

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**Kevin R. Hamblin, AICP, Director***Lisa D. Shikany, Environmental Planner*

531 K Street • Eureka, California 95501-1146

Ph (707) 268-5265 • Fax (707) 441-4202 • lshikany@ci.eureka.ca.gov**PROJECT TITLE:** Waterfront Drive Extension Project**PROJECT APPLICANT:** City of Eureka, Engineering Department**PROJECT LOCATION:** Westerly and parallel to Highway 101 (Broadway) from Del Norte Street south to Hilfiker Lane**ZONING & GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** *Zoning* – Natural Resources (NR), Coastal Dependent Industrial (MC), General Industrial (MG), Planned Shopping Center (CP), Service Commercial (CS), and Public (P) *General Plan* – Coastal-Dependent Industrial (CDI), General Industrial (GI), Natural Resources (NR), General Service Commercial (GSC), Community Commercial (CC), and Public/Quasi-Public (PQP)**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The City of Eureka is proposing to construct a two-lane extension of Waterfront Drive (approximately 9,000 lineal feet) southerly from Del Norte Street to Hilfiker Lane primarily along and within existing North Coast Railroad Authority (NCRRA) and City of Eureka rights-of-way. Potential connections to State Route 101 (Broadway) are proposed at Truesdale Avenue, McCullens Avenue and Bayshore Way. The new street section is proposed to vary between 32 feet and 40 feet wide, with Class II bike lanes in both directions and a sidewalk along the eastern side. A traffic signal is proposed at the Broadway and Hilfiker Lane intersection. Other possible roadway connections to Broadway could include either traffic signal modification or new installations, depending on the intersection. In addition, the project involves a separate Class I multiuse recreational trail located on an existing utility easement adjacent to the roadway. The trail would extend from Del Norte Street to the Bayshore Mall near Parcel 4, with a connection at Vigo Street.

The project starts on Railroad Avenue approximately 450 feet north of Del Norte Street and extends south to Hilfiker Lane. The project involves numerous elements, including construction of a variable width roadway; construction of a multiuse recreational trail; realignment of existing roadway; relocation of railroad tracks; construction of railroad crossings; relocation or rehabilitation of utilities such as storm drains, sewer lines, utilities poles and fire hydrants; construction of new utilities such as street lights; and construction of bioremediation swales and landscaping strips. Creation of an underground utility district is proposed, which will apply to new and relocated utilities. A detailed project description is attached.

LEAD AGENCY/CONTACT: City of Eureka, Community Development Department; Lisa D. Shikany, Environmental Planner; 531 K Street, Eureka, CA 95501-1165; phone: (707) 268-5265; fax: (707) 441-4202; e-mail: lshikany@ci.eureka.ca.gov**SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:** The project is located west of Highway 101 (Broadway) and east of Humboldt Bay, extending south from Del Norte Street to Hilfiker Lane. The project corridor lies within the Coastal Zone, and within areas under the coastal permit jurisdiction of the

California Coastal Commission and the City of Eureka. The northern section of the proposed alignment is located between the main 39-acre Palco March which is designated as a Natural Resources Zone by the City, and lands designated as Coastal Dependent Industrial along Humboldt Bay. The southern section is comprised of a mix of commercial and industrial uses. The Bayshore Mall is located near the central segment and directly east of the proposed alignment. The property known as Parcel 4, designated Coastal Dependent Industrial, is located behind the Bayshore Mall and directly adjacent to the proposed alignment. A trailer park is located at the existing terminus of McCullens Avenue, directly east of the proposed roadway extension.

OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS, OR MAY BE REQUIRED (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (San Francisco District, Eureka Field Office) - Section 404 Permit
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Arcata Field Office) – Endangered Species Act (ESA) Consultation/Concurrence
- NOAA Fisheries (Arcata Field Office) – ESA Consultation/Concurrence
- Federal Highway Administration – Funding, NEPA Lead Agency Approval
- California Coastal Commission – Coastal Development Permit
- California Department of Transportation (District 1) – Encroachment Permit
- Department of Fish and Game (Region 1) – Streambed Alteration Agreement
- North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board – Section 401 Water Quality Certification and General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit
- City of Eureka – Coastal Development Permit

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

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

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **could not** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **may** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **may** have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only 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.

Lisa D. Shikany
Environmental Planner, City of Eureka

Date

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. Since the City has determined that an EIR will be required for the Waterfront Drive Extension Project, the discussions presented in this Initial Study (IS) are not comprehensive. Instead, a preliminary discussion of potential key issue areas and potential strategies to address these key issues in the EIR are provided. Effects found to be absent or insignificant will be identified in this Initial Study along with a statement that the issue will not be addressed in further detail in the EIR. In the checklist below the following definitions are used:

"Potentially Significant Impact" means that there is either substantial evidence that an effect may be significant or, due to lack of existing information, may have potential to be a significant effect.

"Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" means the incorporation of one or more mitigation measures can reduce the effect from potentially significant to a less than significant level. For purposes of this particular checklist, this category will not be utilized.

"Less Than Significant Impact" means that there is sufficient evidence available to determine 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.

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

Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:

- a) Temporary or permanent change in the visual character of the project area that would be perceived by the public as detracting from the visual character of the project study area.
- b) Permanent changes to the environment that would eliminate or substantially degrade key elements of the visual character of the project area near, or visible from Highway 101/Broadway.
- c) Permanent changes in the project area that would result in a degraded visual character in the project area, particularly from the eastern bluffs that overlook Humboldt Bay or from Palco Marsh.

- d) The introduction of a temporary or permanent source of bright light or glare that would detract from a project area that is otherwise subject to little artificial light or glare.

DISCUSSION: The measure for determining whether a project will result in aesthetic impacts is a qualitative judgment rather than a set of quantifiable parameters. As such, the opinion of what may be an adverse aesthetic impact can vary from person to person.

