BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Certified copy of portion of proceedings, Meeting of April 25, 2017

RESOLUTION NO. 17-35

RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED SOUTHERN HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY PARK PROJECT, AND ADOPTING THE ASSOCIATED MITIGATION AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES, THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
CASE NUMBERS GPA-10-02, ZR-10-02, CUP-10-04, SP-10-10
ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS: 222-091-014 AND 222-241-009

WHEREAS, in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a formal Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was issued on September 13, 2010 soliciting public input regarding the EIR for the Southern Humboldt Community Park. The NOP was sent by certified mail on September 13, 2010 to all the responsible and trustee agencies. The comment period ran from September 13, 2010 through October 12, 2010. A public scoping meeting was held on September 9, 2010 to obtain public comments on the issues to be considered in the EIR; and

WHEREAS, a Notice of Completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Southern Humboldt Community Park was filed with the State Clearinghouse on April 28, 2016 (State Clearinghouse No. 2010092037); and

WHEREAS, a Notice of Availability was published in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21092 and CEQA Guidelines section 15087 on May 9, 2016 and was sent by mail to organizations and individuals who requested such notice. The Notice of Availability provided for a public comment period commencing on May 9, 2016 and ending on June 27, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Notice of Availability contained substantially all of the information required by Public Resources Code section 21092 and CEQA Guidelines section 15087 and was published in the manner required by law, and was consequently made in full accordance with CEQA, notwithstanding any minor errors, which were not prejudicial; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR describes the environmental impacts of the proposed project, and concludes the project will have significant and unavoidable agricultural resource impacts and land use plan conflicts; and

WHEREAS, the County received public and agency comments on the draft document; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with CEQA, all comments received on the Draft EIR during the public comment period were responded to and included in a Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) completed on November 14, 2016; and

WHEREAS, on January 5, 2017, the Humboldt County Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to receive testimony on the adequacy on the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR was reviewed and considered by the Planning Commission, consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) prior to making its recommendations; and

WHEREAS, on January 5, 2017, the Planning Commission voted to recommend that the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors certify the Final EIR for the Southern Humboldt Community Park and approve the Project as proposed, with a minor modification; and

WHEREAS, the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors held duly noticed public hearings to review and consider and receive testimony on the Southern Humboldt Community Park and the Final EIR on March 28 and April 25, 2017; and

RESOLUTION NO. 17-35

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors received significant public input prior to the close of the public hearing, including a letter dated January 4, 2017, from Lynne Saxton; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors, although not required to formally respond to such input, has nonetheless fully considered such input and has concluded that all of the concerns raised by members of the public, including any alleged non-compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, are adequately addressed by the Final EIR, the Statement of Overriding Considerations and these Findings; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors deliberated the matter on March 28, 2017, and directed staff to prepare these findings supporting certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Southern Humboldt Community Park, adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adoption of the proposed project for final Board action on April 25, 2017; and

WHEREAS, on April 25, 2017, the Board of Supervisors completed its deliberations, and now desires to make environmental findings, certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Southern Humboldt Community Park, adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and approve the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (FEIR, Chapter IV) ; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors' deliberations on March 28, 2017 and April 25, 2017 were conducted as part of public meetings held in accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Humboldt, having received, reviewed, and considered the entire record, both written and oral, relating to the Southern Humboldt Community Park, and associated Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report, finds as follows:

1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.
2. The Findings of Fact contained in Attachment A – Part 2 hereto and the Statement of Overriding Considerations contained in Attachment A – Part 3 hereto are fully incorporated herein.
3. Introductory Findings:
    a. Independent Judgment/CEQA Compliance/Effect of Findings.
        i. The Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and these Findings, and the Findings in Attachment A – Part 2, attached hereto and incorporated herein, represent the independent judgment of the Board of Supervisors, and are hereby certified and found to comply with the procedural and substantive requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The process by which the EIR was prepared and circulated (including responses to comments), and by which this matter was brought to the Board for consideration and decision, likewise complies with the requirements of CEQA.
        ii. The Board of Supervisors recognizes that there may be differences in and among the different sources of information and opinions offered in the documents and

testimony that make up the EIR and the administrative record; that experts disagree; and that the Board of Supervisors must base its decision and these Findings and the Findings contained in Attachment B and Attachment D hereto on the substantial evidence in the record that it finds most compelling. Therefore, by these Findings and the Findings contained in Attachment B and Attachment D hereto, the Board of Supervisors ratifies, clarifies, and/or makes insignificant modifications to the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and resolves that these findings shall control and are determinative of the significant impacts of the Project. Except where these Findings and the Findings contained in Attachment B and Attachment D hereto are more specific, the Board adopts the reasoning, analysis, and conclusion set forth in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report as its own.

b. The Board of Supervisors finds that the Final EIR identifies and describes significant effects that may occur as a result of the Project. With the implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR, these effects can be mitigated to levels of less than significance except for unavoidable significant impacts as discussed in the Findings of Fact (Attachment A – Part 2) and the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Attachment A – Part 3).
c. There is no substantial evidence the proposed Project will have a significant effect on the environment in those areas described in the Findings of Fact as areas of no significant impacts and areas with less than significant impacts.
d. There are also areas described in the Findings of Fact involving potentially significant environmental effects that have not been fully mitigated. In considering these environmental impacts, the Board finds that there are overriding social, economic and other considerations that are described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Attachment A – Part 3) which justify approval of the Project despite these impacts.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the Findings of Fact contained herein and in Attachment A – Part 2, attached hereto and fully incorporated herein; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that having made the Findings of Fact contained herein and in Attachment A – Part 2, attached hereto and fully incorporated herein, the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Southern Humboldt Community Park (consisting of the Draft EIR, Final EIR, and all appendices); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Support of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Project (Attachment A – Part 3); and

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Certified copy of portion of proceedings, Meeting of April 25, 2017

RESOLUTION NO. 17-35

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors hereby incorporates and adopts all of the mitigation measures described in the Final EIR applicable to the Project including the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program in the Board of Supervisors staff report for March 28, 2017, which is incorporated by reference as if set forth in its entirety herein; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the individual parts of this resolution are severable, such that if one or more parts are determined to be invalid, all the other parts will remain in full force and effect.

The Director of Planning shall promptly file a Notice of Determination as provided in California Code of Regulation, title 14, section 15094.

Dated: April 25, 2017

Virginia Bass
VIRGINIA BASS, Chair
Humboldt County Board of Supervisors

Adopted on motion by Supervisor Fennell, seconded by Supervisor Sundberg, and the following vote:

AYES:	Supervisors	Sundberg, Fennell, Bass, Bohn, Wilson
NAYS:	Supervisors	--
ABSENT:	Supervisors	--
ABSTAIN:	Supervisors	--

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
County of Humboldt)

I, KATHY HAYES, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, County of Humboldt, State of California, do hereby certify the foregoing to be an original made in the above-entitled matter by said Board of Supervisors at a meeting held in Eureka, California.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Seal of said Board of Supervisors.

Ana Hartwell
By ANA HARTWELL
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Humboldt, State of California

ATTACHMENT A - PART 2

FINDINGS OF FACT

In Support of the
Final Environmental Impact Report
For the
Proposed Southern Humboldt Community Park Project

(SCH 2010092037)

FINDINGS OF FACT TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the FEIR is to consider the environmental effects of creating the appropriate land use regulatory framework for continued use and enhancement of the existing infrastructure, resources, and other assets within the project site for community park purposes.

SECTION 2: PROJECT AREA

The 405.7-acre project site is located in an unincorporated portion of southern Humboldt County, approximately 1 mile west of Garberville, at 934 Sprowel Creek Road at the intersection of Sprowel Creek Road with Kimtu Road.

SECTION 3: THE RECORD

For the purposes of CEQA and the findings contained in this document, the administrative record of the County relating to the project includes:

A. Meetings, Hearings and Workshops: Throughout the review process, there have been several public workshops a Planning Commission meeting, and two Board of Supervisors meetings at which proposed project was considered. The minutes of all such meetings are part of the record of proceedings which has been considered by the Board of Supervisors in making findings regarding the proposed project and FEIR. All staff reports, memoranda, maps, letters, minutes of meetings and other Planning documents prepared by the County staff relating to the project are included in the record of proceedings.

B. Documents: The documents on which the Board of Supervisors has relied in making its findings concerning the proposed Project and FEIR include, but are not limited to the following:

1. The draft Environmental Impact Report for the project.
2. The Final Environmental Impact Report for the project.
2. All testimony and comments on the project whether written or oral presented at the noticed public hearings before the Humboldt County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.
3. All background information, technical reports, and technical correspondence received by the Planning Division that formed the basis for the factual information presented in the staff reports and the corresponding environmental analysis.
4. The staff reports presented during the various meetings and the resolutions, findings of fact, and statement of overriding considerations adopted by the Board of Supervisors.
5. Location of Record: The record of proceedings for the Board's decision on the proposed Project is in the custody of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors located at 825 5th Street, Eureka, California 95501 and in the custody of the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department, Planning Division, located at 3015 H Street, Eureka, California 95501.

SECTION 4: PROJECT HISTORY FINDINGS

A. FINDING: A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was sent by certified mail on September 13, 2010 to all the responsible and trustee agencies. The notice of preparation included a project description, a listing of the affected properties and the nearest cross streets, and a description of the potential environmental impacts of the project.

EVIDENCE: Found on file with the Planning Division and the Office of Planning and Research CEQANET website (www.opr.ca.gov).

B. FINDING: Prior to completing the Draft EIR, the staff of the Planning Department contacted the interested agencies, individuals, and jurisdictions to secure their input. Issues identified are contained in Appendix A of the FEIR. The responses of the County are set forth in the FEIR and are supported by empirical data, scientific authorities, and explanatory information which facilitates a comparison of the impacts involved with the proposed project and alternatives as set forth in the FEIR.

EVIDENCE: Found on file with the Planning Division and on the Planning Division website (www.humboldtgov.org/156/Planning-Building).

C. FINDING: A Notice of Completion of the draft EIR was given by mail to organizations and individuals who requested such notice. The Notice of Completion was filed with the State Clearinghouse on April 28, 2016 (State Clearinghouse No. 2010092037). The Notice was also published as a 1/8 page display ad in the Times Standard Newspaper on May 9, 2016, which included a brief description of the project, the project location, the address where copies of the draft EIR were available, and the review period during which comments were received in the draft EIR.

EVIDENCE: Found on file with the Planning Division and the Office of Planning and Research CEQANET website (www.ceqanet.ca.gov).

D. FINDING: Copies of the Draft EIR were posted to the County's website, made available for inspection at the Planning Division office (3015 H Street, Eureka, California), and sent to the State Clearinghouse and County Branch Library Eureka for review for a period of at least 45 days.

EVIDENCE: Found on file with the Planning Division and on the Planning Division website (www.humboldtgov.org/156/Planning-Building).

E. FINDING: The County staff reviewed the comments to the Draft EIR.

EVIDENCE: Correspondence between the County and other agencies as found in Chapter 2 of the FEIR.

F. FINDING: The County prepared a FEIR consisting of:

1. The Draft EIR which was considered by the Board of Supervisors on March 28 and April 25, 2017;
2. Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR. The comments are found in Chapter 2 of the FEIR.
3. A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the FEIR.
4. The responses of the County as lead agency to significant environmental points and to the review process are set forth in Chapter 2 of the FEIR.

EVIDENCE: FEIR on the Project; SCH #2010092037 found on file with the Planning Division and on the Planning Division website (www.humboldtgov.org/156/Planning-Building).

G. FINDING: The FEIR focuses on the significant effects of the project on the environment. The scope of the discussion of the significant effects is in proportion to the severity and probability of occurrence. The potentially significant effects on which the FEIR focuses are:

☒ Aesthetics	☒ Agriculture /Forestry 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	☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	

EVIDENCE: FEIR on the proposed plan and zoning amendments; SCH #2010092037 found on file with the Planning Division located at 3015 H Street, Eureka, California, and on the Planning Division website (www.humboldtgov.org/156/Planning-Building).

H. FINDING: The FEIR focuses on the significant effects on the environment and not on speculative impacts. The FEIR identified several potentially significant impacts of the project if implemented as described. This FEIR establishes general criteria for determining the significance of potential impacts. The potential impacts are discussed and identified for each issue area. A level of significance is determined by evaluating whether there will be impacts beyond those which will be addressed by existing and proposed requirements. For example, a potential impact may be less than significant after mitigation due to proposed policies which serve to reduce the potential impacts. Following the discussion of potential impacts is a discussion of mitigation measures required to reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. Impacts are defined as:

Potentially Significant (PS) — Should be considered synonymous with significant. This designation is used to indicate pre-mitigation level of significance.

Less than Significant (LS)	An impact is defined as "less than significant" when there are no substantial adverse changes in the physical environment.
Significant (S)	A "significant" impact is identified where an impact will have a substantial adverse impact on the environment.
Significant Unavoidable (SU)	Considered to have a significant adverse effect on the environment which cannot be avoided even with implementation of the mitigation measures.

EVIDENCE: FEIR on the proposed plan and zoning amendments; SCH #2010092037 found on file with the Planning Division and on the Planning Division website (www.humboldtgov.org/156/Planning-Building).

I. FINDING: The degree of specificity in the FEIR corresponds to the specific activities that might follow. For example, the FEIR analyzes the impacts of the proposed ballfields by including a sketch of the layout of the ballfields on the project site. Also the FIR includes a lighting plan showing the location of temporary lighting that will be used during medium- and large-sized events. On the other hand the FEIR does not describe other projects that may involve the use of the new PR - Public Recreation land use designation after it is added to the General Plan because Planning staff is unaware of any other projects being contemplated that may use that new plan designation.

EVIDENCE: FEIR, SCH #2010092037 found on file with the Planning Division and on the Planning Division website (www.humboldtgov.org/156/Planning-Building).

J. FINDING: Notice of the meetings at which the Planning Commission was to review the DEIR and recommend its certification was given by mail to organizations and individuals who requested such notice. Notice was also given by publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the affected area (the Times-Standard).

EVIDENCE: Found on file with the Planning Division.

K. FINDING: At their noticed public hearing of January 5, 2017 the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the DEIR and the FEIR, and recommended to the Board of Supervisors that they complete the environmental review of the project by certifying the FEIR.

EVIDENCE: Planning Commission Action Summary for January 5, 2017 on file with the Planning Division.

L. FINDING: Notice of the meeting at which the Board of Supervisors was to review the final EIR was given by mail to organizations and individuals who requested such notice. Notice was also given by publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the affected area (The Times-Standard).

EVIDENCE: Found on file with the Planning Division.

M. FINDING: Two noticed public hearings were held before the Board of Supervisors to consider, review and certify the FEIR.

EVIDENCE: Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 5 PROJECT HISTORY SUMMARY

FINDING: The proposed Project has involved extensive public participation. The following is a chronology of events relating to adoption of the proposed Project and FEIR:

Public workshops on the Project:

On November 10, 2009, the Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to accept a General Plan Amendment petition at a noticed public hearing.

The applicant conducted extensive public outreach in its multi-year park planning process, including: three initial public visioning events with 30 to 60 attendees in 2002; a series of four targeted public planning sessions beginning in 2008, with 40 to 200 attendees; and a 2012 survey of 425 individuals. This community input formed the basis for park planning efforts and shaped the proposed project.

Local tribal representatives were consulted on the proposed Project and DEIR.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing to review the proposed Project and the FEIR on January 5, 2017. Notice of the meeting was published as legal ad, and sent to neighbors and occupants within 300 feet of the Project site and all those who submitted comments on the Project.

The Board of Supervisors held two public hearings to review the proposed Project and the FEIR on January 5, 2017. Notice of the meeting was published as a legal ad, and sent to neighbors and occupants within 300 feet of the Project site and all those who submitted comments on the Project.

EVIDENCE: Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 6: DRAFT AND FEIR; COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN THE FEIR

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a "reasonable range of alternatives" to a proposed project be considered in environmental impact reports. The evaluation of alternatives does not need to be as exhaustive as the evaluation of the project itself.

FINDING: In addition to the Project as proposed, three (3) alternatives are considered for the Project: 1) the "No Project" alternative, 2) the "Reduced Public Facilities" alternative, and 3) the "Benbow Lake State Recreation Area" alternative.

EVIDENCE: DEIR, Chapter 5, "Alternatives".

FINDING: There were other alternatives that were considered, but rejected because they were not considered to be feasible. One alternative that was considered and rejected from further

discussion is to relocate some on-site facilities elsewhere on the property. This alternative was rejected because it would require more extensive road grading than the proposed Project.

EVIDENCE: DEIR, Chapter 5, "Alternatives".

FINDING: Another alternative that was considered and rejected was to include multifamily zoning on the site. This alternative was rejected as infeasible because the site is not served with public water and sewer, among other factors.

EVIDENCE: DEIR, Chapter 5, "Alternatives".

FINDING: **Preferred Alternative**
Following considerable study and after the receipt and consideration of extensive public testimony and written comments, the Planning Commission recommended adoption of the proposed Project. Based on the Planning Commission recommendation, the staff report, EIR and public testimony at their two public hearings, the Board of Supervisors selected the Preferred Alternative.

EVIDENCE: Found on file with the Planning Division.

FINDING: **No Project Alternative**
Under this alternative, the proposed Project would not be adopted and future development in the site would occur under the programs and policies in the existing general plan and zoning designations.

EVIDENCE: DEIR, Chapter 5, "Alternatives".

FINDING: **Reduced Public Facility Acreage Alternative**
This alternative ("Alternative 2") would leave 17 .1 acres more land in agricultural use. With less acreage in Area 4 that could ultimately be converted to public facility use, more of the site could be used for agriculture in the future. The area is currently used for hay crops and is assumed to remain in this use. In addition, some trails traverse this area and these are also assumed to remain.

EVIDENCE: DEIR, Chapter 5, "Alternatives".

FINDING: **Benbow Lake State Recreation Area Alternative**
The Benbow Lake State Recreation Area Site Alternative (hereinafter referred to as the "Benbow Alternative" or "Alternative 3") would occur if some or all of the proposed project were located on a site other than the Southern Humboldt Community Park. Benbow Lake State Recreation Area (APN 033-301-017 and 033-301-018) is approximately 2 miles south of the proposed project site.

EVIDENCE: DEIR, Chapter 5, "Alternatives".

FINDING: **Summary of the Alternatives Analysis**
For this project, the No Project Alternative would not be the environmentally superior alternative as it would leave the site in the existing zoning in which up to 54 new residences could theoretically be developed, potentially resulting in more impacts than identified for the proposed project. The Environmentally Superior Alternative would be Alternative 2 in which a total of 335.7 acres would remain in an agricultural designation and would not be rezoned as Public Facility. While Alternative 2 does meet all of the project objectives , it would not provide sufficient area for the expansion of public facilities in the future, so it was not selected. The applicant expressed to the Board of Supervisors during the public hearing that the proposed PF zone in Alternative 2 is limited to existing and planned improvements, but there are other non-agricultural uses that the Park could provide to meet local demand that are not yet planned. For example, if the applicant wanted to expand the proposed environmental camp so that more than one group at a time could use the facility, that would likely occur outside of the footprint of the planned environmental camp. This would not be allowed under Alternative 2, but would be allowed with the Preferred Alternative, which includes in the PF Zone a forested area to the west of the planned environmental camp that could be used for an expansion of the environmental camp use.

While Alternative 3 has reduced impacts compared to the proposed project, this alternative is very limited because only some of the project activities could occur at the Benbow site, and many of the project objectives would not be met. Also, because the applicant has no control over the Benbow site, it may not be available for the proposed project events in the future. For this reason, Alternative 3 was not selected.

EVIDENCE: Found on file with the Planning Division.

SECTION 7: STANDARD FOR ASSESSMENT OF ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PREFERRED PLAN

FINDING: In preparing the Draft EIR for the project, staff employed reasonable assumptions in their analysis of the potential impacts of components of the project to give County decision makers and the public an informed understanding of the most likely negative impacts which could theoretically result from the specific decision made.

EVIDENCE: Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 8: PROCESS GOALS, PROJECT GOALS AND ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

Alternatives to the project are described in the FEIR and are summarized in Section 6 of these findings. The Board of Supervisors finds that the alternatives are useful for purposes of environmental comparison as presenting a range of potential development alternatives for the project.

(a) PLANNING PROCESS GOALS

FINDING: Sections 5 and 6 of these findings describe the extensive planning process which preceded the determination by the Board of Supervisors to select the Preferred Alternative.

This process represents an attempt to balance the recreational needs of the community with protection of significant agricultural, biological and cultural resources on the site.

EVIDENCE: Record of Proceedings.

(b) FINDINGS CONCERNING ALTERNATIVES
The proposed Project and each of the alternatives have significant unavoidable environmental impacts. Since recreational uses serving the community's recreational needs requires development of ballfields and other infrastructure on the project site, that land will no longer be available for agricultural purposes, and will therefore be a conversion of agricultural land to other uses. This will lead to significant environmental impacts on the conversion of agricultural land and conflicts with the General Plan policies supporting protection of agricultural land from conversion regardless of which alternative is selected.

The FEIR describes two additional mitigation options — purchase of conservation easements on agricultural land and payment of fees to fund agricultural land preservation. The first option, purchase of conservation easements, appears to be economically infeasible for the project. According to the project applicant, purchase of an off-site easement would be economically infeasible because the applicant would not be able to afford the purchase cost. The applicant has investigated the possibility of establishing an on-site easement, but found that the property was not large enough to interest agricultural conservation groups and that the costs of an on-site easement (e.g., creating an endowment to fund the easement upfront, paying annual monitoring and reporting fees) would be too high for the applicant alone to afford. The second option, payment of mitigation fees, also appears to be infeasible, as the County does not have a mechanism for collecting and administering such fees. Both of these additional mitigation options are infeasible.

EVIDENCE: FEIR

(c) FINDINGS CONCERNING THE COMPARISON OF THE PROJECT WITH THE EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING
The analytical process of comparing and analyzing impacts of the Preferred Alternative to the existing environmental setting has permitted the Board of Supervisors to weigh impacts attributed to the proposed Project against the continuation of the existing general plan and zoning designations.

EVIDENCE: Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 9: GENERAL EXPLANATION OF FINDINGS
In subsequent sections, the Board of Supervisors will make findings concerning the significant adverse impacts and potentially adverse impacts which have been identified in the FEIR. These findings will also set forth mitigation measures proposed in the FEIR.

SECTION 10: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS
FINDING: Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that two related

impacts have been identified as significant and unavoidable: Impact AGFR-1 - the conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses, and Impact LAND-1 - the project's conflict with Humboldt County General Plan policies for protecting agricultural land. All other identified impacts can be mitigated to a less than-significant level with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. The EIR also addresses less than significant impacts for which mitigation measures are not needed.

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that mitigation measure AGFR-1 generally reduces the environmental impacts of the Project on the conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses and conflicts to general plan policies protecting agricultural land by requiring the 4-acre temporary parking zone in Area 3 to be not be used for parking until after the hay crop is harvested. It also requires the project applicant remove all trash and debris from fields used for parking and return the field to productive use for the next season. Further, to protect the continued agricultural use of Area 3, the mitigation measure requires the applicant record a deed restriction on the Area 3 part of the property that would convey to the County the development rights for any development other than the existing uses. This restriction will preclude any improvements in the area except those for agricultural purposes, such as greenhouses and barns. The restriction would allow the use of the area for parking for temporary events, and the use of ranch roads for moving people and equipment associated with those events, because no new development would be needed for these temporary uses. The deed restriction may include a clause releasing the restriction at the time the zoning and general plan are changed to limit the use of the property to agricultural uses.

The FEIR describes two additional mitigation options — purchase of conservation easements on agricultural land and payment of fees to fund agricultural land preservation. The first option, purchase of conservation easements, is economically infeasible for the project. According to the project applicant, purchase of an off-site easement would be economically infeasible because the applicant would not be able to afford the purchase cost. The applicant investigated the possibility of establishing an on-site easement, but found that the property was not large enough to interest agricultural conservation groups and that the costs of an on-site easement (e.g., creating an endowment to fund the easement upfront, paying annual monitoring and reporting fees) would be too high for the applicant alone to afford. The second option, payment of mitigation fees, also appears to be infeasible, as the County does not have a mechanism for collecting and administering such fees. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that both of these options are infeasible.

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that no additional mitigation is available for the loss of farmland. The Board further finds that the mitigation measures discussed above would help reduce the farmland conversion impact, but the project would still result in a net loss of farmland. The impact would therefore be significant and unavoidable. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a) and CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a), the Board hereby finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the 2008 General Plan Update outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Attachment A – 3, attached hereto and incorporated fully herein.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-1 through 3-35, 4.10-10 through 4.10-11, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 11: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ON AESTHETICS

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Scenic Resources Visible from State Scenic Highway

FINDING AND RATIONALE: Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the no designated state scenic highways exist in the vicinity of the site and thus no visual impacts to scenic resources from such highways would occur. The Board finds that the project would not impact rock outcroppings or historic buildings. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the Project would have no impact on scenic resources visible from a state scenic highway.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, and 4.1-1 through 4.1-9, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

AESTHETICS-1:

IMPACT

Implementation of the project would result in construction of new community facilities including recreation fields, a skatepark, a dog park, concessions stands, and visitor amenities and parking areas that would be visible from Kimtu Road and that would change the scenic vista from this road. Such new features could also visually contrast with the natural surroundings. This impact is potentially significant (PS).

EXPLANATION

New recreational features and buildings could conflict with the predominantly natural surroundings of the project site, especially if such features contrasted significantly in color or materials from the natural surroundings. No landscape plans have been submitted for the project site; thus, it cannot be determined if new landscaping may screen some features from

the view of motorists on Kimtu Road. Area 5, the Sports Area, would have the most significant permanent changes on the project site. During construction, the construction staging area may contain worker vehicles and construction equipment.

Park events such as the medium and large festival events would change the site's visual character in terms of bringing in many people and cars to the project site; however, this use would be very short-term and would not require mitigation.

The project would not result in significant amounts of vegetation loss, substantial alteration of the site's natural character, or extensive grading visible from beyond the site boundaries. The sports fields would require some grading to level the fields. The view from U.S. Highway 101 would not be significantly altered due to the distance of the site from the highway where new facilities would be developed, the orientation and speed of the driver (e.g., that would generally require motorists to stop by the road to take in views of the site), and the fact that the site is at a much lower elevation than the highway. The Community Facility/Sports Field area is approximately 1 mile from the highway. The open space nature of sports fields and the distance from Highway 101 would not have a significant impact on the overall visual aesthetics.

While the installation of sport fields may require some changes to the sites typography, the area that is now a large open area would primarily remain a large open area. There are no potentially significant features that would be affected in the area such as distinctive landmark trees, unique rock formations, or other rare features.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure AESTHETICS-1a: New landscaping shall be planted at the edge of the gravel parking area fronting on Kimtu Road in Area 5, the Sports Area. This landscaping shall be low evergreen shrubs that would partially screen parked cars from view from Kimtu Road. All vegetation planted as mitigation shall be planted outside the County-maintained road right-of-ways, meet the County visibility ordinance, not block county road drainage, or cause additional maintenance for the road crew. Prior to installing vegetation, the planting plan should be reviewed by the Department of Public Works.

Mitigation Measure AESTHETICS-1b: Similar evergreen shrubbery shall be planted. After 5 years the shrubs shall be at least 4 feet in height and provide a visual screen for a minimum of 85 percent of the view of the parking areas for Area 5 adjacent to Kimtu Road adjacent to Kimtu Road to screen the proposed skatepark and dog park in Area 5 from view. However, landscaping plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department to ensure that landscaping would not interfere with sight visibility for safety reasons.

Mitigation Measure AESTHETICS-1c: All new buildings and other built features at the project site shall be painted in neutral colors to blend into the surroundings and shall not include reflective materials.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the changes to the project discussed above would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, and 4.1-1 through 4.1-11, Record of Proceedings.

AESTHETICS-2:

IMPACT

Project components such as special events would have a need for nighttime lighting that would create a new source of nighttime light or glare that may adversely affect nighttime views in the area (see Appendix I: Lighting Plan). This impact is potentially significant (PS).

