



CEQA INITIAL STUDY CITY OF EUREKA

PROJECT TITLE: Draft Historic Preservation Element

PROJECT APPLICANT: City of Eureka

CASE NO: GP-04-002

PROJECT LOCATION: Citywide

ZONING & GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: N/A

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The City of Eureka Community Development Department and the City's Historic Preservation Commission have undertaken the task of drafting a Historic Preservation Element. On July 1, 2002, the City of Eureka was notified by the State Historic Preservation Office that the City had been awarded a Certified Local Government grant for the preparation of a Historic Preservation Element. The City subsequently entered into a contract with a consultant team to complete the Preservation Element. After numerous community workshops, extensive surveys, research, Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council meetings, the City was presented the Element's background data and drafted a set of goals, policies, and implantation measures which have been completed for the Element. The Draft Element proposes to serve as a long range guide for the City of Eureka's historic and archeological preservation efforts. The Draft Historic Preservation Element is proposed to be added to the 1997 Eureka General Plan as an optional element (*California Government Code §65303*).

LEAD AGENCY/CONTACT: City of Eureka, Community Development Department; Robert Wall, AICP, Senior Planner; 531 K Street, Eureka, CA 95501-1165; phone: (707) 441-4163; fax: (707) 441-4202; e-mail: rwall@ci.eureka.ca.gov

SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTINGS: The City of Eureka is a charter city located on Humboldt Bay, approximately 300 miles north of San Francisco and 100 miles south of the Oregon border. Initially founded in the spring of 1850, the City of Eureka was incorporated through a special act of the State Legislature on April 18, 1856. The community was reincorporated as a City on February 19, 1874, and received a charter on February 8, 1895. As the county seat for the 572 square mile Humboldt County, Eureka is the center of business and government; the major industries include agriculture, fishing and tourism. The average July maximum temperature is 61.6°F and the average January maximum temperature is 54.3°F. The average July minimum temperature is 52.3°F and the average January minimum temperature is 41.5°F. The average annual precipitation is 39.0 inches; the average annual snowfall is 0.3 inches.

Humboldt Bay is one of the largest bays on the Pacific Coast. Historically, the bay and associated wetlands covered approximately 27,000 acres. Diking, drainage and filling has reduced the effective bay area to approximately 13,000 acres. Humboldt Bay is located about 30 miles northeast of the junction of the Gorda, Pacific and North American crustal plates. Tectonic activity in the area is extremely high: the Gorda Plate is being subducted under the North American Plate, and large-scale tectonic motion has produced a number of northwest-southwest trending faults in the region. Uplifting and folding,

differential motion at the various fault lines, and erosion have resulted in a complex pattern of geologic formations – the Franciscan, Hookton, Yager, and Wildcat – in the bay region (Barnhart et. al., 1992).

OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS, OR MAY BE REQUIRED (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, City of Eureka Building Department, City of Eureka Community Development Department, City of Eureka Public Works, City of Eureka Engineering, California Department of Transportation.

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

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **could not** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

- I find that the proposed project **may** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** 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.

Robert Wall, AICP
Senior 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. The explanation of each issue identifies (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant. In the checklist below the following definitions are used:

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

"Potentially 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.

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

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

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

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers whether the proposed project may have any significant effects on visual aesthetics because of: (a) the short-term or long-term presence of project-related equipment or structures; (b) project-related changes in the visual character of the project area that may be perceived by residents or visitors as a detraction from the visual character of the project area; (c) permanent changes in physical features that would result in the effective elimination of key elements of the visual character of the project area near a State scenic highway; or (d) the presence of short-term, long-term, or continuous bright light, such as from welding or nighttime construction, that would detract from a project area that is otherwise generally dark at night or that is subject to artificial light.

