

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 *Environmental Review* is available and can be reviewed at the Humboldt County Community Development Services, Planning Division, 3015 H Street, Eureka, California.

- 1. **Project title:** Wallan Conditional Use/Surface Mining Permits and Reclamation Plan APN 207-181-16 et al. (Garberville area)
Case Nos.: CUP-06-30/SMP-06-01/RP-06-01
- 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 site is located in Humboldt County, in the Garberville area, on the north side of Alderpoint Road, approximately 1.1 miles northeast from the intersection of Alderpoint Road with US Highway 101, on the properties known to be in Section 18 Township 4 South Range 4 East.
- 5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**

APPLICANT

Kenneth and Meredith Wallan
601 Hillcrest Drive
Garberville CA 95540
Phone: 923-2293

OWNER(S)

AGENT

Streamline Planning Consultants
1062 G Street
Arcata CA 9552
Phone: 822-5785

- 6. **General plan designation:** Agricultural Lands (AL20 and AL40); Garberville/Redway/ Alderpoint/Benbow Community Plan.
- 7. **Zoning:** Agriculture Exclusive with a Special Building Site Combining Zone specifying lot size as shown on subdivision map of record (AE-B-6); Heavy Industrial with a Qualified combining zone (MH-Q).

8. **Description of project:** Approval of Conditional Use/Surface Mining Permits, Reclamation Plan and Financial Cost Estimates for the Wallan Quarry, previously known as the Monschke Quarry, with a 15-year permit term. The site has been intermittently quarried since at least 1963 for major highway construction projects, riverbank flood repair and bridge abutment protection. The quarry was previously permitted in 1989 (CUP-21-89/SMR-01-89). The project proposes continued operations for the intermittent extraction and processing of up to 45,000 cubic yards in any given year with an average annual rate not to exceed 15,000 cy.

Since the 1989 approval, approximately 70,000 cy of material has been removed from the site and utilized for highway construction and rip rap. The current project proposes a project limit of nine acres with the proposed quarry area of 3.5 acres containing approximately 190,000 cy of massive greywacke with minor amounts of shale and greenstone. Quarry material will be used for jetty rock, highway construction projects, rip rap, erosion control and rock-slope protection.

Operations will primarily involve drilling and blasting and excavation, on-site road and staging area improvements, on-site storage of rock, sorting, loading and hauling by truck, erosion control and incidental and final reclamation. The typical types of equipment to be used include: front-end loader, bulldozer, excavator, dump trucks, portable screen plant and weigh scales. Final reclamation includes final grading, drainage improvements, restoration of surface soils and revegetation.

- 9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The quarry is located along the west to southwest-facing slope of an unnamed tributary creek of the South Fork Eel River. The quarry has been operational since at least 1963. Surrounding areas consist of timber, agricultural and rural residential uses.

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, Division of Mines and Geology (Reclamation Plan and Financial Assurance Approval), California Department of Fish and Game, National Marine Fisheries Service, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

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.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.

Amira Punla

11.17.08

Signature

Date

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 as 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 identify:
- 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The quarry has been operational since at least 1963. The project site is approximately one mile northeast from the intersection of US Highway 101 and Alderpoint Road, approximately 1.5 miles from the town of Garberville. Intermittent views of the site are available along Quarry Road, Alderpoint Road and US Highway 101. Views from the highway, which is designated as a Scenic Highway in this area, are limited due to the existing tree cover and view of the project primarily occurs along a 300-foot section of an overpass. The quarry area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and rural residential uses.

The project is intermittent and limited to daylight hours. The nearest residences are located approximately one-quarter mile to one-half mile from the site. Because of the intermittent nature of the operation and the limited hours of activity, impact on light, glare or nighttime views is considered less than significant.

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 State-wide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The quarry area is an approximate 3.5 acres. The rock to be quarried is a steep slope of exposed bedrock. The extraction operation will not be conducted on designated prime, unique or important agricultural lands. Surrounding areas are timber/agricultural lands and rural residential. The quarry has been operational since at least 1963. The quarry area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and rural residential uses. 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

plan?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including re-releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The site lies within the North Coast Air Basin (NCAB). No final attainment plan currently exists for Humboldt County. The site is located approximately one mile northeast from the intersection of US Highway 101 with Alderpoint Road, and approximately 1.5 miles from the community of Garberville. The nearest residence is approximately one-quarter mile from the quarry operations, with thirteen residences between one-quarter to half-mile away. The quarry has been operational since at least 1963.