- a) Although there is existing development and a railroad alignment within the project study area, the railroad is currently non-functioning (can reinstate operations at anytime without discretionary approval and are looking at reactivation in the northern section of the system which would include the project area absent the Eel River Valley section) and is not readily visible from outlying areas due to overgrowth of vegetation. The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension Project would be introducing a new element within the project area; a 32-foot to 40-foot roadway that supports continuous traffic, although it should be noted that there will be no overhead utilities associated with the project. A qualitative visual impact assessment will be conducted to determine if elements of the proposed project would have an adverse effect on scenic views associated with Humboldt Bay from the existing developed areas along the bluffs east of Highway 101, as well as bird watchers and others visiting Palco Marsh for the natural resources it has to offer. Mitigation will be prescribed for any significant impacts that are identified. This visual impacts assessment would include a site reconnaissance, photo-documentation of key public viewing areas (including photos of key views from the proposed road, key views from the bluff overlooking Humboldt Bay, and key views from the bay and from Palco Marsh to the proposed road), and a consistency review of local planning and coastal zone management regulations for aesthetics. Concerns raised by local public stakeholders may also be considered in the analysis.
- b) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension Project is not expected to substantially damage existing scenic resources such as Humboldt Bay and Palco Marsh. Aesthetic impacts associated with the project are anticipated to be limited to scenic views/vistas from adjacent locations, including the bluffs to the east, as described above. Highway 101 is not a state scenic highway and based on existing topography the majority of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension would not be visible to motorists driving along Highway 101. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- c) The proposed project may introduce new elements (i.e., 32-foot to 40-foot roadway) that could degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project corridor or surrounding area, even though the project area already supports commercial uses and a railroad alignment. A qualitative visual impact assessment will be conducted and mitigation prescribed, as warranted.
- d) Both construction and on-going operation of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension Project will result in increased lighting associated with the headlights of construction equipment (temporary impact if nighttime construction occurs), vehicles using the new roadway extension, and streetlights (permanent impacts). This level of increased lighting may have an adverse affect on night-time views in the project area. A visual impact assessment will be conducted to determine if new light sources would substantially alter night-time views within the surrounding area. If warranted, the City will incorporate mitigation measures for any significant impacts that are identified.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:

- a) Introduction of changes in the availability or use of important agricultural lands that are designated under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
- b) Change in land use regulation as a result of the proposed project that would adversely affect agricultural activities in lands zoned for agriculture, particularly lands under Williamson Act contracts.
- c) Introduction of changes into the project area that would affect the availability of or ability to use existing farmlands.

DISCUSSION:

- a) The project study area supports a mix of commercial, industrial, and natural resources uses and does not contain lands that have been mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- b) The project study area lands are not currently devoted to agricultural resources. In addition, none of the parcels that would be affected by potential right-of-way acquisition are currently under a Williamson Act contract. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- c) Since there are no existing farmland uses within the project study area, construction and operation of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project will not result in the conversion of farmlands to a non-agricultural use. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.

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 Incorporation	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	

Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:

- a) Project-related effect that would directly interfere with the attainment of long-term air quality objectives identified by the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District.
- b) Contribution of pollutants by the project that would violate an existing air quality standard, or contribution by the project in a substantive way to a non-attainment of air quality objectives in the project area air basin.
- c) Generation of pollutants by the project that would cumulatively contribute to non-attainment for any priority pollutant.
- d) Pollutant loading generated by the project near sensitive receptors that would result in a locally significant air quality impact.
- e) Release of a project-related odor that would affect a number of receptors.

DISCUSSION: Air quality is a general term used to describe various aspects of the air to which plants and human populations are exposed on a regular basis. Air quality can be degraded by a variety of contaminants including criteria pollutants that consist of gases or suspended particulate matter (PM-10). Ambient air quality standards and allowable limit levels are set at both the state and federal level; in most cases the standards are similar. The standards are set for air pollutants in outside air and are based on predicated health effects of those pollutants. Humboldt, Del Norte, and Trinity Counties are located in the North Coast Air Basin under the regulation of North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD). Air quality measurements for Humboldt County are taken in Eureka at 6th & I Streets.

Humboldt County is listed as attainment (i.e., within allowable limits) for the following criteria pollutants: ozone; carbon monoxide; nitrogen dioxide; sulfur dioxide; sulfates; hydrogen sulfide; and vinyl chloride. Humboldt County is listed as non-attainment for the state standard for PM-10 air emissions, which include chemical emissions and other inhalable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 10 microns. Examples include smoke, dust, fly ash, and airborne salts or other particulate matter naturally generated by ocean surf. The major sources of PM-10 pollutants include industrial processes, automobiles, wood smoke from open burning and residential wood heating, dust from paved and unpaved roads, construction, and agricultural practices. Pursuant to data from the California Air Resources Board

as presented by the Center for Economic Development, California State University, Chico (2003), Humboldt County has not exceeded the national PM-10 standard since at least 1990.

Despite the state status of non-attainment for PM-10 pollutants, based on the published data it is evident that the implementation and enforcement by the NCUAQMD of the Particulate Matter (PM-10) Attainment Plan and the Air Quality Regulation 1, Chapter IV, that Humboldt County is on the correct path towards attainment. As evidence, in 1990, Humboldt County exceeded the state standard for PM-10's on 30 days, in 1994 on 12 days, in 1999 and 2000 on 6 days each, and in 2001, only on 1 day.

- a) As discussed above, the NCUAQMD has a PM-10 Attainment Plan that it is currently being implemented. The proposed project has the potential for the short-term release of fugitive dust and particulate matter during the construction process that could affect the attainment of air quality objectives; however, the City will adhere to the current NCUAQMD air quality guidelines for minimizing PM-10 effects. The potential for cumulative effects is considered to fall under items III. b and c below. This effect will be discussed in the EIR and specific best management practices (BMP's) consistent with the current NCUAQMD guidelines will be provided that will keep this impact at a less than significant level.
- b) The proposed project has the potential for release of fugitive dust and particulate matter during the proposed construction process and release of particulate matter and carbon monoxide during the operation phase. The generation of particulate matter by construction activities and equipment, by itself, is not expected to violate air quality standards established for the air basin. However, the air basin is non-attainment for particulate matter smaller than 10 micrometers in size and the project could be seen as contributing to a cumulative effect for this pollutant criteria. Regarding the release of carbon monoxide during the operational phase of the project, the project is not anticipated to elevate existing carbon monoxide levels because the proposed roadway extension would not generate additional traffic, but would handle traffic that would otherwise be stacking-up at adjacent intersections along Highway 101 to the east. The improvement in traffic operations expected to occur as a result of the project is anticipated to reduce emissions. The City will conduct an air quality study to verify this preliminary determination and mitigation measures will be prescribed for any significant impacts that are identified. Potential mitigation for fugitive dust will comply with Air Quality Regulation 1, Chapter IV, Rules 420 and 430, which will reduce potential fugitive dust emission impacts.
- c) The North Coast air basin is currently non-attainment for PM-10, under the State of California criteria. As previously discussed, the project will generate PM-10 due to exposure of fine-grained soil to potential wind erosion and the use of diesel-powered construction equipment. This could be part of an environmentally significant cumulative air quality impact, which will be addressed in the EIR. Appropriate mitigation measures will be prescribed in the EIR.
- d) Although there are no sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals, or daycare centers within 500 feet of the project study limits, there are residences located within the trailer park located at the terminus of McCullens Avenue. It is acknowledged that the project may result in air quality impacts to biological receptors and this is discussed in Section IV. below. These residences, as well as people utilizing adjacent commercial and industrial businesses could be exposed to increased levels of particulate matter during both the construction and operation phases of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension Project. As described above under item III.a, the EIR will provide specific best management practices (BMP's) from the current NCUAQMD guidelines that will keep this impact at a less than significant level.