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. The prevalent characteristic that one could form an aesthetic opinion of is predominantly historic architecture, although the proposed Element addresses other types of resources such as archaeological sites. The City of Eureka is home to many Local, State, and Nationally listed Historic properties. The basic purpose of the proposed Element is to provide an overall constitution that guides the treatment of these resources. A majority of Goals, Policies and Implementation measures listed in the Draft Element recognize not only the historic importance of these resources, but the aesthetic value in maintaining and preserving these resources. The impact of adopting the Historic Preservation Element is expected to have a positive outcome regarding "aesthetics."

The Draft Element does not include any goals, policies, or implementation measures that would necessitate the need for mitigating glare or other substantial lighting schemes. Conversely, the Element contains draft programs that propose the creation of design guidelines within historic areas/districts which could address the issues of light and glare (*see Programs 9.21, 9.22.a, and 9.23*).

Therefore, based on the conclusions above, Staff finds that that the project will not result in significant adverse aesthetic impacts.

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

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers to what degree the proposed project would: (a) change the availability or use of agriculturally important land areas designated under one or more of the programs above; (b) cause or promote changes in land use regulation that would adversely affect agricultural activities in lands zoned for those uses, particularly lands designated as Agriculture Exclusive or under Williamson Act contracts; or (c) change the availability or use of agriculturally important land areas for agricultural purposes.

DISCUSSION: The City does have farmlands, and lands of a size suitable for agricultural production within City Limits. The properties are all zoned and planned Agriculture. It is reasonably foreseeable that the proposed Draft Historic Preservation Element will not have a significant impact on the farmlands or farmland production. The Draft document contains a policy that pertains to identifying cultural landscapes (Policy 9.C.1). That policy is proposed to be implemented through a possible future survey. If any of Eureka's farmlands are officially designated cultural landscapes as a result of an historic survey, this would have no effect on the property's ability to continue agricultural activities. The City of Eureka, at this time, has no legitimate governmental interest, including an official cultural landscape designation, to require the modification of any farm practices as a result of adopting the Historic Preservation Element.

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	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers to what degree the proposed project would (a) directly interfere with the attainment of long-term air quality objectives identified by the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District; (b) contribute pollutants that would violate an existing air quality standard, or contribute to a non-attainment of air quality objectives in the project's air basin; (c) produce pollutants that would contribute as part of a cumulative effect to non-attainment for any priority pollutant; (d) produce pollutant loading near identified sensitive receptors that would cause locally significant air quality impacts; or (e) release odors that would affect a number of receptors.

DISCUSSION: The North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD) is responsible for monitoring and enforcing local and State air quality standards. Air quality standards are set for emissions that may include, but are not limited to: visible emissions, particulate matter, and, fugitive dust. Pursuant to Air Quality Regulation 1, Chapter IV, Rule 400 – *General Limitations*, a person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public or which cause or have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property.

Visible emissions are fairly self-explanatory. They include emissions that are visible to the naked eye, such as smoke from a fire. The project does not involve any visible emissions.

With regard to particulate matter, all of Humboldt County has been designated by the California State Air Quality Board as being in “non-attainment” for PM-10 air emissions. PM-10 air emissions include chemical emissions and other inhalable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 10 microns. PM-10 emissions include smoke from wood stoves and airborne salts and other particulate matter naturally generated by ocean surf. Because, in part, of the large number of wood stoves in Humboldt County and because of the generally heavy surf and high winds common to this area, Humboldt County has exceeded the State standard for PM-10 air emissions. Therefore, any use or activity that generates unnecessary airborne particulate matter may be of concern to the NCUAQMD. The amount of dust and other small particulate matter that will be released is of such a small scale that it clearly will not add to the PM-10 non-attainment.

The Draft Element supports the rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, and reconstruction of

historic properties. The work on historic structures or properties may have the potential for introducing additional particulate matter. However, the frequency and number, at which these treatments would take place on these properties is not expected to increase significantly over what would normally occur within the City limits of Eureka. Therefore, based on the conclusions above, Staff finds that that the project will not result in significant adverse air quality impacts.