EXPLANATION

Except for Areas 6 and 7, new lighting would be added to the project site to provide light to restroom facilities, parking areas, on-site residences, and other components of the site. During festivals, the exit to the event site would also be lit. Low-voltage lighting would be used to light the portable toilets during festival events. Portable solar and battery-powered lighting would be used when possible. Craft and food booths that remain open after dark would also provide their own lights.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure AESTHETICS-2a: The applicant shall prepare a lighting plan that shall address the facility lighting placement and design for ongoing operations. This plan shall be reviewed and approved by the County's Planning Department. To avoid intrusion into neighboring properties and visibility from nearby roads, all lighting shall be shielded and directed downwards, and shall use the minimum wattage to allow safe conditions. Pathway lighting shall be placed low to the ground to minimize excess lighting. Temporary lighting of parking areas during festival events shall be shielded and directed to minimize glare.

Mitigation Measure AESTHETICS-2b: Lighting shall be on timers to minimize the number of hours of lighting at the project site.

Mitigation Measure AESTHETICS-2c: During festival events, all concession participants shall be informed of the need to minimize lighting at the project site. This requirement shall be included in the Conditional Use Permit for the project site.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE
DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, and 4.1-1 through 4.1-11, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 12: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Conflicts with Agricultural, Forest Land, or Timberland Zoning
Finding and Rationale: Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not create any conflicts with existing agricultural, forest land, or timberland zoning. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
As discussed under "Environmental Setting" above, most of the 405.7-acre project site is currently zoned Agricultural Exclusive (AE); the only exception is a 12-acre area in the northern part of the site that is zoned MH-Q (Heavy Industrial-Qualified). None of the project site has forest land or timberland zoning.

Under the project, the 12-acre area would retain its MH-Q zoning, and approximately 307 acres of the site would remain zoned AE but would have a Qualified (Q) combining zone that would allow public recreation uses. Approximately 87 acres would be rezoned to a new Public Facility (PF) zoning classification with a Q combining zone that would allow agricultural uses. (See further discussion in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR.) The project proposes to continue existing agriculture activities and forest land management on the project site. The project does not propose timber production.

With implementation of the project, the same areas of the site that are currently zoned for agricultural use would continue to have zoning that allows agricultural use. The proposed zoning of PF with a Q combining zone, which would apply to 87 acres of the site, would allow agricultural uses as well as recreational uses and would not cause significant conflict with the existing AE zone, which allows agricultural uses. Similarly, adding the Q combining zone to allow public recreation uses in the existing AE zone, as proposed by the project, would not cause significant conflict within the existing AE zone. The project includes rezoning as necessary to accommodate the proposed uses. The proposed project uses and zoning therefore would not conflict with the existing zoning of the project site. The project therefore would not create any conflicts with agricultural, forest land, or timberland zoning. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

The issue of project conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use is different from project consistency with existing agricultural zoning. The farmland conversion impact is addressed under Impact AGFR-1 below. DEIR pages, and 4.1-1 through 4.1-11.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.2-1 through 4.2-14, Record of Proceedings.

Conflict with Williamson Act Contract

Finding and Rationale: As discussed under "Regulatory Framework" above, the project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not create a conflict with a Williamson Act contract. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.2-1 through 4.2-14, Record of Proceedings.

Conversion of Forest Land to Non-Forest Use

Finding and Rationale: Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

As discussed under "Environmental Setting" above, the project site contains approximately 186 acres of land that supports native tree cover. No changes to the existing management of this land are proposed by the project. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the impact would therefore be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.2-1 through 4.2-14, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

AGFR-1:

IMPACT

The project would convert farmland (approximately 4 acres in Area 3 and 16 acres in Area 5) to non-agricultural use, reducing the overall inventory of agricultural land in Humboldt County and conflicting with Humboldt County General Plan policies for protecting agricultural land. This impact is potentially significant (PS).

EXPLANATION

The conversion of farmland can occur through direct conversion to urban uses or the land falling idle due to conflicts with nearby urban uses, subdivision of the land, or change in use to parkland or open space. While the project would generally increase agricultural production on the project site, it would convert farmland to non-agricultural uses in certain limited areas of the site, representing a significant impact.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines states that a project would have a significant impact if it would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the FMMP of the California Resource Agency, to non-agricultural use (see "Significance Criteria" above). Humboldt County does not participate in the statewide FMMP; thus, it is not possible to analyze project impacts on these lands. However, the NRCS Soil Survey provides soil maps and data for the project area (NRCS, 2013). The NRCS soil survey data were used to analyze impacts on agricultural resources on the project site.

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, in determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California LESA model prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. The LESA model uses soil types and characteristics, relative project size, water availability, and surrounding uses as factors to rate the project based on its agricultural value. A final score is determined based on weighted ranks of the individual factors.

The LESA model was used to confirm the significance of the conversion of farmland on the project site. For the purpose of this analysis, the LESA model is used to assess the significance of the conclusions presented in this report. The LESA model report and findings are included in Appendix B of the EIR.

The final LESA score for the project was 45, with a Land Evaluation subscore (soil types and characteristics to agriculture) of 27.9 and a Site Assessment subscore (project size, water availability, surrounding agriculture) of 17.1. This score is considered significant only if Land Evaluation and Site Assessment subscores are each greater than or equal to 20 points. Since the Site Assessment subscore was less than 20 points for the project site, pursuant to the LESA model, the proposed conversion of the site to non-agricultural uses would not be considered significant.

Although the proposed project would not have a significant impact based on the LESA model results, it would conflict with the Humboldt County General Plan policies for protecting agricultural land. The policies state that "agricultural lands shall be conserved" and that "the conversion of agricultural land should only be considered where continued agricultural production is not economically feasible and the proposed development is consistent with the Remote Rural Development Section 2550" (see "Regulatory Framework" above).
In general, agricultural activities on the project site would continue as part of the project, and most of the existing agricultural buildings would remain in use. In addition, proposed physical changes to the project site would allow expanded and new opportunities for agricultural uses of the site. The project proposes community uses of existing agricultural land to increase the productivity of the land by allowing multiple farmers, community groups, and individuals to use the land and existing facilities.

In Area 3, however, the project would include 500 spaces of temporary on-site parking for moderate- and large-sized events. This parking area would cover approximately 4 acres of Prime Farmland that are not irrigated (see Figure 4.2-1). According to the project applicant,

this field is currently producing a hay crop every spring (see Figure 4.2-2), and the field would be used for parking after crop harvest (Lobato, 2014). Under the project, Area 3 would retain its AE zoning but have a Q combining zone to allow recreational uses.

In addition, in Area 5, the project proposes a community facilities and sports area. Area 5 has a soil rating of excellent and a farmland classification of "Prime Farmland (if irrigated)" (see Figure 4.2-1). According to the project applicant, however, Area 5 is not currently irrigated and is not under agricultural production, and similar soils in this area have had poor crop production (Lobato, 2014). Under the project, Area 5 would be rezoned to PF.

The total of approximately 20 acres of farmland (approximately 4 acres in Area 3 and 16 acres in Area 5) that would be converted to non-agricultural use by the project would represent less than 0.01 percent of Humboldt County's total agricultural acreage (approximately 345,238 acres) and the total acreage with an agricultural land use designation in the Garberville/Redway/Alderpoint/Benbow Community Planning Area of southern Humboldt County (approximately 7,146 acres).

Applicant Rationale for Farmland Conversion

According to the project applicant, the project was designed so that many of the proposed activities would occur outside the areas of the site that are suitable for agriculture. The proposed Community Commons Area (Area 4) that would be used for educational camps and events is within a forested area that was selected for this proposed use to avoid impacts on agriculture. According to the applicant, Area 5 was chosen for the proposed community facilities and sports area in part due to the poorer soil compared to other areas of the site and the lack of agricultural productivity in this area of the site. Also according to the applicant, project timing would allow for compatible recreation and agricultural uses; for example, in Area 3, harvest of hay (conducted in mid-spring) would be completed before events that would use field parking (late spring through summer).

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure AGFR-1: The 4-acre temporary parking zone in Area 3 shall be not be used for parking until after the hay crop is harvested. The project applicant shall remove all trash and debris from fields used for parking and return the field to productive use for the next season.

To protect the continued agricultural use of Area 3, the applicant shall record a deed restriction on the Area 3 part of the property that would convey to the County the development rights for any development other than the existing uses. This restriction shall preclude any improvements in the area except those for agricultural purposes, such as greenhouses and barns. The restriction would allow the use of the area for parking for temporary events, and the use of ranch roads for moving people and equipment associated with those events, because no new development would be needed for these temporary uses. The deed restriction may include a clause releasing the restriction at the time the zoning and general plan are changed to limit the use of the property to agricultural uses.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that no additional mitigation is available for the loss of farmland. This measure would help reduce the farmland conversion impact, but the project would still result in a net loss of farmland. The impact would therefore be significant and unavoidable (SU).

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.2-1 through 4.2-14, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 13: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT AIR QUALITY IMPACTS

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Conflict With or Obstruction of Implementation of Air Quality Plan

As discussed below under Impact AIR-1, operation of the project would not involve substantial emissions of PM_{10}, the only criteria pollutant for which the area is non-attainment. Construction emissions due to project implementation would be mitigated to a less than-significant level. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 1995 PM_{10} Attainment Plan and this impact would be less than significant.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.3-1 through 4.3-13, Record of Proceedings.

Violation of Air Quality Standards

As discussed under Impact AIR-1, operation of the project would not involve substantial emissions of PM_{10}, the only criteria pollutant for which the area is non-attainment. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that construction emissions due to project implementation would be mitigated to a less than-significant level.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.3-1 through 4.3-13, Record of Proceedings.

Carbon monoxide emissions from traffic generated by the project would be the pollutant of greatest concern at the local level. Congested intersections with a large volume of traffic have the greatest potential to cause high, localized concentrations of carbon monoxide. However, the area is attainment from carbon monoxide standards at both the State and federal level. As a point of reference, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) screening guidance indicates that a project would have a less than-significant impact with respect to carbon monoxide levels if project traffic projections indicate traffic levels would not increase at any affected intersection to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that because intersection

volumes in the project area are far less, the project would have a less than-significant impact with respect to carbon monoxide.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.3-1 through 4.3-13, Record of Proceedings.

Objectionable Odors

The project would generate localized emissions of diesel exhaust during construction equipment operation and truck activity. These emissions may be noticeable from time to time by adjacent receptors. However, they would be localized and are not likely to adversely affect people off-site by resulting in confirmed odor complaints. The project would not include any sources of significant odors that would cause complaints from surrounding uses. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project's odor impacts would therefore be less than significant.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.3-1 through 4.3-13, Record of Proceedings.

Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations

Health risks from TACs are a function of both concentration and duration of exposure. Unlike the above types of sources, construction diesel emissions are temporary, affecting an area for a period of days or perhaps weeks. The proposed project would have a significant effect if it would allow the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial levels of TAC. The use of construction-related off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment would be temporary and limited. In addition, the CARB adopted emission standards whereby engine manufacturers are now required to meet stricter exhaust standards for NO_X and PM, making emissions from off-road engines substantially less. The closest sensitive receptors (residences) are located over 800 feet from proposed construction of the Community Facilities/Sports Area, the area with the greatest magnitude of proposed construction equipment. As a result, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the construction-related TACs emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial emissions of TACs. The Board also finds that compliance with the construction dust mitigation requirements listed under Mitigation Measure AIR-1 below would also reduce PM exhaust emissions.

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that there would be no stationary sources of TACs as part of the project operation. Because construction-related sources are temporary in nature, and the majority of emissions would occur at a substantial distance from nearby receptors, the community health risk impact posed by temporary construction equipment would be a less than-significant impact.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.3-1 through 4.3-13, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

AIR-1: Construction Emissions

IMPACT

During construction, the project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants (i.e., PM_{10}) for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable national or State ambient air quality standard (PS).

EXPLANATION

Humboldt County is in attainment of all federal and State criteria air pollutant standards, except for State PM10 levels, for which the entire North Coast Air Basin is currently designated as a non-attainment area.

During grading and construction activities, dust would be generated. Most of the dust would result during grading activities. The amount of dust generated would be highly variable and is dependent on the size of the area disturbed at any given time, amount of activity, soil conditions, and meteorological conditions. Unless controlled, fugitive dust emissions during construction of the proposed project would be a potentially significant impact.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would assure that best management practices are implemented to feasibly control fugitive dust emissions, and this impact would be considered less than significant with mitigation.

Construction activities also generate exhaust emissions from construction equipment and the hauling materials to and from construction sites, and from motor vehicles transporting construction crews. Exhaust emissions from construction activities vary daily as construction activity levels change. However, fugitive dust from a project construction site is typically the main source of PM10 emissions and, for the most part, the proposed project would not require substantial use of heavy-duty construction equipment.

Area 1 – Tooby Memorial Park
Construction in this area would involve minimal grading, and heavy equipment would be limited to less than one single dump truck and small tractor.

Area 2 – Park Headquarters
The new construction and conversion of structures is expected to involve minimal grading, and heavy equipment would be limited to less than one single dump truck and small tractor.

Area 3 – Main Agricultural Area
Construction activity in this area is anticipated to be limited and is not expected to require heavy equipment.

Area 4 – Community Commons

The proposed new trail in this area would be constructed from hand tools and the bridge would be constructed using a flat-bed trailer.

Area 5 – Community Facilities/Sports Area
There would be direct exposure of soils when the ball fields, parking area, service road, skate park, playground, and proposed buildings are constructed. Substantial grading may be needed to create a level play field and parking areas.

While the depth of grading would be less than 24 inches, there is a large area that would be graded; approximately 9 acres (14,333 cubic yards) of soil may be disturbed during construction of the ball fields, structures, and parking area. Grading would be graduated from 0 to a maximum of 24 inches.

Construction would require the use of several types of heavy equipment, including graders, backhoes, loaders, and dump trucks.

After grading occurs, the exposed soils are proposed to be covered with material that would prevent dust emissions. The parking areas are proposed to be covered with 3 inches of gravel, and the ball fields would be covered by turf.

Area 6 – Riverfront
Construction in this area would be limited to a single dump truck and small tractor.

Area 7 – Forestland
The proposed trails in this area would have unpaved surfaces and would be constructed with hand tools.

Installation of Water Tanks
All tanks would be installed without soil removal or disturbance. Installation would require one pickup truck for materials.

Water Pipe Installation
Installation of proposed pipeline and waterline is expected to take less than three days (with the installation of the waterline from Area 3 to the Sports Facilities – Area 5 occurring at the same time as installation of the ball fields). All soil removed during trenching would be replaced after installation, and equipment proposed for use includes two delivery trucks.

MITIGATION MEASURES
Mitigation Measure AIR-1: The project lies within the jurisdiction of North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD). All project construction and management shall comply with NCUAQMD ordinances for dust control. Project grading and construction shall use best available fugitive dust control measures during operations in order to reduce the amount of particulate matter that is present in the air as a result of man-made fugitive dust sources.

The following best management practices shall be implemented to reduce emissions and control dust during all project construction and grading activities that involve ground disturbance of 1,000 square feet or more:

1. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily;
2. Maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard for haul trucks;
3. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials;
4. Plant vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible;
5. Cover inactive soil storage piles; and
6. Treat accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved or gravel road with a 6- to 12 inch layer of wood chips or mulch, or treat accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6-inch layer of gravel.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.3-1 through 4.3-15, Record of Proceedings.

AIR-2: Operational Emissions

IMPACT

The project would result in the potential release of fugitive PM_{10} emissions from temporary large and medium-sized events due to a temporary increase in the number of vehicles on dirt roads (PS).

EXPLANATION

The proposed project would lead to increases in the number of vehicle trips and the distance of vehicle trips in the vicinity of the project site. Visitors attending events at the site, or playing or watching games at the new ball fields, would result in increased PM_{10} emissions, for which the North Coast Air Basin is in non-attainment for State standards.

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2013.2.2 was used to predict greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from operation of the project assuming full buildout. The project land use type and size, trip generation rate and other project-specific information were input to the model. The use of this model for evaluating emissions from land use projects is recommended statewide. Unless otherwise noted below, the CalEEMod model defaults for Humboldt County were used. CalEEMod provides emissions for transportation, areas sources, electricity consumption, natural gas combustion, electricity usage associated with water usage and wastewater discharge, and solid waste land filling and transport. CalEEMod output worksheets are included in Appendix C of the EIR.

Table 4.3-4 of the EIR shows computed project operational emissions. As shown in Table 4.3-4, PM_{10} emissions from project operation would be 0.9 tons per year. For comparison, stationary sources in the air basin are restricted to 15.0 tons of PM_{10} emissions per year (NCUAQMD 2014c). While there are no thresholds of significance established by the Air District for PM_{10}, predicted operational emissions are relatively low. Operation of the project would include events ranging from small (800 people) to large (up to 5,000). The air quality impact would be potentially significant unless mitigated. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-2a and AIR-2b would reduce this impact to a less than-significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure AIR-2a: On-site access roads used for movement of people and goods shall be watered at least twice daily for large and medium-sized events to reduce PM_{10} emissions. Access roads shall be treated to a distance of 100 feet from the paved or gravel road with a 6- to 12-inch layer of wood chips or mulch, or accesses shall be treated to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6-inch layer of gravel.

Mitigation Measure AIR-2b: For large and medium-sized events, the Traffic Control Plan (see Appendix E of the EIR) shall be implemented. The Traffic Control Plan demonstrates how shuttle ridership and carpools would be strongly encouraged in an effort to reduce traffic on Sprowel Creek Road; how the use of shuttle buses from both Redway, Garberville, Benbow, and Richardson Grove campground would help reduce the impact of vehicles on park properties, and how all attendees and volunteers would be encouraged to use the shuttle (e.g., by charging parking fees while shuttles would be free).

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.3-1 through 4.3-15, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 14: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES IMPACTS

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Special-Status Species

In general, no significant impacts on special-status species are anticipated with implementation of the proposed project. No special-status plant species were encountered or are suspected to occur on the portion of the site proposed for zoning changes and future development, and no adverse impacts are anticipated. The uncommon long beard lichen would be retained in buffer areas established along the riparian corridors and the forested habitat that would remain largely undisturbed as part of the project.

Essential habitats for State or federally-listed special-status animal species are generally absent from the portions of the site proposed for zoning changes and future development, and none have been reported from these areas. Northern spotted owl may occasionally forage in the forested habitat in the southern portion of the site, but these areas would remain as natural habitat. The proposed Environmental Camp, Wedding Grove, and Temporary Event location would be dispersed along the edge of the forest and woodland cover where suitable foraging and roosting opportunities for northern spotted owl are limited. Modifications along the edge of the South Fork of Eel River, which is known for dispersal and possible foraging by bald eagle, are limited to improving existing parking areas and improvements to the facilities at Tooby Memorial Park, and would result in minimal changes to this important riparian corridor, known as dispersal and foraging habitat for bald eagle and State and federally-listed anadromous fish species. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the potential impacts on State or federally-listed special-status animal species would be less than significant.

The Water Supply and Demand Analysis and Potential Impacts on Surface Water and Aquatic Habitat (WSDAPISWAH) in Appendix H of the EIR provides an assessment of the potential impacts of the project on aquatic habitat and a determination on the effects of the anticipated demand on surface water flows, including the South Fork Eel River. As described above, the on-site streams are ephemeral in nature and do not support suitable habitat conditions for special-status fish and amphibian species, and project implementation is not expected to result in any adverse impacts on existing aquatic habitat conditions along these riparian corridors. For potential effects on the aquatic habitat of the South Fork Eel River , even if the park's infiltration gallery were being pumped at the maximum diversion rate of 0.24 cfs as allowed under the applicant's Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement with CDFW, the riffle crest water surface elevation would drop roughly about 1/8-inch when based on the low flows in July 2015 where the shallowest observed segment of channel was about 30 square feet with a minimum riffle crest depth of about 8 inches. The conclusion in the WSDAPISWAH was that this worst-case reduction in water depth during the critical dry period was unlikely to affect summertime juvenile fish passage along the reach of the South Fork Eel River on the site, and even under the projected maximum diversion rate allowed by the park's water rights, would not lead to a break in surface flows. Therefore, the project is not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts on surface water flows or aquatic habitat in the South Fork Eel River, including suitable habitat for state and federally listed anadromous fish species. Most of the special-status animals known or suspected from the site are bird and bat species recognized as SSC species or maintained on a Watch List by CDFW. Proposed improvements have been sited to avoid most of the riparian corridors formed by the seasonal creeks and the broad expanse of seasonal freshwater marshlands on the site, protecting foraging, roosting and possibly nesting opportunities for most of these species. Suitable nesting and maternity roosting habitat for most of these species occurs in areas of dense riparian woodland and scrub, including potential nesting by olive-sited flycatcher, willow flycatcher, yellow warbler, yellow-breasted chat, pallid bat and Townsend's big-eared bat. **Figures 4.4-3** through **Figure 4.4-6** of the EIR show the mapped wetlands and riparian corridors in relation to proposed improvements, and demonstrate that both a 50-foot setback

buffer called for under the County's SMA Ordinance and a minimum 100-foot buffer is achieved in most instances around these features. Similarly, the riparian and wetland avoidance and buffers would serve to protect the potential dispersal and foraging habitat for northern red-legged frog and other amphibians in the seasonal creeks and seasonal freshwater marshlands on the site. And most of the woodland and forest habitat would also be avoided by proposed improvements, protecting suitable roosting and nesting substrate for Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, white-tailed kite and other raptors protected under the MBTA.

There remains a potential that vegetation clearing, construction of proposed improvements, and future maintenance and operations could result in inadvertent loss of nests in active use if careful controls are not implemented. This would be a violation of the MBTA and CDFW Code, and would be a potentially significant impact if active nests are located in the immediate vicinity of construction and other project-related activities as assessed further below under Impact BIO-1.

Sensitive Natural Communities

In general, the areas of sensitive natural communities, including the stand of old growth redwoods in Tooby Memorial Park and regulated waters would be avoided, and no adverse impacts are anticipated on sensitive natural communities (see Figure 4.4-3 through Figure 4.4-6). Areas of seasonal freshwater marsh and riparian forest/scrub are regulated by State and federal agencies, as discussed above under "Regulatory Framework". A review of the potential impacts of the project on regulated waters is assessed below under Impact BIO-2 and Impact BIO-3.

Adopted Habitat Conservation Plans

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that there are no adopted habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or other approved conservation plans encompassing the site or vicinity, and therefore there are no related potential impacts.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.4-1 through 4.4-25, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

BIO-1:

IMPACT

Construction activities and site fire fuel management activities could result in the loss of bird nests in active use, which would be a violation of the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and State Code (PS).

EXPLANATION

Proposed improvements are generally located in areas of past disturbance and non-native grassland cover. These include: the traffic circle and bathroom in the Tooby Memorial Park Area (Area 1); the temporary stage, new bathroom, improved parking and road improvements in the Park Headquarters Area (Area 2); the Wedding Grove and Temporary

Event location in the Community Commons Area (Area 4); and the play fields, roadways, buildings and other facilities in the Sports Area (Area 5). The likelihood of bird nesting is expected to be relatively low in these disturbed areas, and also low in areas subject to on-going activities and events where birds would either avoid nesting those areas or would have acclimated to the disturbance level and not be significantly affected by human presence. But locations where new, substantial disturbance to existing vegetative cover would occur, such as vegetation grubbing and grading associated with major construction activities initiated during the bird nesting season (generally from February 15 to August 31) could result in inadvertent loss of eggs and young of birds if present within the limits of construction, or abandonment of nests in active use if in close proximity to noise, movement, dust and other disturbance generated during construction. This could include loss or abandonment of nests of birds recognized as SSC species by CDFW and more common resident and migratory species protected under the MBTA and CDFW Code. The MBTA prohibits killing, possessing, or trading in migratory birds, except in accordance with regulations prescribed by the USFWS; this prohibition includes whole birds, parts of birds, and bird nests and eggs. This would be considered a potentially significant impact.

In addition to the relatively short-term construction-generated disturbance, vegetation management activities associated with fire fuel reduction could result in inadvertent loss or disturbance to nests in active use. Fire fuel management activities would typically occur in the spring and summer months when bird breeding and nesting occurs. Ideally, construction and vegetation removal for fire fuel management activities would be initiated during the non-nesting season (September 1 to February 14) to avoid the potential for disturbance to bird nests in active use. However, conduct of preconstruction surveys and implementation of appropriate avoidance measures would serve to ensure nests in active use during the breeding and nesting season are adequately avoided in compliance with the MBTA and CDFW Code. Birds typically acclimate to on-going vegetation management practices associated with farming and property maintenance, such as mowing for trail clearance, on-going maintenance of specific use areas, and set-up for special events that occur in designated areas. and no special avoidance measures are considered necessary for these activities.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measure has been recommended to recognize the potential for birds nesting on the site and to provide adequate avoidance for both construction and on-going management activities that could result in inadvertent take of nests in active use.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Major construction activities and vegetation management for fire fuel reduction shall be performed in compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and relevant sections of the California Fish and Wildlife Code to avoid loss of bird nests in active use. This shall be accomplished by preferably scheduling vegetation removal for fire fuel management and major construction activities outside of the bird nesting season (which occurs from February 15 to August 31) to avoid possible impacts on nesting birds if new nests are established in the future. Major construction activities requiring pre-construction surveys include: sports field improvements in the Sports Area; Environmental Camp and concession stand in the Commons Area; the new restroom, new parking, and roadway improvements in the Park Headquarters Area; and traffic circle and replacement restroom in Tooby Memorial Park. Major tree limbing and brush thinning for fire fuel management shall also require a pre-construction nesting survey when performed during the nesting season. Birds typically acclimate to on-going vegetation management practices associated with farming and property maintenance, such as hay crop harvest, field tilling, and mowing for trail clearance, special event area maintenance and other property maintenance, and no preconstruction surveys or special avoidance measures are considered necessary for these activities.

Alternatively, if these major construction activities and vegetation management for fire fuel reduction cannot be restricted to the non-nesting season (September 1 to February 14), a pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted depending on the proposed activity as defined below. The pre-construction nesting survey(s) shall include the following:

- A qualified biologist (Biologist) shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird (both passerine and raptor) survey within 14 days prior to major construction and fire fuel management activities.
- If no nesting birds are observed, no further action is required and scheduled activities shall be initiated within 14 days of the survey to prevent take of individual birds that could begin nesting after the survey. The Biologist shall document their observations and submit them to the County Planning Department for filing.
- Another nest survey shall be conducted if more than 14 days elapse between the initial nest search and the beginning of the scheduled major construction activities or fire fuel management activity during the nesting season. Follow-up nest surveys are not required for on-going maintenance activities and events because birds typically acclimate to these activities or would avoid nesting in the vicinity if sensitive to the associated noise, increase in human activity and other disturbance levels.
- If any active nests are encountered, the Biologist shall determine an appropriate disturbance-free buffer zone to be established around the nest location(s) until the young have fledged. Buffer zones vary depending on the species (i.e., typically 75 to 100 feet for passerines and 300 feet for raptors) and other factors such as on-going disturbance in the vicinity of the nest location. the dimensions of the buffer zone shall be determined in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

- Orange construction fencing shall be installed to delineate the buffer zone around the nest location(s) within which no construction-related equipment or operations shall be permitted. Continued use of existing facilities such as occupied buildings, existing parking, and site maintenance may continue within this buffer zone where the nesting birds have acclimated to these activities.
- No restrictions on activities outside the prescribed buffer zone are required once the zone has been identified and delineated in the field and workers have been properly trained to avoid the buffer zone area. But additional controls on lighting, noise amplification and other possible disturbance sources that could affect the viability of nest success shall be considered by the Biologist, and recommendations and restrictions defined, if necessary.
- Construction activities shall be restricted from the buffer zone until the Biologist has determined that young birds have fledged and the buffer zone is no longer needed.
- A survey report of findings verifying that any young have fledged shall be submitted by the Biologist for review and approval by the County Planning Director prior to initiation of major construction activities and major fire fuel vegetation management within the buffer zone. Following written approval by the County, restricted activities within the nest-buffer zone may proceed.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.4-1 through 4.4-38, Record of Proceedings.