e) The project does not propose any use or construction technique that will result in odors that could reasonably be considered objectionable by the general public. There will be temporary odors associated with paving, which is a common construction practice throughout the City. This is judged to be below the level of significance and will not be evaluated in the EIR

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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			

Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:

- a) Uncompensated loss of any plant or animal species or individuals listed as rare, threatened, or endangered by the federal or state government, or loss or degradation of habitat that supports such species.
- b) Uncompensated loss of more than an incidental and minor area of riparian habitat or other sensitive habitat type (excluding wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act) identified under federal, state, or local policies.
- c) Uncompensated loss or severe degradation of more than an incidental or minor area of wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.
- d) Uncompensated loss or substantive modification of key habitat areas that provide for continuity of movement for resident or migratory wildlife, or as a loss or substantive degradation of key habitat components that would result in a loss of use of important concentration areas for wildlife.
- e) Uncompensated loss of important biological resources that is inconsistent with local ordinance or policies.
- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community

Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

DISCUSSION: An assessment of sensitive plant resources for the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project has been completed. An assessment of wildlife resources and a delineation of jurisdictional waters within the project study area will be conducted prior to completion of the CEQA review process.

- a) A formal list of federally-listed and candidate species for the *Eureka* and *Fields Landing* quads was received from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on May 22, 2003. Species included on the list that may have potential to occur in the project vicinity are: Menzies' wallflower (*Erysimum menziesii*); beach layia (*Layia carnosa*); western lily (*Lilium occidentale*); tidewater goby (*Eucyclogobius newberryi*); California coastal chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*); Southern Oregon / Northern California coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*); Northern California steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*); California brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus*); short-tailed albatross (*Phoebastria albatrus*); and western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*). A review of the California Department of Fish and Game's Natural Diversity Database for the *Eureka* and *Fields Landing* quads did not detect known occurrences of federal- or state-listed species within the project study area.

Focused botanical surveys in Spring/Summer 2002 did not reveal the presence of any special-status plant species within the proposed project alignment, although populations of Pt. Reyes Bird's (*Cordylanthus maritimus* ssp. *palustris*) and Humboldt Bay Owl's clover (*Castilleja ambigua* ssp. *humboltiensis*) were observed in the vicinity. Neither of these plant species are listed or proposed for listing, but are considered sensitive for purposes of CEQA analysis as both species are designated as federal species of concern and CNPS List 1B species.

A focused assessment of wildlife and fisheries resources will be conducted prior to circulation of the EIR. Based on a search of existing literature, the project study area is located outside of designated critical habitat for the federally threatened western snowy plover (50 CFR Part 17, December 7, 1999). In addition, direct impacts to listed salmonids are not anticipated. As indicated above, after completion of all the field studies, a comprehensive NES report will be prepared and submitted to Caltrans, FHWA, and the resource agencies for review and approval.

- b) Palco Marsh, Maurer Marsh, Railroad Marsh, and Humboldt Bay would all be considered sensitive natural communities by the California Coastal Commission and the California Department Fish and Game. The project corridor also supports clumps of Willow Riparian Forest, which is also considered a sensitive natural community. The proposed project may result in effects to these sensitive communities due to construction, hydrologic disruption and water quality degradation associated with storm water runoff from a new roadway. These potential effects will be examined in more detail in the environmental document and appropriate mitigation measures will be prescribed for any significant impacts that are identified.
- c) The project area contains wetland categories regulated under local and state policies, as well as wetlands meeting federal criteria. These features range from ditches to freshwater marsh. Construction activities will generally be limited to the North Coast Railroad Authority (NCRA) railroad alignment and adjacent roadways. The proposed project may result in effects to wetland features due to construction, hydrologic disruption and water quality degradation associated with storm water runoff from a new roadway. These potential effects will be examined in more detail in the environmental document and appropriate mitigation measures will be prescribed for any significant impacts that are identified.
- d) Humboldt Bay and its associated wetlands are an important component of the Pacific Flyway

migratory corridor. These wetlands are a major staging and foraging area for shorebird and waterfowl migrating along the Pacific Coast. The proposed extension of Waterfront Drive between Palco Marsh, Maurer Marsh, and Railroad Marsh and Humboldt Bay would result in the placement of a physical barrier to resident wildlife species that inhabit these wetland features. Vehicles traveling along a new roadway extension would result in increased traffic noise, vehicle exhaust emissions, and traffic/wildlife collisions. A qualitative assessment of potential project operational effects of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project on wildlife (i.e., traffic noise, vehicle exhaust emissions, traffic/wildlife collisions) will be conducted by reviewing existing literature and scientific data.

- e) The City of Eureka’s general plan and associated Local Coastal Program (LCP), as well as the Coastal Act, contain policies that protect biological resources associated with Humboldt Bay. Typically, these policies require that mitigation measures for adverse effects be included in a project that is otherwise consistent with the policies. These effects will be considered in the environmental document and mitigation measures will be prescribed as appropriate.
- f) There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other similar plans that cover the project study area. There is, however, an open space easement over a portion of the City’s Palco Marsh property in favor of the State Coastal Conservancy. There may be a potential for conflicts with this easement as a result of the operation of this project. This effect will be evaluated in the EIR.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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	

Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:

- a) Physical changes in known or designated historical resources, or in their physical surroundings, in a manner that would degrade their significance.
- b) Physical changes in archaeological sites that represent important or unique archaeological or historical information.
- c) Physical changes that could adversely affect a unique paleontological resource/site or unique geologic feature.
- d) Disturbance of human burial sites as a result of project construction activities.