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

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers whether the proposed project would result in a significant adverse direct or indirect effects to: (a) individuals of any plant or animal species (including fish) listed as rare, threatened, or endangered by the Federal or State government, or effects to the habitat of such species; (b) more than an incidental and minor area of riparian habitat or other sensitive habitat (including wetlands) types identified under Federal, State, or local policies; (c) more than an incidental and minor area of wetland identified under Federal or State criteria; (d) key habitat areas that provide for continuity of movement for resident or migratory fish or wildlife, or (e) other biological resources identified in planning policies adopted by the City of Eureka.

DISCUSSION: The City of Eureka is host to wetlands, Humboldt Bay, hydrologic resources, and biological resources. Construction or ground disturbing activities adjacent to these resources could result in impacts to these assets. However, the main purpose of the Historic Preservation Element is to ultimately manage and retain existing structural resources (buildings) within developed “urban” areas and business districts such as Old Town. The construction of new buildings and / or ground disturbing activities adjacent to sensitive habitat is not promoted within the Draft Element. Regarding the existing inventory of historic properties, the City of Eureka maintains an effective surface water run-off system where roof drains and sheet flow waters from a property are captured in the City’s system and conveyed to drainage systems. The locations of a majority of these

structures are within developed urban areas. On the rare occasion that historic property development or archeology is proposed near sensitive habitat areas, protection measures such as Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) or other preventative measures designed to reduce sedimentation and erosion into sensitive areas, will be properly implemented and reviewed in the development phases of a project. These measures would involve both temporary and permanent mitigation. However, as mentioned previously, the Draft Element does not espouse any particular development projects beyond rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, and reconstruction of historic properties within the City of Eureka.

The Draft Historic Preservation Element proposes no additional lands for residential development and therefore, no new impacts are anticipated.

Based on the discussion above, the project will not result in any substantial impacts to biological resources.

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

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

DISCUSSION: The Draft Historic Preservation Element contains numerous goals, policies, and implementation measures that strive to protect and/or enhance historic and archeological resources within the City of Eureka. The Draft Element does not contain goals, policies, and programs that would indirectly or directly affect (negatively) any unique paleontological resources or geologic features. The same can be said of the Draft Element leading to the disturbing of human remains interred outside of formal cemeteries. The main focus of the Element is to better manage the very impacts described in Questions a, b, and d of this **Cultural Resources** Section of this Initial Study. Based on the above discussion the project will not result in any substantial impacts to Cultural Resources.

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:			X	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined by the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers project-related effects that could involve or result from: (a) damage to project elements as a direct result of fault movement along a fault identified in the Alquist-Priolo study or other known fault; (b) damage to project elements as a direct or indirect effect of seismically derived ground movement; (c) damage to project elements because of landslides that are not seismically related; (d) project-derived erosion by water or wind of more than a minimal volume of earth materials; (e) project-derived or project-caused secondary instability of earth materials that could subsequently fail, damaging project elements or other sites or structures; (f) location of project elements on expansive soils that are identified by professional geologists, which could result in damage to project elements or other sites or structures.

DISCUSSION: The North Coast is the location of numerous fault lines and is near the intersection of three tectonic plates. All property within the City of Eureka is located within special Seismic Design Category zones (SDC) as prescribed by the 2007 California Building Code (CBC). Therefore, all new construction must comply with the construction standards for these specific design categories as mandated by the CBC.

Because all construction must comply with the standards of the CBC, and because construction that conforms to these Standards is presumed to meet the Seismic Design Category, the potential impacts from seismic ground shaking and seismic ground failure, including liquefaction are considered (on any future, new construction) less than significant. However, it can be assumed that the continued use of historic structures, built prior to adoption of seismic building codes, will be maintained indefinitely. The adoption of the Historic Preservation Element does not change the legal status of historic structures within the City or increase the risk of geologic hazard to these structures or inhabitants. To the contrary, the Draft Element contains policy statements that attempt to address the issue of unreinforced masonry and seismic retrofitting.

Any future development shall be connected to the City's sewage disposal system; therefore, the

project will not have septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems.

