CHAPTER II
Summary

A. Project Under Review

The project applicant, CUE VI, proposes to construct the Marina Center, a mixed-use development that would include retail, office, multi-family residential, light industrial, restaurant, and museum. The proposed project would provide surface and structured parking, pedestrian amenities, roadway improvements, landscaping throughout the project site, and new on-site infrastructure. The buildings of the proposed project would generally be between one- and five-stories, with most buildings being single story. Parking would be provided adjacent to the developed buildings. Second and Fourth Streets would be extended through the project site.

To facilitate project access along the U.S. Highway 101 corridor three signalized intersections would be constructed and/or modified; the signals would be located at Broadway at Fourth Street, Broadway at Sixth Street, and Commercial Street at Fourth Street. In addition to developed areas, the project also proposes the restoration of a wetland and buffer area located in the southwest portion of the site, surrounding Clark Slough.

B. Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project are summarized in Table II-1. This table lists potential impacts, recommended mitigation measures and the level of significance of the impact after any recommended mitigation measures are implemented.

There are three levels of significance used in Table II-1: **Significant and Unavoidable**, which is an impact that exceeds the defined threshold(s) of significance and cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less-than significant level through the implementation of feasible mitigation measures; **Less-than-Significant**, which is an impact that does not exceed the defined threshold(s) of significance or an impact for which mitigation measure(s) can reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level; and, **No Impact**, which means the project would result in no impact.

A complete discussion of each impact and associated mitigation measure is provided in Chapter IV, *Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures*.

C. Alternatives

Chapter V of this EIR analyzes a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project. After considering many possible alternatives, the four alternatives to the project that are analyzed in detail in this Draft EIR are:

- **No Project**

  The "No Project" Alternative is the circumstance under which the Marina Center project does not proceed. The No Project Alternative will compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state and including, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services, what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved.

- **Marina Center Reduced Foot Print**

  The Marina Center Reduced Foot Print Alternative would include the following: 154,000 square feet of retail/service/furniture; 28,000 square feet of nursery/garden; 160,000 square feet of office; 7,000 square feet of restaurant; and 96,000 square feet of industrial. This alternative would eliminate the residential and museum use proposed by the Project. Second and Fourth Streets would be extended through the site as under the Proposed Project.

- **Light Industrial Zoning**

  Under this alternative, the zoning and general plan would be amended to Light Industrial. Under this alternative, retail sales establishments with single occupant floor areas of 40,000 square feet or larger would be allowed, offices would be allowed. There would be no residential development, no retail development of less than 40,000 square feet, and no museum. Second and Fourth Streets would be extended through the site as under the Proposed Project.

- **Off-Site Shoreline Property**

  The Shoreline Property off-site alternative is approximately 30 acres located in city limits adjacent to Humboldt Bay in the coastal zone. The property is north of the terminus of "W", "X" and "Y" Streets and east of Eureka Slough. It would be presumed to be developed with the same mixed uses as proposed for the project.

Among the "build" alternatives, the environmentally superior alternative is the Marina Center Reduced Foot Print Alternative. Because this alternative would provide approximately 76 percent of the building area proposed by the Marina Center project, it would result in some reduced impacts, although it would not avoid or substantially lessen many of the significant or potentially significant impacts of the project.

D. Potential Areas of Controversy

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123 specifies that the summary shall identify "areas of controversy" known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects. The following issues are known to the Lead Agency to be controversial, or that have

potential to be controversial: building design and character; increased air quality impacts; impacts to biological resources; site remediation; land use; increased traffic; and, urban decay.

The potential impacts associated with all of these areas of controversy are addressed in Chapter IV.