DISCUSSION:

- a) Known resources of potential historical significance that may occur within or adjacent to the identified Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project include the following: Humboldt Harbor Historical District (California Historic Landmark No. 882); Bucksport; Elk River Railroad; Elk River Mill and Lumber Company; and the Holmes Eureka Lumber Company. A historic architectural evaluation will be conducted within the APE to determine if any historical resources are present and would be affected by the proposed project. The City will incorporate mitigation measures for any significant impacts that are identified.
- b) The project APE is located near several recorded archaeological sites. An archeological study will be conducted within the identified APE for the proposed project to determine if any significant archaeological resources, including the three recorded sites, are present. The City will incorporate mitigation measures for any significant impacts that are identified.
- c) The project study area is not known to support any unique paleontological or geologic resources. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- d) Although the APE is not known to contain any known burial sites or human remains, there may be unknown archaeological resources within the APE that could be unearthed during the construction phase of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension Project. In addition, the likelihood is low because the majority of the area proposed for excavation is comprised of non-native fill. If undiscovered archaeological, historical, ethnic or religious resources are encountered during grading or construction activities, State Law requires that all work cease and a qualified cultural resources specialist be contacted to analyze the significance of the find and formulate further mitigation (e.g. project relocation, excavation plan, protective cover). Pursuant to the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are encountered, all work must cease and the County Coroner contacted. This initial study concludes that the project effectively avoids crossing the threshold of significance, and the effect will not be addressed in the EIR.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			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

Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:

- a) i) Loss or damage to project elements as a direct result of fault movement along a fault identified in the Alquist-Priolo study.
- ii) Loss of or damage to project elements as an indirect result of seismically derived ground movement, which is not the direct result of fault offset, landslide, or other ground movement.
- iii) Loss of or damage to project elements as a direct result of seismically derived ground failure.
- iv) Loss of or damage to project elements due to landslides that are not seismically related.
- b) Erosion by water or wind of more than a minimal volume of earth materials.
- c) Secondary instability of earth materials, related to the project, that could subsequently fail, damaging project elements or other sites or structures.
- d) Location of the project on expansive soils that are identified by professional geologists, which could result in damage to project elements or other sites or structures.
- e) Placement of a septic tank or alternative disposal system on soils that are not capable of supporting such systems.

DISCUSSION:

- a) The North Coast is the location of numerous fault lines and is near the intersection of three tectonic plates. However, based upon a review of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps, the proposed project is not in an area where fault rupture is known or expected, therefore, potential impacts resulting from fault rupture are less than significant. All property within the

City of Eureka is located in 'Seismic Zone 4' as prescribed by the Uniform Building Code. Therefore, all new construction must comply with the construction standards for Seismic Zone 4. Because construction must comply with the Seismic Zone 4 standards of the Uniform Building Code as well as Caltrans standards, and because construction that conforms to the Uniform Building Code and Caltrans standards is presumed to meet the building and transportation safety standard, the potential impacts from seismic ground shaking and seismic ground failure, including liquefaction are considered less than significant. Since the project study area is flat, there is no potential for landslides. These effects will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.

- b) There is potential for soil erosion along the new roadway fill prisms and within relocated drainage swales/ditches after construction of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project. All areas of disturbed soils will be stabilized and revegetated as appropriate. The environmental document will provide specific impact analysis and detailed mitigation measures for any significant erosion-related impacts.
- c) The project study area is not expected to support unstable soils since the majority of the propose project would be located on non-native fill material associated with the existing NCRA railroad alignment. The railroad has existed for years, and previously supported multiple tracks carrying heavier loads than the new road would experience. The City will be conducting a geotechnical investigation during the design phase and any potential constraints would be addressed during the final project design. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- d) According to the City of Eureka General Plan Background Report, the project area is located within an area supporting quaternary alluvial sediments. The project study area is not expected to support expansive soils since the majority of the propose project would be located on non-native fill material associated with the existing NCRA railroad alignment. As noted above, the railroad berm has proven stable over the years. The City will be conducting a geotechnical investigation during the design phase and any potential constraints would be addressed during the final project design. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- e) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project will not require the installation of a septic tank or alternative wastewater disposal facility. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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	
<p>Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Potential storage or use of chemicals, on a regular basis, that could be hazardous if released into the environment. b) Construction conditions that would be likely to result in the generation and release of hazardous materials. c) Use of hazardous materials within a quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school. d) Siting of the project on a listed hazardous materials site, as defined by Government Code Section 65962.5. e) Increase in use intensity by people within the boundaries of, or within two miles of, the Airport Planning Area for Eureka Airport or Murray Field. f) Increased exposure of people within the vicinity of a private airstrip to a safety hazard. g) Physical change in the environment that would interfere with emergency responses or evacuations. h) Increased exposure of people or structures to significant risk of life involving wildland fires. 				

DISCUSSION:

- a) The existing portion of Waterfront Drive and Railroad Avenue may be currently used for the transport of potentially hazardous materials. The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project would provide a new segment of roadway that existing truck traffic carrying potential hazardous materials may use. While the project may result in a potential change in traffic patterns, it is not expected to result in an increase in the level of hazardous materials transport in the project area. It should be noted that whatever hazardous materials could be transported along an extended Waterfront Drive are already being transported along existing roadways within the project area, adjacent to Humboldt Bay and Palco Marsh, as well as adjacent to pedestrians and cyclists. Since the bicycle lane associated with the proposed extension of Waterfront Drive is a Class 1 facility located away from the roadway north of Vigo Street, there would be a reduced potential for a significant hazard associated with an accident as compared to other streets in the City. This impact will not be addressed in the EIR.
- b) Potential hazardous sites within the project study area include: NCRA railroad (contaminated soil and ballast material); former Eureka-Holmes Lumber Company (contaminated soil); existing NCI property (contaminated soil); and the Hilfiker and McMurray properties (contaminated soil). The City will be conducting a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment to determine if the project study area contains a potentially hazardous site (listed and unlisted). If a hazardous site is identified, a more focused Phase 2 Site Investigation will be conducted to determine the extent of the site and to identify appropriate remediation measures.
- c) The proposed project is not expected to generate hazardous emissions. In addition, there are no schools located within 0.5 miles of the project study area. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- d) There are no known hazardous materials sites, as designated under Government Code 65962.5 present within the project study area. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- e) The project site is more than two miles from the Murray Field airport and is located outside the airspace analysis zone identified in the 1993 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Murray Field. The project site is located within two miles of the City-owned Eureka Municipal Airport. This airport, located on the Samoa Peninsula, is currently used only occasionally by small private aircraft. The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project would be a compatible use since it would not involve the construction of tall structures and would be outside the normal flight patterns of any airplanes using Eureka Municipal Airport. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- f) The project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- g) The project will have no impact on the City of Eureka's emergency response or evacuation plans. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- h) The project site is located within City Limits of Eureka; there are no "wildlands" near the project site. The project study area is heavily vegetated in most of the undeveloped segments and these areas, particularly Parcel 4, have been subject to high fire incidences associated with transient activity. The proposed roadway is not expected to increase the potential for fires in the area and may actually reduce transient activity and associated fire danger in the area. This effect will not

be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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 stormwater 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	

Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:

- a) Discharge of sediment or other pollutants that would violate Basin Plan standards or Waste Discharge Requirements associated with NPDES permits.
- b) Change in groundwater movement that would affect potential uses of groundwater.
- c) Erosion due to concentrated runoff from the project site.
- d) Increased potential for localized flooding directly related to construction and operation of the project.
- e) Increase in runoff, as a result of the project, that would exacerbate existing drainage problems, or a runoff increase that would carry pollutants to surface water courses or Humboldt Bay.
- f) Impacts to water quality that are otherwise not addressed above.
- g) Development of housing within a FEMA-designated 100-year flood hazard area.

- h) Placement of structures that would affect flood flows.
- i) Increased exposure of people or structures to potential flood flows.
- j) Exposure of people or structures to the effects of a potential tsunami.

DISCUSSION:

- a) Both construction and on-going use of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project have the potential to violate water quality standards that are regulated by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. These impacts include the potential for sediments or other pollutants to be mobilized within adjacent wetlands as a result of construction activities within and adjacent to the proposed roadway alignment; the potential for sediment or petroleum products to enter adjacent wetlands from storm water runoff; the potential for petroleum products to enter wetlands as a result of fueling, cleaning, maintenance or general operation of construction equipment; and the potential for concrete and asphalt waste to enter adjacent wetlands during construction. The City will analyze the potential effects of the project in relation to established water quality standards and appropriate mitigation measures will be prescribed. As part of the project, the City is proposing the construction of several bioremediation swales along the proposed roadway to reduce potential water quality effects. In addition, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and corresponding Notice of Intent to the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board will be required for this project.
- b) Construction and on-going operation of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project would not deplete local groundwater supplies. In addition, there would be no net change in local aquifers or the local groundwater table as a result of the project because there are no existing groundwater wells located in the vicinity of the project. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- c) The new roadway will result in more concentrated runoff draining into new culverts associated with the proposed project. This may alter existing drainage patterns in the study area and could result in minor erosion in areas where substrate is exposed because of excavation/grading activities; however, erosion control measures will be implemented that are expected to avoid erosion of disturbed substrates during periods of rain. As indicated above, the project will require the preparation of a SWPPP. The City will analyze the potential effects to water quality associated with erosion and siltation and appropriate mitigation measures will be prescribed.
- d) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension would increase the amount of impervious surface within the project study area. The additional surface area would result in increased storm water runoff. This new source of surface runoff is not expected to result in significant flooding on- or off-site because project design will include the following elements: improvements to the existing storm water drainage system in the project area to accommodate the potential for increased storm water runoff from a new roadway extension; construction of new drainage culverts, drop inlets, drains, and drain lines; and creation of bioremediation swales. Caltrans and FHWA specifications will require that any new roadways be designed to accommodate additional storm water runoff. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- e) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension would increase the amount of impervious surface within the project study area. The additional surface area could result in the increased potential for polluted runoff (i.e., oils and greases from road surfaces). The project design includes improvements to the existing storm water drainage system in the project area to accommodate the potential for increased storm water runoff from a new roadway extension, including the

construction of new drainage culverts, drop inlets, drains, drain lines, and bioremediation swales to act as treatment filters for potentially polluted runoff. The City will analyze the potential effects to water quality associated with storm water runoff and appropriate mitigation measures will be prescribed. As part of the project, the City is proposing the construction of several bioremediation swales along the proposed roadway to reduce potential water quality effects.

- f) No other water quality impacts beyond what are described above (a-e) are anticipated to occur as a result of project implementation. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- g) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project would not include the construction of new housing that would be located within a 100-year flood hazard area, nor would it result in a change in the designated 100-year floodplain that would result in existing housing within the project area being placed within a designated flood zone. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- h) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project would be located on existing fill materials (i.e., NCRA railroad bed), which are elevated above the existing 100-year floodplain. The project is not anticipated to substantively impede or redirect flood flows beyond the existing site conditions. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- i) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project will be located on existing fill materials associated primarily with the NCRA railroad. The existing storm water drainage system in the project area will be modified to accommodate the potential for increased storm water runoff from a new roadway extension, including the construction of new drainage culverts, drop inlets, drains, and drain lines. In addition, there would be no levees or dams associated with the proposed project. As a result, the proposed project is not expected to expose the public or structures to the risk of loss associated with flooding. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- j) Since the project study area is located within a tsunami run-up zone that could be affected by a tsunami resulting from Cascadia Subduction Zone seismicity, the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project would provide a new segment of roadway and associated recreational trail system that has potential to experience a tsunami run-up event. While the project may result in the placement of facilities that would locate the public within a tsunami run-up zone, this potential threat already exists within the project study area since several other public roadways and facilities are currently located within tsunami run-up zones throughout the City's waterfront. Further, the project is not proposing structures that would be concentrating large numbers of people for an extended amount of time within a confined area (i.e., commercial building); instead, the majority of the public using the new facilities would be moving through the area and would not be congregating in large numbers. A common approach for addressing potential tsunami run-up concerns is to install signs that inform the public that the project facilities are located within a potential tsunami run-up zone. This potential need for tsunami run-up advisory signage will be addressed as part of the design recommendations for the project. With regards to discussion in the EIR, tsunami run-up will only be discussed within the context of other seismic and hydrological topics that will be addressed in the document.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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			

Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:

- a) Removal of existing structures or placement of new structures that result in a perception that the project will adversely affect existing residential or commercial areas for a duration greater than the construction period.
- b) Project-related effects to resources for which protective policies have been adopted in the City's General Plan or other planning documents.
- c) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