Based on the above findings, staff concludes that the project will not result in substantial adverse impacts relating to geology and/or soils.

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	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers to what degree the proposed project would involve: (a) potential storage or use, on a regular basis, of chemicals that could be hazardous if released into the environment; (b) operating conditions that would be likely to result in the generation and release of hazardous materials; (c) use of hazardous materials, because of construction-related activities or operations, within a quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school; (d) project-related increase in use intensity by people within the boundaries of, or within two miles of, the Airport Planning Areas; (e) project-derived physical changes that would interfere with emergency responses or evacuations; (f) potential major damage because of wildfire.

DISCUSSION: In the development of the Historic Preservation Element, Staff has not become aware of circumstances that would place residents in proximity of hazardous materials. Certainly, there are historic structures within the City that contain lead paint, asbestos, and unreinforced masonry. The adoption of the Element, in no manner, increases the risk of exposure to the previously mentioned materials which are all regulated by the County Health Department, City Building Department, and Regional Air Quality Control Board.

Murray Field is an airport located within the City Limits and is surrounded by agricultural lands in the coastal zone. Adoption of the Draft Element will not have a significant effect on the properties surrounding the airfield or persons residing or working in proximity to Murray Field.

The project will not have an effect on the City of Eureka's emergency response or evacuation plans. No modifications of evacuation plans are therefore anticipated. Citywide emergency access and circulation are already developed and function appropriately.

The project site consists of all lands within the City Limits of Eureka; there are no "wildlands" near or within the project site. Therefore, there will be no impact as a result of wildland fires.

Based on the discussion above, Staff concludes that the project will not result in any substantial impacts with regards to hazards and hazardous materials.

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

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers to what degree the proposed project would involve: (a) improvements that would violate standards set for water quality and for discharge of waste water; (b) use of, or interference with ground water such that the amount of flow

of groundwater is adversely impacted; (c) drainage improvements that would alter or cause an increase in amount or flow of drainage, or that would affect the free-flow of a stream or river or cause an increase in silt runoff as to cause adverse impact; (d) added runoff from the site that would exceed the capacity of drainage facilities; (e) the creation of polluted runoff or other general adverse water quality impacts; (f) the placement of housing or other structures within the 100-year flood plain, or other area subject to flooding; (g) development in such a manner or location that it would be adversely affected by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

DISCUSSION: The adoption of a Historic Preservation Element will not alter the amount or rate of surface runoff, proposes no grading, and will not result in foreseeable alterations to the drainage patterns. The project does not include development that would impact the quality or quantity, rate or flow, and removal, recharge or addition to groundwater supplies. The Draft Historic Preservation Element is primarily concerned with the preservation of existing resources, not new construction or grading.

A majority of Historic Structures within the City of Eureka are connected to the City's water supply system.

Based on review of the Flood Insurance Rate Map prepared by the Federal Emergency Agency, some areas of Eureka do include the 100-year floodplain. However, the predominant concern of the Draft Element is on existing construction built roughly between the 1860's to the 1950's. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Element has little chance of impeding or redirecting flood flows or exposing people or structures to flooding above and beyond what exists today.

Due to the known seismic activity in the Pacific Rim, a tsunami could impact Humboldt Bay. It is expected that the impact of a tsunami on Humboldt Bay would primarily occur along the north and south spits and the King Salmon and Fields Landing areas, which are located directly across from the opening to Humboldt Bay. Humboldt State University faculty and graduate students have conducted a number of studies on the impacts to Humboldt Bay resulting from tsunami inundation. These studies indicate that although a wave from 12 to 20 feet high could threaten the southern end of the north Spit, including the U.S. Coast Guard base, Fairhaven and parts of Samoa, the largest tsunamis occurring on Humboldt Bay, including those dating back as early as 1700 a.d., did not entirely inundate the north spit. This is partially due to the fact that the northern end of the north spit is almost a mile wide, and in addition, a tsunami of less than 20 feet high is unlikely to overtop the stable dunes there. The last recorded tsunami of any observable height to occur in Humboldt Bay was in 1964 as a result of the Gulf of Alaska earthquake. It had a recorded maximum height of twelve feet on the inside of the north spit, with lower heights occurring along the Eureka waterfront area.