BIO-2:

IMPACT

Proposed development could result in filling or modifications to regulated waters, including areas of freshwater emergent wetland and seasonal creek channels (PS).

EXPLANATION

Proposed improvements have generally been sited to avoid most of the riparian corridors formed by the seasonal creeks, the riparian forest along the edge of the South Fork Eel Creek, and the broad expanse of seasonal freshwater marshlands on the site. Figures 4.4-3 through Figure 4.4-6 in the EIR show the mapped wetlands and riparian corridors in relation to proposed improvements, and demonstrate that both a 50-foot setback buffer called for under the County's SMA Ordinance and an even larger minimum 100-foot buffer is achieved in most instances around these features. The few exceptions to this larger 100-foot setback adherence include: the proposed traffic circle and replacement bathroom in Tooby Memorial Park (see Figure 4.4-3 in the EIR); the temporary stage, new bathroom, and the parking and roadway improvements in the Park Headquarters Area (see Figure 4.4-4 in the EIR); the

pedestrian bridge crossings over the seasonal creeks, most of the temporary stage and booths associated with the Temporary Event location, and the layout of a portion of the Environmental Camp where about 9 tent sites would be located near the top of bank to the adjacent seasonal creek within the buffer setback in the Community Commons Area (see Figure 4.4-5 in the EIR); and a new irrigation line that would cross over the seasonal creek for the sports fields in Area 5 (see Figure 3-11 in the EIR).

Of these exceptions to the setback adherence, only the proposed new bridge crossings in Area 4, the irrigation pipeline in Area 5, and the roadway improvements in Area 2 would directly affect regulated waters. Detailed plans have not been prepared for these improvements, but the new bridges and irrigation pipeline crossing could affect existing riparian vegetation and aquatic habitat if initiated when surface waters are still present in the channels. For Area 2, the roadway improvements could result in loss of limited areas of seasonal freshwater marsh habitat for a distance of several hundred feet along the south side of the main entrance road to the Park Headquarters.

Proposed fills and modifications to jurisdictional waters would require authorizations from regulatory agencies, including the Corps, RWQCB, and CDFW as described above under "Regulatory Framework." Given the size of the proposed fills to areas of seasonal freshwater marsh, the project may qualify under the Nationwide Permitting Program of the Corps, which typically allows for smaller fills of up to half an acre in size as long as all standard and regional conditions are met. This includes compliance with the federal Endangered Species Act and provisions for adequate compensatory mitigation.

In addition to the potential for direct impacts on regulated waters, construction and long-term management activities could have indirect effects on the water quality of receiving waters. Improper drainage both during and after construction could interrupt important surface water flows or result in significant discharges of sediment-laden water into the downstream reaches of seasonal creeks and ultimately the South Fork Eel River. Adequate best management practices would be required to prevent transport of sediments into receiving waters, and to prevent long-term degradation as a result of increased urban pollutants, including oil and gasoline from vehicles parked in permanent and temporary parking areas, and fuel and lubricant spills from construction and property management equipment fueling and maintenance. A detailed discussion of the potential water quality impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality. Collectively, these represent significant direct and indirect impacts on regulated waters.

Potential impacts on jurisdictional waters would be significant, and any modifications would require appropriate authorization by regulatory agencies, compensatory mitigation, and adherence to best management practices during construction, as indicated in the following mitigation measures.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure BIO-2a: A Wetland Protection and Replacement Program (WPRP) shall be prepared by a qualified wetland specialist and implemented to provide compensatory mitigation for modifications to any areas of jurisdictional waters affected by the project, and to ensure compliance with County General Plan policies and the SMA Ordinance related to stream and wetland protection and mitigation. The WPRP shall contain the following components:

- If on-site avoidance of jurisdictional waters is not feasible, the WPRP shall provide compensatory mitigation at a minimum 2:1 ratio (ratio of mitigation acreage or credits to affected jurisdictional waters), subject to the review and approval by the County and regulatory agencies. Any habitat created as compensatory mitigation shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years or until success criteria are met, as defined in the WPRP to ensure successful establishment. The WPRP shall specify success criteria, maintenance and long-term management responsibilities, monitoring requirements, and contingency measures.
- Annual monitoring reports shall be provided to the County and resource agencies before December 31 of each monitoring year, summarizing the status of revegetation efforts, and any maintenance activities performed or required. Photographs of the location from either side of the treatment area shall be included. Maintenance and monitoring shall continue until the area is completely revegetated with a minimum of 80 percent absolute cover.
- Orange construction fencing shall be installed at the edge of adjacent jurisdictional waters to be preserved to ensure no disturbance to these features. The construction fencing shall remain in place for the entire duration of construction to ensure construction equipment avoids these areas.
- A qualified biologist/restoration specialist shall meet with heavy equipment operators prior to the beginning of site-disturbing activities to explain the required mitigation and shall be available during the initial phase of construction to provide situation-specific avoidance measures.
- Installation of the pedestrian bridges and other seasonal creek crossings or modifications shall be performed during the summer and fall months when the channels are dry, to minimize disturbance to aquatic habitat and avoid the need for temporary coffer dam and possible dewatering during construction.
- Any areas to be retained as natural habitat and disturbed as part of construction shall be restored to prevent erosion and contamination of nearby receiving waters. Monitoring shall be provided as part of the larger WPRP for a minimum of 5 years to ensure the disturbed area is successfully revegetated.
- Authorization for modifications to jurisdictional waters on the site shall be obtained by the applicant from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) under Section 1602 of the State Fish and Game Code.

- All legally required permits or other authorizations shall be obtained by the applicant from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries), and CDFW for the potential "take" of protected species under the federal and California Endangered Species Acts, if required. Although considered unlikely given the absence of suitable habitat for State- or federal-listed special-status species, the resource agencies make the determination on the need for any consultation or incidental take permits.
- Proof that all appropriate authorizations have been secured from the Corps, RWQCB, and CDFW and that adequate compensatory mitigation has been defined shall be furnished to the County prior to the issuance of a grading permit for any component of the project affecting jurisdictional waters.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2b: To address potential indirect impacts on water quality and downgradient receiving waters in the vicinity of the site, the applicant shall implement best management practices under the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) called for in Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a and the Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) called for in Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1b.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.4-1 through 4.4-38, Record of Proceedings.

BIO-3:

IMPACT

Proposed development would replace areas of existing natural habitat and could disrupt wildlife use of the site unless adequate controls are taken to prevent significant disruption (PS).

EXPLANATION

Installation of large playfields and other improvements, on-going recreational use, and temporary events would degrade the value of the remaining natural habitats on the site. Possible undesirable activities could include planting of highly invasive non-native plant species, vegetation clearance beyond that needed to accommodate proposed improvements, and unauthorized off-road vehicle activity. Sporting activities and the temporary special events would introduce additional visitors to the site, resulting in intensified human presence and disturbance from vehicles and event-generated noise, lighting, and other sources.

Detailed revegetation and landscaping plans have not been prepared for areas proposed for improvement areas such as the sports area, but many species used in landscaping are highly invasive, and could spread into open space areas to be retained as natural habitat, further

reducing the habitat values of the site. The California Exotic Pest Plant Committee has identified plant species considered to be unsuitable due to their invasive character and tendency to out-compete native flora (California Exotic Pest Plant Council, 2006.). Although species such as Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*) and French broom (*Genista monspessulana*) are currently not a severe problem on the site, grading would create preferred habitat for these species and further development of the site could contribute to their spread. Unauthorized off-road vehicle activity could destroy groundcover vegetation, damage shrubs and trees, and contribute to sedimentation in drainages.

Wildlife species dependent on the resources currently available on the site would be displaced during construction and possibly as a result of special event activities when occupied. If not properly secured, trash and garbage generated by construction activities and events may attract opportunistic wildlife species and adversely affect healthy behaviors for these species. Increased vehicle and human activity, night-time lighting, and uncontrolled pets could all contribute to the reduction in value of the developed and adjacent undeveloped portions of the site to many wildlife species. Uncontrolled dogs and cats could contribute to loss of birds and small terrestrial wildlife, and harassment of larger mammals unless they are restricted or leashed on trails and natural areas. These would be potentially significant impacts on the existing wildlife habitat values of the site.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: A qualified landscape architect or restoration ecologist who specializes in native habitat restoration shall be retained to incorporate the following provisions into the Landscape and Revegetation Plans for the project The Landscape and Revegetation Plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the County Planning Director in consultation with CDFW prior to any new development in Area 5 (Sports Area), or prior to the first large-sized event on the site, whichever comes first.

- Prohibit the use of highly undesirable species in landscape improvements on the site which could spread into the adjacent open space areas. Unsuitable species include: blue gum eucalyptus (Eucalyptus globulus), acacia (Acacia spp.), pampas grass (Cortaderia selloana), broom (Cytisus spp. and Genista spp.), gorse (Ulex europaeus), bamboo (Bambusa spp.), giant reed (Arundo donax), English ivy (Hedera helix), German ivy (Senecio milanioides), cotoneaster (Cotoneaster pannosus), and periwinkle (Vinca spp.), among others identified in the CalEPPC List.
- Define maintenance and monitoring provisions to ensure the successful establishment and long-term viability of native plantings and the control and eradication of highly aggressive non-native broom and other noxious weeds. The maintenance and monitoring program shall be implemented during a minimum 5-year monitoring required as part of tree replacement and wetlands mitigation, and shall continue as part of long-term maintenance of open space areas.
- Provide adequate controls to prevent unauthorized vehicle access to natural areas to be retained. These can include appropriately placed bollards, gates, and wildlife friendly fencing that serves to control unauthorized vehicle access but allows for movement by larger terrestrial wildlife.

- Provide for reseeding of all graded slopes not proposed for roadways and other improvements with a mix of native grasses and forbs appropriate for the site rather than a conventional seed mix typically used for erosion control purposes to replace and improve existing habitat values of grasslands disturbed on the site.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3b: Measures recommended in Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2a, BIO-2b, BIO-3a, and BIO-4 would serve to partially protect important natural habitat on the site for wildlife, avoid the potential loss of nests in active use, and minimize disturbance to wetlands and provide for replacement of affected jurisdictional waters. The following additional provisions shall be implemented to further protect wildlife habitat resources that could otherwise be compromised as part of the project:

- Permanent and temporary lighting shall be carefully designed and controlled to prevent unnecessary illumination of natural habitat on the site. Lighting shall be restricted to the immediate vicinity of areas necessary to provide the minimum level necessary for safety purposes to illuminate pathways and other outdoor areas. Lighting shall generally be kept low to the ground, directed downward, and shielded to prevent illumination into adjacent natural areas.
- Dogs and cats shall be kept on leash at all times when on trails and natural areas on the site.
- All garbage, recycling, and composting shall be kept in closed containers and latched or locked to prevent wildlife from using the waste as a food source. This shall include trash generated during temporary special events.
- Interpretive signs (ie "crumb clean") shall be strategically placed throughout the park to discourage abandonment or improper storage of food.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.4-1 through 4.4-38, Record of Proceedings.

BIO-4:

IMPACT

Proposed development has the potential to conflict with local regulations related to Stream Management Areas and the intent of relevant policies in the Humboldt County General Plan related to streams and wetlands (PS).

EXPLANATION

The project generally complies with the relevant policies and standards in the County General Plan. As discussed above under Impact BIO-2, proposed improvements have generally been sited to avoid most of the riparian corridors formed by the seasonal creeks, the

riparian forest along the edge of the South Fork Eel Creek, and the broad expanse of seasonal freshwater marshlands on the site. Figure 4.4-3 through Figure 4.4-6 in the EIR show the mapped wetlands and riparian corridors in relation to proposed improvements, and demonstrate that a 50-foot setback called for under the County's SMA Ordinance and even a larger minimum 100-foot buffer is achieved in most instances around these features. The few exceptions to this setback adherence include: the proposed traffic circle and replacement bathroom in Tooby Memorial Park (see Figure 4.4-3 in the EIR); the temporary stage, new bathroom, and the parking and roadway improvements in the Park Headquarters Area (see Figure 4.4-4 in the EIR); and the pedestrian bridge crossings over the seasonal creeks, most of the temporary stage and booths associated with the Temporary Event location, and the layout of a portion of the Environmental Camp where about 9 tent sites would be located near the top of bank to the adjacent seasonal creek within the buffer setback in the Community Commons Area (see Figure 4.4-5 in the EIR).

The County's SMA Ordinance sets minimum development and setback standards adjacent to blue line streams in unincorporated areas of County. The SMA Ordinance defines development allowed within the designated setbacks and requires that a permit be secured for any development within or affecting SMAs or other wet areas. Development allowed within the SMA setback area is generally restricted to aquatic and habitat-related functions, such as restoration, agricultural diversions and wells, new crossings, bank stabilization, and other essential public projects. No blue line streams occur on the site, with the exception of the South Fork Eel River.

Most of the Temporary Event improvements and a portion of the Environmental Camp in the Community Commons (Area 4) and the temporary stage and improved parking in the vicinity of the Park Headquarters (Area 2) all occur within the 50-foot setback called for under the SMA Ordinance and some fall within the mapped 100-foot setback from the seasonal creeks in the area as well (see Figure 4.4-4 and Figure 4.4-5 in the EIR). However, none of these seasonal creeks are technically blue-line streams used in defining setback distances under the SMA Ordinance. The mapped 100-foot buffers in Figures 4.4-3 through Figure 4.4-6 in the EIR were based on a recommendation made by CDFW in their response to the Notice of Preparation for the project in 2010 that a 100-foot buffer be provided from all drainages on the site, rather than the development restrictions under the SMA Ordinance that call for a 50-foot setback from intermittent streams.

Adjustment to some of these proposed facilities in the immediate vicinity of the seasonal creek features would be appropriate, together with seasonal restrictions on temporary activities when surface water is present. But the temporary events would presumably be scheduled during the late spring and summer, and would have only limited adverse effects on the nearby seasonal creek and associated riparian habitat. In some instances, there are no alternatives available to provide important improvements to existing facilities, such as replacing the existing bathroom in seasonal creek setbacks at Tooby Memorial Park (Area 1) and the road improvements and parking at the Park Headquarters (Area 2). Where direct fills and modifications to jurisdictional waters would occur, authorizations would be required from regulatory agencies, which would serve to ensure that appropriate controls and mitigation are incorporated into improvement plans.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-3a and BIO-3b would ensure adequate mitigation is provided for the direct loss of jurisdictional waters on the site, that protection and restoration of nearby waters is provided by the project, and that required authorizations are secured by regulatory agencies with evidence of compliance provided to the County prior to issuance of a grading permit. The following additional provisions shall be implemented to ensure conformance with relevant policies and standards in the County's General Plan and to meet with the intent of the SMA Ordinance:

- Provide compliance with Section 314-61.1, Streamside Management Area Ordinance of the Zoning Code and secure all required permits for any modifications to regulated habitat areas along streams and other wet areas.
- Relocate the portion of the Environmental Camp in Area 4 so that it is sited outside of the 50-foot buffer setback along the adjacent seasonal creek to the east. Although potential impacts associated with the few tents and other improvements near the top of bank are relatively minor, the buffer area is important to minimize vegetation removal, trampling and concentrated human activity along the seasonal creek.
- Restrict use of the Temporary Event facilities in Area 4 to the dry season (May 1 to October 31) to minimize disturbance to nearby seasonal aquatic habitat associated with the seasonal creeks. Exception to this restriction period may be authorized if field inspection verifies that surface water is no longer present in the spring months and that rains are not forecast in the fall months.
- Provide pedestrian bridge crossings over the seasonal creeks in the vicinity of the Temporary Event facilities and the Environmental Camp along designated trails to avoid concentrated pedestrian activity in the channel bottom.
- Install split rail fencing and interpretive signage to direct park users to designated creek crossing locations and minimize the potential for concentrated informal crossings of the creek channels.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.4-1 through 4.4-38, Record of Proceedings.

BIO-5

IMPACT

The project would contribute to a cumulative reduction in the surface water flows to the South Fork Eel River, creating the potential for a significant cumulative impact on aquatic life (PS).

EXPLANATION

As discussed above, the WSDAPISWAH provides an assessment of the potential impacts of the project on aquatic habitat and a determination on the effects of the anticipated demand on surface water flows, including the South Fork Eel River. Project implementation is not expected to result in any adverse impacts on existing aquatic habitat conditions along the on-site ephemeral streams. And no significant adverse impacts on surface water flows or aquatic habitat in the South Fork Eel River are anticipated for the project itself. However, the project would contribute to a cumulative reduction in the surface water flows to the South Fork Eel River, including during the dry summer months when conditions become critical. As acknowledged in the WSDAPISWAH, the low-flow conditions that have existed for the past several summers are a limiting factor for survival of juvenile Coho and Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and other aquatic species. During drought conditions, any reduction in flow could exacerbate the undesirable conditions of high water temperatures, low dissolved oxygen levels, and elevated nutrient concentrations, and could contribute to the creation of conditions that could be lethal for salmonids and other aquatic life. Because of these extreme low flows in the South Fork Eel River during current drought conditions, any further reduction in surface flows, including the relatively small diversion volume associated with the proposed project, could be cumulatively considerable and result in a significant cumulative impact on aquatic life.

The WSDAPISWAH included detailed recommendations to address the perception of using water to irrigate future playfields on the site, based on the principles of good environmental stewardship and water conservation, and to recognize that water use in the park must be adjusted based on the availability of water necessary to support the conservation values of the South Fork Eel River. These consist of 1) general recommendations for design and operation of the park, 2) adaptive management practices during times of water scarcity, and 3) controls on water availability through increased water storage capacity and restrictions on flow diversions from the South Fork Eel River during the dry season. Collectively, implementation of these recommendations from the WSDAPISWAH would serve to fully mitigate any project contribution to the potentially significant cumulative impact on aquatic life in the South Fork Eel River.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Recommendations contained in the Water Supply and Demand Analysis and Potential Impacts on Surface Water and Aquatic Habitat (WSDAPISWAH) shall be implemented to address the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on aquatic life in the South Fork Eel River. These consist of the following and are described in more detail below: 1) general recommendations for design and operation of the park, 2) adaptive management practices during times of water scarcity, and 3) controls on water availability through increased water storage capacity and restrictions on flow diversions from the South Fork Eel River during the dry season.

General Recommendations

The following are general recommendations to address the project contribution to cumulative impacts on aquatic life in the South Fork Eel River and to improve the beneficial effects of the project on improving habitat conditions. Some of these must be rigidly enforced, such as use of appropriate drought-tolerant turfgrass species and appropriate irrigation design that can substantially reduce water demand. These are very specific recommendations where compliance with the recommendation can be established as a performance standard for the measure.

- Improvements to Water Storage Capacity – As a goal of improving habitat conditions, the applicant shall work with the appropriate specialists to improve water storage capacity on the site. The project vicinity typically receives an average of 58 inches of precipitation, but the majority of the precipitation occurs between mid-October and mid-May. Thus, retaining water on-site during the wet season and allowing it to discharge back into the river during the dry season is the best means of further enhancing the hydrologic benefits that the park already provides. Water can be retained on-site by enhancing wetlands, restoring riparian areas, constructing infiltration or water storage ponds, and storing water in tanks. It is likely that enhancing groundwater recharge by enhancing wetlands, and restoring riparian areas would be the least expensive and infrastructure-intensive means of accomplishing this goal and would bring with it a suite of additional environmental benefits.
- Installation of Drought-tolerant Turfgrass – Drought-tolerant cool turfgrass species, such as Native Bentgrass™ from Delta Bluegrass, Zoysia 'De Anza', and/or Buffalo grass 'UC Verde' shall be used for turf plantings in the playfields and other areas of irrigated turf on the site. Each species and cultivar has differing benefits and advantages, but factors that shall be considered when selecting the type(s) of grass to be planted include evapotranspiration potential, drought tolerance, dormancy, soils structure and fertility, fertilizer demand, mowing height, invasive weed potential, and durability. Species that are recognized as an invasive species by the California Invasive Plant Council shall not be used. A landscaping firm experienced in turfgrass cultivation in similar Mediterranean climate zones shall be consulted by the applicant in selecting the exact species and cultivars for the playfields. Hybridized drought-resistant grass species and cultivars typically use about 70 percent of the water required by non-hybridized species.

- Appropriate Design of Irrigation Systems – Irrigation systems shall be designed with best available irrigation technologies, and be low-to-the ground and subsurface to reduce the potential for evaporation. Generally, sprinkler systems that apply water as close to the ground surface as possible will result in less evaporative loss. In addition, watering shall occur at night or in the early morning hours, which also reduces evaporation.
- Seasonal Restrictions for Irrigation – Most importantly, the irrigation allowance shall be determined based on the characteristics of each water year (when and how much precipitation falls) as that should influence how playfields are managed. Deciding when to cease irrigating the playfields is one of the most critical adaptive management measures for mitigating the potential adverse impacts associated with turf irrigation, and restrictions are defined further below under recommendations for adaptive management.

Adaptive Management Practices

There is a hierarchy of need for water in most communities during times of water scarcity. While sports fields are important for communities to congregate, turfgrass can be replanted after a drought in which irrigation is halted and grass dies. Water needed for direct human consumption often overrides most other uses, trailed closely by irrigation for food crops, and water needed to support instream beneficial uses. However, while alternative water supplies may sometimes be available for human needs, requirements for aquatic organisms can only be met through maintenance of life-sustaining minimum flows and viable water quality. Given the drought conditions that have been ongoing for at least 3 years (at the time of this writing), irrigation of the sports field during extended drought conditions is likely to be highly scrutinized and of reduced priority compared to other needs.

For this reason, the WSDAPISWAH recommends establishing a water budget for various irrigation demands on the site, as well as a triggering mechanism for the reduction or cessation of irrigation during periods of water shortage, based on higher priority uses. There are likely to be several tiers of demand within the beneficial uses that currently need to be serviced at the site including direct human consumption, residential uses, irrigation of trees and other established semi-permanent vegetation, irrigation of annual row crops, irrigation of turfgrass, and irrigation of pasture/wetlands. This water budget and management procedures would be defined as part of an Adaptive Management Plan for the site, as required below. The monitoring and management strategy defined in the Adaptive Management Plan shall consider current riverine, atmospheric, and antecedent precipitation conditions when determining the quantity of water available to irrigate turfgrass on the playfields. When the design and construction of new facilities is initiated, they shall be informed by the findings contained in the Adaptive Management Plan, and the findings shall be used in determining what type of and how many playfields are to be constructed. Phasing of the playfield construction would also allow field capacities to equilibrate with user demand and resource availability.

The WSDAPISWAH recommends that the irrigation cutoff threshold for the playfields be significantly higher than the 17-cubic-foot-per-second (cfs) flow conditions in the South Fork Eel River observed in July 2015. A threshold of 30 cfs beyond which the playfields could only be irrigated with stored or recycled water is recommended. This threshold would result in less vigorous turf at the onset of the wet season. One adaptation could be rotating the location(s) and layout(s) of fields in active use throughout the dry season in a manner that spreads the recreational impact on desiccated turf throughout the entire playfield area.

The following measures are recommended to provide adaptive management in future water use at the site:

- Develop an Adaptive Management Plan by a qualified hydrologist/landscape contractor that establishes a reliable means of determining the annual irrigation water diversion cutoff date. The Adaptive Management Plan shall be in place by the onset of construction of any playing fields.
- Consult with turfgrass and sports field irrigation system experts before laying out sports fields and designing irrigation systems in order to determine the best drought-tolerant turfgrass and irrigation strategies to reduce water consumption.
- Refine the water demand summary for agricultural areas and turfgrass (from the 2014 "Water Supply and Demand Analysis Memorandum" prepared for the project applicant by GHD; see Appendix G of the Draft EIR) using the WSDAPISWAH Estimated Water Demand to provide more detail for the site.

Future Water Storage and Restrictions on Flow Diversions
The Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA) with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) allows up to 2,000 gallons per day to be diverted from the spring currently used by the applicant between November 1 and July 1 of each year. The other diversion serving the site is from an infiltration gallery in the South Fork Eel River that is allowed to operate at a maximum diversion rate of 0.24 cfs. Use of the infiltration gallery currently does not have a specified period of diversion in the LSAA.

The following measures are recommended to improve future water storage and ensure adequate restrictions on in-channel diversions that could otherwise result in a cumulatively significant contribution to adverse effects on the aquatic habitat of the South Fork Eel River during the dry season:

- The applicant shall install additional non-potable water storage facilities on the site for irrigation and as a source of fire suppression water for the Main Agricultural and Forestland areas.
- Diversion from the South Fork Eel River infiltration gallery shall cease after the flow at Sylvandale (USGS Gauge #11476500) is nominally less than 30 cfs, contingent on calculation of a more robust metric.

- The LSAA with the CDFW requires that streamflow be measured prior to and during any diversion if water is diverted between July 1 and October 31. Measurements shall be taken at USGS Gauge 11476500. The operations manager for the applicant shall verify streamflow on-line on the USGS website for the gauge prior to any diversion, and shall monitor weekly or daily depending on changes in streamflow and how close the flows are to the 30 cfs threshold. An annual summary report of any diversion activities shall be prepared by the applicant's operations manager. The annual report shall briefly summarize diversion activities, including dates when diversions were initiated and terminated, if the 30 cfs threshold is met. The annual report shall be used to verify with the CDFW that the applicant is in compliance with the LSAA.
- The applicant shall seek funding to install additional water storage tanks and other on-site facilities to improve availability during the dry season. The additional water storage capacity can be defined as part of the Adaptive Management Plan, and preferably implemented in conjunction with construction of the future sports fields. Depending on the location selected for these tanks and other storage facilities, additional environmental review may be required. Any necessary environmental review shall be conducted before the facilities are installed.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact on surface water flows to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.4-1 through 4.4-38, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 15: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT CULTURAL RESOURCE IMPACTS

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Paleontological Resources or Unique Geological Features

No paleontological resources (fossils) or unique geological features would be affected by the project. Holocene and Pleistocene terrace deposits are mapped north of slopes bordering the southern third of the project site (McLaughlin et al, 2000). Although fossils have been identified in Pleistocene deposits in Humboldt County, these resources—if present—would likely underlie soil and Holocene sediment at a considerable depth. The project includes proposed construction that would result in earth-moving activities, including new bathroom facilities; entrance and driveway upgrades; new fencing for livestock security, public safety, and protection of riparian areas; and new trails. The proposed construction, however, does not involve deep, extensive excavations that have the potential to unearth significant fossils that may be associated with Pleistocene deposits. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project therefore would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or geological feature.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.5-1 through 4.5-16, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

CULTURAL-1

IMPACT

The project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Wood/Tooby Ranch Complex, a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Remodeling contributing properties to the Wood/Tooby Ranch Complex could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of this resource (PS).

EXPLANATION

Portions of the ranch house, cabin, and garage may be remodeled to accommodate new uses in addition to residential uses. Use conversion may include physical alterations to these buildings to accommodate offices, meeting spaces, a community kitchen, restrooms, and reconfigured residential uses. These three buildings are contributors to the Wood/Tooby Ranch Complex, a resource that appears eligible for listing under CRHR criteria 1 and 3 for its association with early 20th-century local ranching operations and as a good example of vernacular, utilitarian architecture. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3), "Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources." Remodeling and reconfiguring buildings associated with the Wood/Tooby Ranch Complex have the potential to materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that justify its inclusion in the CRHR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-1: Any remodel, reconfiguration, or rehabilitation of the ranch house, cabin, garage, or other contributing buildings to the historical Wood/Tooby Ranch Complex by the project shall be conducted in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards) and undertaken with the assistance of an individual meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for historic architecture (qualified architect). The qualified architect shall review the applicant's plans for work on the Wood/Tooby Ranch Complex buildings and provide written recommendations to the applicant and County to ensure that modifications to historical buildings are done in compliance with the appropriate standards. The qualified architect shall oversee remodeling, reconfiguration, or rehabilitation of the historical buildings to ensure that work is done in compliance with the standards. The County shall ensure that the recommendations of the qualified architect are followed as a condition of project approval.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described

changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.5-1 through 4.5-19, Record of Proceedings.

CULTURAL-2

IMPACT

The project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources, resulting from construction-related ground disturbance. Also, increased use of and visitation to the property from public and private events as well as recreational uses have the potential to result in incidences of vandalism of resources, unauthorized collection of archaeological materials, and trampling of archaeological deposits (PS).

