

Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration

Note: Pursuant to Section 15163 of the California Environmental Quality Act, this document is a Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration. The previous document Conditional Negative Declaration is available and can be reviewed at the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department, 3015 H Street, Eureka, California.

1. **Project title:** Mason Materials, LLC – Mason Quarry
Conditional Use/Surface Mining Permits and Reclamation Plan
APN 316-2163-02 (Upper Redwood Creek area)
Case Nos.: CUP-14-91X/SMR-02-91X
2. **Lead agency name and address:** Humboldt County Planning and Building Department, 3015 H Street, Eureka, CA 95501-4484; Phone: (707) 445-7541; Fax (707) 445-7446
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Anita Punia, Senior Planner (707) 268-3727
4. **Project location:** This project is located in Humboldt County, in the Upper Redwood Creek Area, on the south side of State Highway 299, approximately 1.5 miles south from the intersection of State Highway 299 and Old Chezem Road on the property known to be in the Southeast ¼ of Section 23 Township 06 North Range 03 East.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**

APPLICANT

Mason Materials
3445 Central Ave.
McKinleyville, CA 94119
707-839-1291

OWNER(S)

WAYNE M. MASON
1633 Henry Lane
McKinleyville, CA 95519
707-839-2668

AGENT

WESTERN TIMBER SERVICES, INC
c/o William E. Kleiner
PO BX 1136
Arcata, CA 95518
707-822-3628

6. **General plan designation:** Timber Production (T) Framework Plan (FRWK).
7. **Zoning:** Agriculture Exclusive (AE); Timberland Production (TPZ).
8. **Description of project:** The project involves renewal of, and modification to, Conditional Use/Surface Mining Permits and Reclamation Plan for continued mining operations on the quarry site known as the Mason Quarry. The Mason Quarry was originally developed in the 1950's for construction of Old Chezem Logging Road to provide access for the upper Redwood Creek Valley. Large rip-rap and smaller rocky embankment material have been mined since 1953 for the maintenance of Old Chezem Logging Road and County and State roads and highways. The County approved permits for existing operations in 1991 and allowed for the total extraction volume of 200,000 cubic yards of material over a 15-year period on a 5-acre portion of APN 316-163-02. A Conditional Negative Declaration was adopted with the project approval. The current project proposes modification to existing operations: (1) an increase in the annual extraction volume to 65,000 cubic yards for the 15-year permit term, (2) the option of blasting (although blasting has not occurred in the past and it is not anticipated that blasting will be necessary in the future), and (3) an increase in acreage to an approximate 10 acres to allow for possible expansion of the quarry on the area adjacent to the site that has been cleared of trees as part of a Cal Fire-approved "Less than 3-Acre Conversion Exemption", an exemption that is granted to a landowner one time per contiguous ownership. **If approved, the permit will expire June 21, 2021.**

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 .
Signature

Oct. 5, 2012
Date

Anita Punla, Senior Planner

Humboldt County Planning and Building Department

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: The Negative Declaration is available for review at the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department, 3015 H Street, Eureka CA.
 - 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: In 1991, the County permitted operations of the historic rock quarry used since at least 1953. The site is located 1.5 miles south of State Highway 299 approximately 400 feet above the Redwood Creek drainage at its closest point. The site is primarily surrounded by Douglas-fir and oaks, and primary uses of the area and surrounding parcels are timber production with some grazing and rural residential uses. The quarry floor, rock face and gravel stockpile located adjacent to the working benches are visible from Old Chezem Road. The site is an historic rock quarry, and will be reclaimed consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and timber uses. There is no evidence that the project will have a significant adverse aesthetic impact.

The project is intermittent and limited to daylight hours. The nearest residences owned by the landowner are approximately one-quarter of a mile away or more from the site. The nearest residence not owned by the landowner is approximately 1.5 miles away and protected by rugged, forested terrain. Because of the intermittent nature of the operation and the limited hours of activity, impact 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 Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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: In 1991, the County permitted operations of the historic rock quarry used since at least 1953. The site is primarily surrounded by conifers and hardwood timber, and primary uses of the area and surrounding parcels are timber production with some grazing and rural residential uses in the vicinity of the site. The rock to be quarried consists of massive greywacke.

