

Prepared for:



# Garberville Sanitary District

## Final Recirculated Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration



### Garberville Sanitary District Annexation Project: Change in Jurisdictional Boundary & Place of Use



Prepared by:



Consulting Engineers  
& Geologists, Inc.

September 2013  
011184

# Table of Contents

	Page
Project Information .....	1
Project Title .....	1
Lead Agency .....	1
Lead Agency Contact .....	1
Project Location .....	1
General Plan Designation .....	1
Zoning.....	1
Recirculation .....	1
Project Description.....	3
Water Services Outside the Existing GSD Boundary .....	4
Bear Canyon Road, Redwood Drive, and Bushnell Lane .....	4
Hillcrest Drive/Downtown Area .....	4
Leino Road/Sprowel Creek Road .....	5
Kimtu Meadows Subdivision.....	6
Connick Creek Subdivision .....	7
Meadows/ Alderpoint Area.....	8
SWRCB DWR Place of Use .....	9
Baseline Conditions .....	10
Population .....	10
Existing and Planned Uses .....	11
Current Water System .....	12
Current Wastewater Service .....	18
Cumulative Impacts Methodology .....	19
Potential Housing Projects within the Garberville Area .....	19
Projects by the Garberville Sanitary District .....	21
Projects by Other Agencies in the Garberville Area .....	22
Other Projects in the Garberville Area .....	23
Development Potential in Proposed Boundary and POU.....	27
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is or May Be Required.....	33
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected .....	33
Determination:.....	33
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts .....	34
Environmental Checklist.....	35
I. Aesthetics. Would the project: .....	35
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources. ....	37
III. Air Quality. ....	40
IV. Biological Resources .....	42
V. Cultural Resources.....	45
VI. Geology and Soils. ....	46
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. ....	48
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	51
IX. Hydrology and Water Quality .....	55
X. Land Use and Planning .....	58

# Table of Contents, Continued

	Page
XI. Mineral Resources.....	60
XII. Noise.....	61
XIII. Population and Housing .....	63
XIV. Public Services .....	67
XV. Recreation.....	68
XVI. Transportation/Traffic .....	69
XVII. Utilities and Service Systems .....	71
XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	77
List of Preparers .....	79
Source/Reference List .....	79
Proposed Mitigation Measures, Monitoring, and Reporting Program .....	83

## Attachments

1. Figures
2. Proposed for Annexation into Jurisdictional Boundary (LAFCo)
3. Proposed Additions to Place of Use (SWRCB-DWR)
4. Southern Humboldt Community Park Figures

Tables	On Page
1. Summary of Changes .....	3
2. Existing General Plan Land Use Designations in District Boundary .....	12
3. Water Billed to Customers.....	14
4. APNs Not Currently Consuming GSD Water in Existing Jurisdictional Boundary and License POU .....	16
5. APNs Not Currently Consuming GSD Water in Existing Jurisdictional Boundary and Permit POU.....	16
6. APNs Not Currently Consuming GSD Water Outside Existing Jurisdictional Boundary and Inside Permit POU.....	17
7. Summary of Water Consumption.....	17
8. Summary of the Development Potential for APNs to be Added to the Jurisdictional Boundary .....	29
9. Development Potential by Assessor's Parcel Number .....	30
10. Summary of Water Consumption for Expanded Jurisdictional Boundary .....	74
<b>Graph 1. Summary by Year of Water Diversion Reported .....</b>	<b>On Page 15</b>

# **Project Information**

---

## **Project Title**

Garberville Sanitary District Annexation Project: Change in Jurisdictional Boundary and Place of Use

## **Lead Agency**

Garberville Sanitary District  
919 Redwood Drive  
P.O. Box 211  
Garberville, CA 95542  
(707) 923-9566

## **Lead Agency Contact**

Jennie Short, Capital Projects Manager  
707-223-4567

## **Project Location**

The Garberville Sanitary District (GSD or the District) is located within the community of Garberville, in the southern portion of Humboldt County (Figure 1 in Attachment 1). Garberville is located approximately 65 miles south of Eureka, California, and approximately 200 miles north of San Francisco. See Figure 2 in Attachment 1 for the existing GSD boundary, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) defined Place of Use (POU), and sphere of influence (SOI).

## **General Plan Designation**

See Attachment 2

## **Zoning**

See Attachment 2

## **Recirculation**

---

A previous initial study (IS)/mitigated negative declaration (MND) for this project was circulated by GSD on March 9, 2012, for 30 days (State Clearinghouse No. [SCH] 2012032025). That document was not adopted by GSD. During the comment period, the County of Humboldt released the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan Update, which includes some changes to land use designations, and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) identified prime agricultural soils within the Garberville area. Since then, a municipal service review (MSR) and updated SOI has been adopted by the Humboldt Local Agency Formation Commission (Humboldt LAFCo) in March 2013. A revised IS/MND was prepared for recirculation to address the impending Humboldt County General Plan update (no schedule of completion is currently available as of the date of this preparation), changes to the environmental setting, clarification of the project description, and information from the March 2013 MSR and SOI.

The Recirculated Draft IS/MND comment period at the State Clearinghouse was from May 29, 2013 through June 27, 2013 (State Clearinghouse Number 2012032025). A Notice of Intent to adopt a mitigated negative declaration was circulated in a local newspaper and County clerk on June 4,

2013 through July 8, 2013. The difference in public review dates is attributed to the State Clearinghouse timing for posting documents once received. The public review period and State Clearinghouse is not required to be identical pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Written comments during the public review were received from the following:

- State Water Resources Control Board (June 7, 2013)
- Kristin Vogel (July 8, 2013)
- Donald Courtemanche (via electronic mail on July 8, 2013)
- Sandy Feretto (via electronic mail on July 7, 2013)
- Humboldt County Department of Health and Human Services–Division of Environmental Health (via electronic mail on July 3, 2013)
- Humboldt LAFCo (July 8, 2013)
- Saxton & Associates (on behalf of Ed Voice and the Voice Family; July 8, 2013)

Additional written comments received after the public comment period ended were received from the following:

- Sandy Feretto (at the August 19, 2013 GSD Board meeting, dated August 19, 2013)
- Kristen Vogel (July 24, 2013)
- Southern Humboldt Community Park (September 19, 2013)

This final IS/MND has been prepared to clarify the impact analysis as it relates to cumulative impacts and clarification of the project description. Changes to the project description include the following:

- After GSD Board of Directors discussions, the GSD Board directed staff to remove Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 222-091-014, known as the Southern Humboldt Community Park (SHCP);
- The SWRCB provided a copy of the POU map for the water rights license, which is different than the POU for the permit. It was assumed that the POU for the license and permit were the same. The figures have been updated to reflect each POU and data supplied for the consumption within the license POU.
- Humboldt County Planning and Building discovered several documents pertaining to the Meadows Subdivision after the public comment period ended. These documents include Certification of Completion (Humboldt, 1978), Garberville Sanitary District Resolution No. 77-1 (Exhibit A of the Certification of Completion), legal description (Exhibit B of the Certification of Completion), and a letter from Humboldt LAFCo to the State Board of Equalization (Humboldt LAFCo, 1978). Upon review of these documents, it was evident the "Forest Service Fire Station and the Humboldt County "Old Dump Site" were excluded from the GSD boundaries. It was assumed that the "Forest Service Fire Station," currently owned by the California Department of Forestry (Cal Fire) was part of the GSD boundary because this APN was included in the Geographic Information System data from Humboldt County Planning and Building Department and Humboldt LAFCo. Because this APN is currently served water and sewer by GSD they have been included in the proposed project.



## Project Description

The GSD has a jurisdictional boundary and SOI that has been approved by the Humboldt LAFCo. The GSD also has a POU for the surface water diversion permit and a POU for the water rights license that has been approved by the State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Rights (SWRCB DWR). The GSD proposes to modify its existing jurisdictional boundary and POUs to include areas currently served by the water system purchased from the Garberville Water Company (GWC) in 2004 or contracted from the GSD for future water service.

The area that receives water service is larger than:

- The existing GSD Jurisdictional Boundary
- The existing POUs for the permit and license
- The Public Utility Commission service area approved in 1978 for the GWC.

See Table 1 for a summary of the proposed changes and Figure 3 in Attachment 1 for the GWC service area, areas served by water, and locations of areas contracted for future water service. Water service is provided outside the District's boundaries, because the GSD is contractually obligated to continue to provide these services based upon the historical service by the GWC.

<b>Table 1 Summary of Changes</b>		
<b>Description</b>	<b>Jurisdictional Boundary (acres)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Permit Place of Use (acres)<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Existing area</b>	581	723
<b>Area to be added</b>	368	344
<b>Highway 101 added</b>	65	-
<b>Area to be removed</b>	-	53
<b>Proposed total area</b>	1,014	1,014
<b>Percentage increase</b>	63%	40%
1. Calculated in geographic information systems		

There are two Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) with sewer service outside the existing District boundary. These APNs are within areas of historical water service. Originally, both services were located on the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) parcel. A lot line adjustment was approved by the County, which separated an existing residence from the WWTP facility. In summary, one wastewater connection is for the office at the WWTP, and the other is a single-family residence (SFR). These services are shown on Figure 3 in Attachment 1.

An application will be submitted to the Humboldt LAFCo to annex APNs into the GSD's jurisdictional boundary to reflect existing water and wastewater service areas. Within the District boundary, the majority will be served by both water and sewer. There is a subset of the area within the boundary that is proposed for limited services. This proposed limitation is for a water-only service area overlay. See Figure 4 in Attachment 1 for the proposed boundary and service area. See Attachment 2 for a list of APNs included in the annexation. Boundary changes are subject to approval by the Humboldt LAFCo. Therefore, Humboldt LAFCo is a responsible agency as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and will rely on this recirculated IS/MND in support of a decision.

In November 2012, the District submitted a SWRCB DWR “Petition to Change the Place of Use for the Permit and License” to change the POU to reflect areas currently served with water outside of the existing POU. See Figure 5 in Attachment 1 for proposed SWRCB DWR POU. As a responsible agency defined by CEQA, the SWRCB DWR will be relying on this CEQA analysis for its use in approval of the District’s “Petition to Change the Place of Use for the Permit and License.”

A Cease and Desist Order (CDO) from the SWRCB, dated December 27, 2012, was received by GSD on January 2, 2013, regarding: bulk water sales outside of the existing POU, petition for change of the POU to match existing conditions, and submittal of annual water use reports. GSD discontinued all bulk water sales and developed a process for approval of emergency domestic uses. Since the CDO was received, GSD has approved two bulk water customers, but so far no water has been delivered to those customers due to the lack of availability of a certified delivery company. As also required by the CDO, GSD is pursuing a change to the POU, which is the subject of this final IS/MND.

## **Water Services Outside the Existing GSD Boundary**

In 2004, when the District acquired the GWC, there were water services outside the existing GSD boundary, as well as some services that were outside of the 1978 GWC Public Utility Commission-approved “Service Area” and the POU for the license and permit (see Figure 3 in Attachment 1 for locations). The District has continued service to all existing and historical customers, even if they are outside the GSD boundary or POU. These areas are described below and detailed information is included on Figures 6 through 6g (Attachment 1) and presented by APN (Attachments 2 and 3). A detailed description of the potential development is included as a separate section below and summarized in the following description of the annexation areas.

### **Bear Canyon Road, Redwood Drive, and Bushnell Lane**

Connections within this area are located along Bear Canyon Road, Redwood Drive, or Bushnell Lane (Figure 6a in Attachment 1; Attachment 2). This area includes the WWTP. Of the 17 APNs in this area, 4 are undevelopable, 2 could be developed as industrial, 4 are within a “Housing Opportunity Zone,” that are residential uses, 2 are public facilities, and the rest do not have additional development potential beyond the current uses. All but two of the developable APNs are active water customers. Several APNs are proposed to be served water only and some, with sewer and water.

Most of, or a portion of these APNs are within the existing POU and GSD is proposing that the remainder be added to the POU as shown on Figure 6a in Attachment 1. All these APNs are proposed for annexation into the GSD boundary.

### **Hillcrest Drive/Downtown Area**

Connections within this area are located along Hillcrest Drive (Figure 6b in Attachment 1; Attachment 2). Of the 12 APNs in this area, 1 is owned by GSD, 3 are undevelopable, 6 are within a “Housing Opportunity Zone” with a SFR, 1 has water service with a barn, and 1 is vacant and not a current water customer. Except for one APN, all are within the General Plan Update (GPU) Urban Study Area. Most, or at least part of each these APNs are within the existing POU for the permit; therefore, GSD is proposing that the remainder be added to the POU as shown on Figure 5b in Attachment 1. All these APNs are proposed for annexation into the GSD boundary.

## Leino Road/Sprowel Creek Road

Connections within this area are located along Leino Road or Sprowel Creek Road (Figures 6c and 6d in Attachment 1; Attachment 2) and are all within the GPU Water Study Area. Of the 18 APNs; 5 are undevelopable; 3 residences within a Housing Opportunity Zone; 3 are vacant and not current GSD customers (they could support a SFR); 1 APN has the potential for 3 SFRs and; 5 have a SFR.

All of the connections for these APNs are proposed to be transferred to the new Kimtu waterline upon LAFCo approval of the annexation. This will require an amendment by LAFCo to the conditions in Resolution 10-06. The amendment to GSD's water permit from CDPH also contains conditions for minimum fire flow at the Kimtu Meadows Subdivision hydrant that must be satisfied, prior to the District receiving approval by the California Department of Public Health for the connection to the Kimtu water line.

Most of these APNs are outside of the existing POUs. All are proposed for annexation into the GSD boundary and are to be added to the POUs as shown on Figure 5c and 5d in Attachment 1.

**Southern Humboldt Community Park/Buck Mountain Ranch/River Ranch Homes.** Additional information is warranted regarding the Southern Humboldt Community Park (SHCP)/Buck Mountain Ranch/River Ranch Homes APNs. The connection for APN 222-091-001 originally went to a SFR dating back to around the 1960s (known locally as the yellow house). From 2000 to 2004, several lot line adjustments were recorded, which resulted in APN 222-091-006. Private water lines extended throughout the APN to bring water from the yellow house to a caretaker's cottage and various other outbuildings on APN 222-091-006. The date of the installation of the private water lines is unknown.

Currently, APN 222-091-006 is considered inactive, because in 2009, the SHCP, Buck Mountain Ranch, and Stephen Dazey completed a lot line adjustment to realign the property boundaries of several APNs in the immediate area, which resulted in APN 222-091-006 being split into APNs 222-091-011 and -014. Therefore, the SHCP structures that were served by the GWC (and subsequently GSD) are now located on a portion of APN 222-091-014. The SHCP has documented two alternative water sources that will continue to provide water to these two residences and associated outbuildings. Figure 7 in Attachment 1 shows an overview of the changes in APN boundaries since 2004.

The scope of future development is unknown at this time. The previous property owner, Sanford Goldeen indicated potential development ideas to GSD staff and the County. He also sent a letter to Humboldt County as part of the GPU stating his desire to propose a planned unit development with three additional residences on the 80 acres. A general plan amendment was briefly considered as part of the Humboldt County multifamily rezoning project, but rejected by Sanford Goldeen (Goldeen, 2011). The property is no longer owned by Mr. Goldeen, and the current property owner has not submitted any development plans to the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department.

Water service to APNs 222-091-011 and -014 was supplied through one meter for the three existing residences on both APNs. This meter was turned off in September 2009 due to a leak in the private waterline between the meter and the houses. The water connection has paid the base rate for this water connection. A replacement meter for the yellow house on APN 222-091-011 will be installed sometime after the Drinking Water Improvement Project is completed and the waterline in Tooby Ranch Road is operational.



As part of an easement agreement between GSD and the River Ranch Homes, LLC on APN 222-091-011 for the Drinking Water Improvement Project, GSD will eventually provide three ¾-inch water meters when the property owner obtains development approval from Humboldt County. These meters would be connected to the Kimtu Meadows Subdivision transmission line or the new transmission line in Tooby Ranch Road.

The County is in the process of preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for a general plan amendment, rezoning, physical site development, and conditional use permit for the SHCP property on APN 222-091-014. Additional information about the project proposed by the SHCP is described below in "Cumulative Impacts Methodology." Due to the previous water use to the two residences on this APN, the GSD would consider water service in the future upon completion of the SHCP environmental process. This would require approval by Humboldt LAFCo and the SWRCB POU, but annexation of any portion of APN 222-091-014 is not included in this project.

### **Kimtu Meadows Subdivision**

On July 21, 2010, the Humboldt LAFCo approved an out-of-area water service extension for the GSD to serve the Kimtu Meadows Subdivision under Resolution 10-06. The Kimtu Meadows Subdivision consists of 24 APNs and 20 water connections (Figure 6e in Attachment 1; Attachment 2). Four APNs in the subdivision are small and contain the old Kimtu Meadows Mutual Water Company's infrastructure. As part of the LAFCo Resolution 10-06 of July 21, 2010, any future connections to the GSD waterline extended to serve Kimtu Meadows Subdivision must be submitted to Humboldt LAFCo for review and approval prior to the connection being made. Furthermore, all new services are restricted to development conditions at the effective date of May 31, 2011 as stated in Consolidation and Water Service Agreement, 2011-11758-26 recorded by Humboldt County.

As required by the LAFCo Resolution 10-06 conditions, GSD adopted Amended Resolution No. 10-007 stipulates that no additional requests for service along the proposed facilities shall be approved by GSD prior to the completion of the planned comprehensive review of water service and approval by Humboldt LAFCo. This applies to expansion of existing services and any future services along Leino Road or Sprowel Creek Road. The District adopted Resolution 10-007 with amendments to satisfy the conditions of LAFCo's approval of the Kimtu waterline extension.

On March 20, 2013, LAFCo adopted Resolution 13-02 adopting the GSD MSR and Resolution 13-03 adopting the updated SOI, which included adding the Kimtu Meadows Subdivision into the SOI. As part of the proposed change in jurisdictional boundary, the District will request that LAFCo amend its action of the Kimtu waterline extension to authorize connections for the APNs on Leino Lane and Sprowel Creek Road once approved for annexation, to be serviced off the Kimtu waterline. This is also subject to approval by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH). As required by the Amended Permit No. 01-01-12(P)-002 letter, the GSD is not allowed to add any additional connection if doing so will reduce the fire-flow at the Kimtu Meadows Subdivision fire hydrants to below 750 gallons per minute. Prior to any connection, GSD will provide CDPH the necessary information to satisfy the fire-flow requirements.

The Kimtu Meadows Subdivision APNs are outside of the existing POUs and existing GSD boundary; therefore, all are proposed for annexation into the GSD boundary and are to be added to the POUs. See Figure 6e in Attachment 1.

## Connick Creek Subdivision

The following is directly obtained from the GSD MSR prepared and approved by Humboldt LAFCo (Humboldt LAFCo, 2013d):

*The Connick Creek Subdivision was originally one APN 213-096-005. In a will serve letter dated October 16, 1991, the Garberville Water Company committed to providing domestic water to this parcel for nine 5-acre lots from a meter located east of the Eel River on Thomas Lane. The subdivision owners were responsible for constructing the pipe and maintenance of the waterlines from their subdivision to Thomas Lane. The subdivision owners then approached the Garberville Sanitary District Board to ascertain whether they would be allowed to utilize the District's private waterline that crossed the South Fork of the Eel River on an aerial span from the Thomas Lane location to the wastewater treatment plant parcel. In October 1997, the District executed an agreement with the Connick Creek Subdivision owners that required them to upgrade the waterline on the District's aerial span and to purchase water from the District at a master meter set adjacent to Bear Canyon Road on the wastewater treatment plant parcel. This agreement was recorded on February 2, 1998 as Instrument Number 1998-2664-11. APN 213-096-005 was subdivided and resulted in eight parcels. Those APNs are 222-156-014 - 021.*

*In 2010, the Connick Creek Subdivision Association approached the District about installing individual meters to each of the APNs. This agreement also identified two additional connections that had been installed by the developer on the private waterline. These two connections were added to the list of APNs that were to receive a meter.*

*The District approved the agreement with the property owners that reiterated that the waterline from the master meter to the subdivision is a privately owned and maintained waterline. The agreement further stipulates that the quantity of water billed by the District to each property owner is based upon the total volume through the master meter. The District reads the individual meters and ratios out the usage to each active property owner based upon the total volume at the master meter. If there is a discrepancy between the sum of volumes through the individual meters and the master meter volume, then the difference is evenly split between the active customers. This agreement was recorded on October 8, 2010 as Instrument # 2010-22217-9.*

As part of Instrument Number 2010-22217-9 recorded on October 8, 2010, the Connick Creek Subdivision Association's private water line has the potential to provide 11 water connections (8 within the Connick Creek subdivision, 1 adjacent to the Connick Creek subdivision (APN 222-156-012), and 2 along the private water line [APN 222-156-025]) of which 10 already have meters set. Within the Connick Creek subdivision, 3 APNs are active water service customers. Two other APNs have an account with GSD for the connection to a water meter only. The remaining three APNs are not current GSD customers. Although the agreement promises future water service to these APNs, all have water meters set for the APN's use. One APN is already developed with a SFR, but is using its own water source. See Figure 6f in Attachment 1. Humboldt County approved this subdivision with the knowledge that the water supply was to be from the Garberville Water Company through the GSD aerial waterline.

Along the private water line, two water connections for SFRs are located on APN 223-061-025 (See Figure 6a in Attachment 1 for location). Only a small area of the 105-acre APN is proposed for annexation. This includes two residences. Instead of annexing these two residences into the District boundary, there is the possibility that these areas could be approved by LAFCo under the "Policies and Procedures for Cities and Districts to Provide Services Outside Agency Boundaries," adopted November 2012 by Humboldt LAFCo. For purposes of this CEQA document, both alternatives have been included to allow for both options.

The area adjacent to the Connick subdivision includes APN 222-156-012, which is a party to the agreement recorded on October 8, 2010, as Instrument Number 2010-22217-9. This APN does not have an existing water connection, and is not included in the proposed District boundary or existing SOI. No service will be provided until the property owner petitions the District for water service and appropriate approvals have been granted by all appropriate agencies, including but not limited to the SWRCB DWR, County of Humboldt, and Humboldt LAFCo.

No changes to the conditions of the agreement with the Connick Creek Subdivision Association, recorded on October 8, 2010, as Instrument Number 2010-22217-9, are proposed. This agreement requires that all infrastructure, except the water meters, continue to be managed by the Connick Creek Subdivision Association. The GSD will not be responsible for maintenance or modifications of any water infrastructure to serve this area. Annexation of the Connick subdivision is not intended to constitute a modification, express or implied, of the October 8, 2010, agreement (recorded as Instrument # 2010-22217-9), or an expansion of any rights or interests any member of the Connick Creek Subdivision Association possess under said agreement.

All of the APNs associated with the Connick Creek Subdivision are outside of the existing POU's and GSD jurisdictional boundaries. All of these APNs are proposed to be added to the POU's and GSD jurisdictional boundaries, the exception being that only the portion of APN 223-061-025 that contains the two residences is proposed to be added. There is the possibility that these areas will be approved by Humboldt LAFCo to provide services outside of agency boundaries.

## **Meadows/Alderpoint Area**

The Meadows Subdivision Unit #1 is comprised of approximately 69 APNs occupying approximately 400 acres of hillside within the north part of the existing District. The Meadows Subdivision Unit #1 was annexed into the GSD jurisdictional boundary effective November 15, 1978. Most of the subdivision occurs within the existing District boundary, although two parcels were listed as exclusions in the legal description for the annexation of this subdivision. The two excluded parcels were the Cal Fire (Forest Service Fire Station) and one that was owned by the County of Humboldt (Old Dump Site). These two previously excluded parcels are proposed for inclusion in this annexation to eliminate these holes in the jurisdictional boundary. This subdivision was recorded in two phases—Phase 1 on October 3, 1978, and Phase 2 on October 14, 1982. Adjacent to the Meadows Subdivision are three APNs on Bushnell Drive that have water service, but not sewer service, and are not within the District boundary.

Three of the five APNs not currently within the existing District boundary have a SFR that is within a "Housing Opportunity Zone." The other two APNs are within the "Housing Opportunity Zone" and one is the Cal Fire station.