EXPLANATION

Three archaeological sites are recorded at the project site. Although no project ground disturbance is proposed at or within the boundary of these three sites, intensified use of the community park may occur and could result in indirect impacts on archaeological resources. Such indirect impacts could occur from an increase in general agricultural use, including grazing; mid-size to festival-size events accommodating between 800 and 5,000 persons; and recreational trail and track construction. Collectively, these activities could result in increased exposure of archaeological deposits to trampling, surface collection, and vandalism.

Furthermore, project ground disturbance would occur from grading or trenching for proposed infrastructure upgrades and recreational facilities, which could unearth previously unidentified archaeological deposits or human remains. Trenching for proposed potable and irrigation lines, for example, would occur near archaeological sites CA-HUM-1257/H and CA-HUM-1267/H. To avoid direct impacts on these known archaeological resources, the project would construct the water lines outside of the recorded boundaries of these resources. Also, trenching for the proposed water lines would mostly occur within existing roads, which have a reduced potential for intact archaeological deposits due to previous disturbance.

Despite these avoidance measures, however, the potential to unearth subsurface archaeological deposits during project trenching cannot be ruled out. Prehistoric materials that could be encountered include obsidian and chert flakes or chipped stone tools, grinding implements (e.g., pestles, handstones, mortars, slabs), bedrock outcrops and boulders with mortar cups, locally darkened midden, deposits of shell, dietary bone, and human burials. Historical materials that could be encountered include ceramics/pottery, glass, metal, can and bottle dumps, cut bone, barbed wire fences, building pads, structures, and trails/roads.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2A: The Site Monitoring and Protection Protocols described in the Community Park Cultural Resources Management Plan (Verwayen and Whiteman, 2008) shall be implemented for the project. These monitoring and protection protocols include the following:

1. Placement of Protective and/or Interpretive Signs: Signs shall be placed at strategic locations in the community park—such as near restrooms, at kiosks, and at trailheads—prohibiting surface collection of artifacts or digging in archaeological sites.

2. Site Patrols: Community park staff shall routinely patrol archaeological resources, particularly during mid-size and festival-size events, to ensure that visitors remain on designated trails and away from archaeological deposits. Community park staff shall maintain a record of archaeological site inspections, including the date of inspection, observed damage or sources of potential damage (e.g., volunteer trails or cattle grazing) to archaeological resources. At its discretion, the County may request a copy of the inspection record(s) from the applicant. If damage or sources of potential damage to archaeological resources is observed, community park staff shall implement site-specific measures to mitigate or prevent further damage. Such measures may include fencing to prevent incursion on archaeological deposits, signs requesting that visitors stay on designated trails, and planting of dense vegetation near archaeological resources to reduce the potential for site incursion.

3. Fencing: A fence or section of fence shall be used to direct foot traffic away from archaeological resources on the project site. Temporary chain-link fencing or construction fencing could be used to keep people off archaeological sites during mid-size and festival-size events.

4. Archaeological Survey: Prior to project ground disturbance within 100 feet of a recorded archaeological resource, a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards shall conduct a survey to ensure that archaeological deposits would not be affected by the project. If an archaeological deposit is identified during the survey, project activities shall be redirected to avoid the deposit. If project activities cannot be redirected, the archaeological deposit shall be evaluated and mitigation carried out, as appropriate. Such mitigation may include a controlled excavation to recover archaeologically and historically significant information as well as public outreach and interpretation.

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2b: Prior to project approval, the County shall ensure that the following compulsory specification be included in the project construction contract plans: If cultural resources greater than 50 years old, such as chipped or ground stone, historical debris, building foundations, or bone are discovered during project ground disturbance, work shall be stopped within 20 meters (66 feet) of the discovery. Work near the archaeological finds shall not resume until a professional archaeologist has evaluated the materials and offered recommendations for further action.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.5-1 through 4.5-19, Record of Proceedings.

CULTURAL-3

IMPACT

The project could disturb human remains interred outside of formal cemeteries. The project site includes one historical grave (CA-HUM-1267/H) and a prehistoric site with possible Native American human remains (CA-HUM-1257/H). Furthermore, previously unrecorded human remains, either in isolation or in association with archaeological deposits, may be unearthed during project ground disturbance (PS).

The project site includes the circa 1867 grave site of Nellie Woods (CA-HUM-1267/H), and possible grave sites have been observed at CA-HUM-1257/H during an archaeological survey of the property (Van Kirk et al., 2001). Although no project ground disturbance is proposed at or near known or potential grave sites, intensified use of the community park may occur from project implementation and could result in indirect impacts on archaeological resources containing human remains.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-3: Refer to Mitigation Measures CULTURAL-2a and CULTURAL-2b. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CULTURAL-2a and CULTURAL-2b would reduce this potential impact to human remains by (1) establishing controls and protocols that would decrease the likelihood of public intrusion or destruction of archaeological resources containing human remains, i.e., through the use of signs, site patrols, and temporary fencing; and (2) establishing notification procedures for construction personnel in the event that archaeological resources and/or human remains are identified during project implementation.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.5-1 through 4.5-19, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 16: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE GEOLOGIC AND SOILS HAZARD IMPACTS

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Fault Rupture

Based on information discussed under "Environmental Setting" above, the Board finds that the geologic mapping indicates the nearest active fault is approximately 14 miles from the project site, and therefore the potential for on-site fault rupture is negligible.

Soil Erosion

Development of the project could result in soil erosion and/or loss of topsoil. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that proper implementation of existing regulatory programs would ensure that this impact would be less than significant, however, and no mitigation would be required.

The project would involve grading of more than 1 acre and 5,000 cubic yards of material, triggering the most stringent requirements of the County Code, requiring a soil engineering report, an engineering geology report, a grading plan, erosion control plan, and a qualified soils inspector present during all construction activities. In addition, as the construction site is greater than 1 acre in area, the construction site would be subject to the requirements of the Construction General Stormwater Permit, described in more detail under Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality. This would include implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would include further BMPs designed to prevent soils from becoming entrained in stormwater during project construction. Following construction, the areas subject to grading would be covered by buildings, roadways, parking lots, and landscaping and would not be subject to ongoing erosion hazards.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.6-1 through 4.6-9, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

GEO-1

IMPACT

Development of the project could expose future site workers and patrons to significant seismic hazards, including ground shaking and seismic related ground failure (PS).

EXPLANATION

The San Andreas and other faults located in the project site vicinity are capable of producing very strong to violent ground shaking, and a major seismic event is likely during the operational lifetime of the project. Violent seismic shaking could cause serious structural damage to buildings and other park improvements not engineered and constructed to comply with the current CBC, and could cause extensive non-structural damage even to properly constructed buildings. A site-specific geotechnical investigation would include recommendations for site preparation and construction details, including seismic design parameters, to ensure that the CBC was complied with in site construction. A soils engineering report and engineering geology report would be required for the project in accordance with County grading permit requirements. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 provides performance standards for those reports to ensure that the recommendations are incorporated in final project design for project improvements.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: As a condition of approval for any grading or construction permits for the project, a design-level geotechnical investigation shall be prepared by a licensed professional and submitted to the Humboldt County Building Department for review and approval. The geotechnical review shall verify that the project plans incorporate the recommendations for design contained in the preliminary geotechnical report, the current California Building Code (CBC), and other applicable design standards. All design measures, recommendations, design criteria, and specifications set forth in the design-level geotechnical review shall be implemented as a condition of project approval.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.6-1 through 4.6-11, Record of Proceedings.

GEO-2

IMPACT

Development of the project could expose future site workers and patrons to significant geologic hazards, including hazards related to lateral spreading, slope instability, liquefaction, subsidence, and differential and total settlement (PS).

EXPLANATION

No site-specific geotechnical data regarding lateral spreading, slope instability, liquefaction, subsidence, and differential and total settlement are available for the project site. A number or potential geotechnical concerns are present at the project site. For example, development of the environmental campground, wedding grove, and community event facilities and installation of the 500-gallon potable water tank and 2,500 feet of potable waterlines in Area 4 would take place in areas mapped as having moderate relative slope instability.

Improvements proposed in Area 5, including a skate park, playground, concession stand, and approximately 1,200 feet of potable and irrigation waterlines, could potentially be affected by differential settlement and expansive soils.

A site-specific geotechnical investigation would evaluate these potential hazards and include recommendations for site preparation and construction details. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would address geotechnical as well as seismic hazards and therefore reduce this potential impact to a less than-significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1, requiring a design-level geotechnical review as a condition of approval for grading and construction

permits, would reduce potential geologic impacts to less than-significant levels. No additional mitigation is required.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.6-1 through 4.6-11, Record of Proceedings.

GEO-3

IMPACT

Soils at the project site may be incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater (PS).

EXPLANATION

The project site is located outside the service area of the Garberville Sanitary District; thus, wastewater disposal would require septic tanks or other appropriate alternative wastewater disposal system. Portable toilet facilities would be used during large events.

NRCS soils data rank soils for their capability to support the proper operation of septic systems using criteria such as depth to saturation zone and water percolation rates. Soils at the project site were rated as somewhat limited to very limited due to the high water table and slow water movement (NRCS, 2014). NRCS guidance indicates that these limitations must be addressed by special soil reclamation, design, or installation procedures and can reduce the performance and raise the costs for installation and maintenance of the systems (NRCS, 2014).

As detailed in Section 4.9 of the EIR, Hydrology and Water Quality, septic systems are regulated through state, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, and county requirements. Adherence to those requirements, as modified by Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2, would reduce the potential impact from inadequate soils to a less than-significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure GEO-3: Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2, requiring demonstration of adequate capacity and operation of septic and wastewater systems, would reduce this potential impact to a less than-significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.6-1 through 4.6-11, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 17: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Conflict with Applicable Plans, Policies, or Regulations

The adopted AB 32 Scoping Plan includes proposed GHG reductions from direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, and market-based mechanisms such as cap-and-trade systems. The project would be subject to all applicable permit and planning requirements in place or adopted by the State of California or locally. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the proposed project would not conflict with plans or policies related to the reduction of GHG emissions.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.7-1 through 4.7-6, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

GHG-1

IMPACT

The project could generate an increase in direct and indirect greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (PS).

EXPLANATION

The California Emissions Estimator Model Version 2013.2.2 (CalEEMod) was used to predict GHG emissions from operation of the project. The model predicts emissions of GHGs in the form of CO_2e. The project land use type and size, trip generation rates, and other project-specific information were input to the model. Unless otherwise noted below, the CalEEMod model defaults for Humboldt County were used. CalEEMod provides emissions for transportation, areas sources, electricity consumption, natural gas combustion, electricity usage associated with water usage and wastewater discharge, and solid waste land filling and transport. CalEEMod output data are included in **Appendix C** of the EIR.

The model uses mobile emission factors from CARB's EMFAC2011 model. This model is sensitive to the year selected since vehicle emissions have been and continue to be reduced due to fuel efficiency standards and low carbon fuels. Adjustments to the modeling are described below.

Construction Emissions

Construction of the proposed project would, for the most part, involve minimal heavy-duty equipment, such as hand tools, trucks and trailers, dump trucks, and small tractors. During construction of Area 5 (Sports Area), graders, backhoes, loaders, and dump truckers would be needed. Though temporary, construction of the proposed project would emit GHGs in the form of exhaust emissions. However, neither the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD) nor Humboldt County have established a significance threshold for construction GHG emissions. While the project would not be required to comply with guidance from other air districts, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) recommends that all construction projects implement the following best management practices, where feasible: use alternative-fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment for at least 15 percent of the fleet, use at least 10 percent local building materials, and recycle or reuse at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. The project would be encouraged to incorporate all reasonable and feasible measures to reduce construction GHG emissions.

Operational Emissions

Land Use Descriptions

The proposed project land use was input into CalEEMod as 405.7 acres entered as "City Park."

Trip Generation Rates

Trip generation rates were input to CalEEMod using the daily trip numbers provided in the project traffic report by W-Trans.

Model Year

The model uses mobile emission factors from the California Air Resources Board's EMFAC2011 model. This model is sensitive to the year selected, since vehicle emissions have and continue to be reduced due to fuel efficiency standards and low carbon fuels. The year 2016 was analyzed since it is the first full year that the project site could conceivably be occupied, assuming construction were to occur in 2015.

Other Inputs

Default model assumptions for emissions associated with area sources, solid waste generation, and water/wastewater use were applied to the project.

Energy Usage

Default rates for energy consumption were assumed in the model. Emissions rates associated with electricity consumption were adjusted to account for Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) projected future CO_2 intensity rates. These rates are based, in part, on the requirement of a renewable energy portfolio standard of 33 percent by the year 2020. CalEEMod uses a default rate of 641 pounds of CO_2 per megawatt of electricity produced that is based on

PG&E's 2008 certified rate. The derived 2016 rate for PG&E was estimated at 370 pounds of CO_2 per megawatt of electricity delivered and is based on the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) GHG Calculator (CPUC, 2010).

Calculation of Project Operational Emissions
Project emissions are calculated to be 1,317 MT of CO_2e per year. Though there is no established threshold of significance for GHGs in Humboldt County, for comparison, a stationary source which emits less than or equal to 5,000 tons per year of CO2e would be exempt from recordkeeping and reporting under Rule 111 (NCUAQMD, 2011). Overall, outdoor recreation is a low impact activity in terms of GHG emissions. However, proposed sports fields, restrooms, and concessions should incorporate energy-efficiency features to reduce GHG emissions to the degree feasible and reasonable; otherwise, GHG emissions from these operations would represent a potentially significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES
Mitigation Measure GHG-1: The project applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions:

1. Design buildings to be energy-efficient.
2. Site buildings to take advantage of shade, prevailing winds, and landscaping to reduce energy use. The project shall make use of strategically-placed shade trees.
3. Limit the hours of operational outdoor lighting.
4. Install renewable systems, including solar and tank-less hot water heaters, where feasible.
5. Create water-efficient landscapes. All landscaped areas shall be designed to reduce their water requirements. Landscaping shall make extensive use of drought-tolerant species.
6. Install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls.
7. Control irrigation by using systems designed to ensure water efficiency.

FINDING
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.7-1 through 4.7-8, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 18: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT HAZARD AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS IMPACTS

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Routine Hazardous Materials Transport, Use, or Disposal

The project would involve the routine management of hazardous materials that could potentially pose a significant threat to human health or the environment if not properly managed or if accidentally released. During construction, this routine management would include the use of fuels, lubricants, and other hazardous materials associated with heavy construction equipment. During project operation, it would be expected that cleaning, maintenance, and landscaping products would be used and stored at the project site. Use of hazardous materials during construction would be temporary and limited to the period when grading, construction, and trenching for waterlines takes place at the project site. The use would be subject to the County Grading, Excavation, Erosion, and Sedimentation Control Ordinance, described under Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, described under Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality. These programs require handling, use, and storage of hazardous materials in a safe manner during construction activities.

The routine storage, use, handling, generation, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials during site operation are addressed by federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and programs, described under "Regulatory Framework" above. At the project site, HCDEH implements regulatory programs for sites that routinely manage hazardous materials to ensure the safe storage, management, and disposal of hazardous materials in accordance with the Unified Program. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the existing regulatory framework would reduce potential impacts from routine hazardous materials transport, use, or disposal to a less-than-significant level.

Hazardous Materials Emissions Near Schools

No schools are located within ¼-mile of the project site and no impact would occur.

Hazardous Materials Sites

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that no sites within ½-mile of the project site are located on regulatory agency lists of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (EDR, 2014b) and no impact would occur.

Aviation Hazards

No airstrips are located in the project vicinity. Although the project site is located near Garberville Airport, there are no project elements proposed that could potentially obstruct or interfere with airport operations or conflict with the airport land use plan. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that no significant impact would occur.

Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

The project would not result in significant changes in the road network or change patterns of vehicular or pedestrian traffic that would interfere with emergency response. The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the County Emergency Operations Plan or any other adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that no significant impacts related to emergency response and evacuation would be anticipated.

Wildland Fires

Existing State and county vegetation management requirements and building codes would apply to new facilities constructed at the project site. Vegetation would be required to be cleared at least 30 feet from all structures, and structures must be constructed out of ignition-resistant material. Campfires and other sources of ignition, with the exception of park-provided portable kitchen facilities, would not be permitted in the Environmental Camp or other areas of the project site. The addition of four 500-gallon water storage tanks and the extension of waterlines through Areas 4 and 5 would extend water supply to these portions of the project site, which could aid in firefighting activities. Although these measures would not prevent wildfires from starting off-site and affecting wildlands at and near the project site, the measures are intended to provide for defensible spaces around areas where park patrons and workers would be present and therefore minimize the potential impacts on persons and structures. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that existing regulations would reduce wildland fire hazards to a less-than-significant level.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.8-1 through 4.8-10, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

HAZ-1

IMPACT

The project could expose the public or the environment to risks from reasonably foreseeable releases of hazardous materials during building renovation and demolition of buildings in Area 2 (PS).

EXPLANATION

The project applicant proposes to renovate the existing 2,241-square-foot main ranch house, the 300-square-foot cabin, and the 432-square-foot garage in Area 2 to accommodate new uses. Other buildings in Area 2 are in poor condition and may be demolished as part of project development. Based on aerial photographs, many buildings in Area 2 were constructed prior to 1948 and likely contain lead, asbestos, and other hazardous materials. Though these materials do not pose a health risk during current use, if not abated prior to building demolition, lead dust, asbestos fibers, and other hazardous materials could be released to the air. This has the potential to pose a potential health threat to construction workers and the nearby public.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: As a condition of approval for project construction and demolition permits, a hazardous building materials survey shall be conducted by a qualified and licensed professional for all structures proposed for demolition or renovation as part of the project. All loose and peeling lead-based paint and asbestos-containing materials shall be abated by a certified contractor in accordance with local, state, and federal requirements. All other hazardous materials shall be removed from buildings prior to demolition in accordance with California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH) and California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) regulations. The completion of the abatement activities shall be documented by a qualified environmental professional and submitted to the County with applications for issuance of construction and demolition permits.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.8-1 through 4.8-10, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 19: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ON HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Groundwater Impacts

Changes in impervious surface as part of proposed project would be minor compared to the area of the project site, and no significant changes in groundwater recharge would be expected as a result of development associated with the project. Project impacts on water supply, including use of groundwater, are discussed in Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems, of this EIR.

Erosion and Siltation Due to Alteration in Drainage Patterns

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or a river. In general, the project would not include large areas of grading or impervious surfaces that would alter drainage patterns, except in Area 5 with the construction of a concession/bathroom building and a skate park. Required erosion control plans and other provisions of Humboldt County grading permit requirements, discussed in Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, would prevent potential impacts from erosion and siltation during construction. Potential impacts from erosion would be further reduced through compliance with construction- and operation-phase stormwater requirements (Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b, below).

Exceedance of Existing or Planned Stormwater Drainage System Capacity

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that no existing or planned stormwater drainage systems are present at the project site; thus, no capacity exceedances would occur as part of the project. The volume and drainage patterns of stormwater generated by the project would be generally the same as under current conditions. In Area 5, stormwater during storm events would be reduced somewhat through compliance with required stormwater management provisions (Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1b, below).

Other Water Quality Concerns

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the operation of the proposed project would not result in any substantial changes to on-site water quality, with the exception of potential impacts associated with stormwater runoff and septic systems. Adherence to regulatory requirements, as described in Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a, HYDRO-1b, and HYDRO-2 described below, would reduce these potential impacts on water quality to a less-than-significant level. The Board finds that no other impacts related to water quality would occur as a result of the project.

Flooding Hazards

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that no new housing is proposed for the project site, and therefore the project would not place housing in a 100-year flood hazard area. The Board finds that no permanent structures are proposed to be constructed within the 100-year flood zone located near the river, and any earthmoving activities in those portions of the project site would be minor and would not redirect or impair flood flows.

Other Flooding Hazards, Including Levees and Dams

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project site is not located within a mapped dam failure inundation area and is not protected from flooding by levees. The Board finds that the project would have no impact in relation to this significance criterion.

Seiches, Tsunamis, and Mudflows

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that based on the elevation of the project site and distance from the ocean and large enclosed bodies of water, there would be no potential impacts due to seiches or tsunamis. Please refer to Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, for further information regarding mudflows, a type of landslide. The Board finds that the project's impact would be less than significant in relation to this significance criterion.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.9-1 through 4.9-8, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

HYDRO-1

IMPACT

Proposed development at Area 5 could result in polluted runoff adversely affecting the water quality of South Fork Eel River (PS).

EXPLANATION

In general, the proposed project would not result in a significant change in the location or area of impervious surfaces at the project site. New roads, trails, and parking lots would be unpaved and infrastructure such as stages, restrooms, and vendor booths for events and camping areas would be temporary. The four proposed water storage tanks would be constructed on 16-square-footplatforms filled with sand to allow for stormwater drainage. Most areas would require only minimal grading, less than the 1-acre threshold in the Construction General Permit. Excavation required for the proposed new water supply infrastructure would also not be expected to result in a significant area of soil disturbance. The total of 4,300 linear feet of waterlines would require ½-foot-wide trenches for a total of 2,150 square feet of soil disturbance, considerably less than the 1-acre Construction General Permit threshold.

However, a significant increase in impervious surfaces would take place in Area 5, which would include the construction of a 1,000-square-foot concession stand/bathroom building and a 10,000-square-foot concrete and wood skate park. Area 5 would require 9 acres of grading, along with trenching for approximately 1,200 linear feet of waterline, and the project would add 10 acres of irrigated ballfields to this location. The location of these facilities, next to the South Fork Eel River, could potentially contribute sediment and pollutants to the South Fork Eel River both during construction and operation of the project. As the Eel River is classified as impaired due to sediment loads, this is a potentially significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1a: Consistent with the requirements of the statewide Construction General Permit, the project applicant shall prepare and implement a Storm

Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) designed to reduce impacts on surface water quality through the project construction period.

The SWPPP shall be prepared by a qualified stormwater professional (QSP). The SWPPP shall include the minimum best management practices (BMPs) required in Attachment C for Risk Level 1 discharges, Attachment D for Risk Level 2 dischargers, or Attachment E for Risk Level 3 dischargers (as applicable, based on final determination of the proposed project's Risk Level status [to be determined as part of the Notice of Intent for coverage under the Construction General Permit]). BMP implementation shall be consistent with the BMP requirements in the most recent version of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Handbook-Construction or similar guidance. BMPs shall include all measures necessary to prevent sediment from the project site from being discharged during drainage.

The SWPPP shall include a construction site monitoring program that identifies requirements for dry weather visual observations of pollutants at all discharge locations and, as appropriate, depending on the proposed project Risk Level, sampling of the site effluent and receiving waters. (Receiving water monitoring is only required for some Risk Level 3 dischargers.) If the proposed project is Risk Level 2 or 3, the project applicant shall also include requirements for Rain Event Action Plans as part of the SWPPP; a Rain Event Action Plan is a written document that must be prepared within 48 hours of any likely precipitation event, describing actions that will be implemented to protect all exposed portions of the site from the predicted precipitation. BMPs shall include measures for dust control, erosion prevention, sediment control, construction vehicle traffic controls and tire washes, and material storage, spill prevention, and housekeeping protocols.

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1b: As a condition of approval for all grading and construction permits for the project site, the applicant shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) for the project site consistent with all requirements of the MS4 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit as implemented by the Humboldt County Public Works Department. The SCP shall include, but not be limited to, BMPs designed into project features and operations to reduce potential impacts on surface water quality and to manage changes in the timing and quantity of runoff associated with development of the project site. The BMPs shall include Low Impact Development (LID) measures, such as minimizing disturbed areas and impervious cover and then infiltrating, storing, detaining, evapotranspiring, and/or biotreating stormwater runoff close to its source, to the maximum extent practicable. The potential for irrigation water runoff containing sediment or other contaminants will be addressed in the SCP, and any BMPs and LID measures to address irrigation water runoff will be included. Increased stormwater runoff may not be channeled or directed to flow across the traveled section of a County roadway, and drainage must be contained at the edge of the County road surface. Funding for the maintenance of all BMPs for the life of the proposed project shall be specified.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described

changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.9-1 through 4.9-10, Record of Proceedings.

HYDRO-2

IMPACT

Inadequate septic systems could potentially adversely affect groundwater and surface water quality (PS).

EXPLANATION

The project includes new 400-square-foot bathrooms in Areas 1 and 2 and a new 1,000-square-foot concession/restroom building in Area 5. Although festivals, camping, and other special events would rely on portable restrooms, the three additional bathrooms would require new septic systems and wastewater disposal. Sewage and wastewater generated during operation of the project may contain fecal coliform and other contaminants that could potentially affect groundwater and surface water quality.

Carefully designed and installed septic systems that are properly maintained are very effective in preventing contaminants in wastewater from reaching groundwater or surface water (Winzler & Kelly, 2007). The state and county have several regulations designed to prevent septic systems from causing pollution or presenting a public health hazard. The State Health and Safety Code requires appropriate sewage disposal be provided for all homes and businesses. Older methods of sewage disposal, such as pit latrines, have been prohibited. The NCRWQCB has established minimum standards for wastewater treatment and disposal in the Basin Plan (NCRWQCB, 2011), which are implemented by Humboldt County. These include groundwater separation, surface water and well setbacks, slope limitations, sizing requirements, and allowance for use of alternative technologies. County regulations incorporating these requirements include the Sewage Disposal Ordinance and Sewage Disposal Requirements in Section 611 et seq of the Humboldt County Code.

The specific septic system for the proposed project has not yet been designed. Although the septic tank/leachfield system is often the easiest and most cost-effective system to implement, approved alternative technologies include mounds, sand filters, recirculation textile and other media filters as well as constructed wetlands (Winzler & Kelly, 2007). Additional discussion of potential constraints to wastewater systems due to native soils is discussed under Impact GEO-3 in Section 4.6, Geology and Soils in the EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2: As a condition of approval for building, grading, and construction permits at the project site, the applicant shall provide detailed plans for septic and wastewater disposal systems. The plans shall be prepared by a qualified professional and shall implement best available technology in the selection and installation of septic systems in compliance with state and county requirements. As a condition of approval for certificate

of occupancy of the project site, the applicant shall provide evidence that the septic system is operating efficiently, that adequate capacity exists to address proposed site uses, and that a maintenance plan has been prepared and implemented for the system.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.9-1 through 4.9-10, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 20: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS REGARDING LAND USE AND PLANNING

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Division of Established Community

The project proposes improvements to the site that include sports fields, playgrounds, picnic areas, and trails. Activities would include a variety of community-based agricultural projects, including a farm stand, along with sports, educational, and camp activities. The project site would include a Park Headquarters (Area 2) that would repurpose existing buildings for park offices and community meeting spaces. Existing and additional agricultural projects would continue on the project site, and new agricultural projects would be added. Existing gravel mining uses in Areas 1 and 6 of the project site would continue. The four existing residential units on the project site would continue to be used for housing caretakers and farm workers or be rented. A detailed description of proposed improvements to the site and approvals required is provided in Chapter 3, Project Description, of the EIR.

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not physically divide an established community. Such an impact would involve, for example, closing an access roadway, constructing a new freeway, or implementing another type of physical barrier that would prevent members of an established community from having access to an area, thereby dividing the community. The project does not contain any features that would act as a barrier to continued access from one portion of the area to another. In fact, the project includes features that would enhance access, such as improvements to the existing pedestrian path under Sprowel Creek Road Bridge between the riverfront area and Tooby Memorial Park which would accommodate hikers and provide river access.

"Dividing an established community" can also be interpreted more generally to mean creating incompatibilities between different land uses. The proposed project land uses would generally be compatible with surrounding land uses. While the sand and gravel mining operation located north of and partially within the northern part of the project site could

theoretically be incompatible with existing and proposed recreational uses in Tooby Memorial Park, land use conflicts have been and would continue to be avoided under the proposed project for the following reasons: (1) the uses are separated by the Eel River, and the closest active part of the gravel operation is ¼-mile from the playground (the closest location in the park with public uses); (2) the main operation is located almost ½-mile from the playground; (3) existing tree cover provides additional buffering between the operation and the playground; (4) the mining operation does not operate in the evenings, or on weekends (when park use is greatest); and (5) there have been no problems or conflicts reported between the two uses in the past 14 years of operation (Lobato, 2014). (See also Section 4.11 of the EIR, Mineral Resources, which discusses project impacts on the mining operation.)