The extraction operation will not be conducted on designated prime, unique or important agricultural lands. The project includes an increase in acreage to an approximate 10 acres to allow for possible expansion of the quarry. An area has been cleared of trees as part of a Cal Fire-approved "Less than 3-Acre Conversion Exemption", an exemption that is granted to a landowner one time per contiguous ownership. Final reclamation will reclaim the site consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and timber production uses. There is no evidence that the project will have a significant adverse impact on 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: In 1991, the County permitted operations of the historic rock quarry used since at least 1953. The site is primarily surrounded by conifers and hardwood timber. The primary uses of the area and surrounding parcels are timber production with some grazing and rural residential uses. The site lies within the North Coast Air Basin (NCAB). No final attainment plan currently exists for Humboldt County. There are two weekend homes north of the quarry and one weekend home below the quarry. The landowner's residence is the nearest residence at one-quarter mile or more away from the quarry. The nearest residence not owned by the landowner is approximately 1.5 miles away and protected by rugged, forested terrain.

The dominant rock type is greywacke sandstone and mudstone. Naturally-occurring asbestos is typically associated with serpentinite in mafic to ultramafic rock formations. None of these rock types were observed within the quarry itself. A laboratory analysis performed in 2005 indicated that no asbestos was present within a specimen from the Mason Quarry.

Air pollutants could result from the project. Emissions from extraction and processing equipment and from trucks used for transporting rock off-site would be created when the site is active. Operations 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.

Dust abatement measures typically used during operations, such as watering the quarry entrance and floor regularly, spraying rock before crushing and wetting truckloads before hauling, will minimize airborne dust. Equipment is generally subject to emission standards, and exceeding those standards may constitute a "nuisance" condition, and can be mitigated by proper vehicle maintenance.

Personnel operating heavy equipment at the site will be exposed to airborne dust. The measures above with the use of facemasks will minimize the level of PM10 exposure to less than significant levels. Odors created by the project consist of heavy equipment and crusher generator exhaust, but operations are intermittent and temporary.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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: In 1991, the County permitted operations of the historic rock quarry that has been used since 1953. The site is within the Redwood Creek Watershed area, and is surrounded by timber consisting mainly of Douglas-fir and oaks. The quarry is separated from Redwood Creek by two or more natural benches and approximately 3,000 feet of naturally vegetated, highly permeable ground. Riparian habitat occurs along the haul roads but not within the mining area.

An Engineering Geologic Investigation prepared by LACO Associates characterized site conditions, evaluated suitability of extraction and stockpiling operations, discussed potential to impact Redwood Creek waters and provided recommendations to be utilized during continued operation of the quarry site. The field investigation concluded that no defined drainage swales or channels are present in the immediate vicinity of the quarry. Relative to the surrounding areas, the quarry site is located atop high ground and is isolated from the existing drainage network of creeks and streams. Drainage of surface runoff along ridge face and side slopes occur via sheet flow. Material from the quarry is coarse rocky material which does not convey surface runoff for significant distance before infiltration occurs. Surface runoff that does not permeate through existing material is caught by the access roadways

and loading areas that are in-sloped to direct runoff; runoff is discharged through an energy dissipater, through a culvert pipe, before it continues down the slope to the creek. Redwood Creek is separated from this culvert location by greater than 300 feet of heavily vegetated ground.

The investigation concluded that existing site conditions, grades and sediment control structures appear to be adequately designed and functioning properly, and the project does not appear to have the potential to impact Redwood Creek.

The quarry area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and timber production uses when the quarry is no longer economically viable. The reclamation plan will restore the area to its natural setting.

A Biological Assessment and a Botanical Survey and Impact Assessment were prepared by Pacific Northwestern Biological Resources Consultants, Inc. The assessment identified habitats where wildlife species could occur based on habitat and geographic location. The area is potential habitat for wildlife species of concern, especially for the Northern Spotted Owl (NSO). There are four NSO activity centers within 0.7 miles of the project area, and are located within the Green Diamond Resource Company (GDRC) ownership. GDRC has monitored adjacent areas for over 15 years and are continually monitoring as required by their Habitat Conservation Plan. Two known NSO centers are located at approximately just over one-quarter mile from the quarry. The US Fish and Wildlife Service estimates a maximum distance of one-quarter mile wherein harassment due to elevated, action-generated sound levels occurs. The Service recommends that blasting not be permitted during the NSO nesting season which occurs from approximately February 1 through July 31st in this area.

Per the botanical assessment, no rare plants were found during surveys. The assessment indicates that continuation of the quarry is not likely to degrade the environment. The quarry site contains no wetlands or riparian vegetation. The site is located in a matrix of managed timberlands and the project area is comparatively minor in scale. This matrix will continue to support wildlife.