The District boundary and POU are inconsistent with each other at the easterly portion of the subdivision. There are 16 APNs which are partially within the permit POU. The project proposes to adjust the POU to match with the APN boundaries. These APNs are already within the District boundary unless listed in Attachment 2.

All of the APNs outside of the existing POU and GSD jurisdictional boundaries are proposed for annexation into the POU and GSD jurisdictional boundaries. See Figure 6g in Attachment 1.

## **SWRCB DWR Place of Use**

The following is directly obtained from the GSD MSR prepared and approved by Humboldt LAFCo (Humboldt LAFCo, 2013d):

*The District holds a water diversion permit from the State Water Resources Control Board for appropriation of water from the South Fork of the Eel River. The permit is number 20789. This permit allows the District to divert a maximum of 0.595 cubic feet per second (267 gpm) from the river, year round. The District also has a fixed license that allows the District to divert an additional 0.155 cfs. The total maximum instantaneous diversion allowed is 0.75 cfs (336 gpm). This would equate to a maximum daily diversion of approximately 484,700 gallons and 177 million gallons per year, if adequate pumps and treatment facilities were available.*

*Over the past five years, the treatment plant processed between 55 and 65 million gallons of water each year. The largest year on record was shown on the 1999 Annual Progress Report submitted by the GWC to the State Water Resources Control Board, which showed 80 million gallons of water processed.*

The existing permit and license each have a POU associated with the locations that the diverted water may be transmitted for beneficial uses. The POU for the license has not been changed since 1939. The District submitted a "Petition to Change the Place of Use" for the Permit and License to SWRCB DWR on November 19, 2012, for consistency between the areas currently served with water and the POU. As submitted, the petition would result in 68 APNs that will be adjusted or added to the Permit POU (See Figure 5 in Attachment 1; Table 1 in Attachment 3) and both POU's would be made consistent with each other. The proposed SWRCB POU boundary is also consistent with the proposed GSD boundary or out-of-agency boundary service connections. In some cases, portions of APNs were already included in the previous POU's. These have been included in the table because they are active GSD water service customers and the proposed POU adjustment would include the entire APN.

As a result of the SWRCB "Petition to Change the Place of Use" for the Permit and License, very small portions of the following 11 APNs will be removed from the POU: 223-171-022; 032-063-001; 032-151-004; 223-061-017 and -018; 223-061-001 and -015; 223-136-001, -003, and -004; and 223-161-003. These areas are proposed for removal because they are not currently provided water service and only a small percentage of each APN is in the existing POU, or the APN is part of roadway or river-bar.

## Baseline Conditions

---

The following is directly obtained from the GSD MSR prepared and approved by Humboldt LAFCo (Humboldt LAFCo, 2013d):

*The Garberville Sanitary District serves the unincorporated town of Garberville and surrounding area. The Garberville Sanitary District was formed by order of the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors on April 12, 1932, pursuant to "The Sanitary District Act of 1923" after a majority vote was cast in a general election prior to April 12, 1932. The District was originally formed for the purpose of providing sanitary sewer services as specified under Health and Safety Code Section 6400 et seq.*

*The existing jurisdictional boundary for the Garberville Sanitary District covers approximately 581 acres and extends from Bluff Creek at the north, Highway 101 to the west, the terminus of Wallan Road to the east, and north-bound Highway 101-Garberville off-ramp to the south. The existing sphere of influence for the District is approximately 1,745 acres and extends south to include the Garberville Airport and Southern Humboldt Community Park.*

See Figure 2 in Attachment 1 for the current GSD boundary and SOI.

## Population

The following is directly obtained from the GSD MSR prepared and approved by Humboldt LAFCo (Humboldt LAFCo, 2013d):

*The total population of Humboldt County in 2010, as reported by the U.S. Census, was 134,587 residents. From 2000 to 2010, the overall population in Humboldt County grew at an average rate of approximately 0.6 percent per year. For unincorporated areas of the county, the population grew at a slightly slower rate, averaging 0.5 percent per year.*

*Garberville is a Census Designated Place (CDP), with a 2010 Census population of 913 residents, most of which is served by the Garberville Sanitary District. Growth in the next 20 years within the District is anticipated to be low. The District contains mostly low and medium density residential and commercial uses in the downtown area, with limited available land for urban-type development. The District's wastewater system serves a total of 353 connections within the District boundaries. It is therefore estimated that roughly 847 residents live within the existing boundaries, based on the average household size in Humboldt County, reported to be 2.4 in the 2010 Census. Using the unincorporated population growth rate of 0.5 percent, the 2030 projected population potentially served by the District would be 936 and 390 housing units, or an additional 89 residents and 37 housing units.*

*In 2012, the Garberville Sanitary District was authorized to provide water services to the Kimtu Meadows Subdivision, formerly served by the Kimtu Mutual Water Company, adding 20*

*housing units outside the District boundary. The District reports that another 41 housing units are being served water outside the boundary, for a total of 61 housing units being served water outside the boundary. The District is completing the CEQA analysis for annexing these 61 housing units into the District boundary.*

*According to the District, there is limited available land for new residential and commercial development within the District boundaries due to existing development densities and physical constraints. Significant additional growth in the future would likely need to occur outside the District's boundary, and would likely be dependent upon construction of water distribution and wastewater collection infrastructure. The area to meet these additional housing units will need to be annexed into the Boundary once the location for this future development has been identified. The location will be highly dependent upon property owners desiring to develop their property to meet the need for the additional housing units.*

## **Existing and Planned Uses**

The following is directly obtained from the GSD MSR prepared and approved by Humboldt LAFCo (Humboldt LAFCo, 2013d):

*Land uses within the Garberville Sanitary District are subject to the Humboldt County Framework General Plan (Framework Plan), Volume I, and Zoning Regulations (Humboldt County Code Title III, Division 1). The District is within and subject to the land use policies in the Garberville-Redway-Alderpoint-Benbow Community Plan (General Plan, Volume II), adopted June 30, 1987, in addition to the Framework Plan and Zoning Regulations.*

*As shown in Table 2, the General Plan designates approximately 6.7 percent of the land in the District boundaries as Commercial General (location, access, and availability of services are suitable for commercial development) and Commercial Services (heavy commercial uses and compatible light industrial uses not serving day to day needs). About 8.2 percent is Residential Low Density (applied in urban areas where topography, access, utilities and public services make the area suitable for development), Residential Medium Density (applied in urban areas where, topography, access, utilities and public services make the area suitable for multi-family development) and Agricultural Suburban (adjacent to urban areas or rural community centers and may eventually require urban services).*

*Approximately 80.5 percent of the land in the District is Agriculture Rural (outside of Urban/Rural Community Center areas, few public services required, timber or agricultural land allowing intensive management opportunities), Agricultural Lands (remote, steep and high natural hazards areas; marginal timber, grazing, mining and quarrying, recreational areas, watershed and wildlife areas, occasional rural residences) and Green Gulch (areas to be left in a natural condition; development may be permitted where consistent with streamside management area and stream channel policies). The remainder is Public Facilities (appropriate for use by a governmental agency or public agency, which has the purpose of serving the public health, safety, convenience, or welfare).*

*According to the District, there is limited available land for new residential and commercial development within the District boundaries due to existing development densities and physical constraints. Significant additional growth in the future would likely need to occur outside the District's boundary, and would likely be dependent upon construction of water distribution and*



wastewater collection infrastructure. The area to meet these additional housing units will need to be annexed into the Boundary once the location for this future development has been identified. The location will be highly dependent upon property owners desiring to develop their property to meet the need for the additional housing units.

See Figure 8 for existing land use designations within and adjacent to the existing GSD boundaries and SOI. See Figure 9 for existing zoning. See Figure 10 for proposed land use designations from the proposed Humboldt County General Plan Update Planning Commission recommended draft.

<b>Table 2</b>		
<b>Existing General Plan Land Use Designations in District Boundary</b>		
<b>Land Use Designation</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Residential Low Density (RL)	32	5.5%
Residential Medium Density (RM)	9	1.5%
Agricultural Rural (AR)	189	32.5%
Agricultural Lands-40 (AL-40)	214	36.8%
Agricultural Suburban (AS)	7	1.2%
Public Facilities (PF)	8	1.4%
Green Gulch	65	11.2%
Commercial Services (CS)	8	1.4%
Commercial General (CG)	31	5.3%
Other (highway/roads)	18	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>100%</b>
Source: Humboldt LAFCo GSD MSR (2013d)		

## Current Water System

The following is directly obtained from the GSD MSR prepared and approved by Humboldt LAFCo (Humboldt LAFCo, 2013d):

*The water system consists of two water sources, a treatment plant, four water tanks, three booster stations, approximately 420 active water service connections, and a waterline distribution network. One of the water sources is surface water from the South Fork of the Eel River and one is a shallow well in downtown Garberville. The surface water source is regulated by the California Surface Water Treatment Rules and Regulations.*

*The South Fork of the Eel River Infiltration Gallery provides collection of the main water source. It was originally installed in 1940. The infiltration gallery has one 6-inch, 320-gpm, 50-HP submersible pump that was installed in November 2009 and was replaced in November 2012. The pump operates against an approximate 380 feet differential elevation head. The pump discharges to the water treatment plant adjacent to the 160,000-gallon main storage tank. The pressure filter in the water treatment plant has a limited capacity of 250 gpm. Over the past five years, the treatment plant processed between 55 and 65 million gallons of water each year. The largest year on record was shown on the 1999 Annual Progress Report submitted by the GWC to the State Water Resources Control Board, which showed 80 million gallons of water processed.*

*The District holds a water diversion permit from the State Water Resources Control Board for appropriation of water from the South Fork of the Eel River. The permit is number 20789. This permit allows the District to divert a maximum of 0.595 cubic feet per second (267 gpm) from the river, year round. The District also has a fixed license that allows the District to divert an additional 0.155 cfs. The total maximum instantaneous diversion allowed is 0.75 cfs (336 gpm). This would equate to a maximum daily diversion of approximately 484,700 gallons and 177 million gallons per year, if adequate pumps and treatment facilities were available.*

*The Tobin Well is the only subsurface water source and it has a limited capacity of 40 to 70 gpm. There is substantial draw down during sustained pumping. The District is evaluating the replacement of the pump with a duplex pumping system.*

*The existing system has adequate production, treatment, and storage capacities for the average peak daily demand. The maximum daily demand is 427,780 gpd recorded during the month of July in 1999. The total storage capacity for the system is approximately 260,000 gallons which is the sum of the four storage tanks in the system. This is sufficient to meet the average dry day water demand. The water treatment facility produces water that meets or exceeds the State regulations for drinking water but does not meet the Surface Water Treatment Regulations. The turbidity and residual free chlorine levels comply with the maximum allowable levels. The existing system provides four pressure zones with adequate pressure throughout the District.*

As discussed above, the “face value” of the South Fork of the Eel River diversion permit is 0.595 cfs or 430 acre-feet per year. The “face value” of the South Fork of the Eel River diversion license is 0.155 cfs or 112.2 acre-feet per year. The license amount is fixed so long as the District continues to divert and beneficially use the amount allowed in the license.

The development period for the South Fork of the Eel River diversion permit from SWRCB DWR expired December 31, 1999. During the development period, the maximum amount of water diverted under the Permit for beneficial use was 43,337,048 gallons in 1999. During that same year 36,662,952 gallons were diverted under the license, for a total of 80 million gallons. The terms and conditions of the permit state that the District is limited in all future years to the maximum amount diverted during the development period, unless an extension to the permit is approved by SWRCB-DWR. The District had submitted a petition for extension in conjunction with the petition for change in the POU's, but has since withdrawn that petition for extension in support of converting the South Fork of the Eel River diversion permit into a license. The District cannot divert more than the 80 million gallons under the terms of the license and permit, and the District will indefinitely be limited to 80 million gallons per year of diversion under the combined permit and license.

The following quantities of water were billed to customers within the two POU's and the areas outside of the POU. These numbers do not reflect the bulk water sales, errors in readings, backwashes, nor system losses, but are purely the number of units of water billed to the customers.

Table 3 Water Billed to Customers						
Description	Connections	Units Billed in 2008	Units Billed in 2009	Units Billed in 2010	Units Billed in 2011	Units Billed in 2012
In License POU	255	42,786	43,553	40,435	38,761	37,057
In Permit POU	129	15,228	14,603	14,042	13,613	13,509
Outside POU	34	2,058	2,172	1,485	1,305	3,132
<b>Total<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>418</b>	<b>60,072</b>	<b>60,328</b>	<b>55,962</b>	<b>53,679</b>	<b>53,698</b>
1. There are three additional water meters that pay the base rate, but do not currently consume water. These customers include the SHCP and two Connick Creek APNs.						


The following graph depicts the annual diversions from the South Fork of the Eel River as reported to the SWRCB for the license plus the permit. The graph reflects the total water diverted by calendar year from the SF of the Eel River. The average from 1985 to 2012 was 65,131,644 gallons per year.

Figure 3b in Attachment 1 illustrates the APNs that are not currently consuming water. There are APNs within the existing jurisdictional boundary, the existing license POU and the existing permit POU that are not consuming water.

In addition to the annual average, the total consumption of the 20 Kimtu Meadows Subdivision customers for August 2012 through June 2013 was 2.4 million gallons, when annualized is 2.6 million gallons. The KMWC was utilizing an unauthorized diversion from the South Fork of the Eel River. When KMWC consolidated to GSD, the historical diversion amount under the unauthorized diversion was not added to the GSD license or permit although this unauthorized diversion has ceased. Thus, GSD must serve these 20 new connections from the existing diversion limits on the license and permit. This additional diversion amount was included in half of the 2012 reporting amounts, but none of the previous years, and is not accounted for in the average annual diversion amount. The 2013 annual report will be the first time that the total annual amount of additional diversion to service the Kimtu Meadows Subdivision has been included in the total water consumption for the District. This additional diversion amount for Kimtu has been accounted for below, as part of the baseline conditions for water consumption.

In addition to the existing consumption, there are vacant APNs and/or APNs that are not GSD customers and are not consuming water within the existing permit and license POUs. For the purposes of determining potential water consumption within the existing license and permit POUs, the following tables 4 and 5 document by APN the potential water consumption in areas within the license POU and permit POU that may be realized in the future if the parcels not currently consuming water becomes GSD customers. The parcels not currently consuming water in the permit POU expansion area were not included, because all of these APNs are also included in the annexation area which is summarized below.

The potential water consumption is based upon the customer type, zoning, and estimates the anticipated future consumption associated with each APN. The GSD customers' billing data was separated by billing code into two categories: residential and commercial/industrial. This separated data was then averaged. The average annual demand of the GSD commercial customers is 177,500 gallons or 237 units per year. This average has been applied to the properties that are commercially or industrially zoned. The average demand of the GSD residential customers is 70,500 gallons or 94 units per year, and this average has been applied to parcels that are residentially zoned.



Graph 1. Summary by Year of Water Diversion Reported

<b>Table 4</b> <b>APNs Not Currently Consuming GSD Water in Existing</b> <b>Jurisdictional Boundary and License POU</b>				
APN	Acres	Zoning <sup>1</sup>	Potential Development (Residential or Commercial)	Annual Consumption Potential Based upon Development Type (gallons)
032-042-017	0.17	C-2-D	Commercial	177,500
032-102-028	0.26	R-4	SFR <sup>2</sup>	70,500
032-231-045	1.65	RS-B-5(5)	Has Shops	177,500
032-111-024	1.41	R-4-Q	16 multifamily units	1,128,000
032-121-019	0.55	C-2-D	Commercial	177,500
032-121-020	0.48	C-2-D	Commercial	177,500
<b>Total</b>				<b>1,908,500</b>
1. C-2-D: Community Commercial-Design Review Combining R-4: Apartment Professional Zone R-4-Q: Apartment Professional Zone – Qualified Combining Zone RS-B-5(5): Residential Suburban- Special Building Site, 5 acre minimum lot size 2. SFR: Single Family Residence				

<b>Table 5</b> <b>APNs Not Currently Consuming GSD Water in Existing</b> <b>Jurisdictional Boundary and Permit POU</b>				
APN	Acres	Zoning <sup>1</sup>	Potential Development (Residential or Industrial)	Annual Consumption based upon Development Type (gallons)
223-181-012	1.79	AE-B-6	SFR <sup>2</sup>	70,500
223-181-017	2.03	AE-B-6	SFR	70,500
223-181-020	2.52	AE-B-6	SFR	70,500
223-183-010	2.38	AE-B-6	SFR	70,500
032-231-056	0.77	R-1	SFR	70,500
032-231-053	0.20	R-1	SFR	70,500
032-231-054	0.10	R-1	SFR	70,500
032-231-016	0.53	R-1	SFR	70,500
032-231-028	0.12	R-1	SFR	70,500
032-231-043	0.85	R-1	SFR	70,500
<b>Total</b>				<b>705,000</b>
1. AG-B-5(5): Special Building Site, 5 acre minimum lot size AE-B-6: Agriculture Exclusive, Special Building Site Combining Zone -6 acre minimum parcel size MH: Heavy Industrial RS-B-5(5): Residential Suburban- Special Building Site, 5 acre minimum lot size 2. SFR: Single Family Residence				

<b>Table 6</b> <b>APNs Not Currently Consuming GSD Water Outside Existing Jurisdictional Boundary and Inside Permit POU</b>				
APN	Acres	Zoning <sup>1</sup>	Potential Development (Residential or Industrial)	Annual Consumption based upon Development Type (gallons)
223-171-002	1.14	MH	Industrial	177,500
223-171-007	5.57	MH	Industrial	177,500
032-211-014	0.54	RS-B-5(5)	SFR <sup>2</sup>	70,500
032-211-021	8.83	RS-B-5(5)	SFR	70,500
032-171-015	4.16	AG-B-5(5)	SFR	70,500
<b>Total</b>				<b>566,500</b>
1. AG-B-5(5): Special Building Site, 5 acre minimum lot size AE-B-6: Agriculture Exclusive, Special Building Site Combining Zone -6 acre minimum parcel size MH: Heavy Industrial RS-B-5(5): Residential Suburban- Special Building Site, 5 acre minimum lot size 2. SFR: Single Family Residence Potential development also included in areas proposed for annexation into the jurisdictional boundary.				

Table 7 summarizes the existing water consumption from the current water customers and potential consumption from the existing permit and license POU.

<b>Table 7</b> <b>Summary of Water Consumption</b>	
Description of Consumption	Amount (gallons)
Existing Average Use	65,131,644
Kimtu Meadows Subdivision Customers	2,600,000
APNs Not Currently Consuming GSD Water in Existing Jurisdictional Boundary and License POU	1,908,500
APNs Not Currently Consuming GSD Water in Existing Jurisdictional Boundary and Permit POU	705,000
APNs Not Currently consuming GSD Water Outside Existing Jurisdictional Boundary and inside Permit POU	566,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>70,911,644</b>

There are also two APNs for which there is either a historical water service or a contract that obligates GSD to provide future water service. One is APN 222-091-014 and the other is APN 222-156-012. APN 222-091-014 has been allocated up to 2,000 cubic feet per month (180,000 gallons per year) and APN 222-156-012 allocated one SFR connection. This brings the total allocated water to 71,162,144 gallons per year.



## Current Wastewater Service

The following is directly obtained from the GSD MSR prepared and approved by Humboldt LAFCo (Humboldt LAFCo, 2013d):

*The Garberville Sanitary District is responsible for collection, treatment, and disposal of the community's wastewater. The existing wastewater facilities are within the boundaries of the District. Existing facilities consist of collection and transmission lines including two headworks stations, two pumping stations, and a treatment plant.*

*The present service area consists of the downtown community of Garberville and the Meadows Subdivision. The Meadows Subdivision occupies approximately 400 acres of hillside with 69 parcels. The District provides approximately 353 existing wastewater service connections.*

*The estimated wastewater flows for the wastewater collection system have been provided by the previous General Manager of the District. The average dry weather (low) flow is approximately 59,000 gallons per day (gpd). The average wet weather (high) flow is approximately 130,000 gpd. The new facility has the capacity to treat 160,000 gallons per dry weather day and 250,000 gallons per wet weather day.*

*The District was under a wastewater connection moratorium until additional capacity was constructed. Presently the WWTP is operating within its waste discharge requirements. In November 2011, the Water Quality Control Board rescinded the moratorium and issued a new Waste Discharge Permit ID# 1B831200HUM.*

*This waste discharge permit contains guidelines for an average dry weather flow of 162,000 gpd, 235,000 gpd average wet weather flow, and wet weather peak flow of 600,000 gpd. The treatment plant is currently operating at 38.88 percent of the capacity during dry weather flows. There is no significant large future capital improvement projects planned for the wastewater system. The existing infrastructure has the capacity to service the District for the duration of the planning period.*

The average wet weather (November through April) flows were 124,858 gallons per day in 2011 and 136,167 gallons per day in 2012. The wastewater treatment plant is currently operating at 55.54 percent of capacity during wet weather flows.

There are 11 APNs that are developed or developable, that are proposed for inclusion into the sewer service area. Ten of these APNs are developed and have onsite sewage treatment systems. GSD is not requiring any residences, commercial or industrial properties to "hook-up" to the existing system until such time as the existing treatment system fails.

# Cumulative Impacts Methodology

---

The CEQA Guidelines require that cumulative impacts be assessed to determine “whether the cumulative impact is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064, subsection (h) (1)). “Cumulative impacts” are defined as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355; see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21083, subd. (b).) CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(a)(3) states that, “cumulatively considerable” effects occur when the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of other closely related projects, including past projects, current projects and probable future projects.

A cumulative impact analysis reflects the fact that, although a project may cause an “individually limited” or “individually minor” incremental impact that, by itself, is not significant, the increment may be “cumulatively considerable,” and thus significant, when viewed together with environmental changes anticipated from past, present, and probable future projects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064, subdivision (h)(1), 15065, subdivision (c), 15355, subdivision (b)). This formulation intends to first create a broad context in which to assess a project’s incremental contribution to anticipated cumulative impacts, viewed on a geographic scale beyond the project site itself, and then to determine whether the project’s incremental contribution to any significant cumulative impacts from all projects is itself significant (i.e., “cumulatively considerable”). If the project does not involve a “cumulatively considerable” contribution to a significant cumulative effect, the project’s effect is not considered significant.

For this IS/MND, cumulative impacts have been considered within the sections of the environmental checklist as a means to analyze subdivision (b) of the “Mandatory Findings of Significance” set forth in Section XVIII of the Checklist, below. Two methods are discussed in the CEQA Guidelines. This includes the list approach and plan approach. The list approach is required to identify “a list of all of the past, present and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects that are outside of the agency.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, subdivision (b)(1)(A).) The plan approach includes, “a summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional, or statewide plan, or related planning document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, subdivision (b)(1)(B).)

For the purposes and analyzing cumulative impacts in this IS/MND, GSD has followed the list approach and determined the following “past, present, and probable future projects,” are within the relevant geographic scope of one or more environmental impact areas and could produce effects related to the project. This list was determined by requesting current information about permits from the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department and known infrastructure projects conducted by the District and CDPH.

## Potential Housing Projects within the Garberville Area

Potential housing projects within the Garberville area include the following:

- **Chautaugqua Natural Foods.** Chautaugqua Natural Foods General Plan Amendment and Zone Reclassification (4 proposed apartment units [Humboldt County, 2009a]). This project has been completed. This project is within the existing GSD Jurisdictional Boundary.