It is possible that certain onsite activities proposed by the project, such as larger events proposed in the Community Facilities/ Sports Area (Area 5), would create traffic, noise, and/or light- and glare-related conflicts with onsite residential uses or with the rural residential, single-family properties, single-family horse ranch, and gravel mining operation located north of the site or the single-family residence to the east. These traffic, noise, and light and glare impacts and mitigation measures to reduce such impacts are discussed in Section 4.1, Aesthetics; Section 4.12, Noise; and Section 41.5, Transportation/Traffic. For these reasons, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not divide an established community or create any significant land use incompatibilities. The impact would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Conflict with Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that there are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans that apply to the project site. The project would therefore have no impact in relation to this significance criterion.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.10-1 through 4.10-10, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

LAND-1

IMPACT

The project would conflict with applicable Humboldt County General Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (PS).

EXPLANATION

Conflicts with adopted General Plan policies are not necessarily significant in and of themselves because these policies are adopted for multiple purposes and may conflict. For

example, a policy to protect natural resources such as agricultural land may conflict with policies to encourage new recreation or housing. In addition, it is the responsibility of the decision-makers to determine how to evaluate policy consistency. When policies are related to potential environmental impacts, however, such policies should be evaluated in an environmental analysis, as indicated by the significance criteria addressed throughout this EIR.

The project would generally be consistent with applicable policies of the Humboldt County General Plan. These policies are listed and referred to throughout Chapter 4 of the EIR where relevant to evaluating the project's impacts on different aspects of the environment (e.g., agricultural resources, mineral resources, noise, etc.). In most cases, compliance with mitigation measures recommended in Chapter 4 of the EIR would reduce the impacts of project conflicts with General Plan policies to less-than-significant levels. As discussed in Section 4.2 of the EIR, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, however, the project would result in loss of farmland, conflicting with the Humboldt County General Plan policies for protecting agricultural land. Please refer to Section 4.2 for more discussion of this impact.

The project would be consistent with General Plan land use designations and zoning, and with General Plan policies specifically related to land use. The project includes a General Plan amendment and rezoning, which would ensure that the project – including existing and proposed land use on the project site – is consistent with the new General Plan land use designations and zoning of the site. (See Chapter 3, Project Description, for details.)

The project also includes banking the existing residential development rights (approximately 54 potential parcels) in the areas of the project site that are currently designated AL(20) and AR(5-20) by the General Plan, so that those rights can be transferred to specific receiving areas when the County develops a Transfer of Development Rights program in the future. (See Chapter 3 for details.) This provision would ensure that the project would not conflict with the Garberville/Redway/Alderpoint/Benbow Community Plan policy encouraging clustered residential development in the "Tooby Flat" area (i.e., the project site vicinity).

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure LAND-1: The project applicant shall comply with all applicable mitigation measures identified in this EIR.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that compliance with the above described changes to the project would generally ensure that project conflicts with applicable Humboldt County General Plan policies would be reduced to less-than-significant levels, thus mitigating the potentially significant environmental effects indicated in the EIR. As indicated in Impact and Mitigation Measure AGFR-1, however, the loss of agricultural land that would result from the project would be a significant, unavoidable impact. The project's conflict with Humboldt County General Plan policies for protecting agricultural land would therefore be significant and unavoidable. (SU)

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.10-1 through 4.10-11, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 21: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE MINERAL RESOURCE IMPACTS

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Existing and permitted future gravel and shale mining would continue under the proposed project. No changes for the mining operation would occur in association with the proposed project. Although a small portion of the permitted extraction area is located in project Areas 1 and 6, no proposed development or park activities would interfere with the mining. It is not anticipated that development or operation of any project -related components would negatively affect mining operations or require a facility shut-down, even temporarily. The South Fork Eel River mining area is not mentioned specifically in the County General Plan or other land use plans. As the project would have no effect on mining, the Board finds that the project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resources, including locally identified mineral resource recovery sites.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.11-1 through 4.11-2, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

No potentially significant impacts related to mineral resources would be anticipated as part of the proposed project development or operation.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.11-1 through 4.11-3, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 22: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE NOISE IMPACTS

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

This analysis finds that the proposed project would have no or less-than-significant impacts related to the following:

- Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Implementation of the project may result in the generation of high airborne sound levels due to the use of music amplification systems; however, such systems are not a significant source of groundborne vibration. Thus, the project would not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

- Exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels due to airport-related activities. The Garberville Airport is less than 1 mile from the project. However due to the low use of the facility, it's orientation such that flight paths to and from the airport are not expected to cross the site, and the fact that the project does involve new residential uses of the site, aircraft operations are not judged to result in a noise impact on the project site.
- A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Traffic data provided by W-Trans was reviewed to calculate potential project-related traffic noise level increases along roadway serving the project site. Traffic noise level increases due to the proposed project under future conditions with the project are calculated to increase by 0 to 1 dBA Ldn above existing levels on the roadway serving the project site. Because traffic noise increases resulting from the proposed project would increase ambient noise levels by less than 3 dBA Ldn, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.12-1 through 4.12-21, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

NOISE-1

IMPACT

Concerts involving full (rock type) amplification during the large annual event, and medium-sized events with concerts involving medium amplification or loud acoustic bands in the Barnyard area, may exceed the County's short-term (L_{max}) land use and noise compatibility (CNEL) standards and increase ambient CNEL levels by 5 dBA or greater at some adjacent noise-sensitive (residential) receptors (PS).

EXPLANATION

A review of Table 4.12-6 of the EIR indicates that maximum noise levels (L_{max}) produced by a large event may exceed the daytime County short-term noise standards for residential uses (see Table 4.12-4 of the EIR) at the homes in the Rivercrest Drive and Airport Bluff areas and the nighttime County short-term noise standards at homes in the Riverview Lane area as well. Calculations also show that maximum noise levels (L_{max}) produced by medium events at the western stage may exceed short-term noise standards for residential uses at the homes in the Rivercrest Drive area. Additionally, CNEL noise levels for a large event may also exceed ambient CNEL levels by 5 dBA or more at homes in the Airport Bluff, Riverview Lane, and Old Briceland Road areas and exceed the County land use compatibility standard of 60 dBA CNEL at homes in the Rivercrest Drive, Airport Bluff and Riverview Lane areas. With the exception of events at the western stage, medium-sized events in all areas are not expected to exceed County standards in the surrounding residential areas. Small and sport field events are also not expected to exceed County standards in any of the surrounding residential areas are capable of producing

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1a: A dispersed (satellite speaker) sound system around the stage and audience area of large amplified music events at the main stage in Area 4A and medium-sized music events at the western stage in Area 2 shall be used to lower point-source sound levels from that of a stage only speaker system. Sound levels needed to produce acceptable sound coverage of an audience with such a system are typically lower than those using stage-mounted speakers.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1b: The following sound level limits shall be employed for all outdoor events involving speech or voice/music amplification at the park:

1. Any outdoor speech or voice/music amplification at the main, secondary or southern stage areas in Area 4A after 10:00 PM shall be limited to a maximum noise level of 90 dBA at 100 feet from the sound source.
2. Any outdoor speech or voice/music amplification at the western stage in Area 2 after 10:00 PM shall be limited to a maximum noise level of 85 dBA at 100 feet from the sound source.
3. Daytime outdoor speech or voice/music amplification at the main, secondary or southern stage areas in Area 4A shall be limited to a maximum noise level of 95 dBA at 100 feet from the sound source; and
4. Daytime outdoor speech or voice/music amplification at the western stage in Area 2 shall be limited to a maximum noise level of 90 dBA at 100 feet from the sound source.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1c: A Noise Management Plan, including the following provisions, shall be developed and implemented for use at the large- and medium-sized events that may generate noise levels in excess of the limits in the Humboldt County General Plan:

1. The Noise Management Plan shall establish a position at which maximum event noise levels may be verified noise to show compliance with Mitigation Measure NOISE-1b;
2. Park staff shall obtain and be trained in the use of a sound level meter so as to capable of determining compliance with noise limits;
3. A member of the park's Board of Directors or management staff shall be designated as a complaint response coordinator and shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about event-related noise;
4. If noise complaints are received during any event, noise shall be monitored during the next (subsequent) event at the residence from which noise complaints were received, and appropriate measures identified to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level; and
5. Records of noise complaints shall be filed with the Humboldt County Planning Department at least once per year and included in any required annual report reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1d: The project shall be subject to the following annual reporting and review requirements:

1. By December 31 of each year a medium-sized or large-sized event is held, the applicant shall prepare and submit 15 copies of a post-event report discussing that year's concert. Verification of attendance levels shall be discussed.
2. The report shall focus on assessing the effectiveness of the plan of operation, mitigation measures, and monitoring program. The report shall also contain written correspondence from agencies participating in monitoring and/or affected by the event (i.e., Planning Department, Division of Environmental Health, Sheriff's Office, and Public Works).
3. Responses to all concerns and issues identified in the report shall be provided and appropriate measures to be undertaken at the following year's event identified as needed. The annual report shall include sufficient data to assess the effectiveness of all required mitigation measures in relation to the total daily attendance and noise.
4. The Humboldt County Planning Commission shall review the post-event report within 120 days of receiving the report. The total attendance levels for medium- and large-sized events shall be determined by the Planning Commission on an annual basis after review and approval of the annual report. The allowed attendance levels for medium-sized events shall range from a low of 800 to a maximum of 2,500 persons total. A large-sized event ranging from 2,500 to 4,000 attendees is not allowed until the Planning Commission has reviewed and approved two consecutive annual reports for medium-sized events with attendance levels of at least 1,800 persons. In consultation with the reviewing agencies, the Planning Commission may waive the annual reporting requirements for medium- and large-sized events for up to 5 years should the applicant demonstrate the use has been conducted in conformance with all the required mitigation, and no changes in attendance levels or mitigation measures are proposed.
5. To address area concerns that may arise, the applicant shall hold a minimum of one community meeting in the vicinity of the site within 90 days of each large-sized event. This requirement may be waived by the Humboldt County Planning Director in consultation with the reviewing agencies if no significant community issues have been reported during that year's large-sized event.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.12-1 through 4.12-25, Record of Proceedings.

NOISE-2

IMPACT

Project construction could result in a substantial temporary increase in noise (PS).

EXPLANATION

Noise-generating construction activities associated with the proposed project facilities are anticipated to result in noise levels that exceed 60 dBA Leq and be at least 5 dBA Leq above the ambient noise environment at adjacent noise-sensitive land uses on a temporary basis. Noise generated by construction activities would temporarily elevate noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive receptors.

The project also includes water infrastructure improvements, which would include the installation of new water lines and water tanks. Waterlines would be installed along the southern side of the existing service road from Area 3 – Main Agricultural Area to Area 5 – Sports Facilities Area, and along the existing service road and trails in Community Commons – Area 4. Waterlines would be installed with a trencher. Pipe would be placed at a depth of 12 to 18 inches with a 6-inch width. All soil removed during trenching would be returned to the trench. The installation of each line is expected to take 2 days and require two truck trips to deliver and return the trenching equipment. Three small water tanks would be installed in Areas 4 and one tank would be installed in Area 5. The capacity of each tank would be 500 gallons. The installation of all four tanks is expected to take one working day and require one pickup truck trip for materials and two vehicles for workers. Construction activities associate with the water infrastructure improvements are not anticipated to result in noise levels that exceed 60 dBA Leq and be at least 5 dBA Leq at adjacent noise-sensitive receptors.
Noise impacts resulting from construction depend upon the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise-generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise-sensitive areas. Construction noise impacts primarily result when construction activities occur during noise-sensitive times of the day (e.g., early morning, evening, or nighttime hours); when the construction occurs in areas immediately adjoining noise-sensitive land uses; or when construction lasts over extended periods of time.

Construction activities generate considerable amounts of noise, especially during earth-moving activities when heavy equipment is used. The highest maximum noise levels generated by project construction would typically range from about 90 to 95 dBA Lmax at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. Typical hourly average construction-generated noise levels are about 81 to 88 dBA L¬eq, measured at a distance of 50 feet from the center of the site during busy construction periods (e.g., during use of earth-moving equipment, impact tools, etc.). Hourly average noise levels generated by the construction of hotel would range from about 65 to 88 dBA Leq, measured at a distance of 50 feet, depending upon the amount of activity at the site. Construction-generated noise levels drop off at a rate of about 6 dBA per doubling of the distance between the source and receptor. Shielding by buildings or terrain often result in lower construction noise levels at distant receptors.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure NOISE-2: The following best management practices shall be incorporated into the project:

- Restrict noise-generating activities at the construction site or in areas adjacent to the construction site to the hours of 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and to the hours of 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM, Saturday and Sunday.
- Equip all internal combustion engine driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Strictly prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.
- Locate stationary noise-generating equipment, such as air compressors or portable power generators, as far as possible from sensitive receptors. Construct temporary noise barriers to screen stationary noise-generating equipment when located near adjoining sensitive land uses. Temporary noise barriers could reduce construction noise levels by 5 dBA.
- Use "quiet" air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
- Route all construction traffic to and from the project site via designated truck routes, where possible. Prohibit construction-related heavy truck traffic in residential areas, where feasible.
- Designate a "disturbance coordinator," who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include in it the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the combination of these mitigation measures would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS).

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.12-1 through 4.12-25, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 23: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ON POPULATION AND HOUSING

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Inducement of Population Growth

The project would not induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (through the extension of roads or other

infrastructure). The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary. Reasons for this conclusion are discussed below.

Impact of Project Employees on Population Growth

The project would include an estimated four additional employees. This number of new employees would have a negligible impact on population growth. If the employees moved with their families to the area from elsewhere, they would create a very small increase in the local population. It is possible that the employees would be people who already live in the area, however, in which case they would have no impact on population growth.

Community Facilities as Incentive for Population Growth

The project plans include improvements to community facility infrastructure. In some instances, community facilities can be an incentive to growth, as parks and healthy lifestyles attract new residents. In this case, however, the project would be unlikely to attract a substantial new population, since it includes improvements to and expansion of an already-existing community park use.

The project would not add new housing. The project would not affect the location or increase the growth rate of the local population. The project therefore would not be an incentive to growth.

Impact of Proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezoning on Population Growth

The project includes a General Plan amendment that would change the land use designation to Public Recreation on the entire project site, including two areas that currently have designations that allow housing: (1) an approximately 240-acre area designated of AR5-20 (Agricultural Rural, one dwelling unit per 20 acres to one dwelling unit per 5 acres); and (2) an approximately 154-acre area designated AL20 (Agricultural Lands, one dwelling unit per 20 acres). The project also includes rezoning of these areas from AE (Agriculture Exclusive) to Public Facility (PF). (See details in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR.) These changes would reduce the availability of land for housing. This aspect of the project would therefore reduce possibilities for population growth.

Impacts on Existing Housing and Population

The project would not displace any existing housing. The project would not displace any people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Under the project, the four existing residential units on the project site would continue to be used for housing caretakers and farm workers or be rented. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the impact would therefore be less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.13-1 through 4.13-5, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not have any potentially significant impacts on population or housing conditions.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.13-1 through 4.13-5, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 24: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ON PUBLIC SERVICES

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

The project may increase the demand for fire protection services, but not to the extent that new or physically altered fire stations or other facilities would be needed. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary. This conclusion is further explained below.

Need for New or Altered Fire Stations

As discussed in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR, the proposed improvements included in the project are expected to increase the number of visitors by an estimated 800 persons per day during the peak seasons (late spring, summer, and early fall). Additional visitors would be allowed at the park for special events under a conditional use permit. Under the conditional use permit, one annual event per year with up to 5,000 attendees (4,000 guests plus up to 1,000 staff, vendors and performers) and up to five events per year with 800 to 2,500 attendees (including staff, vendors and performers) are proposed.

This increased use of the site, especially during moderate- and large-sized events, would be expected to increase calls for fire protection and emergency medical services (e.g., for medical and trauma incidents, traffic collisions, and vehicle, structure, vegetation, or other types of fires).

As discussed under "Environmental Setting" above, the GFPD is the nearest local fire protection agency, and the project site is located outside the GFPD boundaries. While the GFPD provides good will service to Sprowel Creek Road and the Kimtu area, the proposed project uses would likely place strains on GFPD service levels and could reduce the existing level of service within GFPD boundaries.

The project would not create the need for new or altered fire stations or other facilities, however. The project site would continue to be served by the existing GFPD station and the existing seasonal CAL FIRE station in Garberville.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that because the project would not create the need for new or physically altered fire stations or other facilities, the project's impact on fire protection services would be considered less than significant under CEQA.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.14-1 through 4.14-8, Record of Proceedings.

While not necessary as mitigation for public services impacts under CEQA, the project applicant may wish to consider applying for annexation to the GFPD. The GFPD has indicated an interest in annexing areas to which it provides good will service (which include the project site) but has not initiated annexation proceedings through LAFCo.
Also, while not necessary as mitigation for public services impacts under CEQA, the County may wish to require that the project applicant execute a fire protection agreement with the GFPD, subject to LAFCo approval, to ensure that fire protection services would be provided to the project until the annexation is complete.

Related Issues

Emergency access to the project is addressed in Section 4.16, Transportation/Traffic, of this EIR; wildland fire hazards are addressed in Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; and emergency water supply and facilities are addressed in Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems.

Police Services

The project would increase the demand for police services, but not to the extent that new or physically altered police stations or other facilities would be needed. The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary. This conclusion is further explained below.

Need for New or Altered Police Stations

As discussed in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR, the proposed improvements included in the project are expected to increase the number of visitors by an estimated 800 persons per day during the peak seasons (late spring, summer, and early fall). Additional visitors would be allowed at the park for special events under a conditional use permit. Under the conditional use permit, one annual event per year with up to 5,000 attendees (4,000 guests plus up to 1,000 staff, vendors and performers) and up to five events per year with 800 to 2,500 attendees (including staff, vendors and performers) are proposed.
This increased use of the site, especially during moderate- and large-sized events, would be expected to increase calls for police service. As discussed under "Environmental Setting" above, the Humboldt County Sheriff's Office provides law enforcement services to the project site from the Garberville substation. According to the Sheriff's Office, current activities at the project site have not resulted in significant calls for service to date; however, moderate- and large-sized events of the nature proposed by the project would be expected to cause traffic congestion, disturbance of nearby residents' peace and quiet, and potential increases in law enforcement-related calls for service. The Sheriff's Office expects that it

would need more staff to cover calls for service caused by the increase in visitors to the site, especially during the proposed events, but an estimate of the number of new staff needed is not available (Sheriff's Office, 2014).

The project would not create the need for new or altered police stations or other facilities, however (Sheriff's Office, 2014). The project site would continue to be served by the existing Sheriff's Office substation in Garberville and the existing CHP office in Redway.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that because the project would not create the need for new or physically altered police stations or other facilities, the project's impact on police services would be considered less than significant under CEQA. As part of its review of the project, however, the County may wish to consider the need for additional Sheriff's Office staffing in the area.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.14-1 through 4.14-8, Record of Proceedings.

Related Issues

The project would include improvements to the existing Park Headquarters entrance and a Plan of Operation for small-, moderate-, and large-scale events. The Plan of Operation would address issues such as traffic management, emergency access, and security during proposed events. The Sheriff's Office and CHP would need to approve traffic management and emergency operations plans associated with the Plan of Operation for the project.

Schools

Employment associated with the project could be expected to result in an increase of approximately three students in the Southern Humboldt Unified School District. An increase of three students could be accommodated within existing school facilities, and no new or expanded facilities would be needed. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would have a less-than-significant impact on school facilities, and no mitigation is necessary. This conclusion is further explained below.

Buildout of the project is expected to result in approximately four additional full-time permanent employees. Assuming that the additional four employees would be new residents of the Southern Humboldt Unified School District, three additional students would be expected to enroll in the Southern Humboldt School District. This projection was calculated using the statewide average Student Yield Factors from the Enrollment Certification/Projection School Facility Program form (SAB 50-01) from the California Office of Public School Construction, which are as follows: elementary school district = 0.5 student per dwelling unit; high school district = 0.2 student per dwelling unit; and unified school district = 0.7 student per dwelling unit (Humboldt County, 2012).

It is reasonable to conclude that the three students generated by the project could be accommodated within existing school facilities, especially given that enrollment within the Southern Humboldt Unified School District has declined over the last 10 years.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that because the project would not create the need for new or physically altered schools, the project's impact on schools would be considered less than significant under CEQA.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.14-1 through 4.14-8, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The project would not have any potentially significant impacts on public services (fire protection, police, and schools). As discussed under "Less-than-Significant Impacts" above, the project may increase the demand for fire protection, police, and school services, but not to the extent that new or physically altered facilities would be needed. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would have no potentially significant impacts on public services under CEQA.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.14-1 through 4.14-8, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 25: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ON RECREATION FACILITIES

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Deterioration of Existing Parks and Recreational Facilities

The project itself would meet many of the recreational needs of the southern Humboldt County area. The proposed project would not substantially increase the use of existing parks or other recreation facilities such that a substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project's impact would therefore be less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that no adverse physical deterioration of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities is expected to result from the project. While the project would be located close to State park facilities, the project does not include any connections to these areas that would cause overflow of visitors from one site to another.

The project would include community park improvements and other improvements that would serve the recreational needs of the community and the region. These proposed improvements are expected to decrease the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and other recreational facilities, which could extend the physical integrity of these other parks and recreation facilities. In this way, the proposed project could have a positive impact on the existing parks and recreation facilities in the surrounding area. By extending the life of these other facilities, the proposed project could delay any new construction of replacement recreation structures or new structures to meet the demand from future increases in population in the area.

The project site is near State park property. During the proposed large events at the project site, people attending the event may camp at State park facilities. State parks charge fees for the use of their facilities, however, and these fees are used to maintain the facilities. There is no evidence that the fee structure used by State parks is inadequate to provide for the adequate maintenance of the facilities that may be used by persons attending events at the site of the proposed project.

For discussion of impacts due to project employees, see "Need for New or Altered Facilities Due to Project" below.

Need for New or Altered Facilities Due to Project

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not create the need for new or altered parks or recreational facilities. The project's impact would therefore be less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary. As noted above, the project would include community park improvements and other improvements that would serve the recreational needs of the community and the region. The main way in which the project itself could create demand for new or altered parks or recreational facilities would be through the addition of new employees at the project site. The four additional employees expected from the project would not create any new significant demands on parks or recreational facilities, however. Most demand for parks and recreational facilities is created by a community's residents, rather than its employees. The proposed project would not contain any housing and therefore would not generate a resident population. In addition, the four additional employees expected from the project would have a negligible effect on existing parks and recreational facilities and would not create the need for new or expanded facilities. For these reasons, project employees are not expected to create a need for new or altered parks or recreational facilities or cause substantial deterioration of existing facilities.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.15-1 through 4.15-6, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

REC-1

IMPACT
The projects would include recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment (PS).

EXPLANATION
The project would include various on-site recreational facilities. The environmental impacts of constructing these features are evaluated throughout the EIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES
Mitigation Measure REC-1: The project shall comply with all applicable mitigation measures identified in this EIR.

FINDING
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37; 4.15-1 through 4.15-6, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 26: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ON TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Impact on Air Traffic Patterns
The project would be located approximately 1 mile south of the Garberville Airport, which is located in a mountainous region of southern Humboldt County. The airport sits on a bluff above the project site with surrounding mountains in close proximity. The Garberville Airport is at an elevation of 550 feet. The project site is at an elevation of approximately 350 feet, or about 200 feet lower than the airport elevation.

Due to the significant elevation differences between the two locations, there are no proposed project elements that could potentially obstruct or interfere with the flight path or approaches to the airport. No structure, tree, or other object would exceed the height limits established in Section 331 of the Humboldt County Code [16.3.4.1]. Additionally, the proposed project would not exceed heights that require review and approval by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) or Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and

the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would have no impact on air traffic patterns that would result in substantial safety risks.

Emergency Access Impacts

The project site includes multiple access locations for emergency vehicles. There are four entry locations within the project site that provide access for all vehicle types, and any activities associated with the project would not prevent emergency vehicle access to and from the site. As a result, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would have no impact on emergency access.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.16-1 through 4.16-12, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

TRAFFIC-1. Conflict with Applicable Plan, Ordinance or Policy for Circulation System Performance

IMPACT

The project would increase traffic volumes on area roadways. While the volumes associated with typical daily operation would be nominal, medium-sized and large events would generate substantial traffic that could result in a conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation (PS).

EXPLANATION

Proposed Project Components

Traffic impacts are identified for each of the following project components (or "levels"), as identified in Table 4.16-5 of the EIR and described further below:

1. Impacts due to proposed changes in zoning of the project site;
2. Impacts due to proposed changes in General Plan land use designations for the project site;
3. Impacts of proposed activities or construction projects that would be principally permitted; and
4. Impacts due to proposed activities that would require a conditional use permit.

TABLE 4.16-5 PROJECT IMPACT LEVELS

Level 1	Impacts due to Zoning Change
Level 2	Impacts due to General Plan Land Use Designation Changes
Level 3	Impacts of Activities or Projects Principally Allowed
Level 4	Impacts of Projects Requiring Conditional Use Permit

Project Level 1: Change in Zoning from Agriculture Exclusive to Public Facilities
This component of the project would change the zoning on a portion of the project site from Agriculture Exclusive to Public Facility. (See Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR for details.) The change would increase use of the site by the public, which would bring additional cars and people to the site on a regular basis.

Project Level 2: Changes in General Plan Land Use Designation
This component of the project would change the General Plan land use designation of a portion of the project site from AR(5-20) (Agricultural Rural, one dwelling unit per 20 acres to one dwelling unit per 5 acres) and AL(20) (Agricultural Lands, one dwelling unit per 20 acres) to Public Recreation.

Project Level 3: Impacts of Activities or Projects Principally Allowed
Implementation of projects and activities principally allowed under the new zoning and land use designations would result in construction of new community facilities including sports fields, concessions stands, visitor amenities, and parking areas. This change would also allow lower-impact public assembly and small events. These activities would increase the number of trips generated on existing roadways.

Project Level 4: Impacts of Projects Requiring Conditional Use Permit
The project description includes provisions for medium-sized events as well as a festival. These events would require a conditional use permit, and could result in the construction of temporary stages, deployment of portable toilets, and other temporary changes to the site. These events would generate a substantial number of trips on the road network.

Trip Generation
The anticipated trip generation on a typical weekday for the proposed project under the proposed zoning change (Project Level 1) was estimated using standard rates for a County Park (LU#412) published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in the Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition (ITE, 2012). The sites surveyed in developing the rates for this land use had a variety of facilities, including ball fields, soccer fields, camp sites, picnic facilities, trails, bicycling, boating, or swimming facilities and general open space.

While the project site is currently generating trips to the existing Tooby Memorial Park, Park Headquarters, and Community Facilities/Sports Area, use of the park is expected to substantially increased upon completion of the new facilities. The expected trip generation potential for the proposed project was therefore conservatively estimated without any deduction for existing trips, as indicated in Table 4.16-6 below. The proposed project is expected to generate an average of 925 trips per day, including eight trips during the AM peak hour and 37 trips during the PM peak hour. It should be noted that for parks included in the survey of daily trips that were of approximately the same size as the proposed project, the actual numbers of trips were below the average, so this further adds to the conservative estimate of the number of trips the project is expected to generate.

TABLE 4.16-6 TRIP GENERATION SUMMARY

		Daily		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
Land Use	**Units**	**Rate**	**Trips**	**Rate**	**Trips**	**In**	**Out**	**Rate**	**Trips**	**In**	**Out**
County Park	405.7 Acres	2.28	925	0.02	8	5	3	0.09	37	22	15

Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2012; Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc., 2014.

Special events and Levels 3 and 4 are discussed below.

Trip Distribution

The pattern used to allocate new project trips to the street network was based on the turning movement and volumes at the study intersections. The assumptions for inbound and outbound were different due to the configuration of the ramp intersections. The trip distribution assumptions are summarized in Table 4.16-7.