Air pollutants could result from the project. Emissions from extraction and processing equipment and from trucks used for transporting rock off-site will not result in significant contributions to PM10 levels in the area due to the scale and intermittent nature of the project. Mining operations will be done infrequently and for limited duration. If screening of rock material is done on site, 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 extraction, processing and transport activities would be created during the time the site is active. Dust would be generated from the extraction of the rock face and mining activities at the staging area below the face. Dust suppression measures as detailed in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan will be utilized to control dust. This includes periodic watering of the disturbed areas. Dust associated with truck traffic would be reduced due to the speed at which the trucks could travel on the access road. The surrounding tree canopy and vegetation will further reduce dust emissions.

A *Geologic Assessment for Naturally-Occurring Asbestos* was prepared. Due to the presence of asbestos at the site, a *Dust Mitigation Plan for Naturally-Occurring Asbestos* was prepared per the requirements of Section 93105 of the California Code of Regulations regarding Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measures for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations. The Plan provides specific dust mitigation measures to control potential fugitive asbestos dust.

Mitigation M-1:

1. Dust suppression measures as detailed in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan shall be utilized to control dust. This includes periodic watering of the disturbed areas. Water shall be applied to disturbed land surfaces at a frequency high enough to reduce dust to the extent practicable and to maintain soil cohesion.
2. The project shall meet the requirements of the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District.
3. The project shall incorporate the dust mitigation measures specified in the *Dust Mitigation Plan for Naturally-Occurring Asbestos* dated 2006 and as approved by NCUAQMD.

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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The quarry has been operational since at least 1963. The project site is located in a grassland hillside habitat with nearby sporadic clusters of mixed conifer/hardwood forest, shrubs and ferns. The project area does not contain riparian vegetation or wetland areas. However, there is an established corridor of riparian vegetation along the unnamed creek that borders the northern and western boundaries of the site. This corridor is proposed to remain and shall not be disturbed.

Review of the California Natural Diversity Database indicates that no threatened, rare or endangered species or sensitive nesting areas occur within the vicinity of the project. The grassland/mixed conifer forest provides habitat for wildlife.

A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will dictate sediment control to protect the unnamed creek. The project will be consistent with the County's Streamside Management Area Ordinance and General Plan policies to protect sensitive fish and wildlife habitats and to minimize erosion, etc. See further discussion under *Geology and Soils* and *Hydrology and Water Quality* re: site drainage and erosion control. The access road from Quarry Road to the site has multiple seasonal stream crossings that have culverts in poor or degraded condition. The Department of Fish and Game has provided recommendations which have been incorporated into the project; that is, pursuant to Section 1600 (Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement), the owner/operator shall work with DF&G for culvert replacement.

Mitigation M-2:

1. The established corridor of riparian vegetation shall remain and not be disturbed.
2. The project shall be consistent with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prepared for the project, and 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. Pursuant to Section 1600 (Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement), the owner/operator shall work with DF&G for culvert replacement.

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The quarry has been operational since at least 1963. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The site is located in the Garberville area. The project site is located in the Coast Ranges geologic province. The quarry site is within a mélange unit that contains metagraywacke, metagreenstone and other metamorphic rocks. The site is located along a west-southwest facing slope of an unnamed tributary creek of the South Fork Eel River. The quarry site is developed on a hillside outcrop of resistant metagreenstone. The quarry has been operational since at least 1963.

Topography is steep to moderate slopes of 20% to 40%. Soil type in the area is well drained with moderate permeability. Surface soils are easily detached indicating that runoff from stockpiled soils should be dispersed rather than concentrated. Existing drainage from the site is generally dispersed and/or percolates into the fractured subsurface rock, gravel and soil material.

The topography of the coast range is known for its potential for landslides. The north coast of California is one of the most seismically active regions in the United States. Humboldt County in general is at risk for strong ground-shaking. Since removal of rock since at least the 1950's, there have been no recorded slope stability problems. There are no close active seismic features near the project site. This area is not known to have any active fault zones. The project is not located on an unstable geologic unit.

A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan will be enacted and Best Management Practices employed to minimize erosion. See section on *Hydrology and Water Quality* with regards to discussion on drainage improvements. Extraction will be limited to the rock face that has sparse, vegetal cover. The amount of rock extracted in any given year will be dependent on seasonal and market conditions. Extraction standards are subject to annual review by the County and the California Geological Survey. These standards have been designed to minimize erosion, prevent discharges to state waters, protect vegetation and wildlife, ensure worker safety, etc.