TABLE II-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
A. Aesthetics		
A-1: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. *Although some views of the bay from Highway 101 would be lost as a result of the project, the Marina Center project would, overall, augment public coastal viewing.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
A-2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway. *A portion of Waterfront Drive bordering the project site is a local scenic route. The project's amenities would be developed in accordance with the Visual Resource Standards for local scenic routes.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
A-3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. *The project would result in substantial changes in visual character due to the construction of new buildings and parking facilities, the extensions of streets, and an overall intensification of on-site development. However, the project would generally improve the visual character of the current brownfield site.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
A-4: Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. *The Marina Center project would introduce a considerable amount of light and glare to a project site that does not contain existing sources of light or glare. However, the amount of new light and glare would not be inconsistent with the existing light and glare in the vicinity of the project site.*	**Mitigation Measure A-4a:** All lighting installations shall be designed and installed to be fully shielded (full cutoff) and to minimize glare and obtrusive light by limiting outdoor lighting that is misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary, except as in the exceptions below, and shall have a maximum lamp wattage of 250 watts for commercial lighting, 100 watts incandescent, and 26 watts compact fluorescent for residential lighting. The location and design of all exterior lighting shall be shown on the site plan submitted to and approved by the City of Eureka Design Review Committee. Lighting that is exempt includes: 1. Lighting in swimming pools and other water features. 2. Exit signs and other illumination required by building codes. 3. Lighting for stairs and ramps, as required by the building code. 4. Signs that are regulated by the sign code. 5. Holiday and temporary lighting (less than thirty days use in any 1 year). 6. Low-voltage landscape lighting, but such lighting should be shielded in such a way as to eliminate glare and light trespass. See also Mitigation Measure D-3e.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
A. Aesthetics (cont.)		
A-5: In conjunction with cumulative development, adversely alter the visual character in vicinity. *The project site is located in the Redevelopment Area where all new development is subject to the same level of Design Review and analysis.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
B. Agricultural Resources		
B-1: 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. *The project site contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The site has not been used recently or historically for growing crops.*	None Recommended	*No Impact*
B-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract. *The project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not subject to, nor meets the criteria for inclusion in, a Williamson Act contract.*	None Recommended	*No Impact*
B-3: Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use. *The closest agricultural use is oyster aquaculture in Humboldt Bay, and the project would have no impact on oyster aquaculture.*	None Recommended	*No Impact*
B-4: In conjunction with cumulative development, adversely impact agricultural resources. *Because the project would have no impact on agricultural resources, it would not contribute either individually or cumulatively to adverse impacts on agricultural resources.*	None Recommended	*No Impact*
C. Air Quality		
C-1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. The Marina Center project *would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of PM10, for which the North Coast Air Basin region is in nonattainment*.	See Mitigation Measures C-2a and C-2b	*Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
C. Air Quality (cont.)		
C-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. *Residual emissions of ozone precursors and PM10, for which the project region is in nonattainment, would occur.*	**Mitigation Measure C-2a:** The project applicant shall develop and implement transportation management programs designed to reduce traffic congestion and automobile use within and adjacent to the project site in order to reduce total mobile-source emissions. Such a program shall include, at a minimum, the following measures: 1. The applicant shall install electrical outlets at parking facilities for electrical or plug-in hybrid vehicles where appropriate and feasible; 2. The project shall include clearly marked pedestrian and bicycle travel zones, as well as bicycle locking areas; 3. The applicant shall install synchronized traffic signals to smooth traffic flows and thereby reduce pollutant emissions; 4. The project shall be designed to accommodate public transit; and 5. The project applicant shall initiate a voluntary ridesharing program for the workforce. 6. Mitigation Measure C-2b: The project shall implement the following measures for reducing area source emissions: 7. Wood-burning fireplaces or devices shall be prohibited; 8. Where applicable, commercial and residential building shall be fitted with electrical outlets on the exterior walls to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment; and 9. In construction, the project shall use low VOC and low formaldehyde architectural coatings and insulation. See also recommended Mitigation Measures H-3a and K-2a.	*Significant and Unavoidable*
C-3: 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). *Because the project region is in nonattainment, the additional project related PM10 emissions could hinder the Attainment Plan and would be cumulatively considerable.*	See Mitigation Measures C-2a and C-2b.	*Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
C. Air Quality (cont.)		
C-4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. *The cancer risk and hazard index values estimated for the proposed project are well below the minimum stationary source action levels enforced by the NCUAQMD.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
C-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. *The project would not involve the development of the types of land uses typically associated with odor issues, such as wastewater treatment plants, landfills, composting facilities, refineries, and chemical plants.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
C-6: Result in a substantially adverse cumulative net release of GHG emissions. *The project does not pose a conflict with CARB early action strategies, would not be classified as a major source of greenhouse gas emissions, and would comply with energy conservation measures.*	See Mitigation Measures C-2a and C-2b	*Less-than-Significant*
D. Biological Resources		
D-1: 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. *No special-status plants are expected to occur at the project site.*	**Mitigation Measure D-1a:** The project applicant shall install exclusionary fencing material or other barrier to contain dust and grading materials from construction activities and avoid any discharges to Clark Slough and surrounding waters. **Mitigation Measure D-1b**: Construction activities that cause vibration, such as pile-driving, shall be restricted to daylight hours between July 1 and November 30 unless this requirement is waived by NOAA Fisheries and/or CDFG based on a finding that no adverse impacts would occur (because, for example, the fish are not present during the proposed pile-driving time). This would eliminate significant vibration impacts during the salmonid migrations period: December 1 through June 30. Even during the non-migratory period the project applicant shall use the fewest number and smallest size of piles feasible and shall use a cushioning block between hammer and piles, unless these measures are waived by NOAA Fisheries and/or CDFG because the agency determines there would be no adverse impact. See also Mitigation Measure K-2a, which provides for other practices that would be employed to minimize any adverse effects of pile-driving. See also recommended Mitigation Measures H-3a and K-2a.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
D. Biological Resources (cont.)		
D-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. *The project does not contain any defined sensitive natural community. The proposed wetland preserve would be beneficial to the quantity and quality of on-site wetlands and wetland functions and values.*	See recommended Mitigation Measures D-1a & D-1b, and D-3a through D-3f.	*Less-than-Significant*
D-3: 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. *Although the proposed project would fill 5.54 acres of scattered wetlands, it would have a net positive effect of wetlands on the site through the restoration of 8.98 acres of wetlands and 2.91 acres of upland buffer.*	**Mitigation Measure D-3a:** The project applicant shall obtain the requisite 404 permit and 401 certification from the Corps and RWQCB, which shall, at a minimum, require the project applicant to: 1. Replace or restore the affected wetlands on-site at a minimum 1:1 ratio as necessary to ensure that the wetland functions and values shall be equal to or greater than the affected wetlands; and/or 2. Provide wetlands replacement off-site but within the same watershed as the affected wetlands at a minimum 1:1 ratio at a location and of a wetland type approved by the Corps and RWQCB; and/or 3. Contribute in-lieu funds for restoration, enhancement, or preservation of off-site wetlands, subject to approval by the Corps and RWQCB. **Mitigation Measure D-3b:** Prior to site grading, the applicant shall prepare a detailed Restoration Plan in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) *Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Proposal Guidelines* and Regulatory Guidance letters 02-02 and 06-03 as well as the California Coastal Commission's *Procedural Guidance for the Review of Wetland Projects in California's Coastal Zone: Chapter 2 Enhancement and Restoration*. The plan shall include, at a minimum: details of methods for site selection, preparation, and remediation; exotic plant removal; excavation, grading, and rip-rap removal; establishment of hydrological function; planting materials and methods; establishment of native species; creation of an effective buffer; maintenance; monitoring; contingency plans; and plans for long-term funding for wetland monitoring and maintenance.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
D. Biological Resources (cont.)		
D-3 (cont.)	For 5 years following completion of the restoration project, a qualified biologist hired by the project applicant shall monitor the site biannually on the first and last month of the growing season to ensure ongoing success. Upon completion of the restoration, a qualified biologist shall confirm the success of the Restoration Plan and recommend contingency measures, if necessary, to meet the no-net-loss performance requirement. **Mitigation Measure D-3c:** The project applicant shall create a buffer zone surrounding the restored wetland area. The buffer shall be adequate to avoid or minimize effects on wetland and slough resources from direct and indirect disturbances such as entry of sediment, oil, or grease into the preserve; trampling of vegetation; and movement, light, or noise impacts that might interfere with habitat values or wildlife use of the slough and marsh. The buffer shall consist of earthen berms sloped toward any road or other source of runoff pollution, fencing, symbolic fencing (split rails), native vegetation such as blackberries that act as a barrier, and signs warning against intrusion. **Mitigation Measure D-3d:** An open space wetland preserve consisting of the restored estuarine wetland and the upland protective buffer area shall be established and protected by a conservation easement in accordance with California Civil Code Sections 815-816, deed restriction, or other means of preservation approved by the City of Eureka, RWQCB, and the Corps. In the event of a conservation easement, the easement holder shall be a public agency or non-profit organization (i) approved by the City of Eureka, RWQCB, and the Corps; and (ii) qualified and authorized to administer conservation lands within the State of California. The conservation easement, deed restriction, or other means of preservation shall protect against land use changes for other than conservation purposes in perpetuity and shall include an endowment for long-term management and protection of the wetland preserve. **Mitigation Measure D-3e:** To minimize the potentially adverse effect of night lighting on habitat use in the restored remnant of Clark Slough, the project applicant shall, within 300 feet of the preserve, use low-intensity street lamps, low elevation lighting poles, and internal silvering of the globe or external opaque reflectors to direct light away from the slough and buffer area. See also Mitigation Measure A-4a.	