- **Winters Multifamily Project.** Winters multifamily project on APN 032-111-024 (16-units proposed). This project is principally permitted and only required a building permit from the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department (Richardson, 2013c). This project is proposed in phases and a portion is in construction. This project is within the existing GSD Jurisdictional Boundary.
- **Humboldt County Multifamily Rezone Project.** Multifamily rezoning project undertaken by Humboldt County Planning and Building (SCH No. 2009022077; Humboldt County, 2011). This project included rezoning parcels around the County for multifamily uses, which was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2012 and accepted by the Housing and Community Development Department in 2012. The County did not include any areas in Garberville. The closest rezoning project was in Redway.
- **2010 Housing Element Update.** 2010 Housing Element Update undertaken by Humboldt County Planning and Building. This project included developing incentives for housing, which was approved by the Board of Supervisors and accepted by the Housing and Community Development Department in 2012 (Humboldt County, 2012a). This project was countywide.
- **SHCP Multifamily Rezone Project.** Multifamily housing project proposed at the SHCP as described in the NOP (Humboldt County, 2010b; SCH No. 2010092037). As the lead agency under CEQA, Humboldt County Planning and Building is currently evaluating the environmental impacts of changing the existing uses at the SHCP. The project described in the NOP included a multifamily housing area. According to senior planner Michael Richardson, this has been eliminated from the project (Richardson, 2013b). This project is described in more detail farther in this section.
- **Humboldt County General Plan Update.** The General Plan is also in the process of being updated. The "Planning Commission approved Draft General Plan" is not expected to change the expected land use intensity within the GSD boundaries (Humboldt County, 2012c). There could be an increase to the maximum density in select locations because of a new Mixed Use designation that allows for some residences in commercial areas. This designation would be located in the downtown corridor and not in areas proposed for annexation or a change in the POU. Additional information is further described below.
- **2014 Housing Element Update.** The Humboldt County Planning and Building Department has also begun the process for updating the Housing Element. Currently, staff is conducting public workshops and the draft is scheduled for approval by the Board of Supervisors in May 2014 (Humboldt County, 2013). No information about any proposed changes is available.

Other potential housing projects considered for the cumulative impact analysis, but rejected from consideration as not reasonably foreseeable future projects, include the following:

- **APN 222-091-011.** The scope of future development is unknown at this time. The previous property owner, Sanford Goldeen indicated potential development ideas to GSD staff and the County. He also sent a letter to Humboldt County as part of the GPU stating his desire to propose a planned unit development with three additional residences on the 80 acres. A general plan amendment was briefly considered as part of the Humboldt County multifamily rezoning project, but rejected by Sanford Goldeen (Goldeen, 2011). The property is no longer owned by Mr. Goldeen, and the current property owner has not submitted any development plans to the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department.

- **Johnson Property (APN 223-161-003 and 223-136-003).** An application has not been submitted to the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department so the scope of future development is not yet known. These two APNs were the remainder of the Meadows Subdivision Unit 3, and the property owner notified the Humboldt County Planning Department on August 20, 2004 that he had “no immediate plans to develop this.” These APNs are not in the GSD SOI.

## Projects by the Garberville Sanitary District

The following projects have been recently analyzed and/or constructed by the GSD.

- **Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement and Inflow and Infiltration Reduction Project.** The District adopted an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) (State Clearinghouse No. 2005062051) (LACO, 2010b) and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program on July 19, 2005. The District filed a Notice of Determination with the Humboldt County Clerk on July 25, 2005, and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) on February 3, 2008. The inflow and infiltration (I/I) correction component of the Project was not included in the IS/MND. The District filed a Notice of Exemption for the I/I correction component of the Project with the County Clerk on February 2, 2009, and with the OPR (SCH No. 2009028028) on February 3, 2009.

The project construction was completed on July 31, 2011.

- **Alderpoint Road Tank Replacement Project.** The GSD is currently in the planning and engineering phase of the Alderpoint Tank Replacement Project. The GSD has adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration to replace a 30,000 gallon tank with a 200,000 gallon tank at the same location as the existing tank. As documented in the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist prepared by LACO Associates for the project, the current water system lacks sufficient storage, which currently operates at a deficit between 74,000 and 182,780 (LACO, 2013). Therefore, GSD proposes construction of a 200,000 gallon tank, increasing available storage by 170,000 gallons.

An Initial Study and Environmental Checklist was prepared in May 2013 (LACO, 2013). The District filed a Notice of Determination for this Project with the County Clerk on July 25, 2013 through September 4, 2013, and with the OPR (SCH No. 2013062003).

- **Drinking Water System Improvement Project.** An Initial Study and Environmental Checklist was prepared in April 2010 (LACO, 2010a). The District filed a Notice of Determination for this project with the County Clerk on May 28, 2010, and with the OPR (SCH No. 2009122069). This project is currently being constructed.

The project consists of the following elements:

- 1) refurbishment of the existing water intake from the South Fork of the Eel River, including installation of a duplex pumping system;
- 2) construction of a new surface water treatment plant (SWTP) on Tooby Ranch Road;
- 3) construction of a new pipeline within the roadway easement in Tooby Ranch Road to Sprowel Creek Road, where the line will connect the new SWTP to the existing 8-inch Kimtu transmission line; and

- 4) construction of a new 8-inch line inside the Town of Garberville within Sprowel Creek Road, starting at the west side of the U.S. Highway 101 overpass to the Redwood Drive intersection.

The project was designed to treat up to 336 gallons per minute (gpm) from the South Fork of the Eel River plus up to 33 gpm of recycled backwash water. The treatment plant upgrade is to meet existing water demands and current California Department of Public Health (CDPH) requirements for redundancy, providing reliable high quality water to the District's costumers.

## Projects by Other Agencies in the Garberville Area

Projects within the Garberville Area by other agencies include the following:

- **Kimtu Meadows Mutual Water Company.** On behalf of the Kimtu Meadows Mutual Water Company, CDPH proposed a new water main to extend service from the GSD water system. An Initial Study was prepared for this project and a Notice of Determination was filed by the CDPH on July 24, 2010 with the State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2009082046; LACO . This project was constructed and complete in August 2012. As required by the LAFCo Resolution 10-06 conditions, GSD adopted Amended Resolution No. 10-007 stipulates that no additional requests for service along the proposed facilities shall be approved by GSD prior to the completion of the planned comprehensive review of water service and approval by Humboldt LAFCo. This applies to expansion of existing services and any future services along Leino Road or Sprowel Creek Road. The District adopted Resolution 10-007 with amendments to satisfy the conditions of LAFCo's approval of the Kimtu waterline extension.
- **Humboldt County General Plan Update.** On June 12, 2012, Humboldt County staff submitted a "Planning Commission Approved Draft General Plan" and supporting information to the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors for consideration. This "Planning Commission approved Draft General Plan" is proposed to:

*The Draft Plan is intended to be a comprehensive up date of the County's current 1984 General Plan. The General Plan expresses the community's goals for the distribution of future land uses for approximately the next 20 years, both public and private, and establishes policies, standards and implementation measures for future development. It reviews and revises the basic assumptions regarding population projections and future land use demand, and proposes land use designations and diagrams (maps), together with policies to meet that demand in a manner consistent with State law (Humboldt County, 2012c).*

The Board of Supervisors is reviewing the "Planning Commission approved Draft General Plan" and Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 2007021089) circulated for public comments beginning April 2, 2012. This does not include any changes to the current *Garberville-Redway-Alderpoint-Benbow Community Plan (General Plan, Volume II)*, adopted June 30, 1987. At this time, the Board of Supervisors is discussing the "Planning Commission approved Draft General Plan," and has not set a schedule for completion, so the proposed policies and standards do not yet apply and may change. It is also possible the Draft EIR will be re-circulated to address any changes to the "Planning Commission approved Draft

General Plan.” For GSD planning purposes, the Planning Commission-approved land use designations have been included in Table 3 (within the development potential) and Attachment 2. See Figure 10 in Attachment 1.

## Other Projects in the Garberville Area

The SHCP parcel (APNs 222-091-014 and 222-241-009) are zoned Agricultural Exclusive with a very small amount of Heavy Industrial, Qualified Combining Zone. The SHCP has approval from the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department to use the property for “low-impact passive activities that have occurred on park property; for example, walking, hiking, bicycling, horseback riding, swimming, boating, fishing, nature study by individuals, families or small groups, picnics, weddings, celebrations, memorials by families or small groups” (Girard, undated). The Humboldt County Planning and Building Department communication states “the compliance agreement prohibits public assembly, amplified music, commercial performances, motorized recreation, construction of non-agriculturally related improvements and other uses not allowed in the Agricultural Exclusive Zone.” The SHCP parcel has a caretaker residence at the Tooby Memorial Park, a caretaker residence for the large park, and a second residential dwelling on the park property as well as various outbuildings and barns consistent with an operational ranch.

As described in the notice of preparation (NOP) circulated for a public comment period in 2010 by the County, the project at that time consisted of the following (SCH No. 2010092037):

*First, a General Plan Amendment is proposed to change the General Plan designations on portions of the 430 acre property from Agricultural Lands (AL20) and Agricultural Rural (AR5-20) to allow recreation open to the public, multifamily housing, and community assembly uses. Most of the property (305 acres) is proposed for continued agricultural use. The 38 acres of the property currently used for a gravel mining operation would also continue with that use. The 3 - 5 acres proposed for multifamily housing will have an RM - Residential Multifamily Plan designation. The 96 acres proposed for public recreation, the agricultural areas, and the gravel mining areas are proposed to be assigned a PR-Public Recreation designation, a new Plan designation which allows agriculture, playing fields, special events and other recreational uses open to the public.*

*The second part of this project is rezoning portions of the property consistent with the new Plan designations.*

*The third part of the project is the proposed Conditional Use Permit and Special Permit to allow specific activities within the PR areas. Portions of the PR designated areas are proposed to be used for small picnics, day use parking, portable restrooms, public access, a labyrinth, nature study, outdoor education and staff access along existing dirt roads during large events.*

*Portions of the PR areas are proposed to be used for small events of 500 persons or less, such as weddings, birthdays and memorials. Up to five (5) times per year, medium sized events for up to 1,200 persons would be allowed. And one time per year an event is proposed for up to 5,000 persons similar to the Benbow Summer Arts Fair. Amplified music would be allowed at all these events.*



*Other portions of the PR areas will be used as playing fields and accessory uses, such as bleachers, and concession stands, a disc golf course, camping areas, a skate park, a group picnic area, public restrooms, a playground, and multi use trails. The parcel is served by community water and on-site sewer.*

Since the time of the NOP and during the process of the preparing the EIR, a revised project description was submitted to Humboldt LAFCo and GSD staff in February 2013. See Attachment 4 for figures associated with the SHCP that are referenced below. The following describes the proposed activities:

*The SHCP proposes to amend the Humboldt County General Plan land use designation to allow for the phased development of the Southern Humboldt Community Park (Park) within the 405.7-acre SHCP property (a portion of the former Tooby Ranch, including Tooby Memorial Park) on Sprowel Creek Road in Garberville, CA (see Figure 1). In order to allow to a mix of public, private, and non-profit uses, the project would require: amending the land use designation and zoning of park property (APN No. 222-241-009 and 222-091-014); the maintenance and development of park infrastructure; and approval of a County conditional use permit and special permit for certain park uses, as detailed below:*

- 1. General Plan Amendment - Add to the Framework Plan and the 1986 Garberville, Redway, Benbow, Alderpoint Community Plan a Public Recreation (PR) land use designation, which would allow natural resource uses, resource production uses, recreation uses, and education and research uses. Change the land use designation on the 405.7-acre Park property to the new Public Recreation (PR) designation. The current land use designation is a combination of Agricultural Lands with a 20 acre minimum (AL-20) on approximately 124.51 acres, and Agricultural Rural with a 5-20 acre minimum parcel size (AR 5-20) on the remaining approximately 281.19 acres. Land use and zoning setting and impacts are further described and analyzed in the Land Use Section of this EIR. The Park will maintain development credits relative to the current land use designations that are transferable to other properties.*
- 2. Re-Zoning - Change the zoning of 93.7 acres from Agriculture Exclusive (AE) to Public Facilities (PF) to allow the proposed public and civic uses on the site. Approximately 312 acres of the property would retain AE zoning. Add a Qualified (Q) zone throughout the property to allow agricultural activities in PF areas, and recreational activities in the AE areas. Figure 2 identifies the proposed zoning boundaries on the property.*
- 3. Physical Site Development - Retention, alteration, and maintenance of existing infrastructure, in addition to the development of new or expanded infrastructure including: sports fields, playgrounds, picnic areas, trails, equestrian facilities, agricultural facilities, camping facilities, and event facilities among other improvements described in detail in Section 3.3.3 to 3.3.4, below.*
- 4. County Conditional Use and Special Permits - Obtain a conditional use permit (CUP) and special permit to allow specific activities within the PF areas of the Park. Portions of the PF designated areas would be used*

*for a variety of events as further described below. The Park would predominantly serve the communities of Garberville, Redway and surrounding areas (approximately 15,000 residents), in addition to visitors from across Humboldt and Mendocino Counties (a total population of approximately 261,000), California residents, interstate, and international visitors to the area. The project would provide the location and infrastructure to create public/community facilities for recreation, agriculture, education and enrichment, cultural experiences, civic purposes, celebrations, events, and gatherings.*

The SHCP project is being analyzed in a separate EIR being prepared by Humboldt County as the lead agency. This project area is within the boundaries of the existing SOI, but the specific impacts of any changes to zoning and land uses will be included in the SHCP EIR and are not addressed in the GSD project. The SHCP application documents identify other sources of water for the property and the EIR will identify which areas would require public water service and which will be served by these other water sources (Richardson, 2013b).

The Draft EIR is expected to be circulated by the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department sometime in the summer of 2013 (Richardson, 2013a). On July 19, 2013, the schedule of the Draft EIR and project description was confirmed with Humboldt County Planning and Building Supervising Planner, Michael Richardson. According to Michael Richardson, the project as stated in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is the project that will be analyzed in the Draft EIR. Any modifications to the project description described in the NOP will be addressed in the alternative analysis. The Draft EIR is currently scheduled for September 2013, rather than summer 2013 as included in the IS/MND.

Once the Draft EIR has been circulated for public comment, a final EIR will be prepared that addresses all comments received. After the final EIR has been prepared, the project EIR will be subject to a public hearing and recommendation for certification by the Humboldt County Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission recommends certification and project approval, then another public hearing and final approval will be conducted at a Board of Supervisors meeting.

The following conditions, as approved by the GSD Board of Directors during the October 9, 2012, Board meeting will applied to any future annexation application:

*1. SHCP would be given one new connection (3/4" meter) to rectify the condition that both the yellow house and the park are served off the same meter. This condition was created in 2009 when the Lot Line Adjustment was recorded and the property line was moved so that the residential structures were split into two properties.*

*2. The SHCP will make application for this new service connection. The application will stipulate at which location the park is proposing installation of the one new 3/4" meter. The three possible locations currently under consideration are:*

*a. On Tooby Ranch Road near the property line between APN 222-091-014 (SHCP) and 222-091-011 (Buck Mountain Ranch) on the existing 1" line that currently serves the park property.*

*b. On Tooby Ranch Road off the future 8" waterline that may be constructed as part of the Drinking Water Improvement Project. The project is currently unfunded for construction. If the project were to be constructed, the California Department of Public Health ("CDPH") may need to approve service connection(s) on this new line. The Tooby Ranch Road connection location will not be available until or if the District completes the construction of this Project.*

*c. On Sprowel Creek Road off the existing 8" waterline that serves the Kimtu Subdivision. This location requires CDPH and LAFCo approval the connection to the Kimtu waterline. The approval from CDPH cannot be obtained until and unless the currently unfunded Drinking Water Improvement Project is completed.*

*3. No connection fee would be charged, but the SHCP would be responsible for all costs associated with the installation of the new meter, pressure reducer, and backflow preventer plus any associated appurtenances.*

*4. The one new ¾" meter is for residential use only and is not intended to be used to serve future development on the Property contemplated by SHCP in the application for a General Plan Amendment (and associated applications for a conditional use permit, the Operational Plan, and the CEQA Initial Study Checklist as submitted to the Humboldt County Planning Department by SHCP) currently on file with the Humboldt County Planning Department.*

*5. The usage for the connection is limited to 2,000 cubic feet per month. The usage will be monitored monthly in conjunction with the reading of the meters. The SHCP will be notified each time the usage reading is in excess of the 2,000 cubic feet per month limit. The meter will be shut off if the usage is more than 1.5 times (3,000 cubic feet per month) the allowable quantity for any 2 months in a 12 month period. If the meter is shut off, the SHCP will have to petition the Board for reinstatement of service and obtain approval from LAFCo if necessary.*

*6. As part of the application for the new connection, the SHCP will be required to enter into a legally binding agreement that will be recorded for the parcel agreeing to the stipulated types and quantities of use as well as the enforcement methods.*

At such time as the SHCP completed the Draft EIR, the GSD as a responsible agency will review the proposed water consumption that is dependent upon future water service from the GSD utilizing this basis. Water service to the SHCP is also subject to approval from Humboldt LAFCo and SWRCB DWR.

## Development Potential in Proposed Boundary and POU

---

A review of the development potential in the areas to be added to the jurisdictional boundary was conducted. This includes all areas proposed for boundary annexation regardless of whether an APN is already within or partially within the Permit POU. The review of development potential was based upon the following assumptions and information:

- Non-developable APNs include Highway 101 right-of-way, SF of the Eel River gravel bars, and APNs that are too small to meet minimum building criteria;
- within “Housing Opportunity Zones;”
- potential for secondary dwelling units and;
- existing development as compared with maximum build out indicated by the existing zoning;

The following information was developed to assist in determining the development potential in the areas proposed for annexation into the Jurisdictional Boundary:

- Figure 11 in Attachment 1 for locations of developable areas;
- Figure 12 for “Housing Opportunity Zones” and Urban Study Areas;
- Table 8 Summary of the Development Potential;
- Table 9 Development Potential by Assessor’s Parcel Number; and
- Attachment 2 for detailed information of all of the APNs proposed for annexation.

The results of this review are further described below.

Garberville is an unincorporated community within the jurisdiction of Humboldt County and therefore is subject to the goals and policies set forth in the County General Plan and Zoning Code. Currently, the General Plan is in the process of being updated. The “Planning Commission approved Draft General Plan” is not expected to change the expected land use intensity within the GSD boundaries (Humboldt County, 2012b). There could be an increase to the maximum density in select locations because of a new Mixed Use designation that allows for some residences in commercial areas. This designation would be located in the downtown corridor and not in areas proposed for annexation or a change in the POU.

There is the potential for increased density as a result of the “Housing Opportunity Zones” identified within the Garberville area. As included in the “General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Amendments Implementing the 2010 Housing Element adopted by the Board February 14, 2012” off-street parking requirements are reduced, relaxed development standards for second dwelling units, and a density bonus is “intended to provide incentives for affordable housing, senior housing, and development of childcare facilities.” Density bonuses have been available in Humboldt County since 1984, but only two projects (one in Eureka and one in McKinleyville) have been conducted (Richardson, 2013a). It seems unlikely, due to the rural nature of Garberville, that a density bonus project would be implemented. According to Humboldt County Planning and Building senior planner Michael Richardson, no second dwelling units have been permitted in the Garberville area since 2000 (Richardson, 2013c). There were two in the Redway area.

As part of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendments, secondary dwelling units are a principally permitted use in Forestry Recreation Zones (FR), Residential One-Family (R-1), Residential Suburban (RS), and Unclassified (U) zones. In Agricultural General zones (AG),

secondary dwelling units are principally permitted if the APN size is five acres or less and within a community plan area and the use is authorized by the plan designation. The *Garberville, Redway, Alderpoint, Benbow Community Plan* (2006) does not authorize secondary dwelling units within AG zones. Secondary dwelling units must also satisfy several requirements of the “General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Amendments Implementing the 2010 Housing Element” adopted by the Board February 14, 2012 regarding development (Humboldt County, 2012a). For planning purposes, all APNs with a zoning of FR, R-1, RS, or U are analyzed as though they could support a second dwelling unit. The exception is the Kimtu Meadows Subdivision, which is not allowed further development due to the conditions in the consolidation agreement as described above.

As a result of the proposed boundary change, 84 APNs will be added to the District boundary. Of the 84 APNs, only 25 APNs will be added to the District boundary that could be further developed under the existing zoning and general plan designation. This was determined independent of whether the APN has existing water or sewer service. A summary of this information is presented in Table 8 and Table 9 illustrates each APN and potential for development.

In an effort to understand the development potential better, the information about the development potential within the expansion area for the jurisdictional boundary has been separated by the status of the POU since the existing POU is similar to the GWC approved service boundary. It is difficult to summarize the additional development potential as a result of the proposed project because the majority of the APNs that are being added and could support additional development are already within, or a majority within the existing Permit or License POU, so adding them to the jurisdictional boundary does not necessarily remove a barrier to potential growth.

The area being annexed in the jurisdictional boundary is larger than the area being added to the Permit POU, so the development potential was evaluated for the change in jurisdictional boundary. In cases where even the majority of the APNs were within the boundary, the entire APN was included, therefore estimations of potential development as a result of water service are likely an overestimation of new development as a result of the change in jurisdictional boundary. When the GSD acquired the GWC, it was obligated to serve water to existing customers and areas within its service boundary so updating the boundaries and POU does not remove a potential barrier to development.

The change in jurisdictional boundary will result in several APNs that are vacant and/or not currently fully developed under current regulations to be annexed and that could be further developed for housing. There are 25 APNs that could be further developed (Table 9). Of these 25 APNs, only 11 are vacant and developable, of these 11 only 9 APNs are not currently GSD customers, and of these 9 only 6 APNs are completely outside the Permit POU (these 6 APNs could support 8 SFRs and 4 single detached dwelling permitted in an agriculture exclusive zone).

In summary, there could be additional residential and industrial development within the areas of the jurisdictional boundary. As stated above, the change in jurisdictional boundary could result in 8 SFRs in the areas that are not already within or partially within the existing Permit POU. Within areas that are partially, within, or mostly within the POU there could be 6 additional SFRs for a total of an additional 14 SFRs on a combination of vacant or underdeveloped APNs. Within areas that are partially, within, or mostly within the POU, 14 APNs are within “Housing Opportunity Zones,” and 9 APNs are allowed second dwelling units (these are all within the “Housing Opportunity Zones”).

Of the 25 developable APNs, there are 10 APNs that are being added for sewer service in areas already within or partially within the existing Permit POU. No sewer service is proposed in areas outside the POU that could be further developed.