TABLE 4.16-7 TRIP DISTRIBUTION ASSUMPTIONS

Route	Inbound	Outbound
U.S. 101 South	60	10
U.S. 101 North	30	80
Central Garberville	10	10
Total	100%	100%

Source: Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc., 2014.

Existing-plus-Project Conditions (Project Level 1)

Upon the addition of project-related traffic to the existing volumes, the study intersections are expected to continue operating acceptable at LOS A overall. These results are summarized in Table 4.16-8. Project traffic volumes are shown in Figure 4.16-1. Appendix F of the EIR contains copies of the calculations.

TABLE 4.16-8 SUMMARY OF EXISTING AND EXISTING-PLUS-PROJECT PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE CALCULATIONS FOR PROJECT LEVEL 1

		Existing Conditions				Existing plus Project			
		AM Peak		PM Peak		AM Peak		PM Peak	
	Study Intersection (Approach)	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1.	Sprowel Creek Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps	3.6	A	3.9	A	3.6	A	3.9	A
	(Southbound Approach)	10.2	B	11.1	B	10.1	B	10.4	B
2	Sprowel Creek Road/Redwood Drive	8.3	A	8.7	A	8.4	A	8.9	A

Notes: Delay is measured in average seconds per vehicle; LOS = Level of Service; results for minor approaches to two-way stop-controlled intersections are indicated in *italics.*
Source: Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc., 2014.

It should be noted that with the addition of project-related traffic volumes, average delay on the southbound off-ramp would decrease during both peak hours. While this is counter-intuitive, this condition occurs when a project adds trips to a movement that has delays below the intersection average, resulting in lower overall average delay. The project would add traffic predominately to the right-turn movement, which has an average delay that is lower than the average for the approach as a whole, resulting in a slight reduction in the average delay for the approach.

The 925 daily trips would increase volumes on Sprowel Creek Road to about 2,300 vehicles per day near Riverview Lane and 2,000 vehicles per day at Tooby Memorial Park. These volumes are still well below the threshold established based on the roadways classification. The study intersections are expected to continue operating acceptably at the same levels of service upon the addition of project-generated traffic, resulting in a less-than-significant impact. The volume of traffic on Sprowel Creek Road would remain within acceptable limits based on the standard applied.

Future-Plus-Project Conditions

Upon the addition of project-generated traffic to the anticipated future volumes, the study intersections are expected to continue operating at LOS A overall and LOS B on the stop-controlled southbound off-ramp approach to Sprowel Creek Road. The Future-plus-Project operating conditions for Levels 1 and 2 are summarized in Table 4.16-9 and copies of the calculations are found in Appendix F of the EIR.

TABLE 4.16-9 SUMMARY OF FUTURE AND FUTURE-PLUS-PROJECT PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE CALCULATIONS FOR PROJECT LEVELS 1 AND 2

	Future Conditions				Future plus Project			
	AM Peak		PM Peak		AM Peak		PM Peak	
Study Intersection (Approach)	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Sprowel Creek Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps	3.7	A	4.0	A	3.6	A	3.9	A
(Southbound Approach)	10.5	B	11.5	B	10.3	B	10.8	B
2. Sprowel Creek Road/Redwood Drive	8.6	A	9.0	A	8.6	A	9.1	A

Notes: Delay is measured in average seconds per vehicle; LOS = Level of Service; results for minor approaches to two-way stop-controlled intersections are indicated in *italics.*

Source: Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc., 2014.

Daily volumes would be expected to increase to 2,400 vehicles near Riverview Lane and 2,100 vehicles at Tooby Memorial Playground under projected future conditions.

All study intersections would continue operating at the same acceptable levels of service with the project as without it, for Levels 1 and 2. As was noted for Existing-plus-Project conditions, because the project would add traffic to the right-turn movement from the U.S. 101 South off-ramp, and this movement has lower delays than the left turn on the same approach, the results with the project indicate reduced average delay per vehicle for the approach as a whole with the project. Sprowel Creek Road has adequate capacity to accommodate the project-generated trips.

Special Events

While standard trip generation rates are adequate for evaluating the project's impact on a day-to-day basis, which would include Project Level 3, the project would also include events of various sizes that would require a conditional use permit (Project Level 4).

Project Level 3: Activities or Projects Principally Allowed (Small Events)
The implementation of projects and activities principally allowed under the new zoning and land use designations would result in new community facilities including sports fields, concessions stands, visitor amenities, and parking areas. It would also allow public assembly and small events. However, it should be noted that many of the Project Level 3 small events have historically been taking place at the project site and the proposed project would not result in changes, as described below.

The following small events would occur frequently with the project, with parking on the site:

- Birthday Parties and Informal Gatherings: With attendance typically ranging from 10 to 50 people, Tooby Memorial Playground and the large barn in the Park Headquarters have been gathering places for family birthday parties, barbeques, and similar events. Tooby Memorial Playground has served as a location for these types of events for more than four decades. This type of activity would continue with the proposed project, with no limit on the number of these types of events annually. Parking for these types of events would be in existing parking areas at Park Headquarters or Tooby Memorial Park.
- Weddings and Memorials: Many weddings and memorial services for community members have taken place at the park. These events would continue in Tooby Memorial Playground, the Park Headquarters, Community Commons Area, and the labyrinth in the Main Agricultural Area. Attendance would be 500 people or less.
- Small Fundraisers and Events: Many local nonprofit organizations and community groups have used the park for fundraising activities. Most of these events include a variety of types of amplified music including prerecorded and live performances. These types of events would continue in Tooby Memorial Playground, the Park Headquarters, and the Community Commons Area, with a maximum attendance of 1,000 people.

Project Level 4: Projects Requiring a Conditional Use Permit
Projects that would require a conditional use permit include medium-sized events and the festival, as follows:

- Medium-Sized Events: This type of event often features multiple performers and performances by well-known groups or individuals that would attract more attendees. These events would take place in the Community Commons Area. Attendance would be between 800 and 2,500 people daily in addition to staff and vendors during the specific event. Not more than five of these medium-sized events would occur per year.
- Festival: The park would host the annual Summer Arts and Music Festival (or an event of a similar nature) that is currently being held at Benbow Lake State Recreation Area. Attendance would range between 2,500 and 5,000 people. The event would occur once per year for a period of no more than two days. The attendance would fluctuate over the course of the day, and the total number of attendees on the site at any one time would be less than the one-day total. Actual attendees would cap at 4,000, with an additional 1,000 staff, vendors, and event support workers.

Operational Constraints
Using the projected future AM and PM peak hour volumes, an iterative process was employed to determine the number of vehicles that could be generated by the site while maintaining operation of LOS C or better at both of the study intersections. Conditions were evaluated for the following scenarios:

1. Only inbound traffic, such as would be experienced at the beginning of an event;
2. Only outbound traffic, representing the end of an event, and
3. Bi-directional traffic, such as would be occur during the middle of a day-long event with attendees both arriving and leaving during the same hour.

Data collected during special events such as a concert indicate that event attendees typically arrive with at least two persons per vehicle, and generally more. An average vehicle occupancy of 2.5 persons per vehicle was applied, though a higher occupancy would be expected for family-oriented events where three or more persons per vehicle would be typical.

Based on the assumptions applied, the number of vehicles that could be accommodated and associated number of attendees were developed, as indicated in Table 4.16-10.

TABLE 4.16-10 SUMMARY OF AVAILABLE CAPACITY

					Bi-Directional Flow			
	Inbound Only		Outbound Only		Inbound		Outbound	
	Vehicles	Persons	Vehicles	Persons	Vehicles	Persons	Vehicles	Persons
AM Peak	750	1,875	540	1,350	650	1,625	475	1,187
PM Peak	725	1,812	475	1,187	675	1,687	415	1,037

Note: Vehicle occupancy of 2.5 persons per vehicle assumed
Source: Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc., 2014.

Impact of Small Events
Even using peak volumes that have been factored upward to reflect long-term growth in the area, the circulation system has adequate capacity available to accommodate the trips associated with small events. No improvements are warranted to serve project traffic and none are therefore recommended.

Impact of Medium-Sized Events
The concerts and other types of events that are expected to fit within this category would generally have a specific start time, and the majority of attendees would plan their arrival within the hour or so prior to the start of the event. The performers and others working at the event would arrive several hours ahead of the start time. If there are multiple performers, some attendees would choose to skip one or more of the acts, and thus may arrive late or leave early.

As noted in Table 4.16-10 for inbound traffic only, between 725 and 750 vehicles per hour could be attracted to the site while still maintaining acceptable traffic operations. While this translates to more than 1,800 persons arriving during a single hour based on a 2.5 person-per-vehicle occupancy, for events attended by more than 1,800 persons, there would be a potential traffic impact. Similarly, events ending during the PM peak hour and having about 1,200 attendees or more could result in unacceptable traffic operations.

Mitigation Measures for Medium-Size Events
Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1a: As indicated in the Traffic Assessment Management Control Plan for the project, for events that are expected to exceed 1,200 attendees, flaggers shall be stationed at the intersection of Redwood Drive/Sprowel Creek Road at the conclusion of the event to direct traffic and to reduce delays.

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1b: For events having more than 2,000 attendees, shuttle buses shall be employed to reduce the total number of vehicles leaving the site to a maximum of 700 outbound vehicles in a single hour.

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1c: At medium-sized events, data regarding the number of attendees and resulting volumes of traffic shall be collected so that the number of trips can be monitored and thresholds adjusted if it is determined that attendance patterns or average vehicle occupancy are substantially different from what was assumed. These data shall be included in the annual report reviewed by the Humboldt County Planning Commission.

FINDING
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact from medium-size events to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.16-1 through 4.16-21, Record of Proceedings.

Impacts of Festival
While the festival would have more attendees than a medium-sized event, because of the type of event it would be, the traffic would be spread out over a much longer period and thus have less of an impact during a single hour. However, based on the assumed vehicle occupancy of

2.5 persons per vehicle, a crowd of 4,000 persons could potentially generate about 1,600 total vehicles.

The parking supply for the project site as proposed is about 700 spaces, though this number is not firm as the parking supply could easily be increased given the substantial amount of open space that could be dedicated to parking if necessary. However, for purposes of this analysis the parking supply was limited to 700 spaces. Assuming that 1,250 event attendees arrive in private vehicles (500 parking spaces with 2.5 persons per vehicle), and further assuming that the 500 attendee spaces are used by a single vehicle all day, the remaining 2,750 attendees would need to travel via bus.

Assuming an average capacity of 72 persons per bus, and occupancy averaging 80 percent, approximately 51 bus trips would be required to transport the remaining attendees to the site. Each bus trip would result in two trip ends, as the bus would need to travel from the off-site parking area to the site, then back to the parking area to load additional passengers. It is anticipated that a fleet of no more than four buses would be deployed, and assuming that a round trip would take at least a ½-hour, the buses would be expected to generate only 24 trips hourly.

The parking for more than 1,000 vehicles would need to be dispersed among numerous off-site locations over the 12 hours of operation, so the bus trips would similarly be spread out over a number of different streets outside the immediate area of Garberville. Some existing passenger loading locations include the Chevron Station for pick-up and Getti-Up Coffee for drop-off in Garberville and Majestic Center in Redway. It should be noted that there is a potential to issue half-day parking passes, which would then allow more attendees to drive to the event and result in a reduced demand for bus trips; however, these trips would occur midday, and the peak hour trips would be unchanged. Thus, this operational adjustment would not affect the results of the analysis.

Given that such events would occur infrequently, and that the number of trips on any particular roadway outside the Garberville area would be relatively low, the off-site impacts associated with shuttles carrying attendees to Level 4 events is expected to be less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measures for Large-size Events (Festivals)

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1d: During the large festival events, on-site parking shall be limited to 500 spaces for attendees and 200 spaces for vendors and others working the event. While the vendors and others employed during the festival would likely remain on-site for an hour or more after the event concludes, the limited parking would ensure that the amount of traffic generated during a single hour results in trips that can be adequately handled by the street network. All other attendees would need to arrive by shuttle from off-site parking fields. It is understood that this is how the festival currently operates in Benbow, where there is substantially less parking than could be made available at the project site.

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1e: Festival parking passes shall be made available through advance purchase only, with a variety of purchase options, including buying them on-line or

at the usual local ticket outlets where attendees purchase their event tickets. The number of parking passes that can be issued shall be limited for each day of the festival to 500. A separate pass shall be required for each day, with the passes to be displayed on the dashboard of the vehicle. The above requirements shall be addressed in the project's Traffic Management Assessment Control Plan (see Appendix E).

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1f: The project shall be subject to the following annual reporting and review requirements:

1. By December 31 of each year during which a medium- or large-sized event is held, the applicant shall prepare and submit 15 copies of a post-event report discussing that year's event(s). Verification of attendance levels shall be discussed.
2. The report shall focus on assessing the effectiveness of the plan of operation, mitigation measures, and monitoring program. The report shall also contain written correspondence from agencies participating in monitoring and/or affected by the event (i.e., Humboldt County Planning Division, Division of Environmental Health, Sheriff's Office, and Public Works Department).
3. Responses to all concerns and issues identified in the report shall be provided, and appropriate measures to be undertaken at the following year's event(s) identified as needed. The annual report shall include sufficient data to assess the effectiveness of all required mitigation measures in relation to the total daily attendance and traffic volume and intensity, and potential safety hazards to pedestrians and bicyclists.
4. The post-event report shall be submitted to the Humboldt County Planning Commission for review. The total allowable attendance levels for medium- and large-sized events shall be determined by the Planning Commission on an annual basis after review and approval of the annual report. The allowed attendance levels for medium-sized events shall range from a low of 800 to a maximum of 2,500 persons total. A large-sized event ranging from 2,500 to 4,000 attendees is not allowed until the Planning Commission has reviewed and approved two consecutive annual reports for medium-sized events with attendance levels of at least 1,800 persons. In consultation with the reviewing agencies, the Planning Commission may waive the annual reporting requirements for medium- and large-sized events for up to 5 years should the applicant demonstrate the use has been conducted in conformance with all of the required mitigations, and no changes in attendance levels or mitigation measures are proposed.
5. To address area concerns that may arise, the applicant shall hold a minimum of one community meeting in the vicinity of the site within 90 days of each large-sized event. This requirement may be waived by the Humboldt County Planning Director in consultation with the reviewing agencies if no significant community issues have been reported during that year's large-sized event.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce the potential impact from large events to less than

significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.16-1 through 4.16-21, Record of Proceedings.

TRAFFIC-2. Conflict with Applicable Congestion Management Program.

IMPACT

The project has the potential to conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways (PS).

EXPLANATION

The Humboldt County Association of Governments (HCAOG) is a Joint Powers Agency comprised of the seven incorporated cities (Arcata, Blue Lake, Eureka, Ferndale, Fortuna, Rio Dell, Trinidad), and the County of Humboldt. It is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and, as such, publishes the Humboldt County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In this plan, the RTPA states its goal "for Humboldt County to have a comprehensive, coordinated and balanced multi-modal transportation system, so that people in the region can travel and move goods safely and efficiently by the modes that best suit the individual or business/industry, and society at large."

The County does not have an applicable congestion management program beyond what is provided in the RTP. The potential project impacts on roadway service levels are addressed in Impact TRAFFIC-1. Potential impacts on modes other than motor vehicles are discussed below and addressed in TRAFFIC-4.

MITIGATION MEASURES

TRAFFIC-2: Refer to Mitigation Measures TRAFFIC-1a through 1f and Mitigation Measures TRAFFIC-4a through 4e.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.16-1 through 4.16-21, Record of Proceedings.

TRAFFIC-3: Safety Hazards

IMPACT

The project has the potential to increase safety hazards associated with access and circulation, especially in the Community Commons area (Area 4) of the site. Specifically, limited sight distance at any or all of the project driveways would result in a potentially unsafe condition (PS).

EXPLANATION

Access to the site would occur at a number of locations including the Park Headquarters, Tooby Memorial Park, the Community Facilities/Sports Area, and the Community Commons.

A number of improvements to site access and circulation are proposed, including the following:

- Unpaved parking areas near the main entrance to the Park Headquarters and at the Community Facilities/Sports Area off Camp Kimtu Road would be expanded. The parking lot at Tooby Memorial Playground would be redesigned for increased safety. A minimum of two access points would be provided for each parking area for medium and large events. Expansion of unpaved parking areas would occur to accommodate moderate-sized events and activities in the Park Headquarters, the Main Agricultural Area, along Camp Kimtu Road, and at the Community Facilities/Sports Area.
- A simple one-lane bridge would be installed over a ravine in the Community Commons area. This bridge would facilitate one-way traffic flow as necessary during larger events.
- Temporary large event parking for higher numbers of cars is proposed for the Main Agricultural Area, Community Commons, and the Community Facilities/Sports Area. New or expanded fencing for public safety is proposed for Tooby Memorial Playground, Park Headquarters, Main Agricultural Area, the Community Commons, and the Community Facilities/Sports Area.
- There is an existing ranch road system that provides access throughout the site for moving farm equipment and property maintenance. It would be maintained and upgraded as appropriate for use as general service roads during events in the Park Headquarters, Main Agricultural Area, Community Commons, and the Community Facilities/Sports Area.
- The existing river access road at the Sprowel Creek Road bridge would be improved for unpaved parking, public access and non-motorized boats. An improved river access would be constructed in Tooby Memorial Playground to upgrade the access to the river for swimming and for people to carry small non-motorized watercraft down to the river for launching.

The following discussion reviews potential hazards associated with site access, circulation, and parking.

Sight Distance
At driveways, a substantially clear line of sight should be maintained between the driver of a vehicle waiting to enter the roadway and the driver of an approaching vehicle. Adequate time must be provided for the waiting vehicle to turn left or right without requiring the through traffic to radically alter their speed.

Sight distance along Sprowel Creek Road at the driveways to the Park Headquarters, Community Commons, and Tooby Memorial Playground was evaluated based on sight distance criteria contained in the *Highway Design Manual* published by Caltrans (Caltrans, 2012). The recommended sight distances both for drivers entering and exiting a driveway are based on stopping sight distance.

Sight distances at the driveways were field measured. Since Sprowel Creek Road does not have a posted speed limit, a 40-mile-per-hour (mph) design speed was assumed. Given the winding nature of the roadway as well as the width, it is likely that most drivers would be traveling slower than this, so the assumed design speed provides a conservative safety assessment.

Sight Distance at Community Commons Area
The existing driveway located at the easterly side of the park site would primarily be used only during medium-sized special events and the festival. While drivers exiting the site would have more than 300 feet of sight distance in both directions, a vehicle waiting to turn left into the site would not be seen by a driver approaching the access point until they were about 200 feet away. Sight distance for drivers following a vehicle stopped to turn left into the site is less than the 300 feet needed for a 40-mph approach speed.

MITIGATION MEASURES
Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-3: During events held in the Community Commons (Areas 4A and 4B), warning signs shall be posted along Sprowel Creek Road in advance of the driveway indicating that there is potentially stopped traffic ahead. While drivers would typically be able to make the left turn with little, if any, delay, this safety measure would ensure that there is adequate warning for drivers approaching the area.

Sight Distance at Park Headquarters and Tooby Memorial Playground
Sight lines are considerably in excess of 300 feet in each direction at both the Park Headquarters Tooby Memorial Playground driveways. Sight distance is adequate in both directions and approaching the Park Headquarters and Tooby Memorial Playground driveways.

Sight Distance at Community Facilities/Sports Area
Sight lines along Camp Kimtu Road were found to be more than 500 feet in each direction, so they would be adequate for speeds in excess of 50 mph. Sight distance is adequate in both directions and approaching the Community Facilities/Sports Area driveway on Camp Kimtu Road.

Parking Capacity
The existing parking lots at the Tooby Memorial Playground, Park Headquarters, and Community Facilities/Sports Area are adequate for typical daily events and small special

events. During medium-sized events and the festival, parking demand at the site would vary depending on the type of events being held. This is addressed in the Plan of Operation - Traffic Assessment Management Control Plan (see Appendix E of the EIR).

Parking for medium-sized events would take place in the Community Commons area with overflow to the main Agricultural Area. These areas have large open fields that could easily be used for parking during events. Parking for these events would be located in the Community Commons (Area 4) adjacent to the Park Headquarters (Area 2) and designated fields in the Main Agricultural Area (Area 3), and temporary parking would be provided in the Community Facilities/Sports Area (Area 5). More than 7 acres of space have been identified that can be made available for parking. Per Section 109.1.3.3.4 of the Humboldt County Code, 18 accessible spaces would be required within this parking supply. Vehicles would enter the site via Tooby Ranch Road.

Likewise, the festival would provide parking using a portion of the site's open space. It is recommended that the parking supply be limited to space for 500 attendee vehicles to park in addition to 200 staff, volunteers, vendors, and performers (see Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1d above). A maximum of 100 vehicles for staff and vendors would remain on-site overnight for security and for early shifts. Conservatively assuming 350 square feet per parked vehicle to include the 9-foot-by-18-foot parking space and room for drive aisles, a total of about 5.5 acres would need to be set aside for parking. About 7 acres have been identified for parking, so adequate space to provide the necessary parking is available. The existing facilities together with available open spaces can provide adequate parking for both typical daily operation and special events.

As noted above, drivers entering the site for the festival should be required to purchase a parking pass in advance and have it available when they enter the site, as recommended in Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1e above. This would reduce the time needed to clear a queue of traffic entering the parking area, resulting in minimal delays that would back up onto Sprowel Creek Road.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.16-1 through 4.16-24, Record of Proceedings.

TRAFFIC-4. Conflict with Provisions for Public Transit, Bicycles, and Pedestrians

IMPACT

The project could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such

facilities. This is especially true for pedestrian use during medium- and large-sized events (PS).

EXPLANATION

The project includes improvements to the existing pedestrian path under Sprowel Creek Road bridge, between the Riverfront Area and Tooby Memorial Playground, to avoid pedestrian use of roadways between these two areas.

Facilities for Non-Motorized Modes

Garberville and Redway are the business centers of Southern Humboldt County, with a greater concentration of businesses in Garberville. While Garberville is a busy business hub for the Southern Humboldt community, the population living within the town of Garberville is only 193 persons based on 2010 Census data. By contrast, the neighboring town of Redway has a much higher population of 1,225 persons and is 3.8 miles from the park. The town of Garberville is the main commercial area serving the outlying rural areas including Shelter Cove, Ettersburg, Briceland, Whitethorn, Redway, Alderpoint, Fort Seward, Harris, Casterlin, Miranda, and Myers Flat. The Southern Humboldt Unified School District serving this area has a single high school; there are no schools in the town of Garberville.

Residents in Southern Humboldt are vehicle-centric and regularly travel distances such as 25 miles to school or 75 miles to Eureka one way. The steep terrain in the area and the distances between destinations do not promote walking and bicycling as convenient methods of transportation.

Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian Behavior. Pedestrian studies have routinely concluded that most people will walk no more than ¼-mile to reach public transportation. The ¼-mile standard is also supported by park equity research. Jennifer Wolch, now at the University of California at Berkeley, wrote "a quarter mile is reasonable for parents taking toddlers and small children to a park for everyday outings and playground opportunities. Trips of more than a quarter mile are unlikely to be acceptable to parents."

Acceptable walking distances will vary depending on geography, climate conditions, age, health, time availability, quality of surroundings, safety, climate, land use, trip purpose, and many other factors. Most people will walk longer distances for exercise purposes, but prefer to walk shorter distances when they are commuting to a destination or in a hurry.

Considerable research has been performed recently on factors that make areas inviting to pedestrians. As mentioned above, the most commonly cited industry standard for the acceptable walking distance is ¼-mile. Barriers to walkability include weather, time, distance, a steep grade, lack of shelter, safety, or loud traffic noise.

Existing Conditions in Project Area. The walk to the project site from the town of Garberville has few of the characteristics that would classify it as highly walkable. There is open exposure to the elements, loud traffic noise, and a long, sustained, steep grade. The walk from Garberville to the Community Park would be characterized as having a low-walkability ranking by these standards. The steep grade alone makes this a difficult walk that would deter even hardy walkers, particularly on the return.

Central Garberville is 1.23 miles from the main entrance to Park Headquarters (Area 2). Garberville is 1.75 miles from the entrance to Camp Kimtu (Area 5) where the community sports facilities are proposed. The population within the walking distance of ½-mile of the main entrance to the Community Park is 60 persons. The population living within the ½-mile radius of the proposed Area 5 community sports facilities is 46 persons.

By contrast, Redwood Fields in the Cutten area of Eureka, cited as a comparable, has a population of 1,433 people living within a ½-mile radius. The density of the population surrounding these fields together with the level roadways and existing sidewalks would make it likely that this location would experience a much higher level of pedestrian traffic than the project site.

Based on current park use, it is reported by staff that the large majority of walkers and bicyclists using the Community Park trails commute by vehicle to the park and then walk or bicycle on the trails within the park. Walkers prefer to spend their walking time in a natural park setting on the trails within the park rather than traveling along a paved roadway. A walker out for exercise or pleasure is more likely to spend the hour they have on a beautiful trail than walking about 2½ miles to reach the park and return home. A user walking to the park would have a total trip in the range of 3 to 4 miles, which is outside the range of what may be desired by most recreational walkers.

The 2002 National Survey of Bicyclist and Pedestrian Attitudes and Behavior, by the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration and the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, reports results of a survey of 7,500 people nationwide over the age of 16 on their walking and bicycling habits. It was reported that the most common destination for walking is home (59 percent of walking trips), while the destination of a park or recreation area was reported by 7 percent of walkers, shopping accounted for another 7 percent, and 6 percent of walking trips were to work. Eighty-one percent of respondents walk once a week during the summer months.

Using the statistics from the 2002 National Survey of Bicyclist and Pedestrian Attitudes and Behavior, and generously calculating that 10 percent of the 193 residents in the town of Garberville would be willing to walk a distance of 1 mile (four times the usual acceptable walking distance of ¼ mile one-way), and noting that 81 percent walked once weekly with 7 percent choosing the destination of a park or recreational area, the park would generate an average of one pedestrian trip in one week during the summer months based on nationwide typical pedestrian behavior.

Considering the typical behavior of pedestrians for the 60 persons living within a ½-mile radius of the project site, and assuming one-half of the 60 residents within a ½-mile radius of the project site were walkers, 81 percent walked once weekly with 7 percent going to a park or recreational area, the park would generate two pedestrian trips per week.
Tooby Memorial Park and playground are located within the project site and have been in use by the public since the 1960s. Park staff reports very few park users either walking or bicycling to the park in the past decade.

Pedestrian Activity Generated by Project. While events would generate more activity at the park, the potential for walking trips remains low as there would still be a small population within walking distance, and of these residents, an even smaller number would be interested in attending the special events held at the site.

Given the rural nature of the site, low resident population surrounding the project site and in the town of Garberville, the distance to the project site and the difficult terrain of the roadway to the project site, including a steep grade to be climbed when leaving, pedestrian traffic to and from Garberville or other areas off-site is expected to continue to be limited. The proposed project would not produce sufficient pedestrian traffic to warrant providing improved pedestrian facilities, including upgrades to the existing shoulders or roadways.

Pedestrian activity would, however, be expected between and through the various components of the project. Paths and trails already exist on the site linking the Park Headquarters area through the Main Agricultural Area to the Community Facilities/Sports Area and the Community Commons, with multiple options existing for some routes that provide recreational opportunities for walking around the site. The proposed improved connection under the Sprowel Creek Road bridge between the Riverfront Area and Tooby Memorial Playground would provide connectivity for the northernmost facilities, and a crosswalk is proposed on Kimtu Road connecting the Riverfront area and the Community Facilities/Sports Area. However, no facilities connecting Tooby Playground to the Park Headquarters have been proposed. While there would likely be a minimal number of pedestrian crossings during typical operating conditions, there could be a substantial number of pedestrians during medium-sized special events and the large festival event.

Pedestrian facilities serving the project site are expected to be generally adequate, though as proposed there is not a connection between the Riverfront/Tooby Memorial Playground and the Park Headquarters. For this reason, the following mitigation measure is recommended.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-4a: For medium-sized special events and the festival, a temporary marked crosswalk shall be created connecting the Tooby Memorial Playground to the Park Headquarters area. The crossing shall be placed to maximize sight lines, and during periods of peak usage, there shall be a crossing guard or flagger available to assist pedestrians and control traffic. This measure is included in the Traffic Assessment Management Control Plan (see Appendix E of the EIR).