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
D. Biological Resources (cont.)		
D-3 (cont.)	**Mitigation Measure D-3f:** The applicant shall implement a non-native invasive species control program for areas disturbed as a result of construction and landscaping activities. Prior to construction, plants considered by the State of California to be exotic pest plants shall be destroyed using environmentally suitable methods, which may include the application of an herbicide approved by the United States Environmental Protection Agency for use near and within aquatic environments. During construction, the project applicant shall: 1. Educate construction workers about invasive species and control measures; 2. Ensure construction-related equipment arrives on-site free of mud or seed-bearing material by, for example, requiring wheel washing upon entry; 3. Use native seeds and straw material to the extent feasible; 4. Revegetate with appropriate native species; and 5. Prohibit the use of the following non-native invasive plants for landscaping or other planting purposes: Pampas grass (*Cortaderia jubata, C. selloana*) Tree-of-heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*) Giant reed (*Arundo donax*) Bamboo (*Bambusa spp., et al*) Cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster pannosa*) French broom (*Genista monspessulana = Cytisus monspessulanus*) Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*) Blue gum (*Eucalyptus globulus*) English ivy (*Hedera helix*) Fig-marigold family members (*Conicosia, Carpobrotus and Mesembryanthemum*) Tall fescue (*Festuca arundinacea*) Mattress vine (*Muelenbeckia complexa*) Tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*) Fountain grass (*Pennisetum setaceum*)	