As much as is feasible, existing vegetation will be retained. The overall drainage pattern of the area is to be maintained as much as practical. Drainage shall be directed towards the rock face. The fractured nature of the rock surfaces absorbs rainfall so there is no runoff from even substantial storm events. Perimeter berms are placed primarily as a safety requirement and only serve as a secondary sediment control measure. Compliance with the specific erosion control and surface erosion prevention practices and revegetation of the site pursuant to the final reclamation standards will reduce the potential for substantial loss of topsoil or soil erosion. The quarry area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and rural residential uses when the quarry is no longer economically viable. The reclamation plan will restore the area to its natural setting. The Reclamation Plan includes performance standards for revegetation and monitoring of revegetation success.

Mitigation M-3:

1. The project shall be consistent with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prepared for the project, and 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.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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: The site is located approximately 1.6 miles northeast of the intersection of Alderpoint Road with Redwood Drive in the community of Garberville. The quarry has been operational since at least 1963.

The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. 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. The Garberville Airport is approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the site. 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.

The quarry operations require fuel for equipment. A fuel truck will service the equipment as needed. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board requires that fuel storage tanks exceeding 10,000 gallons must adhere to Above Ground Petroleum Storage Act Regulations. In general, fuel storage facilities should have impermeable secondary containment. Normal maintenance will include routine lubrication and adding fluids. Maintenance supplies will be stored in locked storage sheds. 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 rock face, 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.

Sporadic drilling and blasting will occur. Blasting will be detonated within the rock to minimize both spark and thrust of material. The nearest residence is approximately one-quarter mile away. The project site is in an area zoned Heavy Industrial. Blasting activities will use regulated explosives. Trained personnel will use dynamite, anfo and blasting caps at the site. The operator is required to hire licensed professionals. State and Federal operating standards require procedures that minimize the risk of wildfire, injury from projectiles, etc. As a standard practice, prior to blasting, adjacent neighbors will be notified of the activity, and flagmen will be posted at the quarry gate to control traffic. All safety regulations concerning the use, storage, transportation and disposal of explosives will be strictly observed. Explosives will be transported to the site. Only trained personnel will transport or handle the explosives. There will be no "abandoned" equipment, structures, refuse, etc. associated with extraction and transport activity to remain on the reclaimed site or elsewhere on the parcel after extraction has been discontinued.

Based on field investigation, it was determined that asbestos-containing rocks occur in the area of the existing rock quarry. A *Geologic Assessment for Naturally-Occurring Asbestos* was completed by LACO Associates indicates that "Naturally-occurring asbestos is present at low concentrations and occurs as thin veining or discontinuous smears randomly in the rock outcrop." Due to the presence of the asbestos, a *Dust Mitigation Plan for Naturally-Occurring Asbestos* has been prepared per the requirements of Section 93105 of the California Code of Regulations regarding Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measures for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations. The Plan contains specific dust mitigation measures that will be implemented to control potential fugitive asbestos dust.

Mitigation M-4:

1. The project shall incorporate the dust mitigation measures specified in the *Dust Mitigation Plan for Naturally-Occurring Asbestos* prepared by LACO Associates and as approved by the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District.

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The quarry has been operational since at least 1963. The site is located along a south-facing slope of an unnamed tributary creek of the South Fork Eel River. The quarry site is developed into a large hillside out-crop of resistant metagreenstone. Water is required only for dust control; water is transported to the site via water trucks. No water impoundments or diversions are proposed.

Mining will not affect pre-mining drainage outside of the project area. As much as is feasible, existing vegetation will be retained. The overall drainage pattern of the area is to be maintained as much as practical. Because of the coarse underlying material, runoff from the mining area will generally percolate into the fractured bedrock and/or will be designed to disperse evenly across the site. Drainage within the project site generally occurs toward the east. On-site grading will direct run-off towards the rock face and be designed to continue dispersing run-off to maximize soil percolation. The fractured nature of the rock surfaces absorbs rainfall so there is no runoff from even substantial storm events. Perimeter berms are placed primarily as a safety requirement and only serve as a secondary sediment control measure. Compliance with the specific erosion control and surface erosion prevention practices and revegetation of the site pursuant to the final reclamation standards will reduce the potential for substantial loss of topsoil or soil erosion. The quarry area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and rural residential uses when the quarry is no longer economically viable. The reclamation plan will restore the area to its natural setting. The Reclamation Plan includes performance standards for revegetation and monitoring of revegetation success. No wastewater is produced by nature of the excavation process.