<b>Table 8</b> <b>Summary of the Development Potential for APNs to be Added to the Jurisdictional Boundary</b>		
<b>Existing POU</b>	<b>Development Potential</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Within and Majority Within (15 APNs)</b>	3 Industrial General APNs	2 APNs are vacant and 1 with a residential trailer; no sewer service proposed
	2 SFRs on 2 APNs	1 Vacant; 1 sewer proposed
	12 APNs within a "Housing Opportunity Zone" that could increase density	8 are proposed for sewer service; 4 APNs with development limited due to zoning and APN size or topography; 8 APNs are zoned for a second dwelling unit; 4 not currently consuming GSD water
<b>Partially Within (4 APNs)</b>	4 SFR on 4 APNs	3 APNs are vacant; 1 sewer service proposed
	2 APNs within a "Housing Opportunity Zone"	No sewer service proposed; 1 APN is zoned for a second dwelling unit; 3 not currently consuming GSD water
<b>Out (6 APNs)</b>	8 SFR plus 4 single detached dwelling units for Agriculture Exclusive zone on 5 APNs	5 APNs are vacant; no sewer service proposed; 4 not currently consuming GSD water
	1 Industrial General APN	Vacant, no sewer service proposed, not currently consuming water
<b>Total SFRs</b>	14 SFRs	10 proposed for sewer service; 9 APNs are vacant
<b>Total "Housing Opportunity Zone"</b>	14 within a "Housing Opportunity Zone"	11 APNs are zoned for a second dwelling unit
<b>Total Industrial General APNs</b>	4 Industrial General APNs	3 APNs are vacant and 1 with a residential trailer; no sewer service proposed



<div>Table 9</div> <div>Development Potential by Assessor's Parcel Number</div>														
Assessor's Parcel Number	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary: (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup> Service	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action (Add All/ Partial/ Remove/ Adjust to Property Line)	Date 1st Billed by GSD <sup>3</sup>	Date Meter Set	Existing Development	Notes about Potential Development	Existing General Plan Land Use Designation <sup>4</sup>	General Plan Update Land Use Designation <sup>5</sup> (Planning Commission Recommendation)	Existing Zoning <sup>6</sup>	Urban Study Area (USA) or Water Study Area (WSA)	Housing Opportunity Zone
<b>Bear Canyon Road/Redwood Drive/Bushnell Lane</b>														
223-171-001	8.24	Out	Majority Within	Water	Adjust to match property line	12/1/2004	6/1/1996	Residential Trailer	Industrial	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes
223-171-002	1.14	Out	Within	Water	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	Industrial	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes
223-171-007	5.57	Out	Within	Water	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	Industrial	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes
<b>Connick Creek Subdivision</b>														
222-156-014	4.90	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	10/1/2010	8/17/2010	Vacant	SFR; contract for future service	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No
222-156-015	4.51	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	SFR; contract for future service	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No
222-156-016	12.31	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	2 SFR; contract for future service	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No
222-156-018	5.30	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	10/1/2010	8/17/2010	Vacant	SFR; contract for future service	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No
223-061-025	105.26	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match developed area	10/1/2010	8/17/2010	2 SFR	None: Only annexing areas with SFR included	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AE-B-5(160)	WSA	No
<b>Hillcrest Drive/Downtown Area</b>														
032-211-003	0.52	Out	Within	W & S	No change	12/1/2004	1992	SFR	Potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-211-010	0.37	Out	Within	W & S	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	SFR	Limited potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-211-012	7.89	Out	Within	W & S	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	SFR	Potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-211-014	0.54	Out	Within	W & S	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	SFR; Potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes

Table 9 Development Potential by Assessor's Parcel Number														
Assessor's Parcel Number	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary: (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup> Service	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action (Add All/ Partial/ Remove/ Adjust to Property Line)	Date 1st Billed by GSD <sup>3</sup>	Date Meter Set	Existing Development	Notes about Potential Development	Existing General Plan Land Use Designation <sup>4</sup>	General Plan Update Land Use Designation <sup>5</sup> (Planning Commission Recommendation)	Existing Zoning <sup>6</sup>	Urban Study Area (USA) or Water Study Area (WSA)	Housing Opportunity Zone
032-211-015	0.49	Out	Within	W & S	No change	12/1/2004	Pre 7/95	SFR	Potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-211-021	8.83	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match property line	Associated with APN 032-211-012	Unknown	Barns and outbuildings	SFR and potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
Leino Road/Sprowel Creek Road Area														
032-171-015	4.16	Out	Within	Water	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	SFR	Potential for increased density	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-171-017	0.14	Out	Within	Water	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	Developed as part of 032-171-015	SFR; Limited potential for increased density due to size	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-171-025	0.10	Out	Within	Water	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	Developed as part of 032-171-015	SFR; Limited potential for increased density due to size	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-171-022	9.25	Out	Out	Water	Add APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	Mostly undevelopable; River bar and steep	IR	IR	MH-Q	WSA	No
032-171-023	3.46	Out	Partial	Water	Adjusted to match property line	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	SFR	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	WSA	No
032-171-024	4.09	Out	Partial	Water	Adjusted to match property line	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	SFR	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	WSA	No
032-211-018	3.88	Out	Partial	Water	Adjusted to match property line	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	1 SFR; Potential for increased density	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
222-091-011	82.38	Out	Out	Water	Entire metered APN to POU	12/1/2004	6/16/2008	SFR	2 SFR; 4 single detached dwelling units per APN	AL(20)	RR20-160	AE	Part USA	No
Meadows/Alderpoint Area														
223-181-031	2.62	Out	Within	W&S	No change	12/1/2004	4/5/1981	SFR	Potential for increased density	AS	RE2.5-5	RS-T	USA	Yes
223-181-043	0.94	Out	Within	W&S	No change	12/1/2004	6/19/1981	SFR	Potential for increased density	AS	RE2.5-5	RS-T	USA	Yes
223-181-044	3.77	Out	Within	W&S	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	SFR	Potential for increased density	AS	RE2.5-5	RS-T	USA	Yes

<div>Table 9</div> <div>Development Potential by Assessor's Parcel Number</div>														
Assessor's Parcel Number	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary: (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup> Service	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action (Add All/ Partial/ Remove/ Adjust to Property Line)	Date 1st Billed by GSD <sup>3</sup>	Date Meter Set	Existing Development	Notes about Potential Development	Existing General Plan Land Use Designation <sup>4</sup>	General Plan Update Land Use Designation <sup>5</sup> (Planning Commission Recommendation)	Existing Zoning <sup>6</sup>	Urban Study Area (USA) or Water Study Area (WSA)	Housing Opportunity Zone
<div> <div> <div>1. POU: place of use</div> <div>2. W&amp;S: water and sewer</div> <div>3. GSD: Garberville Sanitary District</div> <div>4. AR(5-20): Agricultural Rural, 5 to 20 acre minimum parcel size</div> <div>AS: Agricultural Suburban</div> <div>CG: Commercial General</div> <div>GG: Green Gulch</div> <div>IG: Industrial, General</div> <div>IR: Industrial, Resource Related</div> <div>PF: Public Facility</div> <div>RL: Residential-Low Density</div> </div> <div> <div>5. AS: Agricultural Suburban</div> <div>CG: Commercial General</div> <div>IG: Industrial, General</div> <div>IR: Industrial, Resource Related</div> <div>NR: Natural Resources</div> <div>PF: Public Facility</div> <div>RE2.5-5: Residential Estates, 2.5-5 acre minimum parcel size</div> <div>RL: Residential-Low Density</div> <div>RR(5-20): Rural Residential, 5 to 20 acre minimum parcel size</div> <div>RR40: Rural Residential, minimum lot size 40 acres</div> </div> <div> <div>6. AG-B-5(5): Special Building Site, 5 acre minimum lot size</div> <div>AE-B-5(160): Agriculture Exclusive, Special Building Site Combining Zone -160 acre minimum parcel size</div> <div>AL(20): Agricultural Lands, 20 acre minimum</div> <div>C-2-D: Community Commercial-Design Review Combining</div> <div>FR-Q: Forestry Recreation Zone-Qualified Combining Zone</div> <div>MH: Heavy Industrial</div> <div>MH-Q: Heavy Industrial- Qualified Combining Zone</div> <div>MH-S-Q: Heavy Industrial-Standard Combining Zone-Qualified Combining Zone</div> <div>R-1-B-6: Residential One Family Lot, Special Building Site Combining Zone - 160 acres minimum parcel size</div> <div>R-1-B-6-T: Residential One Family Special Building Site and Manufactured Home Combining Zone</div> <div>RR20-160: Rural Residential 20-160 acres minimum parcel size</div> <div>RS-B-5(5): Residential Suburban- Special Building Site, 5 acre minimum lot size</div> <div>RS-T: Residential Suburban-Manufactured Home</div> <div>U: Unclassified</div> </div> <div> <div>7. WWTP: wastewater treatment plant</div> <div>8. SFR: Single Family Residence</div> <div>LUD: Land Use Designation</div> <div>9. KMWC: Kimtu Mutual Water Company</div> </div> </div>														



## Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is or May Be Required

---

Approval of the annexation must be granted from the Humboldt LAFCo. Approval of the change in POUs must be granted from the California State Water Resources Control Board.

## Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

---

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project, and include at least one "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklists on the following pages.

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials         | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic              |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |  |  |


## Determination:

---

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project **could not** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **Negative Declaration** will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project **may** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **Environmental Impact Report** (EIR) is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project **may** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **Environmental Impact Report** is required, but it must analyze only those effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **EIR** or **Negative Declaration** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **EIR** or **Negative Declaration**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature



Date

09/20/2013



# Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

---

- (1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- (2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- (3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- (4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- (5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (California Code of Regulations, title 14 Section 15063(c) (3) (D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

# Environmental Checklist

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Thresholds of Significance:

This IS/MND considers whether the proposed project may have any significant effects on visual aesthetics because of: a) the short-term or long-term presence that would impact the vista points that provide views of or from the project area; b) permanent changes in physical features that would impact the visual character of the project area; c) project-related construction that would detract from the visual character of the Garberville Area; or d) the presence of short-term, long-term, or continuous bright light, or operations occurring at night, that would detract from a project area that is otherwise generally dark at night or that is subject to low levels of artificial light.

## Discussion:

**(a-d) Less Than significant:** The project does not include physical changes to the environment that would have an effect on scenic vistas or visual resources currently provided, or create a new source of light or glare. Highway 101 is not officially designated as a State Scenic Highway. Development of vacant or underused lots is within areas with the same land uses and is not considered inconsistent or incompatible. Any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, which will address conformance with the surrounding aesthetics.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

The project occurs within areas that are currently developed and so any future development (residential or industrial ) in the project area would be consistent with the existing aesthetics within the Garberville area. Any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, which will address conformance with the surrounding aesthetics.

Other infrastructure projects identified by the GSD include the Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement and Inflow and Infiltration Reduction Project, Alderpoint Road Tank Replacement Project, and Drinking Water System Improvement Project. None of the impacts to aesthetics were determined to have a significant impact. Several mitigation measures were included to address potential impacts during operation.

The SHCP project, which is located adjacent to the proposed GSD boundary/POU is proposing changes to the existing uses, for which a Draft EIR is currently in preparation. New uses would involve recreational and community assembly uses. Such uses could result in aesthetic changes in the area, including new lighting sources, which could be potentially significant. Although this projects may contribute to aesthetic impacts in the area, this project's contribution to any potentially significant cumulative aesthetic impacts in the area will not be cumulatively considerable.

<b>II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?		X		
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?			X	
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X	
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		X		
<b>Thresholds of Significance:</b>  This IS/MND considers to what degree the proposed project would: a) change the availability or use of agriculturally important land areas designated under one or more of the programs above; b) cause or promote change in land zoned for those uses, particularly lands designated as Agriculture Exclusive or under Williamson Act contracts; c) conflict with, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)); d) result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use or e) change the availability or use of agriculturally important land areas for agricultural purposes.				



## Discussion:

**(a) No Impact:** None of the involved parcels has soils identified in the California Resources Agency's Department of Conservation as Prime Farmland as shown in the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program because Humboldt County does not participate in the program.

**(b and e) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** The proposed annexation area or POU does not include any parcel subject to the Williamson Act. However, there are areas that are zoned agricultural exclusive and agricultural grazing within the annexation area and POU. Agricultural and prime agricultural soils are located within the proposed boundary expansion as defined by *Soils of Western Humboldt County, California* (McLaughlin and Harradine, 1965). Additionally, prime farmlands and soils of Statewide importance have been mapped recently by the USDA NRCS within the Garberville area (See Figure 13 in Attachment 1). The USDA NRCS information was released during the previous IS/MND public comment period.

All of the agricultural soils identified above are within areas of existing development or are within areas that have been approved for future development. This includes the following with a short description:

- Kimtu Meadows Subdivision was approved by Humboldt LAFCo for an "out of agency boundary service" for water and is fully built. No additional connection is allowed based on conditions of approval from LAFCo or GSD. No additional development will occur without further discretionary approval that would address impacts to agricultural soils.
- Connick Creek Subdivision was approved by the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department. There will be future connections as part of the already approved subdivision.
- No additional development is proposed at the WWTP or is likely due to the existing uses.
- Areas in the north are already developed with a combination of industrial and commercial uses, but there are two vacant, unpaved APNs (223-171-003 and -007) currently zoned industrial and adjacent to the South Fork Eel River. These are also both within the existing POU and GWC service area; therefore, water service could be provided at anytime. This annexation project is not proposing any change in existing conditions that would preclude protection of prime agricultural soils.

The project does not propose physical changes to the environment, but could result in future development. The proposed project is located in some agricultural areas, but they are currently provided water service or have a planned future use as part of a County-approved subdivision, so this project does not propose to convert any prime agricultural soils directly.

This project is restricted to areas of historical service; any future development or change in land use within the project area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes. This includes policies to address prime agricultural soils.

- **(c and d) Less Than Significant:** There are no timberland production zones within the existing or proposed District boundaries or POU. However, there are areas adjacent to the proposed project to the west and east that are zoned for timberland production (See Figure 9 in Attachment 1). Also, there are some pockets of forested areas within the proposed District boundary, but they do not meet the size requirements of non-industrial timber management

plans. Even though the proposed project is located adjacent to timberland areas, these areas are currently provided water service or have a planned future use as part of a County-approved subdivision, so this project does not propose to directly conflict with any existing timberland production.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

Currently, the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department is processing an application from the SHCP for a general plan amendment and rezone for APNs 222-241-009 and 222-091-014 from Agricultural Lands (AL20) and Agricultural Rural (AR5-20) to allow recreational uses and community assembly uses. The SHCP project is located adjacent to the proposed new GSD boundary/POU. It is conceivable that such changes in use could result in impacts to agricultural soils, however this project would not contribute to impacts to agricultural soils if the SHCP developed.

Other projects identified in the “Cumulative Impact Methodology” were determined to not have a significant impact on the prime agricultural soils because they are not located on prime agricultural soils. The exception is the Kimtu Meadows Subdivision that is described previously. No additional development is allowed without further discretionary approval.

Although other projects may contribute to agricultural impacts in the area, this project’s contribution to any potentially significant cumulative agricultural resources impacts in the area will not be cumulatively considerable. Any future development within the project area would be subject to General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes and proposed General Plan update, which include policies to address prime agricultural soils.

III. Air Quality. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

#### Thresholds of Significance:

This IS/MND considers to what degree the proposed project would: a) interfere with air quality objectives established by the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD), b) contribute pollutants that would violate an existing or projected air quality standard, c) produce pollutants that would in part contribute to cumulative effects of non-attainment for any air pollutant, d) produce pollutant loading near sensitive receptors that would cause locally significant air quality impacts, or e) release odors that would affect a number of receptors.

#### Discussion:

**(a-c) Less Than Significant:** The NCUAQMD is responsible for monitoring and enforcing local and state air quality standards in Humboldt County. Air quality standards are set for emissions that may include, but are not limited to, visible emissions, particulate matter, and fugitive dust. The NCUAQMD is in attainment for all federal criteria air pollutants and for all state standards, except particulate matter less than 10 microns in size (PM-10). (PM-10 air emissions include chemical emissions and other inhalable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 10 microns.)

The project does not include physical changes to the environment. Although it can be assumed that the project would generate air emissions as a result of future construction activities, the scope of development and specific impacts cannot be known without the details of future projects. However, compliance with air quality regulations will ensure a PM-10 air quality violation does not occur, because an activity that complies with the state and local standards for air quality emissions will not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in the countywide PM-10 air quality violation.

**(d) Less Than Significant:** The project is not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and Zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes.

**(e) No Impact:** With regard to objectionable odors, the project does not include physical changes to the environment. Any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and Zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes and Humboldt County General Plan update, which will address objectionable odors.

#### *Cumulative Impacts*

Projects identified in the “Cumulative Impact Methodology” were determined to not have a significant impact on the air quality. This is mainly attributed to the temporary nature of construction impacts and compliance with the NCUAQMD regulations.

This project does not include physical changes to the environment that would contribute to this impact. Furthermore, any future development within the project area would be subject to the NCUAQMD and General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, including policies to address air quality. This project’s contribution to any potentially significant cumulative air quality impacts in the area will not be cumulatively considerable.

IV. Biological Resources. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

#### Thresholds of Significance:

This IS/MND considers whether the proposed project would result in significant adverse direct or indirect effects to: a) individuals of any plant or animal species (including fish) listed as rare, threatened, or endangered by the federal or state government, or effects to the habitat of such species; b) more than an incidental and minor area of riparian habitat or other sensitive habitat (including wetlands) types identified under federal, state, or local policies; c) more than an incidental and minor area of wetland identified under federal or state criteria; d) key habitat areas that provide for continuity of movement for resident or migratory fish or wildlife; e) conflict with biological resources identified in planning policies adopted by the County of Humboldt and; f) conflict with other adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

#### Discussion:

**(a-c) Less Than Significant:** The project does not include major physical changes to the environment (such as, ground disturbance). Future land development within the GSD annexation area and POU will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt

County General Plan and Building Codes and other regulations that address biological resources (such as, the streamside management area ordinance and Endangered Species Act). These regulations will address any biological resources within the proposed boundary expansion areas.

The GSD relies on drawing water from the SF Eel River, which is designated as a fully appropriated stream system by the SWRCB, Water Right Order 98-08, Declaration of Fully Appropriated Stream Systems (November 19, 1998). However, an executed (July 2012) California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW; formerly California Department of Fish and Game) Streambed Alteration Agreement (Notification No. 1600-2012-0030-R1) was obtained for both the existing intake and Drinking Water Improvement Project. As part of the Streambed Alteration Agreement, site-specific condition 2.15 was included, which states *"the Permittee shall not divert more than 0.75 cfs or 10% of the streamflow as measured at the USGS Gauge Station No. 11476500 at Miranda."*

GSD holds water diversion license #03404 from the SWRCB for appropriation of water from the SF Eel River, which allows an instantaneous diversion rate of 0.155 cubic feet per second (cfs), which would add up to 112 acre-feet or 37 million gallons annually for continual diversion. At the same point of diversion, GSD maintains water diversion permit #20789, which allows an annual diversion rate of 430 acre-feet, which equals a continual maximum (instantaneous) rate of 0.595 cfs. The total of these two diversion rights is 177 million gallons (542 acre-feet) per year, or continual maximum withdrawal of 0.75 cfs. This would equate to a maximum continual daily diversion of approximately 484,000 gallons, if adequate pumps and treatment facilities were available. Over the past five years, the water treatment plant processed between 55 and 65 million gallons of water each year. The 1999 Annual Progress Report submitted to the SWRCB documented the greatest year on record of 80 million gallons of processed water from both the license and permit. The maximum future annual diversions are limited to the maximum amount diverted under the permit development timeframe. This timeframe expired December 31, 1999; therefore, the 80 million gallon diversion for 1999 is the maximum annual diversion for the license plus the permit and the maximum withdrawal rate of 0.75 cfs remains the same. The maximum daily demand recorded in July 1999 was 427,780 gallons.

Site-specific condition 2.15 in the CDFW SAA is included to be protective of fish and wildlife resources; and reiterates the SWRCB license and permit instantaneous flow restrictions as well as a low flow restriction to maintain 90% bypass flows. Based on United States Geological Survey (USGS) historical records for Gauge Station No. 11476500, the lowest daily mean flow on record is 10 cfs, and occurred on August 30, 1964 (Water Data Report, 2012). The SAA 90% bypass flows requirement is likely to be met, since the SF Eel River at the Miranda gauge station has no records of flows that would be low enough to reduce the 0.75 cfs maximum instantaneous diversion rate.

The purpose of the annexation is to change the existing District boundary to achieve consistency with the actual area being served. All development within the proposed POU and Jurisdictional Boundary can be served within the limits of the SWRCB license and permit and the CDFW SAA restrictions. See the Section "XVII Utilities and Service Systems" for a discussion of the water supplies. The potential additional diversion amount associated with the 8 SFRs that could be developed on the 6 APNs that are outside of the existing POU is 564,000 gallons per year. At all times the District will not divert more than the allowed 80 million gallons per year. The restrictions specified by the SWRCB license and permit and the CDFW SAA on the diversion rate will ensure impacts to aquatic resources within the SF Eel River will be less than significant.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

The Humboldt County Planning and Building Department is processing an application from the SHCP for a general plan amendment and rezone to allow recreational and community assembly uses. The SHCP project is located adjacent to the proposed new GSD boundary/POU. It is conceivable that such changes in use could result in impacts to biological resources, which could result in a potentially significant impact. However, as approved by the GSD Board of Directors during the October 9, 2012, meeting any future annexation application limits the amount of water to the previous uses for the entire APN. This quantity of water was included in the water supplies availability discussed in Section "XVII Utilities and Service Systems." It is also unclear how the SHCP proposes to provide drinking water to their proposed project because they have several existing water supplies. Coupled with the fact that sufficient GSD water supplies are available for the previous residential consumption, the SHCP has a riparian water right at their 400 gpm infiltration gallery in the SF of the Eel River, and the SHCP reports a spring and two groundwater wells on the property, the cumulative impacts are considered less than significant (SHCP, 2010a; SHCP, 2010b).

Other projects conducted by the GSD regarding water supplies include the Drinking Water Improvement Project and Alderpoint Tank Road Project. These projects have been designed to address existing uses, which would not increase the capacity of the water system. Therefore, additional withdrawal from the SF Eel River in excess of the existing permit and license would not result from these projects.

Although other projects may contribute to water withdrawal from the SF Eel River, this project's contribution to any potentially significant cumulative impacts to aquatic resources in the SF Eel River will not be cumulatively considerable. Sufficient water supplies are available to serve the existing and potential users within the GSD. Any changes to the existing users will require review by GSD to ensure sufficient water supplies are available. This is further discussed in the Section "XVII Utilities and Service Systems." This project does not include physical changes to the environment that would contribute to any impact to aquatic resources. Any future development within the project area would be subject to the CDFW Regulations; State and Federal regulations that pertain to threatened and endangered species and communities; and policies in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes and Humboldt County General Plan update, which address biological resources.

**(d) No Impact:** No major migratory route has been identified in Garberville, except for fisheries resources in the SF of the Eel River. No modifications are proposed within the South Fork of the Eel River or identified by CDFW during the permitting process; thus the movement or migration patterns of migratory fish or wildlife species will not be influenced.

**(e) No Impact:** The project does not conflict with any local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as, a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

**(f) No Impact:** No habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other local or regional plan has been adopted within the area that encompasses the annexation areas; therefore, no impact is anticipated and no mitigation is considered necessary.

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

### **Thresholds of Significance:**

This IS/MND considers to what degree the proposed project would cause: a) physical changes in known or designated historical resources, or in their physical surroundings, in a manner that would impair their significance; b) physical changes in archaeological sites that represent important or unique archaeological or historical information; c) unique paleontological resource site or unique geologic feature; or d) disturbance of human burial locations.

### **Discussion:**

**(a-d) No Impact:** The project does not include any physical change to the environment. Any future development within the annexation area or POU will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes. These policies will address any cultural resources within the proposed boundary expansion areas.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

The project would not contribute to any cumulative cultural resources impacts. The project does not include any physical change to the environment. Any future development within the annexation area or POU will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes.



<b>VI. Geology and Soils. Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

#### **Thresholds of Significance:**

This IS/MND considers project-related effects that could involve: a) damage to project as a result of fault movement along a fault zoned by the State under the Alquist-Priolo Act or other known faults, strong seismic ground shaking, secondary seismic effects including liquefaction, or landslides; b) excessive soil erosion resulting from project; c) project-derived instability of earth materials that could subsequently fail, damaging structures or environmental resources on proposed development; d) location of project elements on expansive soils that may be damaging to existing structures; or e) have soils inadequate of supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

#### **Discussion:**

**(a-e) No Impact:** No known active earthquake fault has been mapped in the proposed annexation area or POU (Simpson, 2012). There are older “bedrock” faults in the area, but no fault zoned by the State as active pursuant to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (Humboldt County, 2002).

The annexation area and POUs include areas that have been mapped by the County of Humboldt as low instability, moderate instability, and high instability (Humboldt County, 2002). The scope of development and specific impacts for development within the expanded boundary cannot be known without the details of future projects. Any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan

and Building Codes, which will address any impacts from geologic hazards. Specifically, compliance with the “Title III, Land Use and Development, Division 3, Building Regulations, Section 331-12, Grading, Excavation, Erosion, And Sedimentation Control” will ensure that development will not result in an impact from geology or soils.

#### *Cumulative Impacts*

The project would not contribute to any cumulative geology or soils impacts. The project does not include any physical change to the environment. Any future development within the annexation area or POU will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes and Humboldt County General Plan Update, which addresses the geology and soils.

<b>VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

### Thresholds of Significance:

This IS/MND considers project-related effects that could involve: a) generate greenhouse gases (GHG) that would significantly impact the environment damage; and b) conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.

### Discussion:

**(a-b) Less Than Significant:** At the present time, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the only regulatory agency in California that has adopted quantitative thresholds for a project's operational GHG emissions. Information from other air basins cannot be adapted for use in Humboldt County. No rule or regulation is in place from the Air Resources Board (ARB), State Clearinghouse, or other resource agency that is applicable to the proposed project that define what is a "significant" source of GHG emissions, and there is no applicable facility-specific GHG emission limit or cap. Although the goal of Assembly Bill AB 32 is to reduce in-state GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020, there is no clear metric that would determine if a single project advances toward or away from this goal.