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
D. Biological Resources (cont.)		
D-3 (cont.)	Pyracantha (*Pyracantha angustifolia*) Castor bean (*Ricinus communis*) Black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*) German ivy (*Delairia odorata =Senecio mikianoides*) Spanish broom (*Sparteum junceum*) Tamarisk (*Tamarix spp*.) Gorse (*Ulex europaeus*) Periwinkle (*Vinca major*) Purple fountain grass (Pennisetum setaceum)	
D-4: 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. *There are no established resident or migratory wildlife corridors on the project site. The buffering provided by the dry land area between the project site and the waters of Humboldt Bay, combined with the recommended mitigation measures recommended, would ensure a less-than-significant impact on migratory salmonids or other fish species.*	See recommended Mitigation Measures D-1a & D-1b.	*Less-than-Significant*
D-5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. *The proposed project would provide the course of action most protective of coastal resources. As a result, the project would protect and enhance those resources and be consistent with the General Plan/Local Coastal Program policies protecting biological resources.*	See recommended Mitigation Measures D-1a & D-1b, and D-3a through D-3f.	*Less-than-Significant*
D-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. *No adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan applies to the project site.*	None Recommended	*No Impact*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
D. Biological Resources (cont.)		
D-7: Result in an adverse temporary loss of wetland value and function during construction. *The existing wetland functions and values are minimal, the loss would be temporary, and the resulting wetland preserve would improve on-site wetland functions and values.*	**Mitigation Measure D-7a:** Phasing of project construction shall minimize the amount of time that both the existing degraded wetlands and the wetlands in the southwest corner of the site (slated for restoration) are non-functional. Wetlands restoration work shall begin and shall continue concurrently with the remediation work. Timely completion of the restoration shall be the highest priority and shall be performed, to the extent possible, during the dry season. See also recommended Mitigation Measures D-3a through D-3f and H-3a.	*Less-than-Significant*
D-8: Destroy nests or eggs, or otherwise disturb the reproductive effort of species protected by the Migratory Bird Act. *There would be some potential for project construction activities to destroy nests or eggs or otherwise disturb the reproductive effort of species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.*	**Mitigation Measure D-8a:** The project applicant shall implement one of the following mitigation measures to reduce the potential impact on breeding birds or their nests or eggs: 1. Refrain from performing vegetation clearing/initial grading activities during the avian breeding season (February 1 to August 31); or 2. Perform pre-construction surveys to locate nesting birds in the area and establish 100 to 250-foot-wide exclusion zones around any identified active nest, depending on site conditions and nature of the work being performed.	*Less-than-Significant*
D-9: Together with other developments in the immediate vicinity, contribute to potential cumulative impacts on biological resources, particularly wetlands. *The proposed project would have a beneficial impact on wetland and other biological resources. Even if there were cumulative impacts on biological resources, the wetland restoration and recommended mitigation measures would ensure that the project's contribution would remain less than cumulatively considerable.*	See "D" Mitigation Measures	*Less-than-Significant*
E. Cultural Resources		
E-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. *The closest four historic sites in the area are at least two blocks and up to 3.5 miles away. In addition, there is considerable intervening development.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
E. Cultural Resources (cont.)		
E-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5. *Significant historic deposits would likely be discrete, small in area, and relatively isolated. As such, these historic archaeological deposits, if located within the project site or vicinity, may be significant under one or more NRHP or CRHR criteria, and may constitute significant resources under CEQA.*	**Mitigation Measure E-2a:** For construction in the geographic areas described below workers involved in ground-disturbing activities shall be trained by a professional archaeologist in the recognition of archaeological resources (e.g., historic and prehistoric artifacts typical of the general area), procedures to report such discoveries, and other appropriate protocols to ensure that construction activities avoid or minimize impacts on potentially significant cultural resources. In addition, a Native American representative shall be present to monitor coring activities. If an archaeological artifact or other archaeological remains are discovered on-site during construction, all construction activities shall be halted and a qualified archaeologist shall be summoned within 24 hours to conduct an independent review of the site. If the find is determined to be significant, adequate time and funding shall be devoted to conduct data recovery excavation. Protection plans for either unique archaeological resources or culturally important archaeological resources shall include, at a minimum, one or some combination of the following: removing the object or feature, planning the construction around the object or feature, capping the object or feature with a layer of soil sufficient to protect the integrity of the feature or object, and/or deeding the site as a permanent conservation easement. Geographic areas subject to this mitigation measure are: 1. East of Commercial Street. 2. Within 100 feet of the common property line between the Balloon Track and those properties fronting Broadway that are not a part of the project (e.g., Nilsen's and Bob's Fine Cars). 3. The southeast corner of the property east of the proposed garden area of Anchor 1 and south of Bob's Fine Cars. **Mitigation Measure E-2b:** If human remains are discovered during project construction, all work shall cease within the area until the coroner for Humboldt County is informed and determines that no investigation of the cause of death is required and, if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the descendants of the deceased have made a recommendation to the landowner on how they would like to proceed in handling the deceased and the accompanying grave goods. If there are six or more Native American burials on the site, the site shall be identified as a Native American cemetery and all work on the site within 100 feet of any burial site must cease until recovery or reburial arrangements are	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
E. Cultural Resources (cont.)		
E-2 (cont.)	made with the descendants of the deceased or, if there are no descendants of the deceased, with the California Native American Heritage Commission. If human remains will be removed from the site, the removal shall be done by archaeologists working by hand.	
E-3: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. *There is no evidence that the project site includes any unique paleontological resources or geologic or paleontological features that the project may affect.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
E-4: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. *Any human remains associated with historic Wiyot villages could be inadvertently unearthed, allowing for substantial damage to human burials. Implementation of mitigation measures would be adequate to protect the remains.*	See recommended Mitigation Measures E-2a and E-2b	*Less-than-Significant*
E-5: In conjunction with cumulative development, adversely affect cultural resources in the project vicinity. *The project in combination with other future and approved project is unlikely to result in significant cumulative impacts on cultural resources.*	See recommended Mitigation Measures E-2a and E-2b	*Less-than-Significant*
F. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity		