There are no watercourses in the project site. The project is outside of the channel of the unnamed creek which is tributary to the South Fork Eel River. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Permit will be prepared for the quarry which includes appropriate water quality practices satisfactory to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Best

Management Practices detailed therein will be employed to eliminate or reduce pollutants in storm water discharge.

The project will not draw groundwater and will not cause any change in current groundwater recharge processes. No withdrawals are proposed. Neither significant increase of water quantity nor any overall change from the pre-project drainage pattern is anticipated. No discharge of mineral wastes will occur to nearby tributaries. Major equipment repairs and the changing of fluids or lubricants will not take place on the site. Implementation of erosion control measures contained in the SWPPP and Reclamation Plan will reduce the potential for any surface erosion or siltation. No discharge will occur to waters of the State.

The site is not a part of an existing or planned stormwater drainage system. Adherence to Mining and Reclamation Plan Standards will ensure that water quality is not degraded. The project is not located within the 100 year flood plain of any adjacent stream channel. Extraction activities will not impede or redirect flood flows since the project is not located in the floodplain of any adjacent streams. No housing or structures are being proposed. No levee or dam construction is associated with the proposed project. The project is not located within a tsunami hazard zone, nor is it located on a body of water subject to seiches. Extraction activity will not occur during times of high rainfall, and based on the site and location and type of material, will not cause mudflows. A general NPDES permit shall be obtained as required by CRWQCB.

Mitigation M-5:

1. The project shall be consistent with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prepared for the project, and 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project is located approximately 1.6 miles northeast of the intersection of Alderpoint Road with Redwood Drive in the community of Garberville. The quarry has been operational since at least 1963. The site is surrounded by timber, agricultural and rural residential use. The closest residence is approximately one-quarter mile away.

The mining area is zoned Heavy Industrial with a Qualified combining zone that "provides notice of and protects the site until such time as the quarry rock resource has been depleted." The Q zone also provides operational restrictions and standards to protect surrounding areas. The quarry area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and rural residential uses when the quarry is no longer economically viable.

The commodity to be mined is resistant metagreenstone to be used for commercial rip rap. The Framework Plan recognizes the importance of aggregate extraction sites. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The quarry area is a large hillside outcrop of resistant metagreenstone and has been used to supply local rip rap and construction materials since at least the late 1950's. The project makes available a mineral resource valuable to the region. The quarry site is in a location that meets the needs of Federal, State, County and local construction projects. Products from the Wallan Quarry operation are used as far west as Shelter Cove and as far east as Trinity County. The nearest alternative sites are in Phillippsville, Miranda and Garberville, none of which has a hardness and density of the Wallan Quarry rock. The project site is not delineated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site; however, the importance of the existing quarry operation has been recognized in the Community Plan with the application of a the Qualified combining zone that "provides notice of and protects the site until such time as the quarry rock resource has been depleted." The quarry area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and rural residential land uses when the quarry is no longer economically viable. The final reclamation 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The project is located approximately 1.6 miles northeast of the intersection of Alderpoint Road and Redwood Drive in the community of Garberville. The quarry has been operational since at least 1963.

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 between a few days and a few weeks.

Mining activities that will produce noise include blasting, extraction, processing, loading and transporting rock material. Blasting will occur only when the mine is in an active mode. Bulldozers, loaders, trucks and other similar type equipment will be used to extract and move the rip rap rock,

The closest residence is located approximately one-quarter mile to the east and thirteen residences approximately one-quarter to one-half mile away. Equipment noise will decrease to approximately 60 decibels at Alderpoint Road and to 57 decibels at the closest residence. Noise analysis indicates that there is sufficient distance to

residential receptors and to meet County noise standards. Workers will take safety measures during blasting to minimize effects to workers.

Operations will be limited to daylight hours, generally Monday through Friday from 6am to 6 pm with blasting restricted from 8am to 5pm. The mining method to be used is drilling and blasting with subsequent excavating and, sorting. Due to the fractured nature of the rock, secondary blasting will be minimal.

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip. The Garberville Airport is approximately 2.5 miles from the site.

Mitigation M-6:

1. Operations will be intermittent and will be limited to daylight hours, generally Monday through Friday from 6am to 6 pm, with blasting to occur from 8am to 5pm.