The NCUAQMD has not yet established thresholds for GHG emissions, but effective June 2011, the NCUAQMD promulgated Rule 111 (Federal Permitting Requirements for Sources of Greenhouse Gases) to establish that any new stationary source must comply with the requirements of District Rule 110, including implementation of Best Available Control Technology for GHG emissions, if either of the following thresholds is met:

- A. *On or after January 2, 2011, the new stationary source is a major source under District Rule 110, and the new stationary source has the potential to emit greater than or equal to 75,000 tons per year of CO<sub>2e</sub>, and the potential emissions of all GHGs emitted, without consideration of GWP (Global Warming Potential), will be greater than or equal to 100 tons per year on a mass basis, for any source in a category listed under Section 3.10.C, or 250 tons per year on a mass basis for any other source ; or*
- B. *On or after July 1, 2011, either the provisions of Section 4.1.A apply, or the new stationary source has the potential to emit GHGs greater than or equal to 100,000 tons per year of CO<sub>2e</sub>, and the potential emissions of all GHGs emitted, without consideration of GWP, will be greater than or equal to 100 tons per year on a mass basis, for any source in a category listed under Section 3.10.C, or 250 tons per year on a mass basis for any other source.*

This rule shall apply to any stationary source that has the potential to emit GHG, with some exceptions.

In an attempt to evaluate the project's impacts, available planning documents were reviewed. In 2009, Humboldt County initiated an inventory of GHG emissions for the unincorporated area of the County as the first step in its climate action plan (Humboldt County, 2009b). (Note: The County used the Clean Air Climate Protection [CACPP] software package of International Council on Local Environmental Initiatives [ICLEI], including a 1990 baseline, and 2006 CEQA Notice of Preparation [NOP] baseline for the Draft EIR for the General Plan update, which represents current emissions data). In terms of overall GHG emissions, the County has seen a significant decline in industrial emissions since 1990 from 817,364.3 metric tons (MT) of CO<sub>2</sub>e (in 1990) to 272,233.6 MT in 2006 (a difference of 545,131 MT). This may be attributed to a steady and significant decline in the lumber industry and closure of major industrial facilities related to timber processing, including numerous lumber mills and several pulp mills. Currently (2006 data), the overall GHG emissions in unincorporated in terms of CO<sub>2</sub>e is approximately a half million MT less than in 1990 (Humboldt County, 2009a). In essence, as of 2006, the County was already 545,131 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e below 1990 levels.

Additionally, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution on December 4, 2007, to participate in the ICLEI. This requires a multiple-step process that includes conducting baseline assessments; developing emission reduction targets; and developing, implementing, and monitoring the implementation of the climate action plan.

In regard to project impacts, the project does not include any physical change to the environment that would directly result in GHG. Because the project would result in extending services, there could be an indirect increase in GHG emission from potential development. The final supplemental EIR prepared for the County's adopted Housing Element made the following conclusion regarding global climate change:

*Given the scope of global climate change, it is not anticipated that a single development project, even one of the relatively large scale of the GPU housing element for a sparsely populated rural county, would have an individually discernible effect on global climate change, i.e., that any increase in global temperature or sea level could be attributed to the emissions resulting from the project. In this sense, it is not anticipated that the proposed project [Housing Element] would have a significant impact in and of itself. Rather, it is more appropriate to conclude substantial project-related greenhouse gas emissions will combine with emissions across California, the U.S., and the globe to contribute cumulatively to global climate change (Humboldt County, August 2009).*

*Thus there is a potential for a cumulative significant impact. To mitigate for that potential cumulative impact, the GPU includes policies, standards, implementation measures, and land use strategies for energy, traffic, land use, community design, water conservation, and air quality impacts. These policies, standards, implementation measures, and land use strategies have been designed to incorporate all applicable identified measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally, the County has joined ICLEI and committed to the Cities for Climate Protection Campaign's five milestones (Climate Action Plan) which will serve to mitigate for potential increases in greenhouse gases for the proposed project (Housing Element). With this mitigation, the cumulative effects of the project on greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant.*

Furthermore, the County's draft climate action plan recognized the projected increase of 117,200 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e by 2025 for the unincorporated County, which is still approximately a half million MT less than in 1990, and would remain within the AB 32 target. Indirect impacts associated with future residential development could contribute to regional and global increases in GHG emissions and associated climate change effects. However, the Board of Supervisor's commitment to ICLEI, implementation of the County's climate action plan, and adoption of the GHG policies (contained in the general plan update [GPU]) designed to reduce GHG emissions are expected to reduce incremental impacts to less than significant levels.

With respect to potential industrial development of the two vacant parcels or any current development, any future industrial development will be required to satisfy the requirements of NCUAQMD Rule 111. This will reduce any impacts from industrial activities to less than significant.

Based on the County's analysis in the draft climate action plan and the NCUAQMD Rule 111, the unknown future development of SFRs or industrial land is not expected to result in significant amounts of GHG emissions and would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions.

#### *Cumulative Impacts*

Based on the discussion above, one project or a series of projects will not contribute a significant amount of GHGs in Humboldt County. As such, the project would not contribute to any cumulative GHG impacts. The project does not include any physical change to the environment. Any future development within the annexation area or POU will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, which will address measures to reduce GHGs.

<b>VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized area or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	
<b>Thresholds of Significance:</b>  This IS/MND considers to what degree the proposed project would involve: a) potential storage or use on a regular basis of chemicals that could be hazardous if released into the environment; b) operating conditions that would be likely to result in the generation and release of hazardous materials; c) use of hazardous materials, because of construction-related activities or operations, within a quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school; d) being located on a site listed as hazardous pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; e) a project-related increase in use intensity by people within the boundaries of, or within two miles of, the Airport Planning Areas; f) a safety hazard for people working within and adjacent to a private airstrip; g) project-derived physical changes that would interfere with emergency responses or evacuations; or h) potential major damage because of wildfire.				
<b>Discussion:</b>  <b>(a and b) Less Than Significant:</b> The project does not include any physical change to the environment and no construction is planned as a result of the project. Any future development				

within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, and any applicable regulations regarding hazardous material.

**(c) No Impact:** Due to the nature of the proposed project it will not emit hazardous materials. Any future development that could emit hazardous materials shall be accordance with all state and federal regulations pertaining to the substance.

**(d) No Impact:** There are no sites in the annexation boundary that are located on the California Envirostor database for hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No “hazardous material” site is located within the vicinity (California Environmental Protection Agency, 2013).

**(e) Less than Significant:** The Garberville Airport, owned and operated by Humboldt County Department of Public Works Aviation Division, is a general aviation facility serving Humboldt County and the surrounding communities of Garberville, Redway, Benbow, and Alderpoint. The airport and approach zone are located within the southwest corner of the existing SOI. The airport approach zone covers a section of the Kimtu meadows subdivision, Connick Creek subdivision, and a portion of the Leino Road/Sprowel Creek Road area (See Figure 14 in Attachment 1 for airport land use compatibility zones).

The *Garberville Airport Master Plan* estimates that the total number of aircraft based at the Garberville Airport will increase from its current number of aircrafts , 20 to 28 aircrafts over the 20-year planning period. The airport has sufficient developable land to accommodate the forecasted demand, as well as significantly more aircraft basing capacity (Humboldt County, 2007). According to the Garberville/Redway/Benbow/Alderpoint Community Plan’s Community Policy, 5:

*New residential development on the flat north of Connick Creek shall be clustered in such a manner as to leave the areas under the clear and approach zones and flight track free of new residential structures. New residential development proposed for the Mitchell Ranch/Kimtu Meadows area shall be designated in such a manner as to minimize building sites under the flight track and approach zone, and leave free the area under the clear zone.*

The Kimtu Meadows subdivision is considered built-out and no additional development is possible due to restrictions from both the Humboldt LAFCo and GSD. There is the potential for development at the Connick Subdivision – the existing subdivision approval allows the development of four new SFRs. Because the policy in the community plan was already adopted during the Connick Creek Subdivision process, it is assumed that the County’s approval of the subdivision was granted because it was consistent with the community plan. Additionally, second dwelling units are subordinate to the existing structure and would not be larger than the existing structures.

The project does not propose any physical impact to the environment that could distract small aircraft (such as, use of any vertically large construction equipment). Any future development within the project area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, which will address height requirements for structures and other factors that may interfere with airport operations.

**(f) No Impact:** There is no private airstrip located within the vicinity of the proposed project; therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard in regard to private airstrips.

**(g) No Impact:** Due to the nature of the project it will not impair the implementation, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, because the project will not result in structures or street design that would result in a delay or interruption in service. Any future development within the project area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, which will address design requirements for emergency response and emergency evacuation.

**(h) Less Than Significant:** The project vicinity is within a State Responsibility Area (SRA) area of high and very high potential from wildland fire as defined by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE; CAL FIRE, 2007). CAL FIRE is responsible for suppressing wildland fires within the project area. A CAL FIRE Station is located at 324 Alderpoint Road in Garberville.

Structural fires are managed by the Garberville Fire Protection District (FPD) within a boundary of 1.1 square miles. The total response area is 35.9 square miles (Humboldt LAFCo, 2008). See Figure 15 in Attachment 1 for location of Garberville FPD and response area. The County is working with the Garberville FPD to annex areas within response areas, but this is on hold until property tax exchange negotiations have been completed with the County. Currently, the Garberville FPD does not meet a sufficient storage demand during maximum daily demand, but has sufficient water pressure (LACO, 2010a). Also, as included in the MSR (Humboldt LAFCo, 2013d):

*The fire hydrants are antiquated and fire flow service is limited, due to under sized waterlines based upon current standards. Many of the hydrants installed are wharf hydrants that will not provide sufficient flow for fire suppression. The fire department reported that there are only a few hydrants that are approved for use during a structure fire, and most are located on Redwood Drive, the main street through town. The new wild land interface fire requirements cannot be met with the current spacing of existing fire hydrants.*

The District currently has approximately 260,000 gallons of water storage distributed throughout the system. The drinking water improvement project includes upgrading the transmission lines from the new surface water treatment plant to the downtown distribution system so that all lines are eight inches in diameter. In addition, the Drinking Water Improvement Project includes construction of a new surface water treatment plant that is capable of producing 330 gallons per minute. This increase in treatment capacity will provide additional water for fire suppression activities. The District has identified several capital improvement projects in the MSR that will improve the fire hydrant spacing, distribution line upgrades, and water storage tank replacement (with larger capacity tanks).

The project does not directly include additional housing or physical changes to the environment beyond the current conditions, but rather the potential for additional development within the district boundary and POU. The scope of development and specific impacts for development within the expanded boundary cannot be known without the details of future projects. However, any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes and will be subject to building requirements to ensure development does not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. This includes compliance with Humboldt



Master Fire Protection Plan (MFPP) approved by the County Board of Supervisors in 2006 and new developments within SRA are required to comply with the Fire Safe Regulations contained in Title II-Land Use and Development Code, Division 11.

The proposed policies, standards, and implementation measures listed above would lessen the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

#### *Cumulative Impacts*

The Humboldt County Planning and Building Department is processing an application from the SHCP for a general plan amendment and rezone to allow recreational and community assembly uses. The SHCP project is located adjacent to the proposed new GSD boundary/POU. It is conceivable that such changes in use could result in impacts to hazards and hazardous materials, which could result in a potentially significant impact. However, the SHCP is proposing a development on APN 222-091-014, but the project described in the NOP (2010) and to LAFCo (2013) indicates no structures that would interfere with the airport approach zone.

Other projects identified in the "Cumulative Impact Methodology" by GSD actually have the potential to improve the conditions of fire protection. The District currently has approximately 260,000 gallons of water storage distributed throughout the system. The Drinking Water Improvement Project includes upgrading the transmission lines from the new surface water treatment plant to the downtown distribution system so that all lines are eight inches in diameter. In addition, the Drinking Water Improvement Project includes construction of a new surface water treatment plant that is capable of producing 330 gpm of treated water. This increase in treatment capacity will provide additional water for fire suppression activities. Additionally, the District has identified several capital improvement projects in the MSR that will improve the fire hydrant spacing, distribution line upgrades, and water storage tank replacement (with larger capacity tanks).

This project does not include physical changes to the environment that would contribute to any hazards and hazardous materials impact. Any future development within the project area would be subject to State and Federal regulations and the policies in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes and the Humboldt County General Plan update, which address potential hazards.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?		X		
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X	
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

#### Thresholds of Significance:

This IS/MND considers to what degree the proposed project would involve: a) potential discharges, including sediment, that would violate basin plan standards or waste discharge requirements associated with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit; b) substantial change in groundwater movement, potential uses, or quality; c) substantial increase in siltation or erosion from erosion from concentrated runoff; d) substantial increase in runoff with the potential for localized flooding; e) substantial increase in runoff that would cause drainage problems, or a runoff increase that could carry pollutants to surface waters; f) substantial degradation of water quality; g) project-related effects with placement of housing in a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)-designated 100-year flood hazard area; h) project facilities that would affect flood flows or be affected by flood flows; i) project-related effects that would involve flooding as the results of the failure of a levee or dam; and j) project-related effects that would result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

## Discussion:

**(a) Less Than Significant:** The GSD is not proposing to provide sewer services in all of the proposed annexation areas, thus a separate boundary is proposed only to provide wastewater and water. Presently, the WWTP is operating within its waste discharge requirements (WDRs). In November 2011, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) rescinded the moratorium and issued a new Waste Discharge Permit ID# 1B831200HUM.

This waste discharge permit issued contains guidelines for an average dry weather flow of 162,000 gpd, 235,000 gpd average wet weather flow, and wet weather peak flow of 600,000 gpd. The WWTP is currently operating at 38.88 percent of the capacity during dry weather flows. The average wet weather (November through April) flows were 124,858 gallons per day in 2011 and 136,167 gallons per day in 2012. The WWTP is currently operating at 55.54 percent of capacity during wet weather flows. The project adds 11 residential APNs for wastewater service. There is sufficient capacity to serve these additional parcels and the APNs without service within the existing jurisdictional boundary.

**(b) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** GSD is not proposing new groundwater wells. However, use of groundwater from the District's existing well may be necessary in the future if there is demand. Therefore, Mitigation Measure No. 1 has been proposed to address new connections and changes to existing connections. See Section "XVII: Utilities and Services Systems."

**(c and d) No Impact:** The project does not include any physical change to the environment. Any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, and any applicable regulations that address activities that alter drainage patterns.

**(e) No Impact:** The project does not include any change to the existing stormwater drainage system. Any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes and Humboldt County General Plan update, which address stormwater drainage requirements.

**(f) Less Than Significant:** The project does not include any physical change to the environment. Any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes. Other regulations include coverage under the general permit for construction and land disturbance activities (NPDES Permit No. CAS000002, Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ). Any proposed development is not expected to degrade water quality substantially, if the project is covered under the general permit for construction and land disturbance activities and appropriate best management practices are implemented following project construction.

**(g and h) Less Than Significant:** Part of the proposed boundary includes areas mapped on the Flood Insurance Rate Map. The scope of development and specific impacts for development within the expanded boundary cannot be known without the details of future projects. Any future development within the annexation areas will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes and Humboldt County General Plan update, that address any development within mapped floodplain areas (July 19, 1982 Flood Insurance Rate Map for Humboldt County unincorporated areas (Community Panel No. 060060 1835B and 060060 1830 B).

**(i) No Impact:** The project is not located in an area that would be affected by flooding from the failure of a levee or dam.

**(j) No Impact:** There is no enclosed body of water located anywhere near the annexation boundaries that would put the project at risk due to a seiche. The project is not located near the coast; therefore there is no risk of tsunami inundation. There are steep areas within the existing and proposed boundary that could be at risk for mud flows. Any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, which will address potential for mudflows.

#### *Cumulative Impacts*

None of the cumulative projects identified were determined to have a significant impact on hydrology and water quality. In fact, the GSD wastewater project improved the existing conditions. This project does not include physical changes to the environment that would contribute to any hydrology and water quality impact. Any future development within the project area would be subject to the RWQCB requirements that pertain to water quality and policies in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes and Humboldt County General Plan update, which address water quality.

<b>X. Land Use and Planning.</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?			X	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

### **Thresholds of Significance:**

This IS/MND considers to what degree the proposed project would: a) divide an established community or conflict with existing land uses within the project's vicinity, such as, commercial establishments; b) conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project; and c) conflict with applicable environmental plans and protection measures enforced by regulatory agencies that have jurisdiction over the project, such as, sensitive species and biologically significant habitats.

### **Discussion:**

**(a) Less Than Significant:** The proposed project will not divide an established community. The District boundary is proposed in areas that contain existing water or wastewater infrastructure and/or services, but not all the District boundaries will be contiguous, specifically, the Kimtu Meadows Subdivision, and the Connick Creek Subdivision. However, these areas are already developed and GSD was formed under the Sanitary District Act of 1923 (Health & Safety Code §6400 et seq.), which permits non-contiguous boundaries.

**(b) Less Than Significant:** The purpose of the project is to make the planning boundaries and service boundaries consistent with the existing services provided; therefore, an application will be submitted to the Humboldt LAFCo for approval of the proposed boundaries. The purpose of the project is to attain consistency between Humboldt LAFCo policies and existing conditions. In the future, if any change to the existing SOI or GSD boundary is proposed, it would be subject to the Humboldt County Planning land use regulations and approval by Humboldt County LAFCo. Proposed changes for this project will not result in a conflict with applicable land use plans or policies.

In the northern planning boundary, there is overlap between the Redway SOI and both the existing GSD SOI and proposed boundary. The entirety of this area consists of Highway 101 right-of-way. This area is proposed for inclusion in the District boundaries because the GSD provides water service on both sides of this area. During the March 2013 meeting, Humboldt County LAFCo has indicated that during the next Redway SOI update, the Redway boundary will be modified to address the changes due to this project (Humboldt LAFCo, 2013c).

The project is consistent with the policies in the Garberville/Redway/Benbow/Alderpoint Community Plan. The project does not include any change to land use designation or zoning; rather it updates the existing District boundary to match existing conditions.

**(c) No Impact:** No habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other local or regional plan has been adopted within the project area.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

The project would not contribute to any cumulative land use or planning impacts. The purpose of the project is to attain consistency between Humboldt LAFCo policies and existing conditions.

XI. Mineral Resources. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X
<p><b>Thresholds of Significance:</b></p> <p>This IS/MND considers to what degree the proposed project would interfere with the extraction of commodity materials or otherwise cause any short-term or long-term decrease in the availability of mineral resources that would otherwise be available for construction or other consumptive uses.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p><b>(a and b) No Impact:</b> The project will not result in any physical change to the environment and does not involve extraction of any known mineral resources. Development of vacant or underused APNs would not require a significant quantity of materials necessary for development that could not be served by existing sources.</p> <p><i>Cumulative Impacts</i></p> <p>The project would not contribute to any cumulative mineral resources impacts. The project does not include any physical change to the environment. Any future development within the annexation area or POU would not require a significant quantity of materials necessary for development that could not be served by existing sources.</p>				

XII. Noise. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?			X	
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

### Thresholds of Significance:

This IS/MND considers whether the proposed project would produce: a) sound-pressure levels contrary to County noise standards; b) long-term ground vibrations and low-frequency sound that would interfere with normal activities and is not currently present in the project area; c) changes in noise levels that are related to operations, not construction related, which will be perceived as permanent increased ambient or background noise in the project area; d) a substantial short-term increase in ambient sound pressure levels; e) exposure of persons within 2 miles of a public airport to excessive noise levels; or f) exposure of persons within the vicinity of a private airstrip to excessive noise levels.

### Discussion:

**(a-d) Less Than Significant:** The project does not include any physical change to the environment. Any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, which designates allowable noise levels. Furthermore, the future development will be within areas consistent with the current uses within the vicinity and does not represent incompatible uses that would generate noise in areas currently undisturbed.

**(e and f) Less Than Significant:** The Garberville Airport, owned and operated by Humboldt County Department of Public Works Aviation Division, is a general aviation facility serving Humboldt County and the surrounding communities of Garberville, Redway, Benbow, and Alderpoint. The airport and approach zone are located within the southwest corner of the existing SOI. Any future development within the annexation area will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, which will address any noise generated from airport activities on people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport land use plan or public or private airstrip.



### *Cumulative Impacts*

The project would not contribute to any cumulative ambient noise impacts. Any future development within the annexation area or POU will be subject to the General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, which includes noise restrictions.

<b>XIII. Population and Housing.</b> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and/or businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	

#### **Thresholds of Significance:**

This IS/MND considers to what degree the proposed project would result in or contributes to: a) population growth; b) displacement of housing units, demolition, or removal of existing housing units; or c) any project-related displacement of people from occupied housing.

#### **Discussion:**

**(a -c) Less Than Significant:** The GSD serves approximately 847 residents and 353 connections within its existing boundaries. It is estimated (based on a 5% growth rate) that the 2030 projected population potentially served by the District would be 936 residents and 390 housing units, or an additional 89 residents and 37 housing units (Humboldt LAFCo, 2013d).

The project proposes to update existing District and POU boundaries to encompass areas currently provided water and/or wastewater service. As a result, there are several APNs that are vacant and/or not currently fully developed in the annexation area under current regulations that could be further developed. This is further described as part of the "Development Potential in Annexation Areas" described above. This includes an additional 14 SFRs on a combination of vacant or underdeveloped APNs, 14 APNs within "Housing Opportunity Zones," 9 APNs that are allowed second dwelling unit (these are all within the "Housing Opportunity Zones)," and 1 APN zoned Agriculture Exclusive that allows 4 single detached dwelling units.

Growth in the Garberville area is below the County average, and the lower rate of development is attributed to the area's rural nature (Humboldt LAFCo, 2013d and Humboldt County, 2012e). Most of the parcels are partially or mostly included in the existing Permit POU and could already have been further developed within the existing Permit POU if the property owner was interested. The infrastructure and service to these parcels has been available for more than a decade and there has been very little development of second dwellings and no use of the density bonus (Richardson, 2013a). Nor, is this project likely to make Garberville a destination site that would rapidly increase housing development.

As stated above in the "Development Potential," the change in boundary could result in an increased population of 34 residents (based on development of 14 single family residences), assuming an average household size of 2.4 persons indicated in the 2010 Census for Humboldt County. There could be additional density as a result of a "Housing Opportunity Zone" or second dwelling unit, but this is considered unlikely because previous trends in development in Garberville and Humboldt County, which are slow. According to Humboldt County Planning and Building

senior planner Michael Richardson no second dwelling units have been permitted since 2000 (Richardson, 2013c). There were two in the Redway area. Additionally, as indicated in the *Humboldt County General Plan Update Existing Conditions – Building Communities* (Dyett & Bhatia, 2002), there was a 4.5% reduction in population from 1990 to 2000 in the Garberville Area. Furthermore, the County of Humboldt has documented a reduction in the number of dwelling units permitted in 2011 compared to the 10-year average from 2001 through 2011 (Humboldt County, 2012e). There were 90 less dwelling units in Humboldt County in 2011 than compared to the 10-year average (Humboldt County, 2012e). This information indicates that current development rate than the historical development rate within Humboldt County is slower than from 2001 through 2011. The County does not have specific information regarding the Garberville area.

The additional population of 34 residents is estimated to be 4% of the existing population served by GSD and 3.7% of the population stated in the 2010 Census. This potential residential development did not make any adjustments for other barriers to development, such as existing agricultural land use designations and sewer service so the estimated potential development is a reflection of conditions if all APNs are built to the existing zoning standards.

This project is not anticipated to result in a significant impact to population and housing because the development potential is not significant when compared to the existing population. Given that population growth is expected to be slow as described above; the project will not induce substantial growth or displace existing housing or people that would necessitate construction of replacement housing.

#### *Cumulative Impacts*

The “Development Potential” described above assumed all potential development would occur within the annexation areas under the current regulations. There is one existing contract for water service that is not proposed for inclusion in the annexation or POU. It is located adjacent to the Connick Subdivision on APN 222-156-012. No potential development is known at this time.

Other potential housing projects within the Garberville area include the following:

- Multifamily rezoning project undertaken by Humboldt County Planning and Building;
- Multifamily housing project proposed at the SHCP as described in the NOP;
- Chautaugqua Natural Foods General Plan Amendment and Zone Reclassification (4 proposed apartment units [Humboldt County, 2009a]) and;
- Winters project on APN 032-111-024 (16 units proposed). This project is principally permitted and only required a building permit from the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department.

