1961. *Geologic Map of California*

Thomas, Jack, E. Forsman, J. Lin et al. 1990. *A Conservation Strategy for the Northern Spotted Owl*

US Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX. 2007. *Lower Eel River Total Maximum Daily Loads for Temperature and Sediment*

US Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. *Biological Opinion, Humboldt County Gravel Operations near Founders Grove, Humboldt Redwood State Park*

US Fish and Wildlife Service. 2004. http://endangered.fws.gov/i/b6k.html

US Fish and Wildlife Service. 2006. *Estimating the Effects of Auditory and Visual Disturbance to Northern Spotted Owls and Marbled Murrelets in Northwestern California*

US Fish and Wildlife Service. 2007. www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/Species/Data/YellowBilledCuckoo/default.asp

US Fish and Wildlife Service. 2007. www.fws.gov/arcata/es/birds/MM/m murrelet.html

Contact:

Al Steer, Compliance and Enforcement Manager, North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District. July 11, 2008.