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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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 is no evidence that the project would impact population and housing.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES.

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
i. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project is located approximately 1.6 miles east of the intersection of Alderpoint Road and Redwood Drive in the community of Garberville. The quarry has been operational since at least 1963. The mined area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and rural residential uses when the operation is no longer economically viable. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project is located approximately 1.6 miles northeast of the intersection of Alderpoint Road and Redwood Drive in the community of Garberville. The quarry has been operational since at least 1963. The nearest residence is located approximately one-quarter mile away. 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project is located approximately 1.6 miles northeast of the intersection of Alderpoint Road with Redwood Drive in the community of Garberville. The quarry has been operational since at least 1963. The site is accessed via private road off Alderpoint Road. Materials will generally be transported to Alderpoint Road utilizing Rock Quarry Road and Quarry Road, both 14 -16 feet wide and graveled, and then approximately two miles along Alderpoint Road to State Highway 101. The roads have been used intermittently for quarry operations and timber harvesting activities over the last fifty years.

Truck traffic generated by the project will vary with seasonal and market conditions. During periods of peak use, maximum truck traffic could be four truck loads per hour. There will be long periods with little or no project-generated traffic. The existing traffic volume on Alderpoint Rod is extremely light, and operation of the quarry is not expected to have a significant impact on this roadway.

Most of the heavy equipment used for quarrying will be left on-site during active periods, minimizing the amount of slow-moving/trailer traffic present on the access routes to and from the project site. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The quarry has been operational since at least 1963. Water will be applied for dust abatement. Water for wetting the road and extraction area will be obtained off-site via water trucks. Minimal solid waste will be generated on site. 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. By nature of the excavation process, no wastewater is produced. Site runoff and water will be returned to the groundwater table via ground percolation. No solid waste will be generated. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be prepared as required by Regional Water Quality Control Board. There is no evidence that the project will adversely impact utilities and service systems.

Mitigation M-7:

1. Project shall be consistent with the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan as required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and shall employ the Best Management Practices detailed therein.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: There is no evidence that the project would substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species or cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels. There is no evidence that the project would restrict or reduce the range or number of rare or endangered plants or animals. As noted in Section 4. Biological Resources, the site will be reclaimed and revegetated to an end use consistent with the zone, general plan and surrounding uses.

Several factors contribute to the conclusion of no significant biological impacts: (1) the area is located in a matrix of very similar forested habitats, which will continue to support wildlife use of the area; (2) the quarry site is developed into a large hillside outcrop of resistant metagreenstone that has been used to supply local rip rap and constructional materials since at least the late 1950's.

Potential project impacts have been mitigated during the planning stage of the proposal. There are no water-courses in the project site. The project is designed to preclude the concentration of surface runoff from entering streams or erodable areas.

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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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. The project is designed and mitigated with these long-term goals in mind. The ultimate reclamation of the site 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.

General Plan Consistency:

The project is consistent with general plan policies and standards. Consistency with these policies and standards assures to a large degree that potential community-wide impacts are addressed in a cumulative manner within the context of the community or general plan and its companion environmental document. The Community Plan recognizes the importance of the quarry. The site has a Qualified combining zone that is intended to protect the site for quarry production. The Q zone also specifies operational restrictions and standards to address surround-

ing uses.

Cumulative Impact Project List:

Recent projects or known proposed projects were considered as part of this cumulative impacts analysis.

As evidenced throughout this document, the proposed project as mitigated, does not:
(1) have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment in a cumulative manner;

Discussion: The project does have impacts that by nature are potentially cumulative. These include: increased traffic, increased soil erosion from the site, increased storm water runoff, increased noise, and the increase in particulate matter. Project impact also includes naturally-occurring asbestos.

The potential increase in traffic is not cumulatively significant because the proposed project does not cumulatively result in a significant change in level of service for public roads as identified in the general plan environmental document and the traffic analysis contained in Section 15 of this document. The site is located in a sparsely developed timber/agricultural setting and the current project and proposed end use are consistent with the plan and zone.

The potential increase in soil erosion and storm water runoff is not cumulatively significant because the proposed project does not cumulatively result in a significant change in level of storm water impacts as identified in the general plan environmental document and the hydrology analysis contained in Section 8 of this document. The site is located in a sparsely developed timber/agricultural setting and the current project and proposed end use are consistent with the plan and zone.