The County did not include any areas in Garberville for the multifamily rezone housing project. The closest rezoning project was in Redway. The SHCP project is also not within the proposed project; it is located adjacent to the proposed boundary. As the lead agency under CEQA, the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department is currently evaluating the environmental impacts of changing the existing uses at the SHCP. The project described in the NOP included a multifamily housing area. According to senior planner Michael Richardson, this has been eliminated from the project (Richardson, 2013b).

The Chautauqua Natural Foods project proposed to create 4 one-bedroom apartments on the upper floor of the proposed natural foods store. And the Winters multifamily rezoning project on APN 032-111-024 is proposed to create 16-units in phases (Richardson, 2013c). The Chautauqua Natural Foods project has been constructed. The Winters multifamily rezoning project is proposed to be constructed in phases. Both of these projects are within the existing Jurisdictional Boundary and Place of Use. The result will be an increase of approximately 42 residents to be added, which is estimated to be 9% of the existing population served by GSD and 9% of the population stated in the 2010 Census. This is proposed as infill development and will help meet the housing need for the anticipated population growth.

Other potential projects within the Garberville area that could affect housing and population include the water and wastewater infrastructure projects that could induce growth because they remove barriers to growth. GSD was the CEQA lead agency for these projects and includes the following:

- Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement and Inflow and Infiltration Reduction Project. The District adopted an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) (State Clearinghouse No. 2005062051) and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program on July 19, 2005 (LACO, 2010b). The District filed a Notice of Determination with the Humboldt County (County) Clerk on July 25, 2005, and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) on February 3, 2008. The inflow and infiltration (I/I) correction component of the Project was not included in the IS/MND. The District filed a Notice of Exemption for the I/I correction component of the Project with the County Clerk on February 2, 2009, and with the OPR (SCH No. 2009028028) on February 3, 2009.
- Alderpoint Road Tank Replacement Project. An Initial Study and Environmental Checklist was prepared in May 2013 by LACO (LACO, 2013).
- Water System Improvement Project. An Initial Study and Environmental Checklist was prepared in April 2010 by LACO (LACO, 2010a).

These projects considered the potential impacts to population and housing as a result of improvements to the existing infrastructure. However, in both the Water System Improvement Project and the Alderpoint Road Tank Replacement project environmental analyses, it was determined the project would have a less than significant impact because the purpose of the projects is to meet current drinking water demands and correct deficiencies, not to provide additional capacity to the water system.

The Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project also considered the potential impacts to population and housing. The purpose of the Project was to achieve compliance with North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) Order No. R1-2000-58. On November 29, 2004, the NCRWQCB issued Cease and Desist Order (CDO) No. R1-2004-0097 due to chronic violations of effluent limitations for various constituents, including Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD), Total Suspended Solids (TSS), and Total Coliform. In addition, effluent flow rates chronically exceed the Monthly ADWF effluent limitation during the months of June through October.

Lastly, the General Plan is in the process of being updated. The "Planning Commission approved Draft General Plan" is not expected to change the expected land use intensity within the GSD boundaries (Humboldt County, 2012b). There could be an increase to the maximum density in select

locations because of a new Mixed Use designation that allows for some residences in commercial areas. This designation would be located in the downtown corridor and not in areas proposed for annexation or a change in the POU.

In conclusion, two multifamily projects have added to population in Garberville. Considering the potential increase in population from future development within the project area, which is 34 people, and the two multi-family projects, which is 76, equates to 9% of the existing population. Based on this small increase in population, this proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present, and probable future projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact to population and housing.

<b>XIV. Public Services.</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?			X	
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?			X	
e) Other public facilities?			X	

#### **Thresholds of Significance:**

This IS/MND considers to what degree the proposed project would adversely affect: a) fire protection, b) police protection, c) schools, d) parks, and e) other public facilities.

#### **Discussion:**

**(a through e) Less Than Significant:** The project does not induce significant population growth or propose service in areas not currently provided service; therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for public services. The project will not require any new neighborhood park, or expansion to an existing park or other public facility. The GFPD has a boundary of 1.1 square miles, but has a total response area of 35.9 square miles that includes all the annexation areas (Humboldt LAFCo, 2008). Currently, annexation of response areas is on hold until property tax exchange negotiations are completed with the County. The project as defined will not result in an adverse impact on public services.

#### *Cumulative Impacts*

Given that the project is not expected to induce substantial growth or extend services beyond areas of existing public services, the project would not contribute to any cumulative public services impacts.

XV. Recreation. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

### Thresholds of Significance:

This IS/MND considers to what degree any aspect of the proposed project would be related to demand for: a) recreational facilities, or b) increase use of existing recreational areas such that those areas are physically degraded, including secondary effects (such as, degradation through over-use of environmentally sensitive areas).

### Discussion:

**(a-b) Less Than Significant:** The project in and of itself will not result in any direct impact to existing usage of neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The proposed District boundary is within the neighborhood of the existing Tooby Park and property known as the SHCP operated by the SHCP. No other community or neighborhood park is identified within the Garberville Planning Area (Humboldt County, 2012b). The proposed annexation is not expected to result in a substantial population increase that would result in substantial physical deterioration of a facility occurring or accelerating. As a result of development within the proposed GSD boundaries, there could be increased use of the existing SHCP and/or Tooby Park. However, the addition of the 14 single family residences that could result from annexation is not anticipated to increase use substantially beyond the existing conditions. The project will not require the construction or expansion of any existing recreational facility that may pose adverse physical effects to the environment.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

The Humboldt County Planning and Building is in the process of analyzing a Draft EIR for changes to the existing SHCP. The SHCP project in and of itself is proposed to have a change in recreational uses.

Although other projects may contribute to recreation impacts in the area, this project's contribution to any potentially significant cumulative recreation impacts in the area will not be cumulatively considerable. This project does not include physical changes to the environment that would contribute to any recreation impact. Any future development within the project area could add 14 SFRs, but is not anticipated to increase recreation use substantially beyond the existing conditions.

<b>XVI. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				X
b) 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?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X

#### **Thresholds of Significance:**

This IS/MND considers to what degree, if any, the proposed project would be associated with: a) changes in traffic, circulation, or other changes that might be perceived as adverse traffic effects resulting from temporary construction-related changes; b) any project-related changes in level-of-service on county or state roads or highways; c) safety risks associated with changes in air traffic patterns; d) hazards due to design features or incompatible uses; e) project-associated travel restrictions that would prevent emergency vehicles from reaching the location where they are needed; or f) conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transportation, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or with decreases in the performance or safety of such facilities.

#### **Discussion:**

**(a, b, e, and f) No Impact:** The project does not include any physical impact that would result in an increase in vehicular trips; therefore, there would be no conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system or an applicable congestion management program.

**(c) No Impact:** The project does not involve changes to air traffic; therefore, there would be no impact to air traffic patterns.

**(d) No Impact:** The project does not include design feature or incompatible uses that would result in hazards.



### *Cumulative Impacts*

Given that the project does not include physical changes to the environment and is not expected to induce substantial growth, the project would not contribute to any cumulative traffic impacts.

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

#### **Thresholds of Significance:**

This IS/MND considers impacts of the proposed project as follows: a) result in expansion of existing wastewater facilities or construction of new wastewater facilities and exceeding wastewater treatment requirements established by the RWQCB; b) result in environmental effects caused by the construction of any new stormwater drainage; c) result in expansion of water entitlements due to insufficient supplies for the proposed project; d) exceed the capacity of the wastewater treatment provider and/or landfill provider, thus impacting their service commitments to other customers; or e) result in the violation of any federal, state, or local solid waste regulations.

#### **Discussion:**

**(a and e) Less Than Significant Impact:** The GSD is not proposing to provide sewer services to all of the proposed annexation areas, thus a separate service area is proposed to provide only water service. Of the 11 APNs that are proposed to be served both water and sewer service, 9 SFRs are within a "Housing Opportunity Zones." In November 2011, the NCRWQCB issued Order No. R1-2011-0096 WDID No. 1B831200HUM which contains capacity limitations of an average dry weather flows (ADWF) of 0.162 million gallons per day and an average wet weather flow (AWWF) of 0.235 million gallons per day. The ADWF for the new plant is about 59,000 gallons per day, and the AWWF for 2011 and 2012 is 130,412 gallons per day, which is 55.49 percent of the AWWF allowed in the WDID order. The WWTP is currently operating at 38.88 percent of the capacity during dry weather flows. There is sufficient wastewater capacity to serve these future users because the treatment plant is operating well below the allowable flows in the order; therefore, the project will not result in exceeding applicable RWQCB requirements. Furthermore, the existing services will

continue, and APNs with existing onsite wastewater systems will not be required to connect to the wastewater system unless there is a failing onsite wastewater system or new project or permit is issued.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

The GSD recently constructed the Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project to achieve compliance with the NCRWQCB WDR Order No. R1-2000-58. On November 29, 2004, the North Coast Water Board issued CDO No. R1-2004-0097 due to chronic violations of effluent limitations for various constituents, including BOD, TSS, and Total Coliform. In addition, effluent flow rates chronically exceed the Monthly ADWF effluent limitation during the months of June through October. This project was completed in 2011. The NCRWQCB adopted Order No. R1-2011-0096 on November 3, 2011, which rescinded previous orders. This WDR contains capacity limitations for an average dry weather flow of 162,000 gpd, 235,000 gpd average wet weather flow, and wet weather peak flow of 600,000 gpd. The treatment plant is currently operating at 38.88 percent of the capacity during dry weather flows and 55.49 percent of average wet weather flows.

One project recently constructed is the Chautauqua Natural Food Store located in downtown Garberville. This project included a general plan amendment and zone reclassification to change the 9,800 square foot parcel from Residential, Multiple Family (RM) general plan land use designation and zoned Apartment Professional (R-4) to Commercial General (CG) plan designation and Community Commercial (C-2) zone classification. The result of the general plan amendment and zone reclassification will result in relocation of the Chautauqua Natural Foods to the Masonic Lodge Building and the development of four apartment units on the second floor. Information about this project was gathered from the June 14, 2010 staff report to the Humboldt County Planning Commission (Humboldt County, 2009a). Sufficient wastewater supplies are available for this project.

Another project in Garberville is the Winters multifamily project on APN 032-111-024 (16-units proposed). This project only required a building permit from the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department. Sewer service is proposed. It is estimated that this project will utilize up to 1,128,000 gallons of water per year and discharge approximately 789,600 gallons of sewage per year (2,163 gpd).

The wastewater system is operating below its capacity it is capable of serving the additional development that could result from this project and the other related cumulative projects identified. Therefore, the cumulative impacts to exceeding wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB are less than significant.

### **(b and d) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:**

#### *Background*

The purpose of the annexation is to change the existing District boundary to achieve consistency with the actual area being served.

GSD holds water diversion license #03404 from the SWRCB for appropriation of water from the SF Eel River, which allows the instantaneous diversion rate of 0.155 cfs, which is equivalent to 112.2 acre-feet or 37 million gallons annually for continual diversion. At the same point of diversion, GSD maintains a water diversion permit #20789, which allows a total annual diversion of 430 acre-feet,

which equals a continual maximum (instantaneous) rate of 0.595 cfs. The total of these two diversion rights is 177 million gallons per year (542 acre-feet per year), or continual maximum withdrawal rate of 0.75 cfs. This would equate to a maximum daily diversion of approximately 484,000 gallons, if adequate pumps and treatment facilities were available. The new drinking water treatment plant will be capable of pumping and treating up to 336 gallons per minute and can divert this maximum amount. Over the past five years, the water treatment plant processed between 55 and 65 million gallons of water each year. The average from 1985 to 2012 is 65,131,644 gallons per year. The 1999 Annual Progress Report submitted to the SWRCB documented the greatest year on record of 80 million gallons of processed water from both the license and permit. The maximum future annual diversions are limited to the maximum amount diverted under the permit development timeframe. This timeframe expired December 31, 1999, therefore the 80 million gallon maximum diversion for 1999 is the maximum annual diversion allowed for the license plus the permit. The maximum daily demand was recorded in July 1999 and was 427,780 gallons.

#### *Potential Development*

The following section presents a discussion regarding the potential water consumption that could result from the potential future development within the project area. A summary of this information is also presented in Table 9, above.

The change in boundary will result in several APNs that are vacant and/or not currently fully developed under current regulations that could be further developed for housing. The development potential was derived from a review of all areas proposed for annexation. The project could result in development of an additional 14 SFRs on a combination of vacant or underdeveloped APNs. Of these 14 SFRs, three are already within the POU and were accounted for in the baseline analysis above. Based on the average consumption of a single family residence (70,500 gallons), the projected consumption of development potential of the remaining 11 SFRs is 775,500 gallons per year. Because one of the vacant residential APNs is within the existing license this quantity of future water consumption was assumed as part of the baseline.

There are also two industrial APNs that are vacant in the annexation area that are within the POU and the future consumption for those two parcels was included in the baseline above. There is one industrial APN that is currently developed with a residence that could develop into an industrial customer. The additional water consumption for this conversion is 107,000 gallons per year. This information was included in the baseline information because they are located within the existing Permit POU, but outside the existing jurisdictional boundary.

There could be development as a result of "Housing Opportunity Zones" and second dwelling units, but this is considered unlikely due to the previous development history that does not include second dwelling units in the Garberville area. There are 14 APNs within "Housing Opportunity Zones," and 9 APNs that are allowed second dwelling units (these are all within the "Housing Opportunity Zones)," and one APN with Agriculture Exclusive zoning that allows 4 single detached dwelling units. For planning purposes, water supplies were identified to include potential second dwelling units. Assuming that most second dwellings units are equivalent to an apartment type user, Metcalf & Eddy's estimates that apartment flows are approximately 93% of the average residential house. Using this ratio, the equivalent consumption per second dwelling unit would be 65,465 gallons per year. For the 14 APNs located within a "Housing Opportunity Zone," this would equate to an additional 1,198,510 gallons per year.

In addition to the potential development as a result of the project, there is one developed APN in the Connick Creek subdivision that uses a water source other than GSD. GSD is contractually obligated to provide service to this parcel should they apply, so that APN has been included in the summary of water consumption (Table 10) because water service could be requested in the future. This amount is for one SFR.

<b>Table 10</b>	
<b>Summary of Water Consumption for Expanded Jurisdictional Boundary</b>	
<b>Description of Consumption</b>	<b>Amount (gallons)</b>
Baseline (from Table 7)	70,911,144
11 SFRs	775,500
14 "Housing Opportunity Zones"	1,198,510
APN 222-156-012 (Connick Creek Subdivision Parcel with own water source)	70,500
<b>Total Potential Water Consumption</b>	<b>72,955,654</b>

This demonstrates that on average, the GSD's license and permit maximum diversion of 80 million gallons per year is sufficient to accommodate the average total water consumption at build out with approximately 7,044,346 gallons per year excess. Other than the maximum year of 1999, there has been no other year since 1977 for which the diversion would have exceeded the allowable 80 million gallons after factoring in all of the non-consuming parcels and the development potential in the annexation and POU expansion areas.

The existing system has sufficient water supplies available to serve any potential future development on APNs that are part of the project from the existing license and permit. Because the water license and permit have limits and individual consumers will change over time, Mitigation Measure No. 1 has been included to ensure that GSD has sufficient water supplies for any future development or change in intensification of use. Mitigation Measure No. 1 includes adoption of an ordinance by the GSD that, at a minimum, states that any future and existing development that proposes intensifying uses within the GSD service boundaries that relies on use of the GSD services for implementation will be reviewed by the GSD. A "will serve" letter will be provided to the developer that indicates the ability of the GSD to provide a service connection, based upon the current system capacity (water or wastewater) to provide that service. The ordinance will clearly articulate that future connections to the GSD services will be based, in part, on availability of the water or wastewater system to handle additional demands. Additionally, any change to the General Plan and zoning requires discretionary review by GSD.

#### *Future Service*

**APN 222-156-012.** Water service is currently provided to the Connick Creek area from a master meter regulated by the GSD. Mitigation Measure No. 2 has been included to address continuing service from the Connick Creek Subdivision private water line because it will not be maintained by the GSD. GSD will not be financially responsible for any modification necessary to ensure that distribution meets appropriate and applicable regulations for providing water service or costs associated with obtaining easements. This will ensure that GSD activities will not result in impacts to the delivery of water service that could potentially require the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Furthermore, APN 222-156-012 was a party to the Connick Creek Subdivision agreement recorded on October 8, 2010, as Instrument Number 2010-22217-9. This APN does not have an existing water connection, and is not included in the proposed

District boundary or existing SOI. Mitigation Measure No. 3 specifies that connection of this parcel is subject to approval by all applicable planning and building regulations. Water service to APN 222-156-012 will also require an update to the POU and any approvals by Humboldt LAFCo (annexation or out of boundary connection). A single family residential connection equivalent quantity of water has been set aside for the service of this parcel.

### *Conclusion*

Based the above analysis, the District will be able to serve the existing and potential customers within the proposed POU and jurisdictional boundary within the allowable 80 million gallons per year.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

**SHCP.** In the area known as the SHCP, water service has been previously provided to two residences and outbuildings, but they do not currently consume water. A previous water connection was extended to bring water to a caretaker's cottage and various other outbuildings on the former APN 222-091-006 from the yellow house. As a result of several lot line adjustments, the structures served by the GWC (and subsequently GSD) are now split between a portion of APN 222-091-014 and 222-091-011.

Currently, the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department is processing an application from the SHCP for a general plan amendment and rezone for APN 222-241-009 and APN 222-091-014. A Draft EIR is being prepared and is scheduled for public circulation September 2013 (Richardson, 2013a). It is conceivable that changes in use will result in increased water demand, but the specific details of such a change in service are not known at this time. Implementation of Mitigation Measure No. 1 will ensure that any changes to the existing water quantities or areas of water service will allow review and approval by GSD to confirm sufficient water supplies are available.

**Alderpoint Road Tank Project.** The GSD is currently in the planning and engineering phase of the Alderpoint Road Tank Replacement Project. The GSD has adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration to replace a 30,000 gallon tank with a 200,000 gallon tank at the same location as the existing tank. As documented in the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist prepared by LACO Associates (2013) for the project, the current water system lacks sufficient storage, therefore GSD proposes a 200,000 gallon tank. The storage will be increased by 170,000 gallons, which currently operates in a deficit between 74,000 and 182,780.

The storage tank deficit is based upon the maximum daily demand. The average residential customer uses 305 gallons per day in the maximum annual month. For 23 residential services this would theoretically add 7,015 gallons to the existing storage deficiency. The average commercial customer uses 640 gallons per day in the maximum annual month. For 3 commercial or industrial services this would theoretically add 1,920 gallons to the existing storage deficiency. The total deficiency would then be between 82,935 and 191,715 gallons. The environmental analysis concluded that the GSD has sufficient water supplies for the change in tank size necessary (LACO, 2013). Even though the GSD does not have sufficient storage to meet state standards, the additional capacity necessary would not result in any additional water diversions from the South Fork of the Eel River.

**Water System Improvement Project.** The SWTP is currently in construction and was designed to treat up to 336 gallons per minute (gpm) from the South Fork of the Eel River plus up to 33 gpm of

recycled backwash water. The treatment plant upgrade is to meet existing water demands and current CDPH requirements for redundancy, providing reliable high quality water to the District's costumers. The environmental analysis concluded this project will not result in additional water supplies other than those already established for GSD.

Based the above discussion, the District will be able to serve all the developable parcels within the proposed POU within the allowable 80 million gallons per year. These projects, in conjunction with the proposed project, will not result in a significant cumulative environment impact because the water infrastructure projects planned for the GSD are intended to satisfy current water demands.

**(c) No Impact:** The project does not require or result in the construction of any new stormwater drainage facility or the expansion of any existing facility the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.

**(f- g) No Impact:** The project does not include development that would require a change in landfill capacities, or conflict with any federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste.

**Mitigation Measure No. 1.** The GSD Board of Directors shall adopt an ordinance that, at a minimum, states that any future development or intensification of use within the GSD boundary or future annexations or outside agency boundary service that relies on connection to the GSD water or sewer services for implementation will be reviewed by the GSD prior to approval by the County. A "will serve" letter will be provided by GSD to Humboldt County and the project applicant, indicating the ability of the GSD to provide a service connection based upon the current water and/or wastewater system capacity to provide that service. If sufficient water or wastewater service is not available, the applicant will be denied service until such time that the service is available. This ordinance will also identify the location of the water and sewer service area and only water service area overlay. These areas are shown on Figure 16. GSD shall notify Humboldt County of the new ordinance so that it will be included in current planning activities.

**Mitigation Measure No. 2.** The GSD Board of Directors shall adopt a resolution stating that the Connick Creek Subdivision as described in this IS/MND is responsible for any maintenance necessary to ensure that distribution meets appropriate and applicable regulations for providing water service from the private water line. The resolution shall state that the GSD is not responsible for any costs or maintenance associated with provision of water in this area other than from the master meter described in agreement recorded on October 8, 2010, as Instrument # 2010-22217-9. The resolution shall note that annexation of the Connick subdivision is not intended to constitute a modification, express or implied, of the October 8, 2010, agreement (recorded as Instrument # 2010-22217-9), or an expansion of any rights or interests any member of the Connick Creek Subdivision Association possess under said agreement."

**Mitigation Measure No. 3.** The GSD Board of Directors shall adopt a resolution stating that in the future, all new connections that are guaranteed through existing agreements that are outside of the GSD boundary must satisfy all planning and building regulations at the owner's cost and expense. Specifically, the area adjacent to the Connick Subdivision includes APN 222-156-012, which is a party to the agreement recorded on October 8, 2010, as Instrument Number 2010-22217-9. This APN does not have an existing water connection. No service will be provided until the property owner petitions the District for water service and appropriate approvals have been granted by all appropriate agencies including, but not be limited to the SWRCB DWR, County of Humboldt, and Humboldt LAFCo.

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).		X		
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		

#### Thresholds of Significance:

This IS/MND considers impacts of the proposed project to be significant if: a) the proposed project reduces the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, or causes a fish or wildlife species to decline below a self-sustaining population size; b) the project, in combination with other recent, current, or foreseeable future projects, creates a cumulatively considerable environmental effect for one or more of the environmental issue areas discussed in the checklist, even though the project itself does not; and c) an element of the proposed project could be found to have a demonstrable opportunity of causing harm to individual human beings or groups.

#### Discussion:

**(a -c) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** As discussed above, the project as mitigated will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or eliminate important examples of a major periods of California history or prehistory.

#### *Growth Inducing Impacts*

The annexation project is expected to update the boundary with the existing areas of current service, meaning residential development could occur as in-fill within areas within the new boundary/POU that are developed or planned for development. Thus, the indirect impact of providing water service to these in-fill areas could be additional residential and industrial development. While even a slight increase in population has the perception to be substantial for the Garberville community,



the purpose of this project is not to facilitate additional development. Rather the project is intended to update the boundaries with areas of existing service. Some development could occur as a result of making water or sewer service available to a larger area, but such growth would not be substantial, as described above in Section "XIII. Population and Housing."

The project does remove one obstacle to development, but several obstacles still remain that affect development with the Garberville. These include the existing General Plan and zoning, prime agricultural soils, topographical challenges, and slow rate of development within Garberville and Humboldt County. Development in the Southern Humboldt area has traditionally been slower than other planning areas in Humboldt County. As indicated in the *Humboldt County General Plan Update Existing Conditions – Building Communities* (Humboldt, 2002), there was a 4.5% reduction in population from 1990 to 2000 in the Garberville Area. Furthermore, the County of Humboldt has documented a reduction in the number of dwelling units permitted in 2011 compared to the 10-year average from the 2001 through 2011 (Humboldt County, 2012d). There were 90 less dwelling units in Humboldt County in 2011 than compared to the 10-year average (Humboldt County, 2012d). This information indicates that current development within Humboldt County is slower than from 2001-2011. The County does not have specific information regarding the Garberville area.

Future projects within the proposed boundary are subject to the applicable General Plan and zoning designations set forth in the Humboldt County General Plan and Building Codes, which will address any changes in the existing land uses and impacts on the environment. Additionally, Mitigation Measure No. 1 has been included to address the ability of GSD to provide water service for foreseeable development projects within the project area. See section "XVII: Utilities and Services Systems" for Mitigation Measure. Any change to the existing uses is subject to approval by GSD, ensuring that adequate water supplies are available.