DISCUSSION:

- a) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project will not divide an established community since the new roadway would be the extension of an existing road within a developed area of Eureka. In addition, the proposed alignment for the roadway extension is located primarily along an existing railroad alignment. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- b) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project is consistent with Policy 3.A.8 of the Transportation and Circulation Element of the City's General Plan which states: *The City shall develop Waterfront Drive along Humboldt Bay from the Elk River Interchange to the vicinity of Eureka Slough, consistent with all other applicable General Plan and LCP policies.* The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project is located within the Coastal Zone and will be subject to policies of the Coastal Act (California Coastal Commission and City of Eureka). As part of the environmental analysis, the City will conduct a thorough review of the City's planning documents, including the General Plan and LCP to identify any potential inconsistencies the proposed project may have with established land use policies, including policies pertaining to coastal resource protection.
- c) There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other similar plans that cover the project study area. There is, however, an open space easement over a portion of the City's Palco Marsh property in favor of the State Coastal Conservancy. There may be a potential for conflicts with this easement as a result of the operation of this project. This effect will be evaluated in the EIR.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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>Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:</p> <p>a) A short-term or long-term decrease in the availability of rock, aggregate, or sand that would otherwise be available for construction or other consumptive uses.</p> <p>b) Change in land use that would result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.</p> <p>DISCUSSION:</p> <p>a) The City is unaware of any rock, aggregate, or sand mineral resource deposits that might be affected by the project. This does not cross the threshold of significance and will not be considered in the EIR.</p> <p>b) Not applicable for the project study area because the City planning documents and Humboldt Bay Area Plan do not include such a mineral resources designation for the project study area. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.</p>				

XI. NOISE. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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
<p>Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:</p>				

- a) Generation of sound-pressure levels, or the presence of people within range of these levels that exceed the City's noise ordinance.
- b) New source of long-term ground vibrations and low-frequency sound that interferes with normal activities.
- c) Increase in ambient long-term sound-pressure levels after project completion resulting in a measurable difference to ambient noise levels in the project area prior to the project.
- d) Temporary sound increases related to construction), which will be perceived as increased ambient or background noise in the project area.
- e) Increased noise levels arising from Murray Field and the Eureka Airport as a result of the project, or the introduction (post-construction) of additional people into the vicinity of either of these airports where they will be exposed to sound levels that are not compatible with the City's noise ordinance.
- f) Increased exposure of people within the vicinity of a private airstrip to excessive noise levels.

DISCUSSION: Generally, noise is a level of sound or a particular sound that a specific receiver does not want to hear. Whether a sound is considered a noise depends on the source of the sound, the loudness relative to the background noise, the time of day, the surroundings, and the listener. The difference in people's reactions to different noises or sounds is explained by the perceived noisiness, or how undesirable the sound is to the people in the vicinity of the source. An unwanted sound may be extremely irritating although it is not unreasonably loud. The areas most vulnerable to the harmful effects of sound are residential locations, and particularly at night.

- a) Construction activities associated with the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project, as well as the introduction of vehicle traffic into a new area following construction, could result in the generation of noise levels that exceed local standards. The closest residential area is the trailer park complex located off of McCullens Avenue. At this location, a proposed extension of Waterfront Drive would be located within 50 feet of the nearest residences. Other existing land uses within the project study area include commercial/retail, industrial, and passive recreation. There are no schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches, or theaters located within or adjacent to the project study area. The City will conduct a noise study to determine the potential noise effects of the project for both the construction and operational phases of the proposed project and mitigation measures will be prescribed for any significant noise impacts that are identified.
- b) Construction of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project would not involve activities such as pile-driving which could generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. On-going operation of the new Waterfront Drive extension could result in vehicle-induced ground vibrations which would generally not be considered excessive or to cross a threshold of significance, but could cross a threshold if the vibration affected existing sensitive structures (i.e., historic buildings) within the project study area. The City will conduct a noise study, including the use of vibration measurements and Caltrans criteria for determining the significance of vibration-related impacts, to determine the potential noise effects of the project for both the construction and operational phases of the proposed project and mitigation measures will be prescribed for any significant noise impacts that are identified.
- c) On-going operation of the proposed extension of Waterfront Drive would generate ambient traffic noise which could be discernibly higher than the existing noise levels within the project study area. Potential increases in ambient noise are expected to occur along the new segment of

Waterfront Drive, which would pass by sensitive habitats including Palco Marsh and Humboldt Bay, as well as potential connector streets such as Hilfiker, McCullens, Bayshore Way, and Vigo Street which could experience increased traffic levels. The City will conduct a noise study to determine the potential permanent noise effects of the proposed project and mitigation measures will be prescribed for any significant noise impacts that are identified.

- d) Construction activities associated with the proposed extension of Waterfront Drive would generate ambient noise which could be discernibly higher than the existing noise levels within the project study area. Potential temporary increases in ambient noise are expected to occur along the new segment of Waterfront Drive, which would pass sensitive habitat areas as well as potential connector streets such as Hilfiker, McCullens, Bayshore Way, and Vigo Street which may be subject to minor roadway improvements. The City will conduct a noise study to determine the potential temporary noise effects of the proposed project and mitigation measures will be prescribed for any significant noise impacts that are identified. Potential mitigation measures may include limiting noise-generating activities to daytime hours, requiring notification of potentially effected residences, and requiring the contractor to limit noise generating activities in various ways.
- e) Although the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project is located within two miles of the City's Eureka Municipal Airport, the proposed project would not accommodate new residences or workers. Consequently, the project would not expose people residing or living in the area to excessive noise levels as a result of being located within two miles of an existing airport. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- f) The project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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			

Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:

- a) Removal of an existing impediment to population growth due to an extension of an existing roadway and improved traffic circulation in the project area.
- b) Demolition or removal of five or more existing housing units as a result of the project.
- c) Expulsion of 10 or more persons from otherwise occupied housing.

DISCUSSION: Eureka was 'founded' in 1850 and incorporated in 1856. The 1860 population was approximately 615. By 1920 Eureka had a population of roughly 12,500. According to the City of Eureka's first General Plan, adopted in 1965, the population of Eureka in 1950 had grown to 23,058 and in 1960 it was 28,137. Based on data presented by the Center for Economic Development, California State University, Chico, the 1980 population was 24,350 and the population in 2002 was 26,050. This statistical

data is provided to illustrate that Eureka's population growth over the past half-decade has been constant, regardless of the economic and population trends in the rest of the country. Therefore, it would take a "major" project to induce 'substantial' population growth or decline in Eureka.