The potential increase in noise is not cumulatively significant because the proposed project does not cumulatively result in exceeding the noise levels identified in the general plan environmental document and the noise analysis contained in Section 11 of this document. The site is located in a sparsely developed timber/agricultural setting and the current project and proposed end use are consistent with the plan and zone.

The potential increase in air quality impacts (particulates) is not cumulatively significant because the proposed project does not cumulatively result in exceeding the threshold of significance for this category as determined by referral to the North Coast Air Quality Management District. Air quality impacts for the current project and all project listed for the cumulative analysis have individually been mitigated to levels of insignificance and cumulatively as mitigated are not considered to be a significant contributor. The dust assessment for the site indicates naturally-occurring asbestos is present at low concentrations and the project incorporates specific dust mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the NCAQMD.

Based on the planned land use and zoning of the parcel, the potential environmental effects of these designations analyzed in the general/community plan review, and the recommended mitigation, the cumulative environmental effects of these categories are considered less than significant.

(2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; (3) cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels; (4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; and (5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;

Discussion: Please refer to Section 4. Biological Resources. The potential impacts have been identified in this section. The surface mining activities and final reclamation of the site have no collective impact greater than any individual component. There is no evidence that the project would result in cumulative effects because the current project is consistent with the zone and general plan, and ultimately the site will be reclaimed and revegetated to an end use consistent with the zone and general plan.

(6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory;

Discussion: Please refer to section 5. Cultural Resources. As the project is not anticipated to have any impacts to cultural or historical resources, there is no potential for cumulative impacts to this category of resource.

- 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. Dust suppression measures as detailed in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan shall be utilized to control dust. This includes periodic watering of the disturbed areas. Water shall be applied to disturbed land surfaces at a frequency high enough to reduce dust to the extent practicable and to maintain soil cohesion.
2. The project shall meet the requirements of the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District.
3. The project shall incorporate the dust mitigation measures specified in the *Dust Mitigation Plan for Naturally-Occurring Asbestos* dated 2006 and as approved by NCUAQMD.

Mitigation M-2:

1. The established corridor of riparian vegetation shall remain and shall not be disturbed.
2. The project shall be consistent with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prepared for the project, and 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. Pursuant to Section 1600 (Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement), the owner/operator shall work with DF&G for culvert replacement.

Mitigation M-3:

1. The project shall be consistent with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prepared for the project, and 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.

Mitigation M-4:

1. The project shall incorporate the dust mitigation measures specified in the *Dust Mitigation Plan for Naturally-Occurring Asbestos* prepared by LACO Associates and as approved by the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District.

Mitigation M-5:

1. The project shall be consistent with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prepared for the project, and 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.

Mitigation M-6:

1. Operations will be intermittent and will be limited to daylight hours, generally Monday through Friday- from 6am to 6 pm, with blasting to occur from 8am to 5pm.

Mitigation M-7:

1. Project shall be consistent with the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan as required by the Regional WaterQuality Control Board, and shall employ the Best Management Practices detailed therein.

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

Items 1 and 2 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

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

Bickner, F.R. 1993. *A Soil chronosequence of the Mitchell Ranch fluvial terraces on the South Fork Eel River, age estimates and tectonic implications*. Master Thesis, Humboldt State University, 70 pages.

California Natural Diversity Database, 2008

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

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

Humboldt County. 1987. *Humboldt County General Plan, Volume 2, Garberville/Redway/Alderpoint /Benbow Community Plan*.

Humboldt County. 1987. *EIR for the Humboldt County General Plan, Volume 2, Garberville/Redway Alderpoint/Benbow Community Plan*.

LACO Associates. 2005. *Geologic Investigation Report of Findings – Monschke Quarry*.

LACO Associates. 2006. *Geologic Assessment for Naturally-Occurring Asbestos – Wallan Quarry*.

LACO Associates. 2006. *Dust Mitigation Plan for Naturally-Occurring Asbestos – Wallan Quarry*.

McLaughlin, H. and F. Harradine. 1965. *Soils of Western Humboldt County*.

Streamline Planning Consultants. Revised March 2008, *Wallan Quarry Mining and Reclamation Plans*

United States Geological Survey, 2000. *Geology of the Cape Mendocino, Eureka, Garberville, and Southwestern part of the Hayfork 30x30 Minute Quadrangle and Adjacent Offshore Area, Northern California, Miscellaneous Field Studies MF-2336*.

Humbolddt County. 1989. *Initial Study and Negative Declaration – Monschke Quarry*.

- 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 identify:
- 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.