#### *Cumulative Impacts*

It is anticipated that the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department will continue to pursue a General Plan Update. At this time, it is difficult to predict the nature of the changes from the "Planning Commission Approved General Plan Update" and the one that will be adopted by the Board of Supervisors. Nonetheless, this annexation project and update to the SWRCB POU is not expected to be in conflict with any current or future policy regarding development.

Also, as discussed above throughout the checklist, the project as mitigated will have a less than significant impact that is individually limited, and not cumulatively considerable, and will not have an environmental effect that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

## List of Preparers

---

GSD staff that has assisted with the preparation of this document includes:

- Jennie Short (Capital Projects Manager)

On behalf of the GSD, SHN Consulting Engineers & Geologists, Inc. has prepared this final recirculated IS/MND. SHN authors include:

- Rosalind Litzky (Environmental Planner)
- Mark Chaney (Environmental Planner)
- Stein Coriell (Project Planner)

## Source/Reference List

---

The following documents were used in the preparation of this document and can be found at the GSD office located 919 Redwood Dr., Garberville, California 95542.

California Environmental Protection Agency. (Accessed April 2013). Hazardous Waste and Substances site "Cortese" list. Accessed at:  
<<http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/SectionA.htm>.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. (Executed July 2012). "Streambed Alteration Agreement Notification No. 1600-2012-0030-R1." Eureka, CA:CDFW.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. (Adopted on November 7, 2007). "Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA." Accessed from:  
[http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/webdata/maps/humboldt/fhszs\\_map.12.jpg](http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/webdata/maps/humboldt/fhszs_map.12.jpg)

California Department of Public Health. (February 8, 2013). "Amended Permit No. 01-01-12(P)-002" letter. Redding, CA:CDPH.

Dyett & Bhatia. (2002). Humboldt 2025 General Plan Update, Building Communities, A Discussion Paper for Community Workshops. Accessed at: <http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (July 19, 1982). "Flood Insurance Rate Map for Humboldt County (unincorporated areas [Community Panel No. 060060 1835B and 060060 1830 B]." NR:FEMA.

Garberville Sanitary District. (October 9, 2012). Board Agenda Memorandum, "Boundary Change Proposal (Annexation) Application and CEQA Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration." Garberville, CA:GSD.

Girard, Kirk. (NR). Written communication between Kirk Girard and Kathryn Lobato. Eureka, CA:County of Humboldt.

Goldeen, Sanford. (April 8, 2011). Proposed General Plan Amendment, Garberville, California, letter to Humboldt County Planning and Building Department.

Humboldt County. (1978). Certification of Completion, recorded at the request of Humboldt County, volume 1529, page 297, official records. Eureka, CA:County of Humboldt.

---. (September 2002). "Natural Resources and Hazards." Accessed at:  
<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>.

- . (2006). "Humboldt Master Fire Protection Plan." Accessed at:  
<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>.
- . (NR). "Fire Safe Regulations, Title III, Land Use and Development Code, Division 11."  
Accessed at: <http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>.
- . (September 2006). *Garberville, Redway, Alderpoint, Benbow, Community Plan*; adopted by the Board of Supervisors June 30, 1987; Resolution No 87-82, date of printing reviewed: September 2006. Accessed at: <http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>.
- . (January 2007). "Draft Final Report (Revised May 2007). Garberville Airport Master Plan Report." Accessed at: <http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>.
- . (August 2009a). Board of Supervisors Staff Report prepared for the meeting of September 7, 2010, Chautauqua Natural Foods General Plan Amendment, Zone Reclassification and Special Permit, File No. APN 032-043-01, Case No: GPA-09-03/ZR-09-04/SP-09-41, Garberville Area.
- . (August 2009b). "Appendix 3, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Global Climate Change Analysis, 2009 Housing Element." Accessed at:  
<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>
- . (December 2010). Recorded "Deed of Easement 2010-29250-11." Eureka, CA:County of Humboldt.
- . (2010). Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for a General Plan Amendment, Zone Reclassification, Conditional Use Permit and Special Permit on the Southern Humboldt Community Park in the Garberville Area; Case Numbers GPA-10-02, ZR-10-02, CUP-10-04 and SP-10-10. Eureka, CA:County of Humboldt.
- . (June 1, 2011). Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report Implementation of the 2009 Housing Element Multifamily Rezoning SCH 2009022077. Accessed at:  
<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>
- . (February 2012a). General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Amendments Implementing the 2010 Housing Element adopted by the Board February 14, 2012. Accessed at:  
<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>
- . (April 2, 2012b). "Humboldt 21<sup>st</sup> Century, General Plan, Humboldt County General Plan Update, Draft Environmental Impact Report, SCH 2007012089." Accessed at:  
<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>
- . (June 12, 2012c). "Introduction of the Planning Commission Approved Draft General Plan and Supporting Documents and Discussion of Board Review Process for Future Public Hearings Staff Report." Accessed at: <http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>
- . (August 28, 2012d). Part 2, Chapter 8. Housing Element. Accessed at:  
<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/>
- . (September 20, 2012e). *Annual Report on the Status and Implementation of the 1984 Framework Plan (General Plan) for 2012*. Eureka, CA:County of Humboldt.
- . (Downloaded September 15, 2013). 2014 Housing Element (HE) Update Schedule. Available at:  
<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/gpu/documentshousingelement.aspx>
- Humboldt Local Agency Formation Commission. (November 22, 1978) Meadows Unit #1 Annexation to Garberville Sanitary District, and Meadows Unit #1 Annexation to Garberville Fire Protection District. Arcata, CA:LAFCo.

- . (September 2008). *Garberville Fire Protection District Municipal Service Review*. Arcata, CA:LAFCo.
- . (July 21, 2010). "Resolution 10-06, Resolution of the Humboldt County Local Agency Formation Commission Approving an Out of Water Service Extension for the Garberville Sanitary District to Serve the Kimtu Meadows Subdivision." Arcata, CA:LAFCo.
- . (November 14, 2012). "Policies and Procedures for Cities and Districts to Provide Services outside Agency Boundaries," adopted November 2012 by Humboldt LAFCo. Arcata, CA: LAFCo.
- . (March 20, 2013a) "Resolution 13-02, Making Determinations for the Garberville Sanitary District Municipal Service Review." Arcata, CA:LAFCo.
- . (March 20, 2013b) "Resolution 13-03, Making Determinations and Adopting an Amendment to the Garberville Sanitary District Sphere of Influence." Arcata, CA: LAFCo.
- . (March 20, 2013c). Communication from the Humboldt LAFCo meeting regarding the Redway Sphere of Influence.
- . (Final Report Adopted March, 20 2013d). "Garberville Sanitary District Municipal Services Review." Arcata, CA: LAFCo.
- . (Final Report Adopted March, 20 2013e). "Garberville Sanitary District Sphere of Influence Review and Update." Arcata, CA: LAFCo.
- LACO Associates. (April 2010a). Initial Study and Environmental Checklist prepared for Garberville Sanitary District Water System Improvement Project. Eureka, CA: LACO.
- . (April 2010b) Initial Study and Environmental Checklist for Garberville Sanitary District Water System Improvement Project. Eureka, CA: LACO.
- . (May 2013). Initial Study and Environmental Checklist for Alderpoint Road Tank Replacement Project, Garberville Sanitary District. Eureka, CA: LACO.
- McLaughlin J. and F. Harradine. (1965). *Soils of Western Humboldt County, California*. Davis, CA: Dept. of Soils and Plant Nutrition, UC Davis, in cooperation with Humboldt County.
- Metcalf & Eddy, Inc. (NR). *Wastewater Engineering: Treatment Disposal Reuse, Second Edition*. New York, NY:McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Richardson, Michael. (April 2013a). Personal communication with supervising planner regarding density bonuses in Humboldt County and the status of the SHCP.
- . (July 2013b). Personal communication with supervising planner regarding the SHCP multifamily rezoning and schedule for the Draft Environmental Impact Report.
- . (August 2013c). Personal communication with supervising planner regarding the Winters multifamily project and second dwelling units.
- (July 2013b). Personal communication with supervising planner regarding the SHCP multifamily rezoning and schedule for the Draft Environmental Impact Report.
- Simpson, Gary. (February 29, 2012). Personnel communication with SHN Geosciences Division Director about geologic hazards in the Garberville vicinity.
- Southern Humboldt Community Park. (NR). "Draft Project Description." Garberville, CA:SHCP.
- . (May 5, 2010a). Southern Humboldt Community Park, CEQA Environmental Compliance Initial Study Checklist, Appendix G, Staff Report. Accessed at <http://www.sohumpark.org/library.html>.

---. (July 2010b) Southern Humboldt Community Park, Plan of Operations. Accessed at <http://www.sohumpark.org/library.html>.

State Water Resources Control Board. (November 19, 1998). "Water Right Order 98-08, Declaration of Fully Appropriated Stream Systems." Accessed at: [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water\\_issues/programs/fully\\_appropriated\\_streams/docs/fas\\_list.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/fully_appropriated_streams/docs/fas_list.pdf).

---. (December 27, 2012). Order Adopting Cease and Desist Order for License 3404 (Application 9686) and Permit 20789 (Application 29981). Sacramento, CA:SWRCB.

# Proposed Mitigation Measures, Monitoring, and Reporting Program

---

## Utilities and Service Systems

**Mitigation Measure No. 1.** The GSD Board of Directors shall adopt an ordinance that, at a minimum, states that any future development or intensification of use within the GSD boundary or future annexations or outside agency boundary service that relies on connection to the GSD water or sewer services for implementation will be reviewed by the GSD prior to approval by the County. A “will serve” letter will be provided by GSD to Humboldt County and the project applicant, indicating the ability of the GSD to provide a service connection based upon the current water and/or wastewater system capacity to provide that service. If sufficient water or wastewater service is not available, the applicant will be denied service until such time that the service is available. This ordinance will also identify the location of the water and sewer service area and only water service area overlay. These areas are shown on Figure 16. GSD shall notify Humboldt County of the new ordinance so that it will be included in current planning activities.

*Timing for Implementation/Compliance:* After LAFCo approval or conditional approval  
*Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:* GSD and Humboldt County Planning and Building Department  
*Monitoring Frequency:* Not applicable  
*Evidence of Compliance:* Adoption of an ordinance by GSD

**Mitigation Measure No. 2.** The GSD Board of Directors shall adopt a resolution stating that the Connick Creek Subdivision as described in this IS/MND is responsible for any maintenance necessary to ensure that distribution meets appropriate and applicable regulations for providing water service from the private water line. The resolution shall state that the GSD is not responsible for any costs or maintenance associated with provision of water in this area other than from the master meter described in agreement recorded on October 8, 2010, as Instrument # 2010-22217-9. The resolution shall note that annexation of the Connick subdivision is not intended to constitute a modification, express or implied, of the October 8, 2010, agreement (recorded as Instrument # 2010-22217-9), or an expansion of any rights or interests any member of the Connick Creek Subdivision Association possess under said agreement.


*Timing for Implementation/Compliance:* After LAFCo approval or conditional approval  
*Person/Agency Responsible for Monitoring:* GSD and LAFCo  
*Monitoring Frequency:* Not applicable  
*Evidence of Compliance:* Resolution by the GSD Board of Directors

**Mitigation Measure No. 3.** The GSD Board of Directors shall adopt a resolution stating that in the future, all new connections that are guaranteed through existing agreements that are outside of the GSD boundary must satisfy all planning and building regulations at the owner’s cost and expense. Specifically, the area adjacent to the Connick Subdivision includes APN 222-156-012, which is a party to the agreement recorded on October 8, 2010, as Instrument Number 2010-22217-9. This APN does not have an existing water connection. No service will be provided until the property owner petitions the District for water service and appropriate approvals have been granted by all appropriate agencies including, but not be limited to the SWRCB DWR, County of Humboldt, and Humboldt LAFCo.



Figure 1: Vicinity Map  
Figure 2: Existing Boundaries  
Figure 3a: Areas Served by Water or Contracted for Future Water Service  
Figure 3b: Status for Water Consumption  
Figure 4: Proposed Boundary Changes to Jurisdictional Boundary (Annexation Area)  
Figure 5: Proposed Place of Use Areas Added and Removed  
Figure 6: Annexation Area Overview  
Figure 6a: Annexation Area Bear Canyon Road, Redwood Drive, and Bushnell Lane  
Figure 6b: Annexation Area Hillcrest Drive/Downtown Area  
Figure 6c: Annexation Area Leino Road and Sprowel Creek Road Blowup  
Figure 6d: Annexation Area Tooby Flat  
Figure 6e: Annexation Area Kimtu Meadows Subdivision  
Figure 6f: Annexation Area Connick Creek Subdivision  
Figure 6g: Annexation Area Meadows Subdivision  
Figure 7: Tooby Flat - Overview of Lot Line Adjustment  
Figure 8: Existing Land Use Designations  
Figure 9: Existing Zoning  
Figure 10: Humboldt County General Plan Update Planning Commission Approved LUDs  
Figure 11: Developable Areas  
Figure 12: General Plan Housing Opportunity Zone and Urban Study Areas  
Figure 13: NRCS Soils Designations Prime and Statewide Importance  
Figure 14: Garberville Airport Approach Land Use Compatibility Zones  
Figure 15: Fire Response Areas  
Figure 16: Proposed Boundary, Place of Use and Water Only Service Area






SOURCE: GARBERVILLE & MIRANDA  
USGS 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLES





This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



**Legend**

- Existing Jurisdictional Boundary
- Existing License Place of Use
- Existing Permit Place Of Use
- GWC 1978 PUC Service Area
- Sphere of Influence
- Humboldt County APNs




Annexation Project  
Final Initial Study / MND  
Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

**Existing Boundaries**  
SCALE: 1:30,000  
DRAWN BY: J. SHORT  
DATE: 09/09/2013

Figure  
**2**



This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



#### Legend

- Existing Jurisdictional Boundary
- Existing License Place Of Use
- Existing Permit Place Of Use
- GWC 1978 PUC Service Area
- Sphere of Influence
- x Water Meter or Beneficial Use Locations
- Served or Metered Areas
- Areas Served with Sewer Outside Boundary
- Future Water Service Contract
- Humboldt County APNs



### Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

### Areas Served by Water, Sewer or Contracted for Future Water Service


SCALE:  
1:30,000

DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
**3a**

This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



- Legend**
- Existing License Place of Use
  - Existing Permit Place of Use
  - Proposed Place of Use
  - Parcels Consuming Water
  - Future Water Customers in POU
  - Future Water Customers Outside POU
  - Undevelopable



**Annexation Project**  
**Final Initial Study / MND**


Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566


**Water Consumption Status**

SCALE: 1:30,000	DRAWN BY: J. SHORT	DATE: 09/09/2013
--------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

**Figure**  
**3b**


This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



	<b>Annexation Project</b> <b>Final Initial Study / MND</b>		<b>Proposed Changes to Jurisdictional Boundary (Annexation Area)</b>		<b>Figure</b>  <b>4</b>
	Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566		SCALE: 1:30,000	DRAWN BY: J. SHORT	
				DATE: 09/09/2013	



This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



## Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

## Proposed Place of Use Areas Added or Removed


SCALE:  
1:30,000

DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
**5**

This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



Path: C:\Users\Nannie\Documents\ArcGIS Data\Projects\Annexation\Figures\CEQA\2013 Final IS\MND\Final IS-MND-Fig6-Overview.mxd

Date: 9/14/2013



# **Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND**

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

## **Annexation Area Overview**

SCALE:  
1:30,000

DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
**6**



Date: 9/14/2013




## Annexation Area Bear Canyon Blowup

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
6a



This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



#### Legend

- Existing Jurisdictional Boundary
- Existing License Place of Use
- Existing Permit Place Of Use
- Sphere of Influence
- Parcels To Annex
- Undevelopable
- Vacant
- X Annexation Meter or Beneficial Uses
- Proposed Boundary/Place of Use
- Humboldt County APNs



### Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

### Annexation Area Hillcrest Drive/Downtown Area


SCALE:  
1:5,000

DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
**6b**

This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



Path: C:\Users\Jennie\Documents\ArcGIS Data\Projects\Annexation\Figures\CEOA\2013 Final IS\MND\Final IS-MND Fig6c-Leino.mxd

Date: 9/14/2013



## Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

## Annexation Area Leino Road Sprowel Creek Blowup



SCALE:  
1:6,000

DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
6c

This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



## Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

## Annexation Area Tooby Flat


SCALE:  
1:10,000

DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
6d

This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



# **Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND**

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

## **Annexation Area Kimtu Meadows Subdivision**


SCALE:  
1:3,000

DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
**6e**

This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



## Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

## Annexation Area Connick Creek Subdivision

SCALE:  
1:5,000


DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
**6f**



This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.




<b>Annexation Project</b> <b>Final Initial Study / MND</b>		<b>Annexation Area</b> <b>Meadows Subdivision</b>		<b>Figure</b> <b>6g</b>
Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566		SCALE: 1:15,000	DRAWN BY: J. SHORT	
			DATE: 09/09/2013	

Path: C:\Users\Jennie\Documents\ArcGIS Data\Projects\Annexation\Figures\CEQA\2013 Final IS\MND\Final IS-MND-Fig6g-Meadows.mxd  
Date: 9/14/2013




This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.




Path: C:\Users\Jennie\Documents\ArcGIS Data\Projects\Annexation\Figures\CEQA\2013 Final IS\MND\Final IS\MND Fig7-ToobyFlatOverview.mxd

Date: 9/14/2013

	<b>Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND</b>		<b>Tooby Flat - Overview of Lot Line Adjustment</b>		<b>Figure 7</b>
	Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566		SCALE: 1:10,000	DRAWN BY: J. SHORT	DATE: 09/09/2013



This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



General Framework Land Use Designations	
ZONE DISTRICT	DESIGNATION
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>	
Commercial	CG
Commercial	CR
Commercial	CS
<b>INDUSTRIAL</b>	
Industrial	IG
Industrial	IR
<b>PUBLIC</b>	
Public Lands	P
Public Facility	PF
<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>	
Residential Medium Density	RM
Residential Low Density	RL
Agricultural Suburban	AS
Agricultural Rural	AR
Rural Residential	
<b>RESOURCE</b>	
Agriculture Exclusive	AE
Agricultural Grazing	AG
Timberland	T
<b>UNCLASSIFIED</b>	
Unclassified or Blank	U

#### Legend

<span style="border: 2px solid red; padding: 2px;"> </span> Proposed Boundary/Place of Use	<span style="background-color: #800080; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> AE	<span style="background-color: #D2B48C; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> AL40	<span style="background-color: #FFC0CB; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> CR	<span style="background-color: #4169E1; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> PF
<span style="border: 2px solid yellow; padding: 2px;"> </span> Sphere of Influence	<span style="background-color: #90EE90; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> AG	<span style="background-color: #FFFACD; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> AR	<span style="background-color: #FF6347; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> CS	<span style="background-color: #FFFF00; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> RL
<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> </span> Humboldt County APNs	<span style="background-color: #D2B48C; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> AL	<span style="background-color: #FFD700; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> AR(5-20)	<span style="background-color: #A9A9A9; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> HWY 101	<span style="background-color: #90EE90; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> RM
	<span style="background-color: #D2B48C; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> AL(20)	<span style="background-color: #FFD700; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> AS	<span style="background-color: #808080; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> IG	<span style="background-color: #90EE90; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> T
	<span style="background-color: #D2B48C; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> AL(40)	<span style="background-color: #90EE90; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> AS(1-5)	<span style="background-color: #A9A9A9; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> IR	<span style="background-color: #90EE90; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> golf course
	<span style="background-color: #90EE90; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> AL20	<span style="background-color: #FF6347; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> CG	<span style="background-color: #4169E1; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> P	<span style="background-color: #90EE90; width: 15px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> green gulch



Annexation Project  
Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

Existing General Plan  
Land Use Designations

SCALE:  
1:30,000


DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
8



This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



PRINCIPAL ZONES - INLAND	
ZONE DISTRICT	DESIGNATION
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>	
Neighborhood Commercial	C-1
Community Commercial	C-2
Industrial Commercial	C-3
Highway Service Commercial	CH
<b>INDUSTRIAL</b>	
Business Park	MB
Limited Industrial	ML
Heavy Industrial	MH
<b>PUBLIC</b>	
Airport	AV
<b>NATURAL HAZARD/FLOOD</b>	
Design Floodway	DF
Flood Plain	FP
<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>	
Residential Suburban	RS
Residential One-Family	R-1
Residential Two-Family	R-2
Residential Multiple Family	R-3
Apartment Professional	R-4
Rural Residential Agricultural	RA
<b>RESOURCE</b>	
Agriculture Exclusive	AE
Agriculture General	AG
Forestry Recreation	FR
Timberland Production	TPZ
<b>UNCLASSIFIED</b>	
Unclassified	U

COMBINING ZONES - INLAND	
COMBINING ZONE	DESIGNATION
Special Building Site	B
Design Control	D
Planned Development	P
Qualified	Q
Recreation	R
Development Standard	S
Manufactured Home	T
No Further Subdivision Allowed	Z

### Legend

Proposed Boundary/Place of Use	AE	AG	C-2	FR-B-5(20)	ML	R-1-B-6-T	R-4-P	TPZ
Sphere of Influence	AE-B-5	AG-B-5(10)	C-2-D	FR-B-5(40)	MLQ	R-1-T	R-4-Q	U
Humboldt County APNs	AE-B-5(160)	AG-B-5(5)	C-3-D	FR-B-5(5)	R-1	R-2	RS	
	AE-B-5(20)	AG-B-6	C-3-Q-D	FR-Q	R-1-B-3	R-3	RS-B-5(10)-D	
	AE-B-5(40)	AG-Q	CH	MB-D	R-1-B-3-D	R-3-D-P	RS-B-5(5)	
	AE-B-5(60)	AV	CH-D-Q	MH	R-1-B-3-Q	R-3-P-D	RS-B-5(5)-D	
	AE-B-6	C-1	FP	MH-Q	R-1-B-6	R-3-Q	RS-D	
	AE-P	C-1-D	FR	MH-S-Q	R-1-B-6-Q	R-4	RS-T	



Annexation Project  
Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

## Existing Zoning

SCALE:  
1:30,000


DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure

9

This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



#### Legend

- Proposed Boundary/Place of Use
- Sphere of Influence
- Humboldt County APNs
- AE, AEG, AEG160, AE20, AE60
- AG, AGR
- T, TI, TorTI, TC
- AL160, RR160
- AL60, RR60
- AL40, RR40, RR40-160
- AL20, RR20, RR20-160
- AR
- AR20-5, RR5-20, RR10, RR10-20
- AS
- RE1-5, RE2.5-5, RE2-5, RE, RS
- RL, RL0-2, RL1-7, RL1-4, RL3-8, RL1-2, RL0-2, RL0-4
- RM, RM7-16
- CG, CR, CS
- MU
- IG, IR, CS/IG, MB, MC, MG
- RCC, VC
- CPA
- P, OS, PR, NR
- PF
- CF, CFR
- Tribal Lands
- RR5-20\UR
- UR
- RM/UR

#### Planning Commission Approved GPU Land Use Designations

ZONE DISTRICT	DESIGNATION
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>	
Commercial	CG
Commercial	CR
Commercial	CS
<b>INDUSTRIAL</b>	
Mixed Use	MU
Industrial	IG
Industrial	IR
<b>PUBLIC</b>	
Public Lands	P
Public Facility	PF
<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>	
Residential Medium Density	RM
Residential Low Density	RL
Residential Estates	RE1-5
Residential Estates	RE2.5-5
Rural Residential	RR 5-20, 20
Rural Residential	RR 40, 20-160
Rural Residential	RR 40-160
<b>RESOURCE</b>	
Natural Resources	NR
Agricultural Grazing	AG
Timberland	T



#### Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

#### Humboldt County General Plan Update Planning Commission Approved LUDs


SCALE:  
1:30,000

DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
10

This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



#### Legend

- Existing Jurisdictional Boundary
- Existing License Place of Use
- Existing Permit Place Of Use
- Sphere of Influence
- Proposed Boundary/Place of Use
- Developed
- Vacant - Developable
- Undevelopable



Annexation Project  
Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

## Developable Areas


SCALE:  
1:30,000

DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
**11**

This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



**Annexation Project  
Final Initial Study / MND**

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566


**General Plan Housing Opportunity  
Zone and Urban Study Areas**

SCALE: 1:30,000      DRAWN BY: J. SHORT      DATE: 09/09/2013


**Figure  
12**

Path: C:\Users\Jennie\Documents\ArcGIS Data\Projects\Annexation\Figures\CEQA\2013 Final IS\MND\Final IS-MND Fig12-GP-USA-HOZ.mxd  
Date: 9/14/2013





This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



#### Legend

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <span style="border: 1px solid red; display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px;"></span> Proposed Boundary/Place Of Use | <b>Airport Zones</b>  |
| <span style="border: 1px solid yellow; display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px;"></span> Sphere of Influence         | <span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: #000080;"></span> Horizontal Surface |
| <span style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px;"></span> Humboldt County APNs         | <span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: #4682B4;"></span> Conical Surface    |
|   | <span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; height: 10px; background-color: #ADD8E6;"></span> Primary Surface    |



### Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

### Garberville Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones


SCALE:  
1:30,000

DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
**14**

This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



#### Legend

- Existing Jurisdictional Boundary
- Existing Place Of Use
- GWC 1978 PUC Service Area
- Sphere of Influence
- Proposed Boundary/Place of Use
- Humboldt County APNs
- Garberville Fire PDAA
- Garberville Fire Protection District
- Redway Fire PDAA
- Redway Fire Protection District



## Annexation Project Final Initial Study / MND

Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566

## Fire Response Areas


SCALE:  
1:30,000


DRAWN BY:  
J. SHORT

DATE:  
09/09/2013

Figure  
**15**

This figure was prepared based upon data from Humboldt County and is for planning purposes only. While every effort has been made by Humboldt County to assure the accuracy of this information, it should be understood that it does not have the force and effect of law, rule, or regulation. Should any difference or error occur, the law will take precedence.