- a) A primary purpose of a proposed extension of Waterfront Drive from Del Norte to Hilfiker is to alleviate traffic congestion within the City of Eureka. The project has been identified in the City's General Plan and could accommodate commercial and industrial development along Waterfront Drive consistent with current planning documents. This issue will be evaluated in more detail in the environmental document.
- b) If the McCullens Avenue alternative for the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project is selected by the City, right-of-way acquisition associated this alternative could result in the displacement of several mobile homes located within the existing trailer park. The City will analyze the economic impact of proposed right-of-way acquisitions on area residents and businesses. This analysis is intended to provide compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act of 1970 and Federal Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice). The City will examine project impacts on two primary groups: 1) Residents and 2) Businesses and/or community institutions. Mitigation measures will be prescribed for any significant impacts that are identified.
- c) If the McCullens Avenue alternative for the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project is selected by the City, right-of-way acquisition associated this alternative could result in the displacement of several mobile homes located within the existing trailer park. The City will analyze the economic impact of proposed right-of-way acquisitions on area residents. This analysis is intended to provide compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act of 1970 and Federal Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice). The City will examine the characteristics of households potentially displaced by the proposed project and will analyze opportunities for these households to relocate to commensurate dwelling units within the City of Eureka. Mitigation measures will be prescribed for any significant impacts that are identified.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. 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 Incorporation	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	
<p>Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Changes to an existing fire-protection system, or a perceived need for such changes. b) Changes to an existing law enforcement system, or a perceived need for such changes. c) Changes in existing school enrollments, or the uses of schools, or a perceived need for such changes. d) Changes to an existing park, resulting in less use, or a need for significant repairs to park facilities, or replacement parks. e) Changes to other public facilities that are not directly a part of the City's roadway or storm water conveyance systems. 				
<p>DISCUSSION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a-c, e) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project would not result in an adverse effect to public services including fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. These effects will not be evaluated in the EIR since they do not cross the threshold of significance. d) The project would provide for additional recreation amenities along Humboldt Bay (i.e., Class 1 multiuse recreational trail) along Humboldt Bay and Palco Marsh and may reduce the level of transient activity that currently exists within the project study area. Although it provides recreational amenities, there is potential for the project to decrease the usage of the adjacent marsh areas by bird watchers and others that enjoy the existing solitude that segments of the project study area currently provide. This potential effect will be evaluated in more detail in the EIR and mitigation measures will be prescribed, as warranted. 				

XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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			

Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:

- a) Increased demand for recreational facilities or increased use of existing recreational areas such that those areas are physically degraded.
- b) Increased demand for recreation facilities or increased use of existing recreational areas in a manner that would lead to an adverse change in the environment, such as degradation through over-use of environmentally sensitive areas.

DISCUSSION:

- a) The project does not facilitate any development that would result in an increase in demand for recreational facilities (i.e., a large residential subdivision that could bring new residents into the area requiring additional recreational opportunities). The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project includes recreation amenities (i.e., enhancement of bike/hiking trail along Humboldt Bay). This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- b) The project would include the enhancement of an existing trail system along Humboldt Bay and the three adjacent marshes (Palco, Railroad, Maurer) which may result in additional recreational uses that may have an associated effect on sensitive habitat areas. The City will analyze the effects of these recreational improvements (i.e., Section 4(f) evaluation), as well as all the other components of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project, on the surrounding environment in the environmental document.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	X			
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard 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) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	X			
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
<p>Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Project traffic that would increase existing-plus-project traffic above the capacity of existing streets or highways, resulting in a noticeable and adverse change to circulations, including temporary traffic effects during construction. b) Increased traffic that would cause level-of-service on City streets or County and state highways to fall below LOS D for City roadways or LOS E on state highways. c) Project components that would result in a change to air traffic patterns. d) Introduction of a project element that would result in increased hazards due to design features, particularly a dangerous intersection. e) Project-related traffic restrictions that would prevent emergency vehicles from reaching necessary locations. f) Permanent loss of existing parking spaces. 				
<p>DISCUSSION:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The primary goal of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project is to relieve traffic congestion along Broadway (between Del Norte and Hilfiker), with secondary goals including improved access west of Broadway, implementation of the General Plan Circulation Element, and increased multi-modal access to and along Humboldt Bay (including recreation resources along the Bay). The project itself is not expected to increase the number of vehicle trips within the City but it will likely shift current traffic levels to different streets (i.e., increased traffic along Hilfiker Lane from vehicles using an extended Waterfront Drive and potential for congestion at the Hilfiker Lane / Broadway intersection). The City is conducting a comprehensive traffic study to determine how the proposed project would affect various roadways and intersections within the 				

project study area. Critical traffic issues being evaluated include: intersection Level of Service (LOS), roadway capacity, turn lane and traffic signal warrants, adequacy of sight distance, and potential vehicle or pedestrian conflicts. For any significant impacts identified, the City will prescribe appropriate mitigation measures.