Mitigation M-1:

1. 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, and shall maintain existing erosion and sediment controls.
2. The project shall be consistent with the County's General Plan policies re: sensitive and critical habitats.
3. Blasting will be restricted during the NSO nesting season which occurs from approximately February 1 through July 31st. The operator shall contact US Fish and Wildlife Service prior to blasting.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorpor.	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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Discussion: In 1991, the County permitted operations of the historic rock quarry used since at least 1953. The site is primarily surrounded by conifers and hardwood timber, and primary uses of the area and surrounding parcels are timber production with some grazing and rural residential uses in the vicinity of the site. There are no sites known or recorded at this area. No historical resources as defined in §15064.5 exist. 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 adversely 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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: An Engineering Geologic Investigation prepared by LACO Associates characterized site conditions, evaluated suitability of extraction and stockpiling operations, discussed local fault and geologic hazards and provided recommendations to be utilized during continued operation of the quarry site.

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. The project site is situated on a prominent, northeast trending ridge with approximately 400 to 500 feet of vertical relief. The quarry is located within a complex of fault traces. The project site, however, is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone. Based on the investigation, the native slopes surrounding the quarry site appear generally stable in their

present configuration. LACO Associates provided recommendations to maintain safe, stable cut-faces, and project approval is conditioned accordingly.

Extraction standards are subject to annual review by the County and the Office of Mine Reclamation. These standards have been designed to minimize erosion, prevent discharges to state waters, protect vegetation and wildlife, ensure worker safety, etc. Operations will employ Best Management Practices, including erosion and sediment control, to reduce the potential for substantial loss of topsoil or soil erosion and to reduce pollutants in storm water discharge and siltation. As much as is feasible, existing vegetation will be retained, with the overall drainage pattern of the area to be maintained as much as practical. The investigation concluded that existing site conditions, grades and sediment control structures appear to be adequately designed and functioning properly. See discussion under *Hydrology and Water Quality*. No septic or wastewater disposal systems are associated with the project.

Mitigation M-2:

1. 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, and shall maintain existing erosion and sediment control measures.
2. The project shall incorporate the recommendations identified within LACO's Engineering Geologic Investigation, and shall be consistent with the requirements of the Office of Mine Reclamation.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emission, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: Sources of greenhouse gas emissions due to operation of the project include equipment and vehicles/trucks. The County of Humboldt completed a draft greenhouse gas reduction plan in December of 2007. Redwood Coast Energy Authority is currently completing the first step – the County-wide greenhouse gas inventory (www.redwoodalliance.org). A draft document containing the findings of the inventory will be available in the near future.

Mobile sources of greenhouse gases such as the equipment and vehicles/trucks utilized for the mining operations are required to meet current emission standards to lessen the amount of greenhouse gases they generate. All equipment and vehicles/trucks are maintained and upgraded to meet current emissions standards as required by the California Air Resources Board. Due to the small scale of the project, emissions from equipment and vehicles/trucks would not be significant especially when in compliance with current emission standards.

Mitigation Measures M-3:

1. Equipment and vehicles/trucks will be maintained and upgraded to meet current emission standards.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact
-------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	-----------

		Unless Mitigation Incorp.	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 emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: In 1991, the County permitted operations of the historic rock quarry. The site is within the Redwood Creek Watershed area, and is surrounded by timber consisting mainly of Douglas-fir and oaks, and primary uses of the area and surrounding parcels are timber production with some grazing and rural residential uses in the vicinity of the site. 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.

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.

Fuels and lubrications are used for equipment at the site. Due to the short, generally seasonal nature of annual operations at the site, the quantity of these fuels and lubricants will be small. 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 shall be restricted. 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. Standards of operation minimize any potential impacts from the project.

Mining operations may involve blasting. Blasting activities will use regulated explosives. Trained personnel will use dynamite 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 given a 24-hour advance notice of the activity, and flagmen will be posted at the quarry gate to control traffic as needed. 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.

Mitigation M-4:

1. Fuel storage shall be consistent with the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, and operations shall minimize potential impact from contaminants.
2. Blasting shall occur consistent with State and Federal operating standards and all safety regulations concerning the use, storage, transportation and disposal of explosives shall be strictly observed.
3. Prior to blasting, adjacent occupants will be given a 24-hour advance notice.

9. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
- 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?
- 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?
- j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Discussion: An Engineering Geologic Investigation prepared by LACO Associates characterized site conditions, evaluated suitability of extraction and stockpiling operations, discussed potential to impact Redwood Creek waters and provided recommendations to be utilized during continued operation of the quarry site. The site is within the Redwood Creek Watershed area. The field investigation concluded that no defined drainage swales or channels are present in the immediate vicinity of the quarry. Relative to the surrounding areas, the quarry site is located atop high ground and is isolated from the existing drainage network of creeks and streams. Drainage of surface runoff along ridge face and side slopes occur via sheet flow. Material from the quarry is coarse rocky material which does not convey surface runoff for significant distance before infiltration occurs. Surface runoff that does not permeate through existing material is caught by the access roadways and loading areas that are in-sloped to direct runoff; runoff is discharged through an energy dissipater, through a culvert pipe, before it continues down the slope to the creek. Redwood Creek is separated from this culvert location by greater than 300 feet of heavily vegetated ground.