	<b>Annexation Project</b> <b>Final Initial Study / MND</b>		<b>Proposed Boundary, Place of Use</b> <b>and Water Only Service Area</b>		<b>Figure</b> <b>16</b>
	Garberville Sanitary District (707) 923-9566	SCALE: 1:30,000	DRAWN BY: J. SHORT	DATE: 09/09/2013	





APNs Proposed for Annexation into Jurisdictional Boundary (LAFCo Approval)														
Assessor's Parcel Number	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary: (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup> Service	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action (Add All/Partial/Remove/Adjust to Property Line)	Date 1st Billed by GSD <sup>3</sup>	Date Meter Set	Existing Development	Notes about Potential Development	Existing General Plan Land Use Designation <sup>4</sup>	General Plan Update Land Use Designation <sup>5</sup> (Planning Commission Recommendation)	Existing Zoning <sup>6</sup>	Urban Study Area (USA) or Water Study Area (WSA)	Housing Opportunity Zone
Bear Canyon Road/Redwood Drive/Bushnell Lane														
032-141-007	2.80	Out	Within	W&S	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	None	Undevelopable; SF Eel River - near Bear Canyon Road Bridge	PF	PF	U	USA	Yes
032-141-010	1.37	Out	Within	W&S	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	None	Undevelopable; Small hill with power transmission tower - significantly higher than roads	CG	CG	C-2-D	Not included	Yes
223-061-033	35.34	Out	Partial	W&S	Adjust to match property line	WWTP	2/2/1985	Public Facility; Existing WWTP <sup>7</sup>	None	PF	PF	U	USA	Yes
223-061-034	7.08	Out	Within	W&S	No change	12/1/2004	Pre 1989	SFR <sup>8</sup>	Majority undevelopable; Potential for unknown increased density	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AE-B-5 (160) & U	USA	Yes
223-171-001	8.24	Out	Majority Within	Water	Adjust to match property line	12/1/2004	6/1/1996	Residential Trailer	Industrial	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes
223-171-002	1.14	Out	Within	Water	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	Industrial	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes
223-171-003	1.11	Out	Within	Water	No change	12/1/2004	Pre 4/6/1989	SFR (was Veterinarian office)	None	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes
223-171-004	10.58	Out	Within	Water	No change	12/1/2004	Pre 5/1994	Public Facility	None	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes
223-171-005	0.70	Out	Within	Water	No change	12/1/2004	6/29/91	Industrial	None	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes
223-171-006	1.13	Out	Within	Water	No change	12/1/2004	Pre 4/1997	Commercial	None	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes
223-171-007	5.57	Out	Within	Water	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	Industrial	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes
223-171-008	4.22	Out	Within	Water	No change	12/1/2004	2/1986	Industrial	None	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes
223-171-009	0.79	Out	Within	Water	No change	With APN 223-171-008	2/1986	None	Undevelopable; Bear Canyon Gulch and steep	IG	IG	MH	USA	Yes



APNs Proposed for Annexation into Jurisdictional Boundary (LAFCo Approval)														
Assessor's Parcel Number	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary: (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup> Service	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action (Add All/Partial/Remove/Adjust to Property Line)	Date 1st Billed by GSD <sup>3</sup>	Date Meter Set	Existing Development	Notes about Potential Development	Existing General Plan Land Use Designation <sup>4</sup>	General Plan Update Land Use Designation <sup>5</sup> (Planning Commission Recommendation)	Existing Zoning <sup>6</sup>	Urban Study Area (USA) or Water Study Area (WSA)	Housing Opportunity Zone
223-171-023	22.58	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match property line	11/1/2008	9/11/2008	SFR	None;	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AE	WSA	No
223-171-024	1.23	Out	Within	W&S	No change	12/1/2004	Pre 2004	Industrial	None	IG	IG	MH-S-Q	USA	Yes
223-171-025	0.85	Out	Within	W&S	No change	12/1/2004	Pre 2004	Industrial	None; Developed as part of APN 223-171-024	IG	IG	MH-S-Q	USA	Yes
223-171-026	8.12	Out	Within	W&S	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	None	Undevelopable; SF Eel River + gravel bar	IG	IG	MH-S-Q	USA	Yes
Connick Creek Subdivision														
222-156-014	4.90	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	10/1/2010	8/17/2010	Vacant	SFR; contract for future service	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No
222-156-015	4.51	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	SFR; contract for future service	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No
222-156-016	12.31	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	2 SFR; contract for future service	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No
222-156-017	7.41	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	10/1/2010	8/17/2010	SFR	None	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No
222-156-018	5.30	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	10/1/2010	8/17/2010	Vacant	SFR; contract for future service	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No
222-156-019	4.78	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	SFR	None	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No

APNs Proposed for Annexation into Jurisdictional Boundary (LAFCo Approval)														
Assessor's Parcel Number	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary: (In/Out/ Partial/ Majority Within)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/ Partial/ Majority Within)	Proposed Annexati on into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup> Service	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action (Add All/ Partial/ Remove/ Adjust to Property Line)	Date 1st Billed by GSD <sup>3</sup>	Date Meter Set	Existing Development	Notes about Potential Development	Existing General Plan Land Use Designation <sup>4</sup>	General Plan Update Land Use Designation <sup>5</sup> (Planning Commission Recommend- ation)	Existing Zoning <sup>6</sup>	Urban Study Area (USA) or Water Study Area (WSA)	Housing Opportunity Zone
222-156-020	2.67	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	12/1/2004	Pre 05/04	SFR	None	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No
222-156-021	3.94	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	10/1/2010	8/17/2010	SFR	None	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-6	WSA	No
223-061-025	105.26	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match developed area	10/1/2010	8/17/2010	2 SFR	None: Only annexing areas with SFR included	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AE-B-5(160)	WSA	No
Hillcrest Drive/Downtown Area														
032-141-008	0.72	Part	Within	W&S	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	None	Undevelopable; Hwy 101 onramp	AS	RE2.5-5	RS-T	USA	Yes
032-141-009	1.51	Part	Within	W&S	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	None	Undevelopable; Bear Canyon Gulch and steep	IG	NR	FR-Q	USA	Yes
032-141-011	0.02	Out	Within	W&S	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	None	Undevelopable; Hwy 101 Right-of-Way	AS	RE2.5-5	RS-T	USA	Yes
032-211-003	0.52	Out	Within	W & S	No change	12/1/2004	1992	SFR	Potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-211-007	2.68	Out	Majority Within	W & S	Adjust to match LUD <sup>9</sup>	12/1/2004	Pre 2/1/1994	SFR	Associated with development on APN 032-211-077	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
223-061-007	9.00	Out	Majority Within	W & S	Adjust to match LUD	12/1/2004	Pre 2/1/1994	SFR	Associated development with APN 032-211-007; existing second dwelling unit	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	Part USA	No
032-211-010	0.37	Out	Within	W & S	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	SFR	Limited potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-211-011	0.18	Out	Within	W & S	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Public Facility	None; Small APN, land locked, water tank site	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-211-012	7.89	Out	Within	W & S	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	SFR	Potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-211-014	0.54	Out	Within	W & S	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	SFR; Potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes



APNs Proposed for Annexation into Jurisdictional Boundary (LAFCo Approval)														
Assessor's Parcel Number	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary: (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup> Service	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action (Add All/Partial/Remove/Adjust to Property Line)	Date 1st Billed by GSD <sup>3</sup>	Date Meter Set	Existing Development	Notes about Potential Development	Existing General Plan Land Use Designation <sup>4</sup>	General Plan Update Land Use Designation <sup>5</sup> (Planning Commission Recommendation)	Existing Zoning <sup>6</sup>	Urban Study Area (USA) or Water Study Area (WSA)	Housing Opportunity Zone
032-211-015	0.49	Out	Within	W & S	No change	12/1/2004	Pre 7/95	SFR	Potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-211-021	8.83	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match property line	Associated with APN 032-211-012	Unknown	Barns and outbuildings	SFR and potential for increased density	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
Kimtu Meadows Subdivision														
222-201-002	0.83	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	08/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-003	0.22	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Water Facility	None; small KMWC <sup>10</sup> facility APN	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-004	0.34	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-005	0.27	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-006	0.02	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Water Facility	None; small KMWC facility APN	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-007	0.43	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-008	1.00	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-009	0.68	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No

**APNs Proposed for Annexation into Jurisdictional Boundary (LAFCo Approval)**

Assessor's Parcel Number	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary: (In/Out/ Partial/ Majority Within)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/ Partial/ Majority Within)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup> Service	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action (Add All/ Partial/ Remove/ Adjust to Property Line)	Date 1st Billed by GSD <sup>3</sup>	Date Meter Set	Existing Development	Notes about Potential Development	Existing General Plan Land Use Designation <sup>4</sup>	General Plan Update Land Use Designation <sup>5</sup> (Planning Commission Recommendation)	Existing Zoning <sup>6</sup>	Urban Study Area (USA) or Water Study Area (WSA)	Housing Opportunity Zone
222-201-010	0.88	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-011	0.51	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-012	0.79	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-013	3.43	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6-T	WSA	No
222-201-014	0.82	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-015	1.04	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-016	0.95	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-017	0.02	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Water Facility	None; small KMWC facility	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-018	1.40	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-019	0.87	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No

APNs Proposed for Annexation into Jurisdictional Boundary (LAFCo Approval)														
Assessor's Parcel Number	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary: (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup> Service	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action (Add All/Partial/Remove/Adjust to Property Line)	Date 1st Billed by GSD <sup>3</sup>	Date Meter Set	Existing Development	Notes about Potential Development	Existing General Plan Land Use Designation <sup>4</sup>	General Plan Update Land Use Designation <sup>5</sup> (Planning Commission Recommendation)	Existing Zoning <sup>6</sup>	Urban Study Area (USA) or Water Study Area (WSA)	Housing Opportunity Zone
222-201-020	1.92	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-021	0.03	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Water Facility	None; small KMWC facility APN	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-022	1.38	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-023	0.63	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-024	0.72	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
222-201-025	0.43	Out of Area Approval	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	9/1/2012	8/2012	SFR	None	RL	RL	R-1-B-6	WSA	No
Leino Road/Sprowel Creek Road Area														
032-091-017	0.03	Out	Within	Water	Adjust to match Property Line	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Highway 101	Undevelopable; Highway 101 ROW	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-161-014	21.97	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match Property Line	12/1/2004	1992	SFR	Undevelopable; Mostly steep and gravel bar	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	WSA	No
032-171-009	1.94	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU	12/1/2004	2/9/1984	SFR	None	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	WSA	No
032-171-015	4.16	Out	Within	Water	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	SFR	Potential for increased density	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	USA	Yes





**APNs Proposed for Annexation into Jurisdictional Boundary (LAFCo Approval)**

Assessor's Parcel Number	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary: (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/Partial/Majority Within)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup> Service	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action (Add All/Partial/Remove/Adjust to Property Line)	Date 1st Billed by GSD <sup>3</sup>	Date Meter Set	Existing Development	Notes about Potential Development	Existing General Plan Land Use Designation <sup>4</sup>	General Plan Update Land Use Designation <sup>5</sup> (Planning Commission Recommendation)	Existing Zoning <sup>6</sup>	Urban Study Area (USA) or Water Study Area (WSA)	Housing Opportunity Zone
032-171-017	0.14	Out	Within	Water	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	Developed as part of 032-171-015	SFR; Limited potential for increased density due to size	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-171-025	0.10	Out	Within	Water	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	Developed as part of 032-171-015	SFR: Limited potential for increased density due to size	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-171-019	0.83	Out	Within	W&S	No change	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Highway	Undevelopable; Highway 101 ROW	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-171-020	0.93	Out	Out	Water	Add Entire metered APN to POU	12/1/2004	Pre 8/1999, 7/1993	SFR	None	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	WSA	No
032-171-021	0.27	Out	Out	Water	Entire metered APN to POU	12/1/2004	4/5/1985	SFR	None	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	WSA	No
032-171-022	9.25	Out	Out	Water	Add APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	Mostly undevelopable; River bar and steep	IR	IR	MH-Q	WSA	No
032-171-023	3.46	Out	Partial	Water	Adjusted to match property line	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	SFR	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	WSA	No
032-171-024	4.09	Out	Partial	Water	Adjusted to match property line	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	SFR	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	WSA	No
032-171-026	0.96	Out	Out	Water	Entire APN to POU	12/1/2004	4/1985	SFR	None	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	WSA	No
032-211-018	3.88	Out	Partial	Water	Adjusted to match property line	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Vacant	1 SFR; Potential for increased density	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	USA	Yes
032-211-019	1.40	Out	Out	Water	Entire APN to POU	Not a Customer	Not Applicable	Public Facility	None; GSD Intake	RL	RL	RS-B-5(5)	WSA	No
032-211-020	1.76	Out	Out	Water	Entire metered APN to POU	12/1/2004	1992	SFR	None; very steep	AR(5-20)	RR5-20	AG-B-5(5)	USA	Yes



APNs Proposed for Annexation into Jurisdictional Boundary (LAFCo Approval)														
Assessor's Parcel Number	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary: (In/Out/ Partial/ Majority Within)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/ Partial/ Majority Within)	Proposed Annexati on into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup> Service	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action (Add All/ Partial/ Remove/ Adjust to Property Line)	Date 1st Billed by GSD <sup>3</sup>	Date Meter Set	Existing Development	Notes about Potential Development	Existing General Plan Land Use Designation <sup>4</sup>	General Plan Update Land Use Designation <sup>5</sup> (Planning Commission Recommendation)	Existing Zoning <sup>6</sup>	Urban Study Area (USA) or Water Study Area (WSA)	Housing Opportunity Zone
222-091-011	82.38	Out	Out	Water	Entire metered APN to POU	12/1/2004	6/16/2008	SFR	2 SFR; 4 single detached dwelling units per APN	AL(20)	RR20-160	AE	Part USA	No
Meadows/Alderpoint Area														
223-183-003	4.25	Out	In	W&S	No Change	12/1/2004	Unknown	Fire Station	None	PF	PF	AE-B-6	USA	Yes
223-183-006	2.00	Out	Mostly	W&S	Adjust to match Property line	Not Customer	Not Applicable	Old Dump	None: Very Steep	GG	NR	AE-B-6	USA	Yes
223-181-031	2.62	Out	Within	W&S	No change	12/1/2004	4/5/1981	SFR	Potential for increased density	AS	RE2.5-5	RS-T	USA	Yes
223-181-043	0.94	Out	Within	W&S	No change	12/1/2004	6/19/1981	SFR	Potential for increased density	AS	RE2.5-5	RS-T	USA	Yes
223-181-044	3.77	Out	Within	W&S	No change	12/1/2004	Unknown	SFR	Potential for increased density	AS	RE2.5-5	RS-T	USA	Yes
<div><div><div>10. POU: place of use</div><div>11. W&amp;S: water and sewer</div><div>12. GSD: Garberville Sanitary District</div><div>13. AR(5-20): Agricultural Rural, 5 to 20 acre minimum parcel size</div><div>AS: Agricultural Suburban</div><div>CG: Commercial General</div><div>GG: Green Gulch</div><div>IG: Industrial, General</div><div>IR: Industrial, Resource Related</div><div>PF: Public Facility</div><div>RL: Residential-Low Density</div><div>14. AS: Agricultural Suburban</div><div>CG: Commercial General</div><div>IG: Industrial, General</div><div>IR: Industrial, Resource Related</div><div>NR: Natural Resources</div><div>PF: Public Facility</div><div>RE2.5-5: Residential Estates, 2.5-5 acre minimum parcel size</div><div>RL: Residential-Low Density</div><div>RR(5-20): Rural Residential, 5 to 20 acre minimum parcel size</div><div>RR40: Rural Residential, minimum lot size 40 acres</div></div><div><div>15. AG-B-5(5): Special Building Site, 5 acre minimum lot size</div><div>AE-B-5(160): Agriculture Exclusive, Special Building Site Combining Zone -160 acre minimum parcel size</div><div>AL(20): Agricultural Lands, 20 acre minimum</div><div>C-2-D: Community Commercial-Design Review Combining</div><div>FR-Q: Forestry Recreation Zone-Qualified Combining Zone</div><div>MH: Heavy Industrial</div><div>MH-Q: Heavy Industrial- Qualified Combining Zone</div><div>MH-S-Q: Heavy Industrial-Standard Combining Zone-Qualified Combining Zone</div><div>R-1-B-6: Residential One Family Lot, Special Building Site Combining Zone - 160 acres minimum parcel size</div><div>R-1-B-6-T: Residential One Family Special Building Site and Manufactured Home Combining Zone</div><div>RR20-160: Rural Residential 20-160 acres minimum parcel size</div><div>RS-B-5(5): Residential Suburban- Special Building Site, 5 acre minimum lot size</div><div>RS-T: Residential Suburban-Manufactured Home</div><div>U: Unclassified</div><div>16. WWTP: wastewater treatment plant</div><div>17. SFR: Single Family Residence</div><div>LUD: Land Use Designation</div><div>18. KMWC: Kimtu Mutual Water Company</div></div></div>														



**Attachment 3**

---

**Proposed Additions to Place of Use  
(SWRCB-DWR)**

<b>Table 1</b> <b>Proposed Additions to Place of Use (SWRCB-DWR Approval)</b>					
APN	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary Status (In/Out/Partial)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/Partial/Majority With)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup>	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action
<b>Bear Canyon Road/Redwood Drive/Bushnell Lane</b>					
223-061-033	35.34	Out	Partial	W&S	Adjust to match Property Line
223-171-001	8.24	Out	Majority Within	Water	Adjust to match Property Line
223-171-023	22.58	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match Property Line
<b>Connick Creek Subdivision</b>					
222-156-014	4.90	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-156-015	4.51	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-156-016	12.31	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-156-017	7.41	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-156-018	5.30	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-156-019	4.78	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-156-020	2.67	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-156-021	3.94	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
223-061-025	105.26	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match developed area
<b>Hillcrest Drive/Downtown Area</b>					
032-221-005	21.38	In	Partial	In	Adjust to match Property Line
032-211-007	2.68	Out	Majority Within	W & S	Adjust to match LUD <sup>3</sup>
223-061-007	9.00	Out	Majority Within	W & S	Adjust to match LUD
032-211-021	8.83	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match Property Line
<b>Kimtu Meadows Subdivision</b>					
222-201-002	0.83	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-003	0.22	Out	Out	Water	Add entire APN to POU
222-201-004	0.34	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU

<b>Table 1</b> <b>Proposed Additions to Place of Use (SWRCB-DWR Approval)</b>					
APN	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary Status (In/Out/Partial)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/Partial/Majority With)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup>	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action
222-201-005	0.27	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-006	0.02	Out	Out	Water	Add entire APN to POU
222-201-007	0.43	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-008	1.00	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-009	0.68	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-010	0.88	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-011	0.51	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-012	0.79	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-013	3.43	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-014	0.82	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-015	1.04	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-016	0.95	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-017	0.02	Out	Out	Water	Add entire APN to POU
222-201-018	1.40	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-019	0.87	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-020	1.92	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-021	0.03	Out	Out	Water	Add entire APN to POU
222-201-022	1.38	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-023	0.63	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-024	0.72	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-201-025	0.43	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU

<b>Table 1</b> <b>Proposed Additions to Place of Use (SWRCB-DWR Approval)</b>					
APN	Size (Acres)	Existing District Boundary Status (In/Out/Partial)	Existing POU <sup>1</sup> : (In/Out/Partial/Majority With)	Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&S <sup>2</sup>	Proposed POU <sup>1</sup> Action
<b>Leino Road/Sprowel Creek Road</b>					
032-161-014	21.97	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match Property Line
032-171-009	1.94	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
032-171-020	0.93	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
032-171-021	0.27	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
032-171-022	9.25	Out	Out	Water	Add APN to POU
032-171-023	3.46	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match Property Line
032-171-024	4.09	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match Property Line
032-171-026	0.96	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
032-211-018	3.88	Out	Partial	Water	Adjust to match Property Line
032-211-019	1.40	Out	Out	Water	Add APN to POU
032-211-020	1.76	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
222-091-011	82.38	Out	Out	Water	Add entire metered APN to POU
<b>Meadows/Alderpoint</b>					
223-181-001	14.06	In	Majority Within	W&S	Adjust to match Property Line
223-181-004	18.11	In	Majority Within	W&S	Adjust to match Property Line
223-181-009	2.30	In	Majority Within	W&S	Adjust to match Property Line
223-182-001	9.36	In	Majority Within	W&S	Adjust to match Property Line
223-183-005	20.17	In	Partial	W&S	Adjust to match Property Line
223-183-006	2.00	In	Majority Within	In	Adjust to match Property Line
223-183-007	8.91	In	Majority Within	In	Adjust to match Property Line
223-183-008	11.39	In	Majority Within	In	Adjust to match Property Line
223-191-007	10.67	In	Majority Within	In	Adjust to match Property Line

<b>Table 1</b> <b>Proposed Additions to Place of Use (SWRCB-DWR Approval)</b>					
<b>APN</b>	<b>Size (Acres)</b>	<b>Existing District Boundary Status (In/Out/Partial)</b>	<b>Existing POU<sup>1</sup>: (In/Out/Partial/ Majority With)</b>	<b>Proposed Annexation into Water Only or W&amp;S<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Proposed POU<sup>1</sup> Action</b>
223-191-008	19.33	In	Majority Within	In	Adjust to match Property Line
223-191-009	24.91	In	Majority Within	In	Adjust to match Property Line
223-191-010	4.60	In	Majority Within	In	Adjust to match Property Line
223-191-011	13.74	In	Partial	In	Adjust to match Property Line
223-191-012	15.58	In	Majority Within	In	Adjust to match Property Line
223-191-013	5.04	In	Majority Within	In	Adjust to match Property Line
223-191-014	5.16	In	Majority Within	In	Adjust to match Property Line
1. POU: Place of Use 2. W&S: water and sewer 3. LUD: Land Use Designation					








- SHCP Property Boundary
- Counties
- Limited Access
- Highway
- Major Road
- + Parks (Local)
- ~ Streams

Paper Size ANSI A  
0 1,500 3,000 4,500 6,000  
Feet  
Map Projection: Lambert Conformal Conic  
Horizontal Datum: North American 1983  
Grid: NAD 1983 StatePlane California I FIPS 0401 Feet




Southern Humboldt Community Park  
Environmental Impact Report

Vicinity and Location

Job Number 12556 11 001  
Revision 1  
Date 18 Oct 2012

**Figure 1**





**Figure 2**