Any tsunami, that has the potential to reach the "shores" of Eureka, could impact the City. However, the adoption of the Draft Historic Preservation Element does not increase nor decrease the hazard a tsunami poses for the City. The Draft Element is a constitution that governs, generally, the existing resources (historic structures), and the existing, and yet to be discovered, archeological and Native American, resources.

Based on the discussion above, Staff concludes that the project will not result in a substantial impact regarding hydrology and water quality.

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

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers to what degree the proposed project would (a) divide an established community or conflict with existing land uses within the project's vicinity, such as agriculture resources; (b) conflict with the Eureka General/Coastal Plans designation, policies, and zoning ordinances regarding commercial, public, and quasi-public facilities; (c) conflict with applicable environmental plans and protection measures enforced by regulatory agencies that have jurisdiction over the project, such as habitat conservation plans or a natural community conservation plan.

DISCUSSION: The Draft Element recognizes the long established inventory of historic structures within the City of Eureka. The Draft Historic Preservation Element and adopted Historic Preservation Ordinance principally govern development that occurred between roughly the 1860's and 1950's. The Draft Element, as written, does not propose or foster new development that would have any potential of physically dividing an established community, neighborhood, or district. To the contrary, the Draft Element supports the continuity of established neighborhoods based on their architectural features and design.

The City of Eureka is currently administering historic preservation goals and policies through the 1997 General Plan, predominantly, Section 5, the Recreational and Cultural Resources Chapter. Other Elements of the 1997 General Plan do contain references to historic preservation. Sections 5E and 5F of the City's current General Plan Policy Document contain goal statements regarding historic preservation and archaeological resources. The historic preservation goal is backed by ten policies. The archaeological resources goal is supported by eight policies.

The consultants who authored the Draft Historic Preservation Element stated that the new goals and policies of the Element could be incorporated into the existing Historic Preservation and Archaeological Resources sections of the adopted General Plan; or, they can be used to craft a Historic Preservation Optional Element to the General Plan." The latter was obviously chosen. Staff has converted the consultant's goal and policy section, by plan number and adding implementation timing, verifying for consistency with the rest of the City's General Plan and Local Coastal Plan (***California Government Code §65300.5***). The timing of the implementation measures were added by Staff and were reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission on September 5, 2007.

Regarding habitat and conservation plan compatibility, as mentioned multiple times in this Initial Study, the main purpose of the Draft Element is the preservation of existing historic resources and not new development. The Draft Element in no way encourages incursion or adjacency to Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) or other biologically sensitive areas within the City of Eureka.

Based on the above, the project will not result in an adverse impact to land use and planning.

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>THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers to what degree the proposed project would interfere with the extraction of commodity materials or otherwise cause any short-term or long-term decrease in the availability of mineral resources that would otherwise be available for construction or other consumptive uses.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: Mineral resources used in connection with the development of residences will be those associated with construction and landscaping. Although there are no surface mining operations within the Eureka City limits, the County supports a significant number of river and quarry mining operations that extract over one million cubic yards of material annually. These mining operations support the construction industry of Northern California. There is no doubt that the limited amount of mineral resources needed for the development of residences within the City will have no substantial adverse impact on the local mineral resources or reserves. Additionally, the Draft Element is chiefly concerned with the management of existing structures. It can be safely assumed that the nexus between mineral resources and historic structures would be in landscaping and additions to these resources. Therefore, based on the above, the proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a State or locally known mineral resource.</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

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers whether the proposed project would produce: (a) sound-pressure levels contrary to the City of Eureka noise standards; (b) long-term ground vibrations and low-frequency sound that would interfere with normal activities and which is not currently present in the project area; (c) a substantial increase in ambient short-term or long-term sound-pressure levels; (d) changes in noise levels that are related to operations, not construction-related, which will be perceived as increased ambient or background noise in the project area.