F-1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: a. *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.* b. *Strong seismic ground shaking.* c. *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.* d. *Landslides.* *The project site could experience a range of ground shaking effects during an earthquake on the Cascadia Subduction Zone, Mad River Fault Zone, or other regional active faults. Adherence to the California Building Code and the recommendations presented in the project-specific geotechnical engineering report would reduce potential seismic impact associated with the proposed project.*	**Mitigation Measure F-1a:** The proposed project shall comply with requirements of the most recent California Building Code which include the completion of a site-specific, design level geotechnical report that examines and assesses the potential for the proposed project to be subject to ground shaking, liquefaction, and other seismic hazards associated with the occurrence of a maximum credible earthquake anticipated to affect the Eureka region. The project-specific geotechnical report shall include specific measures to address these hazards including, at a minimum, measures for the design and construction of foundations, underground utilities, and paved areas. These specific measures shall meet or exceed the requirements set in the most recent California Building Code. The project applicant shall implement the specific recommendations included in the project-specific geotechnical report as part of the project.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
F. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity (cont.)		
F-2: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. *Since most of the original topsoil has been removed or buried, and the project applicant shall adhere to erosion control measures outlined in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan as required by law, the potential for erosion impacts during construction would be minimal.*	See recommended mitigation measure H-3a.	*Less-than-Significant*
F-3: 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. *Since no development is proposed west of Clark Slough, where the liquefaction potential is highest, and the remainder of the site would be subject to the findings of the geotechnical engineering report, the potential for impact would be low.*	See recommended Mitigation Measure F-1a.	*Less-than-Significant*
F-4: Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property. *The project geotechnical report identifies clay-rich soils at the site but notes they are typically 5 or more feet deep and therefore typically not at a stratigraphic level that would be expected to affect the building foundation. The risk of adverse consequences associated with soil expansivity is therefore minimal.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
F-5: 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. *The project would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.*	None Recommended	*No Impact*
F-6: Together with other developments in the immediate vicinity, contribute to potential cumulative geologic and seismic hazards including increased soil erosion, slope failure, ground shaking, soil settlement, and liquefaction. *The project in combination with other developments is unlikely to result in any significant cumulative impacts because newer construction is typically built to higher seismic standards.*	See recommended Mitigation Measures F-1a and H-3a.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
G-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. *The project may result in some contamination remaining in situ, which could potentially result in a significant impact to the public or to the environment. A RWQCB-approved site remediation has been completed and a soil and groundwater management contingency plan would be prepared for the property.*	**Mitigation Measure G-1a:** The project applicant shall prepare a site-specific remediation plan and health and safety plan that meets the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or other overseeing agency and shall comply with all federal and state regulations including Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements for worker safety. Applicable regulations and methods of compliance shall depend upon the level of contamination discovered. **Mitigation Measure G-1b:** Prior to commencement of any construction activities, the applicant or the applicant's consultant shall complete any further characterization and/or remediation, as directed, of any remaining contaminated soil to the satisfaction of the RWQCB or other applicable oversight agency, undertaking soil excavation or other appropriate remedial measures as required. If required, soil may be excavated using a backhoe or excavator. The excavated soil shall be loaded into a dump truck and transported as required to a secured stockpile area where it shall be protected from contact with stormwater. The excavation contractor shall employ dust control measures during excavation and stockpiling activities. Soil samples shall be collected from each excavation area, as required by the RWQCB, to confirm that remaining soil meets site clean-up goals. Following site excavation, the excavation pits shall be left open pending receipt of satisfactory confirmation soil sampling analytical results. Each excavation pit shall be secured with a fence during the period that it is left open. Once the excavation work is complete, the excavation pits in areas intended for development shall be backfilled with clean, river-run gravel or other clean fill material and compacted. Three samples of the backfill material shall be collected during the backfill process, submitted to the analytical laboratory and tested to ensure that it, also, meets the site clean-up standards. The excavation pits located in areas intended for wetlands restoration shall be restored in accordance with an approved wetland restoration plan. **Soil Stockpile Characterization** Soil samples shall be collected from various locations and depths of the stockpile for characterization. The soil stockpile characterization shall be conducted in accordance with, and at the frequency required by the applicable disposal or recycling facility.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)		
G-1 (cont.)	**Soil Disposal** Based on the results of the soil characterization, the material shall be properly managed as required by the RWQCB, depending on the concentration of contaminants in the stockpiled material. All excavated material that requires removal shall be removed from the site within 90 days and placed in a permitted disposal facility by a licensed waste hauler. **Mitigation Measure G-1c:** During site preparation, construction, or restoration of the wetland, suspected residual contamination could be detected by a hydrocarbon odor or visually (hydrocarbon sheen or discoloration) despite initial remediation efforts. If suspected contamination is encountered, work shall stop and the site supervisor shall be notified. The site supervisor shall then ensure that site workers have adequate training and proper protective equipment to continue working in the area. Work shall not resume until properly trained and equipped workers are present. Suspect soil shall be excavated using a backhoe or excavator. The excavated soil shall be loaded into a dump truck and transported to a secured stockpile area that is away from routine traffic and protected from contact with ponding water and stormwater. The excavated soil shall be sampled and analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs), as appropriate or required by the RWQCB. The analytical results of the soil stockpile sample(s) shall be used to determine the proper handling and disposal method for the soil. In the event that the soil requires off-site disposal, a contractor licensed to transport such material shall transport the contaminated soil to a facility that is licensed to accept such soil. All contaminated soil that requires removal shall be removed from the site within 90 days following excavation. Following site excavation, the re-filling of excavation pits, soil stockpile characterization and soil disposal shall be the same as for Mitigation Measure G-1a above. Any suspected contaminated groundwater or surface water that is encountered shall be sampled and analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, and VOCs, as appropriate or required by the RWQCB. Identified contaminated water that requires removal shall be pumped into appropriate containers, depending on the volume of water to be removed. If only a small volume is removed, Department of Transportation-approved, 55-gallon steel drums may	