The investigation concluded that existing site conditions, grades and sediment control structures appear to be adequately designed and functioning properly, and the project does not appear to have the potential to impact Redwood Creek. Operations will employ Best Management Practices, including erosion and sediment control, to reduce the potential for substantial loss of topsoil or soil erosion and to reduce pollutants in storm water discharge and siltation. As much as is feasible, existing vegetation will be retained, with the overall drainage pattern of the area to be maintained as much as practical. The quarry area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and timber production uses when the quarry is no longer economically viable. The reclamation plan will restore the area to its natural setting.

Little water is presently used in the mining operation. Water will be imported to the site for dust suppression via water trucks that are filled offsite. No water impoundments or diversions are proposed. The project will not draw groundwater and will not cause any change in current groundwater recharge processes. No withdrawals are proposed. No wastewater is produced by the nature of the excavation process. 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.

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.

Mitigation M-5:

1. 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, and shall maintain existing erosion and sediment control measures to ensure no impact to Redwood Creek.

10. 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: In 1991, the County permitted operations of the historic rock quarry that has been used since at least 1953. The site is primarily surrounded by conifers and hardwood timber, and primary uses of the area and surrounding parcels are timber production with some grazing and rural residential uses in the vicinity of the site. There are two weekend homes north of the quarry and one weekend home below the quarry. The landowner's residence is the nearest residence at one-quarter mile or more away from the quarry. The nearest residence not owned by the landowner is approximately 1.5 miles away and protected by rugged, forested terrain. The commodity to be mined is aggregate rock to be used for County road and State Highway maintenance activities in the region. The Framework Plan recognizes the importance of aggregate extraction sites. The quarry area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and timber production uses when the quarry is no longer economically viable. There is no evidence that the project would adversely impact land use and planning.

11. 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: In 1991, the County permitted operations of the historic rock quarry used since at least 1953. Extracted rock has been used for County road and State highway maintenance projects in the region. The quarry site is in a location that meets the needs of Federal, State, County and local construction projects. The project site is not delineated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. The

quarry area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding agricultural and timber production 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 result in a significant adverse impact to mineral resources.

12. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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: In 1991, the County permitted operations of the historic rock quarry that has been used since 1953. There are two weekend homes north of the quarry and one weekend home below the quarry. The landowner's residence is the nearest residence at one-quarter mile or more away from the quarry. The nearest residence not owned by the landowner is approximately 1.5 miles away and protected by rugged, forested terrain. Northern Spotted Owl activity centers have been identified in the project vicinity.

Ambient noise levels have historically been associated with timber harvesting, agricultural operations and quarry activities. The mine will operate on an intermittent basis; there will be long periods of time when no sounds will be generated. Increased noise levels occur only during periods of operation. Mining activities that will produce noise include extraction, processing, loading and transporting rock material. No onsite processing of rocks with crushers has occurred in the past and there is no proposal to process rock with crushers onsite. Operations will meet County noise standards. Operations are limited to daylight hours. Blasting, if necessary, requires a 24-hour advance notice to adjacent occupants. Blasting is further restricted to address the Northern Spotted Owl nesting season. See discussion under *Biological Resources*. Workers will take safety measures during blasting to minimize effects to workers.

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

Mitigation Measures M-6:

1. Hours of operation shall be restricted to daylight hours, Monday through Friday, 7:00am to 6:00pm.
2. Prior to blasting, the operator shall provide 24-hour advance notice to adjacent occupants.
3. Blasting shall be restricted to not impact the Northern Spotted Owl nesting season; blasting shall not occur between approximately February 1 through July 31st, and prior to blasting, the operator shall contact the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

13. 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 adversely impact population and housing.

14. 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 1.5 miles south of State Highway 299 on Old Chezem Road in an area that consists mainly of timber and agricultural lands with some rural residential development. The mined area will revert back consistent with the plan designation, zoning and surrounding timber and agricultural 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. There is no evidence that the project will adversely impact public services.

15. 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 1.5 miles south of State Highway 299 on Old Chezem Road in an area that consists mainly of timber and agricultural lands with some rural residential development. No recreational facilities or development requiring the need for recreational facilities is proposed. There is no evidence that the project results in significant adverse impacts associated with recreation.