DISCUSSION: Noise does not travel well, it has no staying power beyond that of its source, and it does not accumulate in the environment. Nonetheless, prolonged noise exposure is a serious threat to human health, resulting in high stress levels and impaired hearing. 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, particularly at night.

The City of Eureka's adopted General Plan specifies standards for non-transportation and transportation noise sources. The goal of the General Plan with regard to noise exposure is to protect Eureka residents from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise. For non-transportation related noise, the maximum allowable noise at the property line of lands designated for noise-sensitive uses cannot exceed 65dB (nighttime) to 70dB (daytime).

The highest possible noise levels associated with the Draft Element may result from the temporary, sporadic and relatively short term use of machinery, power tools, and hammering during rehabilitation of historic structures and/or resources and be limited to the duration of the individual rehabilitation projects. Under the Noise Element of the adopted General Plan, general construction noise is considered acceptable because such noise, although loud and often annoying, is of limited duration and intensity. Therefore, the project will not generate noise in excess of established standards.

The only ground borne noise that may be associated with the project would occur during rehabilitation portions of the project. However, any such noises can be considered "normal" and not "excessive" or "substantial."

Changes in ambient noise levels resulting from the rehabilitation or archeological projects would be temporary, sporadic, and limited to the duration of the individual projects. Demolition, new construction, and rehabilitation projects on properties, not on the Local Register of Historic Places, are almost constantly being undertaken within the City. The adoption of the Draft Historic Preservation Element will not significantly increase the number of construction related projects. Rehabilitation project noise levels would be less than the noise levels for new construction projects, since demolition and site preparation portions of the project would be minimal or non-existent. Therefore, ambient noise levels in the rehabilitation projects vicinity will not be substantially or permanently increased.

Murray Field airport is located within the City limits and within 2 miles of commercial and residentially zoned districts where rehabilitation projects would occur. Adoption of the Draft Element would not have a significant effect on persons residing or working in proximity to Murray

Field.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project will not result in the production of unacceptable noise levels.

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	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers to what degree the proposed project would result in, or contribute to, population growth, displacement of housing units, demolition or removal of existing housing units, or any project-related displacement of people from 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 remarkable project to induce ‘substantial’ population growth or decline, in Eureka.

The Draft Element proposes no new areas for residential development not contained in the current adopted Housing Element. No housing will be displaced and no growth inducement will result from the project. Therefore, Staff finds that the project will not result in substantial adverse impacts regarding population and housing.

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	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers to what degree the proposed

project would result in any changes in existing fire or police protection service levels, or a perceived need for such changes, as well as any substantial changes in the need for, or use of, schools, parks, or other public facilities.

DISCUSSION: The Draft Historic Preservation Element contains no new areas that are proposed for conversion to residential uses. The main purpose of the Historic Preservation Element is to ultimately manage and retain existing structural resources (buildings) within developed “urban” areas and districts within the City of Eureka. Therefore, no additional impacts to public services not anticipated in the adopted General Plan are envisioned. Staff concludes that the adoption of the Draft Element will not result in an adverse impact on public services.

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	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers to what degree any aspect of the proposed project would be related to demand for recreational facilities or increase use of existing recreational areas such that those areas are physically degraded, including secondary effects such as degradation through over-use of environmentally sensitive areas.

DISCUSSION: The preservation/alteration of historic structures and resources in the City will not increase the recreational demand beyond what can be accommodated by the City’s 136 acres of parklands and recreational facilities. No new large-scale developments are envisioned or proposed of the Draft Element that would trigger the need for expanded recreation opportunities. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in any adverse impact to any recreational facilities.

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	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers to what degree, if any, the proposed project would be associated with (a) changes in traffic, circulation, or other changes that might be perceived as adverse, including traffic effects resulting from temporary construction-related changes; (b) any project-related changes in levels-of-service on County or State highways; (c) project-associated travel restrictions that would prevent emergency vehicles from reaching the locations where they were needed.