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)		
G-1 (cont.)	be appropriate. If a large volume must be removed, a Baker Tank or equivalent shall be used to temporarily store the extracted water. Contaminated water shall be disposed of as required by the RWQCB in light of the level and type of contamination. **Mitigation Measure G-1d:** Possible reuse of contaminated soils as subgrade fill material shall require approval from the local environmental oversight agency (Humboldt County Department of Health) and/or the RWQCB. **Mitigation Measure G-1e:** The following measures shall be undertaken to the satisfaction of the RWQCB to ensure that human and environmental health is protected: 1. Upon completion of site remediation activities, a post-remediation groundwater-monitoring program shall be implemented as required by the RWQCB; 2. The RWQCB will outline the monitoring schedule, including what constituents will require testing and at what frequency the monitoring will occur; and 3. A groundwater monitoring report of findings shall be prepared for submittal to the RWQCB upon completion of each monitoring event. If required by the RWQCB, additional site remediation shall also occur.	
G-2: 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. *The proposed development has the potential to affect the quality of surface water runoff from the site, because there is a possibility of stormwater contamination from hazardous materials associated with the development, and because the project would result in an increase in impervious surface area on the site.*	**Mitigation Measure G-2a:** The following measures shall be undertaken to the satisfaction of the RWQCB and the County Department of Environmental Health, HazMat Division. All potentially hazardous or regulated materials that are used at the project site during construction activities shall be appropriately covered, handled, stored, and secured in accordance with local and state laws. No hazardous wastes shall be disposed of at the project site. Absorbent materials shall be maintained at locations where hazardous materials are used or stored, in order to capture spilled materials in the event of an accidental release. An emergency response plan shall be developed and implemented for the project site. All jobsite employees shall be trained to respond to any accidental releases. **Mitigation Measure G-2b:** The project applicant shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implement construction site best management practices in accordance with the	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)		
G-2 (cont.)	guidelines for erosion control and pollution prevention during construction that can be found in the *California Stormwater Best Management Practices Handbooks*. The guidelines recommend techniques for erosion and sediment control, non-storm water management, and waste management and materials pollution control. The project applicant shall implement site-appropriate measures from these guidelines. SWPPP implementation is described in more detail in Section IV.H, *Hydrology and Water Quality* of this EIR.	
G-3: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. *The closest school is Jefferson Elementary School at 1000 B Street, Eureka, which is just over one-quarter mile from the project site. The school was closed in June, 2005. Because the school is closed and because potential project impacts concerning hazardous materials would be mitigated to less-than-significant, the project would not result in hazardous materials impacts to a school within one-quarter mine of the project site.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
G-4: 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. *The project site has had a history of hazardous materials releases as discussed above, but would not be considered for listing as a hazardous materials site under Government Code section 65962.5 because it is in compliance with Regional Board orders and all USTs have been removed. Some remediation activities have occurred at the site and any remaining contamination would be mitigated.*	See recommended Mitigation Measures G-1a and G-1e	*No Impact*
G-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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. *The project site is just over 2 miles from the Eureka Municipal Airport which is located on the north spit; the project site is not within the land use plan for the airport. The project site is about 3 miles from the Murray Field Airport and is not within the land use plan for the airport.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)		
G-6: 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. *The Marina Center project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.*	None Recommended	*No Impact*
G-7: Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. *The proposed project would not close any roads or otherwise interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
G-8: 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. *The project site is located in a developed area, well away from any risk of wildland areas and associated wildfire risks.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
G-9: Contribute to significant cumulative hazards impacts in the project site vicinity. *The RWQCB, SWPPP, and other regulatory requirements would reduce the risks of project operation to minimal levels. Other projects will be required to similarly mitigate their site-specific impacts. The cumulative hazards impacts associated with the proposed project and other foreseeable development are therefore minimal.*	See recommended Mitigation Measures G-1a through G-1e, G-2a, and G-2b.	*Less-than-Significant*
H. Hydrology and Water Quality		
H-1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. *The stormwater discharges would be regulated by the SWRCB under the NPDES permit program. The required SWPPP would specify BMPs to prevent construction pollutants from contacting stormwater, measures for erosion and sediment control, and methods for construction waste handling and disposal.*	See recommended Mitigation Measures H-3a and H-3b.	*Less-than-Significant*
H-2: 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). *Water supplies for the proposed project would not be derived from groundwater*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
H. Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)		
wells. In addition, due to the proximity of the project site to Humboldt Bay, the increase in impervious surface area resulting from the proposed project would not have a significant impact on groundwater recharge.		
H-3: 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 of siltation on- or off-site. *Earthwork would occur on the majority of the project site and is expected to include the stripping of the surface vegetation, removal of loose fill materials, and the placement of imported engineered soils on the project site, which could result in a potential impact.*	**Mitigation Measure H-3a**: In addition to the required SWPPP, the following BMPs shall be implemented to protect water quality. *1. Erosion/Sediment Control*. During the construction phase, prior to site grading, combinations of silt fencing, straw wattles, and/or straw bale sediment transport barriers shall be constructed at specific site locations with the intent of containing all site runoff on the project site. This barrier shall be maintained during the rainy season and until completion of construction and shall prevent transport of pollutants, such as excessive sediment, away from the construction area. The barrier shall be constructed so that concentrated surface water flows during heavy rains cannot penetrate it without being dissipated in flow energy, and without the water being filtered through the sediment transport barriers. *2. Scheduling*. The north coast's dry season is typically between April 15 and October 15. Proper timing of grading and construction during the dry season would minimize soil and construction material exposure during the rainy season. Following October 15, areas of disturbed or fill soils more than 6 inches in depth and greater than 100 square feet (10-foot-by-10-foot area) shall be specifically protected from erosion by 1) shaping the ground surface so that concentrated surface flows do not encounter or cross them, or 2) providing localized straw wattles, straw bales and/or silt fencing. During the rainy season, construction materials and equipment shall be stored under cover or in secondary containment areas. *3. Protection of Water Courses and Drainage Inlets*. Site drainage under existing conditions is toward the bay. General guidelines for water course and drainage inlet protection during the rainy season shall include providing downgradient sediment traps or other BMPs that allow soil particles to settle out before flows are released to receiving waters, storm drains, streets, or adjacent property. Drainage inlet protection BMPs, if required, shall be installed in a manner that does not cause additional erosion or flooding of a roadway.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
H. Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)		
H-3 (cont.)	*4. Soil Stockpiles*. Should it be necessary to stockpile excess soil on-site, the soil shall be placed within a sediment-protected area that is not likely to result in off-site sedimentation. If likely to be subjected to rain or high winds, stockpiles shall be covered with plastic sheeting (Visqueen®, for example) at least 6- to 10-mils thick. Plastic sheeting shall be well-anchored to resist high winds. If stockpiles are to be present through the rainy season, they shall be surrounded with silt or straw bale fencing about 5 feet from the toe of the pile. *5. Dust Control*. All construction areas shall be treated and maintained as necessary to minimize the generation of dust that may blow off-site. The most common method of dust control during construction activities is through periodic application of water. However, the application of water for dust control purposes shall be managed to ensure there is no off-site runoff. *6. Material Delivery, Storage and Use*. Materials used during construction, where appropriate, shall be delivered and stored in appropriate containers and in designated areas, to prevent the discharge of pollutants to nearby watercourses or storm drain systems. During the rainy season, materials shall be stored in covered areas. Chemicals, paints or bagged materials shall not be stored directly on the ground, but instead shall placed on a pallet or in a secondary containment system. Materials shall be used according to the manufacturer's instructions and all materials shall be disposed of properly. Any spills shall be cleaned up immediately and an ample supply of spill clean-up materials shall be kept on-site during construction activities. There shall be no fueling or equipment washing activities conducted on-site. *7. Monitoring*. During construction, all erosion and pollution control measures shall be periodically inspected throughout the duration of the project by a qualified professional to ensure that the control measures are properly implemented. If the erosion and pollution control measures are not functioning properly, the owner shall immediately make appropriate modifications to ensure that water quality is protected. **Mitigation Measure H-3b**: Prior to any clearing, grading, excavating or fill within 50 feet from the edge of a delineated wetland, stream, or stream channel or disturbing more than 2,500 square feet, the applicant shall obtain an Erosion Control Permit	