Bicycle Facilities
There are no existing bicycle facilities in the vicinity, so bicyclists must share the roadway with vehicular traffic. While cyclists could easily travel at the same speed as vehicular traffic on the trip to the site, which is downhill, leaving the site requires uphill travel, which is typically quite a bit slower for cyclists. Park staff reports that the majority of bicyclists using the park arrive in vehicles, then unload their bicycles to ride the trails. With the low-resident population surrounding the park, bicycling to the site is not expected to be a primary mode of travel, though bicyclists do need to be accommodated on the roadway. The planned future widening of shoulders by the County would provide additional space for bicyclists to move over and allow vehicular traffic to pass.

In addition, the project site plan does not identify the provision of bicycle parking or storage facilities. Bicycle facilities serving the project site are not expected to be adequate.

MITIGATION MEASURES
Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-4b: "Share the Road" signs shall be posted, and consideration given to installing "sharrows" to indicate the potential presence of cyclists. Sharrows are markings that include a cyclist and arrows, and they are placed in the lane to identify the road as a shared use facility.

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-4c: For large festival events, accommodations shall be made either on the shuttle vehicles or by dedicated vans to ferry cyclists to the top of the hill on Sprowel Creek Road.

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-4d: Bicycle racks shall be included in each of the park's major entrances to encourage bicycle travel.

Transit Service
There are no regularly scheduled transit routes serving the project site. It is, however, anticipated that shuttle buses would be used during the festival and perhaps some of the medium-sized events. Permanent transit facilities serving the project site are not expected to be needed, but temporary shelters would be needed during events.

MITIGATION MEASURES
Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-4e: To facilitate shuttle bus users, a temporary shelter shall be provided during events that use a shuttle bus, both to protect attendees and to provide guidance as to the location of the shuttle stop.

FINDING
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.16-1 through 4.16-27, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 27: FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS ON UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

LESS THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Water Supply

Water supplies are expected to be sufficient to serve the project, and the project would not require new or expanded water entitlements. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project's impact would be less than significant in relation to this significance criterion.

Total Water Demand

According to the "Water Supply and Demand Memorandum" (Appendix G of this EIR), total water demand from the project would range from approximately 33,566 gallons per month (the estimate for the months of December and February) to 1,552,821 gallons per month (the estimate for the month of July, assuming minimum spots field irrigation). Total water supply would range from approximately 2,263,565 gallons per month (the estimate for the month of February) to 2,506,090 gallons per month (the estimate for the months of January, March, May, and December).

Total water demand is a combination of potable and non-potable uses served by multiple water sources, and the maximum month demand of 1,552,821 gallons per month (assuming minimum sports field irrigation) is in July. Under the proposed project water system (water supply Option 2 described in the "Water Supply and Demand Memorandum"), the demands on the Eel River infiltration gallery would be 1,475,565 gallons per month for non-potable uses compared to a supply of 2,388,240. Thus, there would be no shortage of supply for the infiltration gallery demands. For the spring and upland well, the demand in July when the forbearance period begins would be 48,661 gallons per month, compared to a supply of 55,800 gallons plus 55,000 gallons in stored water. Thus, there is also no supply shortage for these sources. For the Tooby Park well, the demand would be 28,595 gallons per month, and supply is anticipated to meet demand.

Groundwater Supplies

Groundwater sources include the Tooby Park well and upland well. As shown in Table 13 of the "Water Supply and Demand Analysis Memorandum" (Appendix G of this EIR), the existing and proposed facilities using the Tooby Park well as a water source include the caretaker's unit, irrigation, and restrooms (toilets, sinks and drinking fountains), all within Area 1. These facilities would continue to use the Tooby Park well as a water source, and demand ranges from a low of 9,072 gallons (January, February, March, November, and December) to a high of 30,245 gallons in September. The upland well is proposed to be used in conjunction with the spring to meet a majority of the potable water demands in the park. Assuming full use of the spring source, the upland well has a minimum demand of zero in the

non-forbearance period of November through June, and a maximum demand of 48,661 gallons in the month of July. Upland well capacity ranges from a low of 50,400 gallons per month in February to a high of 55,800 gallons per month (in January, March, May, July, August, October, and December). Therefore, remaining capacity for the upland well during operations is estimated at a low of 7,139 gallons in July and a high of 55,800 gallons in December.

Consistency with General Plan Policies Regarding Water Supply
The proposed project would be consistent with the Humboldt County General Plan goals and policies listed under "Regulatory Framework" above. Specifically, the project would be consistent with Policies 3, 5, and 6 in that there would be a sufficient water supply for the project as identified in the "Water Supply and Demand Analysis Memorandum" (Appendix G of this EIR). Consistent with Policy 7, the project includes water conservation techniques; for example, the water used for irrigation and livestock in Area 2 has been changed to the infiltration gallery non-potable source in order to maximize potable water throughout the park. Consistent with Policy 13, the proposed project does not include any dam, reservoir, diversion, or other water impoundment facility on the Eel River, which is designated as a State Wild and Scenic River.

Water Entitlements
As shown in Table 4.17-1, the project applicant has a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (R1-2009-0238) for Sources 1 and 2. Sources 1, 2, and 3 have a Statement of Water Diversion and Use (S0243379) on file with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Source 4 (an existing but currently unused well in Area 4) would also require a Statement of Water Diversion and Use with the SWRCB.

Conclusion
Existing water supplies are expected to be sufficient for the project's everyday use and for emergency purposes. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the impact is less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Solid Waste Disposal
The landfills serving the project would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project's impact on landfill capacity would be less than significant.

The applicant estimates that everyday uses of the park (recreation and small gatherings) would generate approximately 130 yards of trash and 40.5 cubic feet of recyclables per year. The annual large-sized event would generate approximately 80 yards of trash, 1.5 tons of recyclables, and 600 pounds of paper/cardboard. The five medium-sized events per year would generate a total of 130 yards of trash, 2.5 tons of recyclables, and 1,000 pounds of paper/cardboard. The ten small events per year would generate a total of 15 yards of trash, 80 cubic feet of recyclables, and 200 pounds of paper/cardboard (Lobato, 2014b). Use of the proposed sports fields and skate park would generate a total of approximately 10,700 pounds (5.35 tons) of solid waste per year (Lobato, 2014c). Construction of buildings and structures included in the project would also generate solid waste and debris.

As discussed under "Environmental Setting" above, the HWMA manages contracts for the transport of the solid waste for disposal at either the Anderson Landfill in Shasta County or Dry Creek Landfill near Medford, Oregon. The Anderson Landfill has a daily permitted disposal of about 1,018 tons per day and a remaining capacity of about 8 million tons. The Anderson Landfill is not expected to reach capacity until 2036. The Dry Creek Landfill has a remaining capacity of about 50 million tons without additional site expansion. It is anticipated that the Dry Creek Landfill could provide disposal capacity for its current service area, including Humboldt County, for another 75 to 100 years. Therefore, the proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste disposal needs. The solid waste generated by the project would represent a relatively small percentage of total landfill capacity, and the project's impact on landfill capacity would be less than significant.

Energy

The project would result in very little energy use except during large events when energy may be needed for temporary lighting or other uses. Project construction would also involve temporary use of energy. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, and impacts would be less than significant.

As described in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR, proposed lighting by area is as follows:

- Area 1 – Tooby Memorial Park. Outdoor lighting is proposed at the existing caretaker's residence and at the restrooms. Temporary lighting would be used on special occasions that continue beyond dark. Solar and battery-powered lighting options would be used whenever possible.
- Area 2 – Park Headquarters. Standard outdoor lighting may be installed at and between existing buildings. Additional solar and battery-powered lighting options would be used whenever possible.
- Area 3 – Main Agricultural Area. No permanent lighting fixtures would be installed. Special events each year may continue past dusk and would use portable lighting stations to illuminate the parking areas. Up to three temporary lighting stations for parking areas would be provided.

- Area 4 – Community Commons. One to three temporary light stands would be positioned in the parking lots during evening seasonal events. The entry to the event site would also be lit. Low-voltage lighting would be used to light the portable toilets. Portable solar and battery-powered lighting would be used when possible. Craft and food booths that remain open after dark would also provide their own lights. At the environmental camp, temporary solar or battery-powered lighting would be used to light portable toilets.
- Area 5 – Community Facilities/Sports Area. For occasional night games held during sports tournaments, lighting stands may be provided for the fields. Bathroom facilities and the concessions would also have outdoor lighting.
- Area 6 – Riverfront. No lighting is proposed for this area.
- Area 7 – Forestland. No lighting is proposed for this area.

As indicated above, much of the lighting would be temporary, and in many cases solar and battery-powered lighting would be used whenever possible. In several areas of the site, no lighting is proposed. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.17-1 through 4.17-10, Record of Proceedings.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

UTIL-1. Water Facilities

IMPACT
The project would require or result in the construction of new water facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (PS).

EXPLANATION
The project would include installation of water tanks, potable water lines, and irrigation lines, as described in Chapter 3, Project Description, of the EIR. All of the proposed water facilities would be located on the project site.

The construction and installation of these new water facilities could cause significant environmental effects. These effects are evaluated in the EIR. (See Section 4.3, Air Quality, Impact AIR-1;.Section 4.4, Biological Resources, Impact BIO-2; Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, Impact CULTURAL-2; Section 4.6, Geology and Soils, Impact GEO-2; Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Impact GHG-1; Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, "Less-than-Significant Impacts;" Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, Impact HYDRO-1; and Section 4.12, Noise, Impact NOISE-2.)

Additional water facilities beyond those included in the project are not expected to be needed to serve the project. The existing on-site fire hydrant connection is located close to the proposed large event site, providing easy access in case of fire. The SHCP owns a portable 300-gallon fire suppression water-pumper tank installed on a four-wheel-drive truck that can provide access to most areas of the project site (GHD, 2014). The park is not located within the Town of Garberville, and only three residences are located at the site. If an emergency takes place, there are a total of four water sources that these residences can divert water from to use.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure UTIL-1: The project shall comply with all applicable mitigation measures identified in this EIR.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce the potential impact of the proposed water facilities to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.17-1 through 4.17-13, Record of Proceedings.

UTIL-2. Solid Waste Disposal

IMPACT

The project would comply with federal, state, or local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. However, The Humboldt County Division of Environmental Health has identified the potential for impacts resulting from the handling of solid waste and recycling at the project, especially during events attracting 500 or more attendees (PS).

EXPLANATION

The volume of solid waste generated by the project would depend on the size, nature, and timing of events. The applicant has provided estimates of solid waste generation from everyday uses of the park as well as from the proposed special events. (See discussion of solid waste disposal under "Less-than-Significant Impacts" above.)
As discussed in Chapter 3, Project Description, day-to-day use of the park is projected to draw a maximum of 800 persons per day during the peak seasons (late spring, summer, and early fall). Additional visitors would be allowed at the park for special events under a conditional use permit. Under the conditional use permit, one annual event per year with up to 5,000 attendees (4,000 guests plus up to 1,000 staff, vendors, and performances) and up to five events per year with 800 to 2,500 attendees are proposed.

An on-site dumpster issued by Recology Humboldt County, which provides weekly trash collection, is proposed to be used for regular trash collection. During small and large events, cardboard, plastic and aluminum items would be collected in ten 50-gallon recycling barrels

strategically placed within the project site and recycled. Event staff and volunteers would recycle materials on a regular basis. An unspecified number of 50-gallon barrels would be available for trash and would be placed strategically throughout the event area and in parking areas. Waste generated by events or in excess of the dumpster's capacity would be taken to the Eel River Disposal container site in Redway by the park staff when necessary. The SHCP indicates that the entire site would be cleaned up after the event to the condition it was in before the event (Lobato, 2014a).

Waste generated by the project would likely not affect the disposal contracts managed by the HWMA. However, the Humboldt County Division of Environmental Health has expressed concern regarding the management of solid waste and recyclables during events. Therefore, impacts from solid waste would be potentially significant without adequate mitigation.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure UTIL-2: The applicant shall submit a plan for the management of solid waste and recycling for events that would attract 500 or more attendees. The plan shall be subject to approval by the Humboldt County Division of Environmental Health. Prior to events attracting 500 or more attendees, the applicant shall manage solid waste and recyclables a manner consistent with the approved plan.

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce this potential impact on solid waste facilities to less than significant (LTS), and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.17-1 through 4.17-13, Record of Proceedings.

UTIL-3. Energy

FINDING

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not result in any potentially significant energy impacts.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.17-1 through 4.17-13, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 28: FINDINGS CONCERNING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Impacts related to aesthetics and visual resources are generally site-specific, rather than cumulative in nature, because each project area has unique aesthetic and visual resource considerations that would be subject to site development and construction standards. Therefore, the potential for cumulative impacts is limited. Impacts associated with potential

aesthetics and visual resources are related to conditions occurring at individual building sites. These effects are site-specific, and impacts would not be compounded by additional development. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the mitigation measures described earlier would reduce impacts to aesthetics and visual resources to less than-significant levels, and lessen the project's incremental contribution to any such cumulative impact to a level that is less than cumulatively considerable. .

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, and 4.1-1 through 4.1-11, Record of Proceedings.

Agriculture and Forestry

The potential impacts of proposed development on agriculture and forestry resources tend to be site-specific, and the overall cumulative effect would depend on the degree to which resources are protected on a particular site. Further environmental review of specific development proposals in the vicinity of the project site should serve to ensure that important agriculture and forestry resources are identified, protected, and properly managed, and to prevent any significant adverse development-related impacts.

As discussed in the earlier project-specific analysis, the project would not result in a significant impact on existing forestry resources. The project would convert certain limited areas of farmland to non-agricultural use, representing a significant, unavoidable impact as discussed earlier. Overall, however, the project could be expected to increase agricultural production on the project site. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the effect of the project on agriculture and forestry resources, in combination with other past, present, and foreseeable projects, would be less than significant. The Board severably and finds that the project would not result in or contribute to any significant cumulative impacts on these resources.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.2-1 through 4.2-14, Record of Proceedings.

Air Quality

Project emissions of criteria air pollutants or their precursors would not make a considerable contribution to cumulative air quality impacts. Air pollution, by nature, is mostly a cumulative impact. While the Air District has no significance thresholds applicable to construction and operational aspects of a development project, such as the proposed project, as discussed under Impact AIR-2, project operational PM10 emissions would be well below those established for stationary sources. The proposed project's construction- and operational-period fugitive dust emissions would be adequately controlled through implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1, AIR-2a, and AIR-2b. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project construction and operation would not make a considerable contribution to cumulative air quality impacts.

A review of cumulative construction projects that are planned and approved in the project vicinity in Chapter 6 of the EIR revealed the Garberville Sanitary District Water System Improvement Project, which is adjacent to the proposed project site and currently under construction. Because the Garberville Sanitary District project would implement Mitigation Measure III-01 to control PM10 and fugitive dust emissions, and because the nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are located over 800 feet from the proposed Community Facilities/Sports Area, as described above under "Less than-Significant Impacts" above, the Board finds that the potential cumulative construction health risk impact would be considered less than significant.

EVIDENCE
DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.3-1 through 4.3-15, Record of Proceedings.

Biological Resources
The analysis of potential cumulative impacts on biological resources considered anticipated development in the surrounding area, including the pending or approved developments. The potential impacts of proposed development on biological resources tends to be rather site-specific, and the overall cumulative effect would depend on the degree to which significant vegetation and wildlife resources are protected on a particular site. This includes preservation of well-developed native vegetation (marshlands, native grasslands, oak woodlands, riparian scrub and woodland, etc.), populations of special-status plant or animal species, and wetland features (including seasonal wetlands and drainages). Further environmental review of specific development proposals in the vicinity of the site should serve to ensure that important biological resources are identified, protected, and properly managed, and to prevent any significant adverse development-related impacts.

To some degree, cumulative development contributes to an incremental reduction in the amount of existing wildlife habitat, particularly for birds and larger mammals. Habitat for species intolerant of human disturbance can be lost as development encroaches into previously undeveloped areas, disrupting or eliminating movement corridors and fragmenting the remaining suitable habitat retained within parks, private open space, or undeveloped properties. Additional development may also contribute to degradation of the aquatic habitat in the tributary creeks. Grading associated with construction activities generally increases erosion and sedimentation, and urban pollutants from new development could reduce water quality if not properly treated and managed. Recommendations to control erosion and sedimentation after grading should serve to minimize the potential for water quality degradation.

With regard to development of the project site and its relationship to surrounding habitat, no cumulatively considerable impacts on biological or wetland resources are expected as a result of anticipated development. Terrestrial wildlife in the area have already become acclimated to human activity on the site, and proposed development is not expected to disrupt important movement corridors or access to surrounding habitat. Mitigation measures recommended above to address potential impacts on regulated waters, potential bird nesting activities, and wildlife habitat would serve to address project-specific impacts and mitigate them to less

than-significant levels, and would address any contribution the project would otherwise make to cumulative impacts.

As discussed earlier, the EIR provides an assessment of the potential impacts of the project on aquatic habitat and a determination on the effects of the anticipated demand on surface water flows, including the South Fork Eel River. Project implementation is not expected to result in any adverse impacts on existing aquatic habitat conditions along the on-site ephemeral streams. And no significant adverse impacts on surface water flows or aquatic habitat in the South Fork Eel River are anticipated for the project itself. However, the project would contribute to a cumulative reduction in the surface water flows to the South Fork Eel River, including during the dry summer months when conditions become critical. As acknowledged in the EIR, the low-flow conditions that have existed for the past several summers are a limiting factor for survival of juvenile Coho and Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and other aquatic species. During drought conditions, any reduction in flow could exacerbate the undesirable conditions of high water temperatures, low dissolved oxygen levels, and elevated nutrient concentrations, and could contribute to the creation of conditions that could be lethal for salmonids and other aquatic life. Because of these extreme low flows in the South Fork Eel River during current drought conditions, any further reduction in surface flows, including the relatively small diversion volume associated with the proposed project, could be cumulatively considerable and result in a significant cumulative impact on aquatic life.

The EIR included detailed recommendations to address the perception of using water to irrigate future playfields on the site, based on the principles of good environmental stewardship and water conservation, and to recognize that water use in the park must be adjusted based on the availability of water necessary to support the conservation values of the South Fork Eel River. These consist of 1) general recommendations for design and operation of the park, 2) adaptive management practices during times of water scarcity, and 3) controls on water availability through increased water storage capacity and restrictions on flow diversions from the South Fork Eel River during the dry season. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and in the administrative record, the Board finds that collectively, implementation of these recommendations from the EIR would serve to fully mitigate any project contribution to the potentially significant cumulative impact on aquatic life in the South Fork Eel River to a level that is less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation measure BIO-5 serves to minimize the project contribution to potentially cumulative impacts on aquatic life in the South Fork Eel River by requiring implementation of the recommendations contained in the Water Supply and Demand Analysis and Potential Impacts on Surface Water and Aquatic Habitat (WSDAPISWAH) which address the project's contribution to cumulative impacts on aquatic life in the South Fork Eel River. These consist of 1) general recommendations for design and operation of the park, 2) adaptive management practices during times of water scarcity, and 3) controls on water availability through increased water storage capacity and restrictions on flow diversions from the South Fork Eel River during the dry season.

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the above described changes to the project would reduce the project's contribution to the cumulative impact to a level that is less than cumulatively considerable, and thus mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the EIR.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.4-1 through 4.4-38, Record of Proceedings.

Cultural Resources

The proposed Project would have a significant effect on the environment if it - in combination with other past, current, or reasonably feasibly foreseeable projects under review by the County - would contribute to a significant cumulative impact on cultural resources. A significant cumulative impact would occur, for example, if other closely related projects would affect buildings or historical roads associated with the Wood/Tooby Ranch Complex or other similar historical ranch complexes within southern Humboldt County.

Aside from the current Project, there are no current or reasonably foreseeable projects planned in the vicinity that would affect the Wood/Tooby Ranch Complex or associated features. A cabin and outhouse possibly associated with the Wood family were identified east of the community park during a survey for the Garberville Sanitary District Water Systems Project. This cabin and outhouse may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources due to their association with the Wood family. Based on information provided by the County, however, it is not anticipated that current or reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity, including the Garberville Sanitary District Water Improvement Project, would affect significant elements of the Wood/Tooby Ranch or other similar historical resources. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the current project, which would have less than-significant impacts on historical resources after mitigation, would not contribute to a cumulative effect on historical resources. No mitigation for cumulative impacts to historical resources is required.

The potential disturbance of subsurface cultural resources that may underlie the project site, including archaeological resources and human remains, could make a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact in the context of other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable local projects identified by the County. As described earlier, implementation of appropriate mitigation measures would reduce impacts on these resources through the use of protective signs, regular site patrols, fencing, focused archaeological surveys, and, in the case of human remains, compliance with Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the current Project would not contribute to a cumulative effect on archaeological resources or human remains, and no mitigation for cumulative impacts on such resources is required.

When development proposals are received by the County in the future, these will undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA and, when necessary, mitigation measures will be

adopted as appropriate. In most cases, this environmental review and compliance with project conditions of approval will ensure that significant impacts on archaeological resources and human remains will be avoided or otherwise mitigated to less than-significant levels with the recovery and analysis of important information through controlled excavation and reburial of human remains.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.5-1 through 4.5-19, Record of Proceedings.

Geology and Soils

Impacts related to geologic hazards are generally site-specific, rather than cumulative in nature, because each project area has unique geologic considerations that would be subject to uniform site development and construction standards. Therefore, the potential for cumulative impacts is limited. Impacts associated with potential geologic hazards related to soil or other conditions occur at individual building sites. These effects are site-specific, and impacts would not be compounded by additional development. Mitigation measures described earlier would reduce impacts from geologic hazards to less than-significant levels. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that implementation of the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to geologic hazards, and the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.6-1 through 4.6-11, Record of Proceedings.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the project would comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program (including plans or regulations for the reduction of GHGs) that provides specific requirements that would avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem within the geographic area in which the project is located. There are no established thresholds or guidelines for assessing a project's impact with regards to GHG emissions in Humboldt County. However, Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would require that the project implement all feasible and reasonable measures to reduce project GHGs. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that no additional cumulative impacts have been identified and no mitigation measures would be required.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.7-1 through 4.7-8, Record of Proceedings.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazards and hazardous materials impacts are generally site-specific and/or have limited mobility, and would not be expected to have cumulatively considerable effects beyond the Project site. Development of properties near the Project site could increase the potential exposure of persons to hazardous materials, including hazardous buildings materials; however, the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials are regulated by federal, state, and local laws and regulations. The handling of hazardous materials at the project site would be subject to these laws and regulations, and as a result the cumulative hazardous materials risks would not be significant. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any significant cumulative hazards or hazardous materials impacts.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.8-1 through 4.8-10, Record of Proceedings.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Stormwater and irrigation runoff discharged from past and existing projects has contained pollutants that have contributed to impairment of the water quality of receiving waters in the project vicinity. Sediment is the pollutant of particular concern for the South Fork Eel River and has been identified as causing impacts on designated beneficial uses. Therefore, a cumulative water quality impact related to sediment in the river is occurring. However, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that implementation of Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1a and HYDRO-1b would prevent the project from contributing considerably to this cumulative impact.

As nearly all of the development projects considered in the cumulative analysis (Table 6-1 of the EIR) are located within a municipal sewer district, they would not require septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the less than-significant impacts from new wastewater disposal systems (after mitigation) at the Project site would not contribute considerably to a cumulative water quality impact.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.9-1 through 4.9-10, Record of Proceedings.

Land Use and Planning

The cumulative analysis for land use impacts considers the immediate vicinity of the Project site. As shown in Table 6-1 in Chapter 6 of the EIR, the main project in the immediate vicinity of the project site is the Garberville Sanitary District (GSD) water treatment plant currently under construction immediately east of the site. The project would generally allow a continuation of existing land uses of the project site and would not create any incompatibilities with the GSD water treatment plant. The General Plan land use designations and zoning proposed by the project also would not contribute to any significant

cumulative changes in land use or any significant policy conflicts. Creating the new Public Facility (PF) zoning classification and inserting the new Public Recreation (PR) land use designation into the Humboldt County General Plan (Framework Plan and 1984 Garberville, Redway, Benbow, Alderpoint Community Plan) would not have a significant cumulative impact because subsequent environmental review would require assessment of cumulative impacts before this zoning or land use designation can be applied to any other site. Thus, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not contribute significantly to cumulative land use impacts, and no mitigation measures would be necessary. Cumulative impacts on agricultural land are discussed in Section 4.2, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, of the EIR.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.10-1 through 4.10-11, Record of Proceedings.

Mineral Resources

The project would not impair or interfere with the extraction of mineral resources at or near the project site. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts related to mineral resources.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.11-1 through 4.11-3, Record of Proceedings.

Noise

Noise levels in the Project area would increase as a result of cumulative growth planned in and around the Project site. This cumulative growth in the project vicinity would generally be located away from the Project site, with any noise produced by such growth localized to these distant sites. The only future growth in the Project vicinity with potential influences on cumulative noise levels in the site vicinity appear to involve continued gravel extraction and mining operations along the on gravel bars upstream of the Project site and the new Garberville Sanitary District (GSD) Drinking Water Improvement Project which would include a water intake, pipelines, and a water treatment plant at the northern and eastern sides of the project site away from identified noise-sensitive receptors. Noise resulting from the gravel the continuation of gravel mining is expected to be similar to that resulting from current operations at noise-sensitive receptors in the project vicinity, and the future operation of the GSD water treatment facilities is not expected to produce any significant noise at noise-sensitive receptors in the Project vicinity. Based on these considerations, and based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that significant cumulative noise impacts are not anticipated in the Project site vicinity.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.12-1 through 4.12-25, Record of Proceedings.

Population and Housing

For population and housing, the geographic scope for assessing cumulative impacts is the area within unincorporated Humboldt County. As discussed in the above project-specific analysis, the project would not result in a significant impact on population or housing conditions. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the effect of the Project on population and housing conditions, in combination with other past, present, and foreseeable projects, would be less than significant. The Project would not result in or contribute to any significant cumulative impacts on population or housing conditions.

EVIDENCE

DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.13-1 through 4.13-5, Record of Proceedings.

Public Services

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

For fire protection and emergency medical services, the geographic scope for assessing cumulative impacts is the area served by the GFPD.

The proposed Project, in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a cumulative increase in demand for fire protection services. As discussed in the above project-specific analysis, however, service demand from the proposed project would not create the need for new or expanded fire stations or other facilities. The projects would be subject to standard requirements for features such as emergency access, signage, lighting, and security. Other projects in Humboldt County would also be subject to these requirements. The GFPD has not identified any need for new or expanded facilities resulting from the project combined with other anticipated projects. The GFPD has identified a long-term need for a new fire station near the Garberville Airport, but this station would only be constructed after the area is annexed to the GFPD and the GFPD has secured funding for new facilities and equipment.

Overall, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the effect of the proposed Project on fire protection services, in combination with other past, present, and foreseeable projects, would be less than significant. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the proposed Project would not result in or contribute to any significant cumulative fire protection service impacts.

Police Services

For police services, the geographic scope for assessing cumulative impacts is the service area of the Humboldt County Sheriff's Office, and specifically the Garberville substation. The proposed Project, in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a cumulative increase in demand for police services. As discussed in the above project-specific analysis, however, service demand from the proposed project would not create the need for new or expanded sheriff's facilities. The Project would be subject to standard requirements for features such as emergency access, signage, lighting,

and security. Other projects in the Sheriff's Office service area would also be subject to these requirements. The Sheriff's Office has not identified any need for new or expanded facilities resulting from the Project combined with other anticipated projects.
Overall, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the effect of the proposed project on police services, in combination with other past, present, and foreseeable projects, would be less than significant. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the proposed Project would not result in or contribute to any significant cumulative police service impacts.