DISCUSSION: The Draft Historic Preservation Element is required by law to be consistent with the adopted General Plan. The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) prepared in conjunction with the General Plan update in 1997 contains an analysis of traffic based on a *City of Eureka Citywide Circulation Study* prepared by TJKM Traffic Consultants, April 6, 1990. The FEIR determined that no new adverse significant impacts to transportation would occur as a result of the land use and development policies of the Plan. The Draft Historic Preservation Element contains no new policies that support development beyond what was analyzed in the Final General Plan EIR (SCH96072062). As such, no impacts to parking, emergency access, traffic increases on arterial or collector streets, or the change in traffic patterns are anticipated by the adoption of the Draft Historic Preservation Element. The project will not impact air traffic, and will not require or impact alternative transportation.

Based on the above, Staff concludes that with the described mitigation the project will not have a significant adverse impact on transportation or traffic.

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	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This Initial Study considers to what degree the proposed project would be related to: (a) a substantial demand for water supplies affecting existing entitlements and resources; (b) increase in runoff intensity that exacerbates drainage conditions and changes; and (c) insufficient provision for solid waste disposal.

DISCUSSION: The City of Eureka's Elk River Wastewater Treatment Plant provides wastewater services for the City of Eureka. The capacity of the facility is 32 million gallons per day (MGD) at peak wet weather flow, but it currently operates at approximately 15 MGD – under half of the capacity. Because the facility operates far below capacity, the project will not necessitate upgrades and will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The City's municipal water supply operates at 4.4 MGD while its capacity is 8 MGD. The Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District currently supplies approximately 40 MGD, but is capable of providing up to 75 MGD. With ample supply available, the project will not 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.

The solid waste provider is the Humboldt Waste Management Authority (HWMA). The HWMA has formulated a joint powers agreement with the County and the most of the incorporated Cities within the County for the disposal of waste. The HWMA has contracted with ECDC Environmental to ship solid waste produced in the County to State licensed land fills located outside of Humboldt County. Currently solid waste is trucked to Medford, Oregon to a new triple line State licensed landfill.

The 1997 General Plan update Environmental Impact Report (SCH96072062), Chapter 5, contains a discussion of the impacts to public facilities and services (as related to the land use diagram) from water and wastewater services, storm drainage, law enforcement, fire protection, solid waste collection and disposal, utilities, and schools, and concluded that no mitigation measures were needed as the environmental effects from the adoption of the General Plan were less than significant. The Draft Preservation Element contains no policies that would be in direct conflict with the land use diagram of the Current General Plan.

Based on the above Staff concludes that the project will not result in any significant adverse impacts to utilities and service systems.

The project is not expected to violate any Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Based on the discussion above the project will not result in any significant adverse impacts to utilities and service systems.

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>DISCUSSION: The project's impacts will not add appreciably to any existing or foreseeable future significant cumulative impact, such as species endangerment, wetland loss, or air quality degradation. Incremental impacts, if any, will be negligible and undetectable. No growth-related cumulative impacts are peculiar to this proposed project. This project is not contingent on or otherwise related to the development of additional facilities or any other project. The project fosters in-fill preservation of historic resources. As discussed herein, the project will have no increased impact on fish or wildlife, will not add to any cumulatively considerable impacts, and no mitigation measures are recommended to reduce the potential impacts to human beings, either directly or indirectly, to a level that is considered less than significant.</p>				

EARLIER ANALYSES

- a) **Earlier Analyses Used.** The following document(s), available at the Community Development Department, have adequately analyzed one or more effects of the project. Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063 (c)(3)(D)).

City of Eureka General Plan, Environmental Impact Report. State Clearinghouse Number 96072062. Certified February 27, 1997.

- b) **Impacts Adequately Addressed.** The following effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the document(s) listed above, pursuant to applicable legal standards.

N/A

- c) **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," the following are mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the document(s) described above.

N/A

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) Project File(s) for the project for which this Initial Study was prepared.