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
H. Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)		
H-3 (cont.)	(ECP) from the City of Eureka. The ECP shall require specific erosion/sediment control devices, which shall be maintained in proper working condition for as long as work is being conducted on the property or for as long as an active permit of any nature is issued for the project. Erosion/sediment control devices required by the ECP may include, but are not limited to, silt fences, straw bales, retention ponds, mulch, sod, rip-rap, vegetation barriers, hydro-seeding, erosion blankets and any other measures that would adequately prevent soil from being eroded and transported onto adjoining property. The ECP shall always require a stabilized construction site access for any sites where sediment can be tracked onto public roads by construction vehicles. The responsibility of the property owner and its agents shall be joint and severable with the entity performing the work for the maintenance of all erosion control devices. The erosion control devices shall be maintained in a condition so as to prevent soil erosion on the property and transport of sediment off the property.	
H-4: 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. *Nearly 29 acres of the approximately 43-acre site would be converted into impervious surfaces and would result in an increase in peak discharge. An on-site conveyance system would need to be designed and constructed to adequately convey stormwater from the site.*	**Mitigation Measure H-4a:** The project applicant shall prepare a drainage plan indicating the specifics of the project drainage system. The drainage plan shall demonstrate that the culverts are adequately sized and configured to address peak runoff and protect against a 10-year storm event. The drainage plan shall ensure that any increase in stormwater drainage runoff in a 10-year storm event remains below 1 cfs. Alternatively, if the 1 cfs threshold cannot be maintained in a projected 10-year storm event, the drainage plan shall provide a retention/siltation basin that limits stormwater runoff to pre-project flows. The plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City of Eureka, and recommendations from the City shall be adopted by the project applicant prior to issuance of a building permit.	*Less-than-Significant*
H-5: 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. *Development of the project site could increase the levels of NPS urban pollutants and litter entering Humboldt Bay, resulting in a potential impact.* The recommended mitigation measures would avoid or minimize the potential for *runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.*	**Mitigation Measure H-5a:** The applicant shall treat stormwater at drop inlets that capture runoff from roof drains, paved pedestrian areas, and parking, prior to connection to the City's storm drain system. The project applicant shall prepare and implement a permanent maintenance program for stormwater treatment facilities on the project site. **Mitigation Measure H-5b:** The project applicant shall incorporate grassed swales (biofilters) into the project landscape plan, to the extent feasible, for runoff conveyance and filtering of pollutants. The	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
H. Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)		
H-5 (cont.)	maintenance of biofilters on the project site shall be the responsibility of the project applicant. **Mitigation Measure H-5c:** The applicant shall ensure that only USEPA-approved herbicides and pesticides are used on the site in any area that might drain to aquatic environments.	
H-6: Otherwise substantially degrade water quality. *Any potential impact on water quality would be reduced by implementation of stormwater quality controls and BMPs.*	See Mitigation Measures H-3a, H-3b, H-4a, H-5a, H-5b, H-5c.	*Less-than-Significant*
H-7: Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. *Proposed residential units would be outside the 100-year flood zone.*	See mitigation measure H-10b.	*Less-than-Significant*
H-8: Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. *The project would not place any structures within the 100-year flood hazard area that might impede or redirect flood flows.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
H-9: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. *The project site is not located downslope of a dam or levee, and therefore the project would not expose people or structures to flooding as a result of dam or levee failure. No structures would be placed within the 100-year flood hazard area, and so there would be no additional risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding from other sources.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
H-10: Inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. *The proposed project site is not located in an area that would be susceptible to mudflows. The shape and underwater topography of Humboldt Bay and the protection provided by the Samoa Peninsula significantly reduce tsunami hazards at the project site.*	**Mitigation Measure H-10a**: The project applicant shall prepare and submit a tsunami Evacuation and Response Plan for the City's approval prior to issuance of a building permit for construction. The Evacuation and Response Plan shall include, at a minimum, a tsunami warning or alarm system integrated into the building designs, specific routes for egress in the event of a tsunami warning (including vertical routes of egress and safe haven as appropriate), identified locations of safe haven, educational materials for residents and business owners, and a list of emergency response agencies, contact numbers, and other methods of communication in the event of a tsunami warning.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
H. Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)		
H-10 (cont.)	**Mitigation Measure H-10b**: Habitable space in building structures shall be prohibited on the first floor, and must be elevated by such means as posts, piles, piers, or shear walls parallel to the expected direction of flow of floodwaters from a tsunami. Building structures shall be designed to resist the effects of coastal floodwaters due to tsunamis. For the purposes of calculating allowable stresses for the building materials (i.e., load factors in the case of ultimate strength or limit design), the same standards used for wind and earthquake loads combined with gravity loads shall be used (e.g., treat loads and stresses due to tsunamis in the same fashion as for earthquake loadings). Main building structures shall be adequately anchored with deep piles and piers and connected to the elevating substructure system to resist lateral, uplift, and downward forces. For any wood construction proposed for the project, toenailing shall not be allowed. Shallow foundation types shall not be permitted unless the natural supporting soils are protected on all sides against scour by a protection structure, preferably a bulkhead. Shallow foundations may be permitted beyond 300 feet from the shoreline, provided they are founded on natural soil and at least 2 feet below the anticipated depth of scour, and provided not more than 3 feet of scour is expected at the structure. Project design plans shall be approved by a licensed architect or structural engineer with expertise in building in areas subject to coastal flooding to ensure that proposed structures are designed and built to withstand coastal flooding. **Mitigation Measure H-10c**: Landscaping and streetscaping shall be designed to reduce the potential for large objects to mobilize in a tsunami event and affect structures below the 30-foot elevation.	
H-11: Together with other developments in the immediate vicinity, contribute to potential adverse cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality. *The project-related impacts on hydrology and water quality would be low, as the City of Eureka will require anticipated future development to implement similar water quality BMPs for construction and post-development conditions.*	See Mitigation Measures H-3a, H-3b, H-4a, H-5a through H-5c, and H-10a through H-10c.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
I. Land Use and Planning		
I-1: Physically divide an established community. *The project would retain some of the existing industrially planned lands and would not divide the existing industrial community on the eastern end of the Westside Industrial Area. The project would continue the commercial community into the project site and provide large anchor retail spaces of a similar scale to the industrial uses adjacent to the project site.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
I-2: 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. *There is a low potential for the Marina Center project to conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction on the project site.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
I-3: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. *There is no adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan that would apply to the project.*	None Recommended	*No Impact*
I-4: Together with other developments in the immediate vicinity, result in any adverse cumulative land use impacts. *The infill development in a brownfield surrounded by previously developed land would increase the density of development in the area but would not create significant adverse environmental impacts that are not addressed in other sections of the EIR, Cumulative projects in the area would similarly be infill projects, furthering the City's overarching waterfront redevelopment goals.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
J. Mineral Resources		
J-1: 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. *There are no mineral extraction operations within the City of Eureka, and the quantity of mineral resources needed for this project is minimal compared to the quantity of minerals mined in Humboldt County annually.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
J. Mineral Resources (cont.)		
J-2: 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. *The site and immediate vicinity contain no existing mining operations or locally important mineral resource recovery sites.*	None Recommended	*No Impact*
K. Noise		
K-1: 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. *Impacts would occur related to locating proposed residences, museums, and offices in an incompatible noise environment.*	**Mitigation Measure K-1a:** Any locations of outdoor activity for sensitive uses associated with the project site shall be designed so that the Ldn from the roadways does not exceed 60 dB at the property line. This shall be done by locating outdoor activity sites outside of the 60-dB noise contours or by buffering. Before building permits are issued, the project applicant shall be required to submit an acoustical analysis demonstrating that outdoor activity spaces associated with sensitive uses do not exceed 60 dBA at the property line. **Mitigation Measure K-1b:** Any residential, office, or museum buildings shall be built to California's interior-noise insulation standard of 45 Ldn. Before building permits are issued, the project applicant shall be required to submit an acoustical analysis demonstrating that the buildings have been designed to limit interior noise to a CNEL (or Ldn) of 45 dBA.	*Less-than-Significant*