- b) As indicated above, the primary goal of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project is to improve the LOS of traffic within the project study area, specifically along Broadway. The traffic study that is being prepared will examine potential changes in LOS along affected roadways and intersections and for any significant impacts identified, the City will provide for mitigation.
- c) The proposed project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- d) The proposed project includes an alignment that is generally straight with a few gentle curves. No dangerous intersections are anticipated as the proposed project will utilize/modify existing intersections. Modifications to existing intersections at Del Norte Street and Hilfiker Lane to accommodate a proposed extension of Waterfront Drive are not anticipated to create dangerous intersections. A new traffic signal will be installed at the Highway 101 (Broadway) / Hilfiker Lane intersection. The various potential connections to Waterfront Drive will be studied for the potential to create traffic hazards, and mitigation will be identified as appropriate. The proposed project will result in traffic that would not create incompatible uses since it would continue to carry the same types of vehicle traffic that currently use the existing roadway systems. Although no hazards are anticipated, the traffic study that is being prepared will examine potential effects to intersections and for any significant impacts identified, the City will provide mitigation.
- e) Construction activities associated with the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project will be primarily situated within areas that do not support an existing roadway (i.e., NCRA railroad). Potential improvements to one or more the following connector streets may require temporary closure of a single traffic lane: Bayshore Way; McCullens Avenue; Truesdale Avenue; Hilfiker Lane. If warranted, a Traffic Control Plan will be prepared and implemented to address any potential concerns regarding emergency access. As part of this plan, the City would contact all businesses on Del Norte Street, Bayshore Way, Truesdale Avenue, McCullens Avenue, Hilfiker Lane, and the Bayshore Mall to inform them of planned work schedules and any changes in access to their businesses that may arise during the construction phase. Long-term, the proposed project may improve emergency access within the project area by alleviating traffic congestion along Broadway. The EIR will examine this issue in more detail.
- f) The proposed project is not expected to result in inadequate parking capacity within the project study area. Depending on the final project design, a small number of parking spaces associated with the Bayshore Mall may need to be removed. This potential for a small reduction in parking would not have a substantive effect on parking capacity for the Mall; the City and the landowner would negotiate any potential compensation for loss of parking through a right-of-way acquisition process. The proposed project would include the construction of some on-street parking spaces along the Waterfront Drive to provide access to the bike/hiking trail system along Humboldt Bay and the adjacent marsh system. The EIR will examine this issue in more detail.
- g) The proposed project would not be in conflict with any adopted plans, policies, or programs that support alternative transportation. The project would provide an improve bicycle path that would provide a safer link between Del Norte Street and Hilfiker Lane. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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 storm water 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

Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:

- a) An increase in hydraulic loading or waste-loading at the City's wastewater treatment facility that results in exceeding the facility's design capacity or in violations of the facility's Waste Discharge Requirements.
- b) Discernible relationship between the effects of the proposed project and a direct need to upgrade or expand either the existing wastewater system or the water delivery system.
- c) Increase in runoff intensity that would exacerbate drainage conditions and increases localized flooding in the project area.
- d) A demonstrated need for additional water supplies from the local water district.
- e) An increase in hydraulic loading or waste-loading that exceeded the approved design features of the wastewater treatment facility.
- f) Discernible relationship between the effects of disposing solid waste generated by the project that would be in excess of the local landfill's permitted capacity.
- g) Violation of any federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

DISCUSSION:

- a) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project does not include a wastewater treatment component. As a result, there would be no impact associated with the exceedance of RWQCB waste discharge requirements. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- b) Construction and on-going use of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project would not necessitate the need to construct a new water or wastewater treatment plant, nor would it require the expansion of any existing treatment facilities. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR

since it does not cross the threshold of significance.

- c) The proposed project will involve the modifications to the existing storm water drainage system within the project area. Several new drop inlets, connecting storm drains, manholes, and bioremediation swales will need to be constructed or existing facilities modified to accommodate a proposed extension of Waterfront Drive. The City will analyze the effects of these proposed storm water system improvements, as well as all the other components of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project, on the surrounding environment in the environmental document. A critical issue to be evaluated is potential effects to water quality associated with increased storm water runoff from a new roadway located near Humboldt Bay and the marshes.
- d) The proposed project will not require any new or expanded water entitlements. There is a sufficient water supply available to serve the project. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- e) The proposed project would be limited to transportation improvements and would not result in a change to existing wastewater treatment demand within the project study area. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- f) Construction activities associated with the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project could generate solid waste in the form of demolished materials, old railroad ties, ballast materials, and other trash. Solid waste generated at the project site will likely be recycled or reused to the extent feasible, with the remaining waste disposed of at the Humboldt Waste Management Authority transfer station in Eureka. Potentially hazardous waste would need to be disposed of at landfills approved Class II landfill (Marysville, Stockton, Livermore) that is equipped to handle hazardous waste. Long-term operation of proposed project is not anticipated to generate solid waste in amounts that would adversely affect the existing capacity of the local landfill. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.
- g) Any solid waste generated by the proposed project will be disposed of at an approved land fill, in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to solid waste disposal. This effect will not be evaluated in the EIR since it does not cross the threshold of significance.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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			
<p>Significance Thresholds: The following thresholds of significance were considered during the preliminary evaluation of this issue area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Significant if the proposed project reduced the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, or caused a fish or wildlife species to decline below a self-sustaining population size. b) Significant if the project, in combination with other recent, current, or foreseeable future projects, created a cumulatively considerable environmental effect for one or more the environmental issue areas discussed in the checklist, even though the project itself did not. c) Significant if an element of the proposed project could be found to have a demonstrable opportunity of causing harm to individual human beings or groups. <p>DISCUSSION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project has the potential to result in adverse effects to Palco Marsh, including traffic and noise impacts to wildlife resources that utilize Humboldt Bay and adjacent marsh systems were identified. These potential effects have the potential for exceeding the significance threshold under both the construction and operational phases. This conclusion requires that an EIR be prepared for the project, in order to fully evaluate the environmental significance of the effects. As part of the EIR process, an assessment of wetland and wildlife resources will be conducted in order to determine if there are any sensitive wildlife species present within the project study area and to determine at what level these biological resources may be affected by the proposed project. b) The proposed project may result in impacts that are limited at a project level, but may be cumulatively considerable when evaluated within the context of past, current, and future projects within the project study area. In the environmental document, the City will evaluate the effects of the proposed Waterfront Drive Extension project in relation to recent and future planned development in the project study area, restoration activities associated with Palco Marsh, as well as current developments such as the Bayshore Mall. It is anticipated that effects to air quality, biological resources, and water quality will have the greatest potential for cumulative impacts. These potential effects will be evaluated in the EIR. 				

- c) The proposed Waterfront Drive Extension Project, particularly during the construction phase, could result in a variety of impacts to human beings, including the potential relocation of residences in the trailer park at McCullens Avenue. Other potential adverse effects to the human environment may include aesthetics, air quality, noise, cultural resources, and potential exposure to hazardous materials. All of these issues will be fully evaluated and the results disclosed in the subsequent environmental document that will be prepared for the project.

SOURCE/REFERENCE LIST: The following documents were used in the preparation of this Initial Study. The documents are available for review at the Community Development Department, 3rd floor, City Hall, during regular business hours.

- a) Eureka Municipal Code
- b) Adopted Eureka General Plan and Certified Local Coastal Plan, as applicable
- c) *Revised Project Study Report, Waterfront Drive Extension Project, Del Norte Street to Hilfiker Lane* (City of Eureka, June 8, 2001).