Schools
For schools, the geographic scope for assessing cumulative impacts is the area within the boundaries of the Southern Humboldt Unified School District. As discussed in the above project-specific analysis, demand from the proposed Project would not result in a significant impact on existing schools or create the need for new or expanded facilities. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the effect of the proposed Project on schools, in combination with other past, present, and foreseeable projects, would be less than significant. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the proposed Project would not result in or contribute to any significant impacts on schools.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.14-1 through 4.14-8, Record of Proceedings.

Recreation
For recreational facilities, the geographic scope for assessing cumulative impacts is the area within unincorporated Humboldt County, since this area contains the recreational facilities that are most likely to be used regularly by people who would also use the facilities proposed by the Project.

As discussed in the above project-specific analysis, the Project would not result in a significant impact on existing recreational facilities, and the environmental impacts of the Project would be mitigated by measures recommended in the EIR. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the effect of the Project on recreational facilities, in combination with other past, present, and foreseeable projects, would be less than significant. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the Project would not result in or contribute to any significant cumulative impacts on recreational facilities.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.15-1 through 4.15-6, Record of Proceedings.

Transportation and Traffic

As discussed in the above project-specific analysis, future and future plus project traffic volumes were estimated using growth factors for Caltrans District 1. Under the anticipated future and future plus project traffic volumes, both of the study intersections are expected to continue operating acceptably, with only minor changes in average delay.

Assuming the same growth for traffic along Sprowel Creek Road, future and future plus project traffic volumes would be expected to increase to about 1,500 vehicles per day near Riverview Lane and 1,200 vehicles near Tooby Memorial Park. These volumes would remain well below the 5,000-vehicle threshold estimated given the road's classification.

As discussed in the above project-specific analysis, the Project would not result in a significant impact on existing transportation facilities, and the environmental impacts of the Project would be mitigated by measures recommended in the EIR. Therefore, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the effect of the Project on transportation facilities, in combination with other past, present, and foreseeable projects, would be less than significant. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the Project would not result in or contribute to any significant cumulative impacts on transportation facilities.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.16-1 through 4.16-27, Record of Proceedings.

Utilities and Services

Water

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a) states that "an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, as defined in Section 15065(a)(3). Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not 'cumulatively considerable,' a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable."

The proposed Project, in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, as listed in Table 6-1 of the EIR, would not result in a cumulatively considerable effect on water supply and demand or the need for new or expanded water entitlements and water facilities because the proposed project would have an adequate water supply to meet its needs, and future individual projects would be analyzed with regard to water supply and demand against existing entitlements, and a determination would be made about whether there is a sufficient water supply.

Most of the cumulative projects listed in Table 6-1 are small residential, retail, hospitality, and related uses that would use minimal amounts of water. The Garberville Sanitary District (GSD) water intake refurbishment project is the refurbishment of the existing water intake from the South Fork Eel River. The GSD project is a drinking water system improvement

project, not a water capacity-increasing project. None of the cumulative projects listed in Table 6-1 would use a substantial amount of water that would be considered cumulatively considerable.

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the effect of the proposed Project on water service, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not be cumulatively considerable.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.17-1 through 4.17-13, Record of Proceedings.

Solid Waste Disposal

For solid waste disposal service, the geographic scope for assessing cumulative impacts consists of the service areas of the Anderson Landfill in Shasta County and the Dry Creek Landfill in Medford, Oregon. These landfills have adequate capacity.

Construction of buildings and structures included in the proposed Project, in conjunction with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a cumulative increase in construction-related solid waste and debris. Operation of the Project also would contribute to cumulative increases in solid waste and debris. Comprehensive implementation of state and local waste reduction and diversion requirements and programs has and would continue to reduce the potential for exceeding existing capacities of the landfills, which still have adequate capacity.

Mitigation Measure UTIL-2 would ensure that solid waste from the Project is responsibly managed.

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the effect of the proposed project on solid waste disposal service, in combination with other past, present, and foreseeable projects, would be less than significant. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the proposed Project would not result in or contribute to any significant cumulative solid waste disposal service impacts.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.17-1 through 4.17-13, Record of Proceedings.

Energy

For electrical and natural gas service, the geographic scope for assessing cumulative impacts is PG&E's northern and central California service area.

Despite annual statewide increases in energy consumption, the net increased energy demand from the project, combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact, for the following reasons:

- As discussed in the project-specific analysis above, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts on energy services. Many energy uses associated with the project would be temporary, and in many cases solar and battery-powered lighting would be used whenever possible.
- The proposed project and other projects have been and would be required to comply with all applicable standards of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.
- PG&E, which provides energy to the project site and vicinity, produces much of its energy from renewable sources and has plans in place to increase reliance on renewable energy sources. Because many agencies in California have adopted policies seeking increased use of renewable resources (and have established minimum standards for the provision of energy generated by renewable resources), it is expected that PG&E will continue to meet future demand for energy via a gradually increasing reliance on renewable resources, including small-scale sources such as photovoltaic panels and wind turbines, in addition to larger-scale facilities, such as wind farms. Therefore, although the proposed project and other anticipated projects would be expected to increase the demand for energy-producing facilities, this increase in demand would likely be met through the development of renewable resources that would have fewer environmental effects than the development of new conventional gas- or coal-fired power plants.

Thus, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the Project would not result in or contribute to any significant cumulative energy service impacts.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 4.17-1 through 4.17-13, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 29: SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES TO BE INVOLVED IN PROPOSED ACTION (IF IMPLEMENTED)

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) states that impacts associated with a proposed project may be considered to be significant and irreversible for the following reasons:

- Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible, since a large commitment of such resources makes the removal or non-use thereafter unlikely;
- Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as a highway improvement that provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses; and
- Irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project.

This project would include the development of new on-site facilities such as playing fields, parking areas, restrooms, camping facilities, trails, pedestrian bridges, and playground equipment. Some structures would be permanent and their installation would constitute an irreversible use of these lands, as it is unlikely that the buildings would be removed for many years. The proposed project would irretrievably commit materials to the construction and maintenance of new buildings/ structures. In addition, the construction and operation of the project would result in the use of energy, including fossil fuels. The applicant is committed to reducing energy use and has proposed some energy saving features such as the use of solar lighting whenever possible. Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project is not expected to result in any activities likely to cause accidents that could lead to irreversible environmental damage.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 6-1 through 6-2, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 30: GROWTH INDUCEMENT

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that EIRs discuss the potential for projects to induce population or economic growth, either directly or indirectly. CEQA also requires a discussion of ways in which a project may remove obstacles to growth, as well as ways in which a project may set a precedent for future growth.

Population and Economic Growth

The proposed Project does not involve a residential component; therefore, it would not directly result in population growth. The proposed project would directly generate temporary employment opportunities on-site. Operation of the proposed Community Park would incrementally increase long-term employment associated with park maintenance. Maintenance of the proposed Project would require the need to hire one or two new employees to operate and maintain the Southern Humboldt Community Park (SHCP). The Community Park is designed to accommodate the recreational needs of existing southern Humboldt residents. If new employees are required, it is not likely that these positions would induce people to relocate to the area to fill the new job opportunities.

Activities that would be principally permitted under new zoning involve the use of the site for community assembly and events numerous times each year such as sport fields, sporting events, weddings, classes, and birthday parties. These activities would trigger the potential for additional seasonal employment. During large festivals, up to 1,000 staff could be on the site for the short duration of the festival but this would not result in the indirect growth inducing impact of requiring nearby housing as employees would be from both the local area and more distant locations.

The Project would have beneficial economic impacts on local businesses by temporarily increasing the demand for goods and services in southern Humboldt County during the community assembly events and any sports tournaments that may be held at the project site. The Project also has a similar beneficial impact on non-profit organizations and private sector businesses that sell concessions at the ball fields and events. However, such economic benefits would not result in any significant growth inducement.

For activities that would require a Conditional Use Permit on the property, such as seasonal events, these activities may provide new part time seasonal employment. The seasonal nature of this employment makes it unlikely that such employment would, however, induce new residents to move to the area. The Summer Arts and Music Festival has been held in the southern Humboldt area for 36 years and it would be hard to argue that it has induced growth in southern Humboldt County. Any growth inducing impacts of the community assembly events are temporary, and limited in nature.

Removal of Obstacles To Growth
The proposed Project would facilitate development of a park on land currently designated for mixed agricultural and clustered rural residential uses. The proposed land use and zoning would reduce the number of potential residences that could be developed on the site. However, the proposed project would potentially allow transfer of those development "credits" to another part of the County; thus, there would be no change in the overall development potential for the County.

The proposed Project does not include expansion of water services beyond those currently allocated to the property. No new roads or other major infrastructure would be developed as part of the Project. The Q - Qualified Zone preserves housing development potential which could be applied to a receiver site, allowing the property owner to sell the credits if and when a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program is adopted by the County. The Q-Zone includes language stating that, "If the project site is found to be eligible to participate as a donor site under a future TDR program, the County shall determine the appropriate level of environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act", which could include a Supplemental EIR. Thus, based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the Project would not result in removing obstacles to growth.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 6-1 through 6-2, Record of Proceedings.

SECTION 31: AGENCIES CONSULTED
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the following agencies were consulted with the Notice of Preparation:

Federal Agencies
Fish and Wildlife Service

California Agencies
Air Resources Board
California Highway Patrol
CalFire
CalTrans District 1
Cal Trans Division of Aeronautics
Department of Conservation
Department of Toxic Substances Control

Department of Parks and Recreation
Fish and Game, Eureka Office
Native American Heritage Commission
Water Resources

Regional Agencies
Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Rosa Office

Local Agencies
Garberville Sanitary District
Garberville Volunteer Fire Department
Humboldt County Division of Environmental Health
Humboldt County Building Department
Humboldt County Sheriff

Native American Tribes
Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria
Wiyot Tribe
Round Valley Reservation/Covelo Indian Community

SECTION 32: FINDINGS RESPONSIVE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS THAT WERE PROVIDED TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION DURING THEIR JANUARY 5, 2017 MEETING

The following findings are made in response to the public comments from Lynne Saxton that were provided to the Planning Commission during their January 5, 2017 meeting:

Comment #1: The EIR failed to analyze a Project Alternative that excluded medium and large events, even though this is a feasible alternative that would substantially lessen the Project's environmental impacts.

Findings in Response to Comment #1:

FINDING:
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the EIR analyzed a reasonable range of alternatives as require by CEQA (14 Cal Code Regs §15126.6(a)).

EXPLANATION AND RATIONALE:
As discussed above in Section 6 - Draft and FEIR; comparison of alternatives analyzed in the FEIR, CEQA requires that a "reasonable range of alternatives" to a proposed project which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. The agency is not required to discuss every alternative to the project. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to "foster informed decision making and public participation".

In addition to the preferred alternative, three (3) alternatives are considered for the Project: 1) the "No Project" alternative, 2) the "Reduced Public Facilities" alternative, and 3) the "Benbow Lake State Recreation Area" alternative. Under the "No Project" alternative, the proposed Project would not be adopted and future development in the site would occur under the programs and policies in the existing general plan and zoning designations. With the "Reduced Public Facility Acreage" alternative, more land would remain zoned agricultural, and would retain more of its agricultural use. Under the "Benbow Lake State Recreation Area" alternative, some or all of the proposed project would be relocated to a site other than the Southern Humboldt Community Park. Benbow Lake State Recreation Area (APN 033-301-017 and 033-301-018) is approximately 2 miles south of the proposed project site.

Evaluation of the alternative suggested in Comment #1, which excludes medium and large events from the site, is very close to what the EIR labels the "Benbow Lake State Recreation Area" alternative. Beginning on page 5-11, the EIR analyzes the impacts of the Project without any medium-or large-sized events held at the project site in Garberville. Instead, all the medium or large events would be moved two miles away to a site in Benbow that has almost no characteristics in common with the Garberville site. The Benbow site is far enough away that medium or large events held there would be accessed by different roads than events held at the project site.

In addition, the events held at Benbow would not be visible from the properties adjacent to the project site in Garberville, the events held at Benbow would not be heard by the properties adjacent to the project site in Garberville, the events held at Benbow would be served by different water and sewer systems, and the events held at Benbow would have none of the same impacts on biological resources. In all these ways, the Benbow Lake State Recreation Area alternative would be the same as the alternative presented in Comment #1.

Perhaps even more important, the only significant impact of the Project involves the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses through the construction of ballfields, and the use of an agricultural field for parking during some medium- and large-sized events (four acres in Area 3). And because the Benbow Lake State Recreation Area alternative would not require the use of that agricultural field for parking, it substantially lessens the significant effect of the project. That would be the same conclusion with the alternative presented in Comment #1; since no medium- or large-sized events are held at the project site, no parking in the agricultural field would be necessary. Given the Benbow Lake State Recreation Area alternative would have the same impacts as those described in the alternative presented in Comment #1, including lessening the significant environmental impact of the Project on the conversion of agricultural lands, the alternative presented in Comment #1 would add no particular value to the range of alternatives described in the EIR, and is not needed to "foster informed decision making and public participation", which is the requirement of CEQA.

EVIDENCE: DEIR pages 3-2 through 3-37, 5 -1 through 5-17, Record of Proceedings.

Comment #2: The record lacks evidence to support a General Plan amendment, which requires a showing that the Project reflects a change in the community's values. The community letters in the Final EIR strongly and overwhelmingly oppose such events.

Findings in Response to Comment #2:

FINDING:
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that Comment #2 is factually incorrect.

EXPLANATION AND RATIONALE:
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the applicant has conducted considerable public outreach to help guide the use of the property in a multi-year park planning process since taking ownership in 2000, including three initial visioning events with attendance of 30-60 people in 2002; a series of targeted public planning sessions beginning in 2008 with 40 to 200 attendees; and a survey of 425 individuals in 2012. The community input formed the basis for the park planning efforts and shaped the proposed project, including the allowance for medium - and large-sized events.

The Board finds that many oral and written public comments were provided to the Planning Commission at the January 5, 2017 hearing expressing community support for medium- and large-sized events at the site. For example, the Planning Commission received twelve pages of signed petitions stating at the top of the page, "I support having events like Hospice Home Brew, the Hoedown & the Summer Arts and Music Festival at Southern Humboldt Community Park", and at the bottom of the page, "SHCP is currently applying for County permission to hold a maximum of 5 mid-size events, like the Homebrew or bicycle races, and 1 festival per calendar year". More than 150 persons signed these petitions, many of them listing addresses in the vicinity of the project site and in surrounding towns like Redway and Whitethorn. The Summer Arts and Music Festival referenced in the petition is an annual event that presently occurs on the Benbow Lake Recreation Area that has attendance levels and features such as amplified music and on-site parking that make it comparable to the large-size events proposed by the Project. These petitions are evidence that supports a finding the proposed Plan Amendment and Zone Reclassification reflect changes in community values and are in the public interest. Additionally, many people provided verbal support in favor of the project, including medium- and large-sized events at the Board of Supervisors Meeting on March 28, 2017.

EVIDENCE: Record of Proceedings.

Comment #3: The State Water Board, Division of Drinking Water stated in their September 20, 2016 letter that a permit to operate a public water system must be applied for and obtained from the State Water Board, Division of Drinking Water before water can be served to the public. Compliance with drinking water standards are not required, if at all, until SHCP holds a medium size event.

Findings in Response to Comment #3:

FINDING:

Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that Comment #3 is factually incorrect.

EXPLANATION AND RATIONALE:
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the project is conditioned to require the applicant comply with the requirements of the State Water Board, Division of Drinking Water's September 20, 2016 letter at the time the project is approved. In addition, the applicants are required to submit a modified Plan of Operation describing how they are complying with the state drinking water requirements prior to the first medium-size event. These requirements are clearly stated in Condition #2 of the Planning Commission staff report, which are also conditions of approval for the Board of Supervisors actions on the Project. Condition #2 reads as follows:

> "2. The project shall comply with the requirements of the State Office of Drinking Water as described in their letter to the Planning Commission dated September 30, 2016. The project applicant shall work closely with the State Office of Drinking Water to ensure compliance with public water system requirements before installing new public drinking water services from on-site water supplies. The applicant shall revise the Plan of Operation to incorporate new information about water supply and distribution that meets the requirements of the Office of Drinking Water as soon as possible, and prior to the first Medium Size event."

EVIDENCE: Record of Proceedings.

Comment #4: The EIR, Staff Report and Plan of Operation all state that the source of water for the restrooms will be the Infiltration gallery (Source #1, South Fork Eel River). However, water used for handwashing must be potable and the South Fork Eel River is not a potable water source. Thus, the EIR, Conditions of Approval, Plan of Operations and Staff Report must be modified accordingly..

Findings in Response to Comment #4:

FINDING:
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that conditions of approval for the project require the project conform to the requirements of the State Water Board, Division of Drinking Water's September 20, 2016 letter upon approval will ensure the source of water for the restrooms meets state standards for potability.

EVIDENCE: Record of Proceedings.

Comment #5: The water demand for daily usage alone will cause undue strain on the South Fork Eel River. The increased burden to supply water for medium (800 to 2,500 people) and large events (up to 5,000 per day) is unreasonable and unsustainable, particularly since these events occur during summer months when flows are already low. Supplying water during drought conditions would be highly consequential to the health of the river. Medium and large events should be excluded from the Project, as a feasible alternative to reduce harmful environmental impacts.

Findings in Response to Comment #5:

FINDING:
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that the EIR includes considerable information about the water demand for the project and water supply available to the project, including recommendations contained in the document titled "Water Supply and Demand Analysis and Potential Impacts on Surface Water and Aquatic Habitat (WSDAPISWAH)" in Appendix H - Biological Background Studies. Further, the Board finds that the recommendations in the WSDAPISWAH are identified as mitigation measures, and will be subject to mitigation monitoring requirements consistent with state law. Based on the substantial evidence presented in the EIR and in the administrative record, the Board finds that the Project's impacts on biological resources, including the aquatic habitat of the South Fork Eel River, will be mitigated to less than significant levels.

Further, the Board finds that no substantial evidence is presented in Comment #5 supporting the claim that water provided to those attending medium- or large-sized events will be "unreasonable and unsustainable". On the contrary, the substantial evidence presented in the EIR supports the finding the Project's impacts on biological resources will be less than significant.

EVIDENCE: Record of Proceedings.

Comment #6: The Department of Fish and Wildlife recommend that a condition for Project approval include the planting of overstory vegetation on the western-most stream in order to mitigate encroachment and disturbance to riparian and stream buffer areas as a result of Project activities. (Final EIR, p. 9, 12.) It does not appear that this specific condition was included as part of the Mitigation Measures for the final Project. Mitigation Measures should be modified (or clarified) to address this issue.

Findings in Response to Comment #6:

FINDING:
Based on the analysis and information contained in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and the administrative record, the Board finds that on page 151 of the Final EIR, Mitigation Measure Bio-2a was modified to provide over-story plantings along the western-most stream to the satisfaction of CDFW.

EVIDENCE: Final EIR page 151.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Certified copy of portion of proceedings; Meeting of April 25, 2017

ATTACHMENT A – PART 3

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

in Support of the
Final Environmental Impact Report
for the
Southern Humboldt Community Park

(SCH #2010092037)

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As set forth in the preceding sections, the County's approval of the Project will result in significant adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided even with the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures. Despite the occurrence of these effects, however, the County chooses to approve the Project because in its view, the economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits that the Project will produce will render the significant effects acceptable. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21021; CEQA Guidelines, § 15093.) Specifically, the County determines that the benefits of the Project outweigh the above-referenced significant environmental effects of the Project, and are therefore acceptable.

The following statement identifies the reasons why, in the County's judgment, the benefits of the Project will outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. Any one of these reasons is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the County would stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this section and in the documents found in the Board of Supervisors staff reports for the March 28 and April 25, 2017 meetings.

The unavoidable significant impacts of the Project are as follows:
As described in the preceding findings and in the FEIR, the project would convert farmland (approximately 16 acres in Area 5) to non-agricultural use, reducing the overall inventory of agricultural land in Humboldt County and conflicting with Humboldt County General Plan policies for protecting agricultural land. The farmland conversion associated with the Project conflicts with the Humboldt County General Plan policies for protecting agricultural land and results in significant and unavoidable impacts to Agricultural and Forest Resources and Land Use and Planning. Even though the conversion conflicts with General Plan policies, the soil type converted is of low productivity and the Project activities include ongoing agricultural uses (some of which may result in an intensification of agriculture on the land).

Mitigation measures are also incorporated into the project: The 4-acre temporary parking zone in Area 3 may not be used for parking until after the annual hay crop is harvested. The project applicant is required to remove all trash and debris from fields used for parking and return the field to productive use for the next season. Applicant is also required to record a deed restriction on the Area 3 part of the property that conveys to the county the development rights for any development other than existing uses. However, no additional mitigation is available for the loss of farmland. The Project would still result in a net loss of farmland and the impacts are significant and unavoidable.

Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative) would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts, but is infeasible because it does not meet project objectives of providing for the recreational, social, and community needs of Southern Humboldt. Additionally, under this alternative, up to 54 new residences could be built.

Alternative 2 would reduce the overall amount of land to be rezoned from AE to PF from 86.6 acres to 69.5 acres, but would not result in a reduction of the amount of farmland converted to non-agricultural use described above. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have the same significant and unavoidable impacts as the Project. Alternative 2 would also not provide as much room to expand the public facilities at the site in the future.

Alternative 3 (Benbow Lake Alternative) is infeasible because most of the significant project features and objectives would be eliminated in this Alternative. No sports facilities construction activities could occur on the Benbow site, and this recreational goal is a main purpose of the Project. Additional project features that could not occur at the Benbow site include the playground, skate park, dog park, bike skills park, and 3.5 miles of multi-purpose trails. Additionally this alternative does not include a location for community based agriculture activities and no facilities on-site that would be appropriate community meeting spaces. Because this alternative does not meet the Project objectives, which are of significant benefit (as described below), this alternative is infeasible.

The following benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable significant effects of the Project:

The Board finds that the Project is designed to balance the protection of farmland with the substantial social benefit of providing opportunity for much-needed, healthy organized sports and other outdoor activities for area youth and families, with particular consideration to the strong public demand for such facilities and the current lack of other suitable locations as evidenced by public input and the facts in the record, recognizes strong mitigation factors contained in the DEIR BIO-5, and recognizes that the project will be managed as both a farm and a park.

Substantial evidence in the record demonstrates that the County would derive the following benefits from approval of the Project:

The Project will provide for the public recreational needs of southern Humboldt residents and visitors to the area. The Project provides expanded and new opportunities for community enrichment events, agricultural uses, and a variety of proposed recreational uses including organized sports, disc golf, specialty group camping, educational classes, workshops, camps, and ecological restoration uses. Assembly is also part of the everyday allowable uses ranging from birthday parties, weddings, and memorial services to non-profit fundraisers, concerns, sporting events, tournaments and a festival. These activities will benefit the Southern Humboldt community and draw visitors to the area which will result in economic gain for businesses in the area and for the County as a whole.

Considerable public testimony was provided during the public hearings that for children and adults alike living in the vicinity of the project, the quality of life is reduced because of the scarcity of areas where organized recreation can occur. Many area residents expressed that there are too few places in the area where groups of people can come together and socialize. Some view the lack of sites for group recreation as a public health issue, contributing to obesity and drug use problems.

The project promotes agricultural use and ecological restoration of the land. The Project increases productivity of the land in Area 3 that will be used for agricultural purposes by allowing multiple farmers, community groups, and individuals to use the land and existing facilities. The Project would allow farmers to share set up costs to make farming more profitable. Additionally the Project includes ongoing restoration activities aimed at watershed and forest improvements as part of ongoing maintenance and stewardship of the land. Additionally, hay crop production and grazing in Area 3 will continue and likely increase. Specialty crops, row crops, and possibly orchards will be grown. SHCP has plans to improve and restore the grasslands, provide habitat for wildlife, and to remove invasive species. Additional acreage will be brought under active agricultural production over time. The hay harvest will occur in early spring before additional recreational uses occur on the location.

The Project promotes and allows for recreational and educational opportunities in the Southern Humboldt Community. The park would be used for educational purposes including workshops, forums, classes, meetings, educational camps, and agritourism. Additional community uses, such as workshops and classes, would also take place in the park. New recreational uses include organized sports, an environmental camp for specialty groups, recreational sports, and educational camping. In addition, the existing park uses of hiking, bicycling, horseback riding, bird watching, skate ramp, disc golf, and dog walking allowed under the current agreement with Humboldt County would be expanded through additional trails, a bike park, a new skate park, and a dog park. The proposed sports and recreational facilities would host tournaments for multiple teams. Activities may also include bicycling and disc golf events. The proposed ballfields balance the protection of farmland with the substantial social benefit of providing opportunity for much-needed, healthy, organized sports and other outdoor activities for area youth and families; with particular consideration of strong public demand and the current lack of other suitable locations as described in the public testimony and in the EIR.

The project allows partnership with private organizations to fund the maintenance of existing and development of new recreational facilities accessible to the public. The project allows for the modified use of existing structures for additional community purposes. The existing ranch/farm house and garage would be modified to include community meeting rooms, offices, and kitchen facilities. The ranch house would also retain living quarters. Remodeling the existing ranch/farm house and garage would create the Park Headquarters offices and a community center facility. The remodeled spaces would be used as a community center, community kitchen, educational, and spaces for meetings, workshops and park offices. Proposed New Facilities: Proposed new facilities would include facilities for organized sports such as baseball, soccer, football, and other similar sports and recreational uses. Concessions and equipment facility, modification of existing water system, restrooms and portable toilets would be added.

The maintenance of existing buildings and development of new facilities will increase public use of the park, encourage community meetings and workshops, and provide a space where community recreation can be developed and carried out. The SHCP will partner with individuals and private organizations to maintain and develop these buildings by soliciting donations of labor and material, charging fees for the use of facilities, charging admission for medium- and

large-sized events, and possibly selling housing credits when the County develops a Transfer of Development Rights Program in the future.

The Project provides for the protection and preservation of historic and cultural resources on the site which would otherwise not be protected or preserved. Remodeling of the historic architecture on the site (including the Wood/Tooby Ranch Complex which has been designated a historical resources per the CEQA Guidelines) will be overseen by an architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for historic architecture. The Project includes Site Monitoring and Protection Protocols which are aimed at preserving the cultural resources and historic resources on site. Additionally, the project incorporates controls and protocols that will decrease the likelihood of public intrusion or destruction of archaeological resources. In these ways, the Project protects and preserves historic buildings and cultural resources which would not be protected and preserved in the absence of the Project.

The Project promotes and provides a location for community gatherings and events. The Project would allow for birthday parties and informal gatherings, weddings and memorials, and small fundraisers and events. These events would bring community members together, attract visitors from other areas, and encourage residents to spend time outside. Additionally, the Project allows for five medium-sized events and one large festival/large event annually. These events would bring money into the Southern Humboldt economy and encourage tourism. The events would also gather members of the community to encourage and cement social connections.

The Project is consistent with the aims of the Quimby Act: The Project helps the County to achieve the recreational goals of the State consistent with Section 66477 of the California Government Code (the Quimby Act) which recognizes that local governments in California provide a critical role in the effort to set aside parkland and open space for recreational purposes, and allows local governments to partner with local organizations and individuals to pay for park acquisitions and improvements.

The Project promotes recreation and physical activity in a rural area: The Project promotes recreation and physical activity which is especially important in rural communities such as Southern Humboldt where populations are statistically more likely to be physically inactive, overweight, and obese comparted to those living in urban locations. The Project is also targeted towards youth and teaching youth the importance of recreation at a young age could have demonstrable positive impact on the health of the population in years to come. (See e.g. Schwantes, Timothy M.S.W., M.P.H. "Using Active Living Principles to Promote Physical Activity in Rural Communities (Presentation)." Active Living Research, February 2010. http://activelivingresearch.org/using-active-living-principles-promote-physical-activity-rural-communities. Accessed March 21, 2107; "Rural Obesity and Weight Control." Rural Health Information Hub. 6/12/2015. https://www.ruralhealthinfo.org/topics/obesity-and-weight-control. Accessed March 21, 2017.)

Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected as infeasible alternatives to the proposed Project discussed above, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced the benefits of the proposed Project against the proposed Project's significant and

unavoidable impacts, the Board hereby finds that the benefits of the proposed Project described above outweigh the significant and unavoidable environmental effects of the proposed Project, which are therefore considered acceptable.