16. 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 1.5 miles south of State Highway 299 on Old Chezem Road. The roads have been used intermittently for quarry operations, timber harvesting and agricultural activities and local residents.

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. The existing traffic volume on Old Chezem Road is

light, and operation of the quarry is not expected to have a significant impact on this roadway. A bulldozer working in the quarry for five days can generate enough material to typically last one month. A loader is at the quarry to load out material and typically one to three trucks haul intermittently during the construction season. Occasionally, during the construction season and depending on demand, the trucking could last four or five days and involve four to six dump trucks per day (per operator).

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 adversely impact traffic and transportation.

17. 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: This is an historic rock quarry. Little water is necessary for the mining operation. Water will be imported to the site for dust suppression. No wastewater is produced. Site runoff and water will be returned to the groundwater table via ground percolation. By nature of the excavation process, there is no waste or overburden material that is generated for disposal. There is no evidence that the project will adversely impact utilities and service systems.

18. 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:

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incoop.	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. See discussion under *Biological Resources*. The site will be reclaimed and revegetated to an end use consistent with the zone, general plan and surrounding uses. Potential project impacts have been mitigated during the planning stage of the proposal. The project is designed to preclude the concentration of surface runoff from entering streams or erodible 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 plan 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. The General Plan recognizes the importance of surface mining operations. 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.

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, the increase in particulate matter, and impact to plant and wildlife.

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. The site is located in a rural, timber/agricultural setting and congestion on Old Chezem Road is not a concern. The increase in traffic on Old Chezem Road during gravel mining activities, which are intermittent and temporary, constitute a small increase in average daily traffic levels.

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 discussion contained under *Hydrology and Water Quality*. The project incorporates Best Management Practices, including erosion and sediment control.

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 discussion under *Noise*. The site is an historic rock quarry. The site is located in a rural, timber/agricultural setting with the closest non-landowner residence approximately 1.5 miles away and protected by rugged, forested terrain.

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.

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: The potential increase in impact to biological resources is not cumulatively significant because the proposed project does not result in a significant change in impacts as discussed under *Biological Resources*. The Engineering Geologic Investigation, Biological Assessment and Botanical Survey and Impact Assessment prepared for the project concludes that the project does not appear to have potential to impact Redwood Creek or habitat in the project vicinity. 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 discussion under *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.

19. 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. The following is a list of Mitigation that addresses and mitigates potentially significant adverse impacts to a level of non-significance. Additional details regarding mitigation for reclamation of the site can be found in the Mining Plan and Reclamation Plan.

Biological Resources - Mitigation M-1:

1. 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, and shall maintain existing erosion and sediment controls.
2. The project shall be consistent with the County's General Plan policies re: sensitive and critical habitats.
3. Blasting will be restricted during the NSO nesting season which occurs from approximately February 1 through July 31st. The operator shall contact US Fish and Wildlife Service prior to blasting.

Geology and Soils - Mitigation M-2:

1. 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, and shall maintain existing erosion and sediment control measures.
2. The project shall incorporate the recommendations identified within LACO's Engineering Geologic Investigation, and shall be consistent with the requirements of the Office of Mine Reclamation.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Mitigation Measures M-3:

1. Equipment and vehicles/trucks will be maintained and upgraded to meet current emission standards.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Mitigation M-4:

1. Fuel storage shall be consistent with the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, and operations shall minimize potential impact from contaminants.
2. Blasting shall occur consistent with State and Federal operating standards and all safety regulations concerning the use, storage, transportation and disposal of explosives shall be strictly observed.
3. Prior to blasting, adjacent occupants will be given a 24-hour advance notice.

Hydrology and Water Quality - Mitigation M-5:

1. 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, and will maintain existing erosion and sediment control measures to ensure no impact to Redwood Creek.

Noise - Mitigation Measures M-6:

1. Hours of operation shall be restricted to daylight hours, Monday through Friday, 7:00am to 6:00pm.
2. Prior to blasting, the operator shall provide 24-hour advance notice to adjacent occupants.
3. Blasting shall be restricted to not impact the Northern Spotted Owl nesting season; blasting shall not occur between approximately February 1 through July 31st, and prior to blasting, the operator shall contact the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

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 and Building Department.

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 were 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 Planning and Building Department – Planning Division during regular business hours.

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*.

Kleiner, William E. 2006. *Mason Quarry Plan of Operation and Initial Study prepared by William E. Kleiner*.

LACO Associates, Consulting Engineers. 2006. *Reclamation Plan for Mining Operations – Mason Quarry*.

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