K-2: Expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. *The operations of the proposed project would not result in excessive ground-borne vibration. Ground-borne vibration from construction activities that involve "impact tools," especially pile driving, could produce detectable vibration at sensitive receptors.*	**Mitigation Measure K-2a:** To mitigate pile-driving and/or other extreme vibration-generating construction impacts, the project applicant shall have a qualified acoustical professional prepare a set of site-specific vibration attenuation measures to reduce project vibration below the vibration annoyance level of 80 VdB. Before the start of grading, the project sponsor shall submit a plan for such measures for review and approval by the City of Eureka to ensure that maximum vibration attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include, at a minimum, the following control strategies: 1. Implement "quiet" pile-driving technology or practices (such as pre-drilling of piles and the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile-driving duration), in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
K. Noise (cont.)		
K-2 (cont.)	2. Monitor the effectiveness of vibration attenuation measures by taking vibration measurements at locations and at a frequency adequate to ensure no excessive ground-borne vibration at sensitive receptors. 3. Limit pile-driving to mid-day weekday periods when the fewest people will likely be at the Best Western hotel. Ensure that the pile-driving in the vicinity of the Best Western is limited in time duration. See also mitigation measure D-1b which describes possible seasonal restrictions and other measures to reduce pile-driving impacts on nearby fish populations.	
K-3: Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels of 5dBA or more in the vicinity of sensitive receptors above levels existing without the project. *The additional project traffic would only minimally increase noise levels along the majority of roadway segments in the vicinity of existing sensitive receptors. The retail, museum, and other uses would generate noise levels less than or equal to ambient noise levels in the vicinity of sensitive receptors.*	**Mitigation Measure K-3**: All outdoor loudspeaker paging systems shall not exceed 60 dBA Leq at the property line. Also, see Mitigation Measure K-1a.	*Less-than-Significant*
K-4: Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. *Construction activities could generate significant amounts of noise at the project site, generating higher noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors to the project site, which are to the east and include the Best Western hotel and the residences along Summer Street. In addition, noise from activities that involve impact tools could produce detectable noise in excess of General Plan standards at sensitive receptors.*	**Mitigation Measure K-4a:** The project applicant shall require construction contractors to limit standard construction activities to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, with pile driving and/or other extreme noise-generating activities (greater than 90 dBA) limited to between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, with no extreme noise-generating activity permitted between 12:30 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. No construction activities shall be allowed on weekends, except that interior construction shall be permitted after buildings are enclosed. No extreme noise-generating activities shall be allowed on weekends and holidays. Construction activities outside of these hours and days may be allowed by prior approval from the City. **Mitigation Measure K-4b:** To reduce daytime noise impacts due to construction, the project applicant shall require construction contractors to implement the following measures: 1. Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
K. Noise (cont.)		
K-4 (cont.)	enclosures, and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible). 2. Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible; this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures, such as use of drills rather than impact tools, shall be used whenever feasible. 3. Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible. **Mitigation Measure K-4c:** To mitigate pile driving and/or other extreme noise-generating construction impacts, the project applicant shall have a qualified acoustical professional prepare a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted for review and approval by the City of Eureka to ensure that noise attenuation and acoustical standards will be achieved. These attenuation measures may include, as necessary, the following control strategies: 1. Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around the construction site. 2. Use noise control blankets on building structures as buildings are erected to reduce noise emission from the site. 3. Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements at locations and frequencies necessary to ensure acoustical standards are satisfied.	
K-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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. *Noise*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
K. Noise (cont.)		
associated with aircraft using the Eureka Municipal Airport does not heavily influence the noise environment within the project site vicinity. The project would therefore not expose people to excessive noise levels.		
K-6: 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. *The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.*	None Recommended	*No Impact*
K-7: In combination with other potential planned or future development, result in adverse cumulative noise increases. *The project-generated traffic in conjunction with other proposed projects is unlikely to result in significant cumulative noise impacts, given that increased noise levels would not be located near sensitive receptors.*	See "K" Mitigation Measures.	*Less-than-Significant*
L. Population and Housing		
L-1: 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). *The population created by the residential portion of the proposed project, the infrastructure designed solely to serve the project site, and the ability of the local labor force to absorb the jobs created by the commercial portion would not induce substantial population growth.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
L-2: Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. *The development of the Marina Center project would permanently displace all unauthorized houseless transient camping on the site, a number which could not reasonably be considered substantial.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
L-3: Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. *The project site is vacant and does not contain any residential structures. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not displace any on-site dwelling units and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing.*	None Recommended	*No Impact*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
L. Population and Housing (cont.)		
L-4: In conjunction with other development in the area, result in a cumulatively substantial population growth. *The Marina Center project and any planned projects in the vicinity are infill development, and therefore the construction of infrastructure to support the new development would not, in itself, introduce a substantial population growth into the area.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
M. Public Services		
M-1: 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 fire protection. *The EFD has indicated that the proposed project would not affect EFD's average driving time. All proposed street improvements and building plans will be reviewed by EFD prior to installation. Also, the proposed project would not require the construction of any new or physically altered off-site facilities. Infrastructure would be constructed to serve the project site, but no new facilities would be required off-site.*	**Mitigation Measure M-1a**: All buildings shall be fully sprinkled. **Mitigation Measure M-1b**: The applicant shall install fire hydrants and fire water mains as required by the Eureka Fire Department. The location, size and flow of all hydrants and fire mains shall be shown on the building construction plans. **Mitigation Measure M-1c**: All traffic calming measures proposed for installation within the parking lots or along internal roadways shall be reviewed and approved by the City Fire Department prior to installation. **Mitigation Measure M-1d**: In order to assure that fire apparatus have adequate width to deploy stabilizers, both sides of the Fourth Street extension adjacent to the five story office building shall be signed as "No Parking." **Mitigation Measure M-1e**: The proposed plaza in front of the five story office building shall be designed to provide fire emergency apparatus access, this shall include the ability for fire apparatus to drive across the plaza and an eighteen foot wide area to deploy the truck stabilizers. The design of the plaza shall be shown on the building plans and shall be approved by the City Fire Department. **Mitigation Measure M-1f**: The applicant shall cause to be installed on all new traffic signals and all existing traffic signals on Broadway between and including Harris Street and Fourth Street an Opticom emergency traffic prompting device, coded to Eureka Fire Department transmitters. Installation shall be coordinated with City of Eureka Engineering Department and Caltrans.	*Less-than-Significant*
M-2: 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	**Mitigation Measure M-2a**: The Marina Center development shall have an on-site security patrol to handle routine situations that do not require emergency response from the Eureka Police Department.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
M. Public Services (cont.)		
impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection. *The EPD has indicated that the proposed project would not substantially affect its emergency response time average. While the project could incrementally contribute to demand for police services, it could have a beneficial effect on the safety of the area. No new facilities would be required as a result of the project.*		
M-3: 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 schools. *The increase in student enrollment as a result of the project would be considered negligible and would not require new or physically altered facilities. Also, the project applicant would be required to contribute its fair share in student impact fees in accordance with City of Eureka School District requirements.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
M-4: 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 parks. *While the new residential population resulting from the proposed project would increase use of City parks and recreation facilities, the proposed project would not affect the existing ratio of park space per 1,000 residents or result in the need to construct new facilities or expand existing recreation facilities.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
M-5: 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 other public facilities. *No additional public services have been identified that would be affected by the development of the Marina Center project.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
M. Public Services (cont.)		
M-6: When combined with other foreseeable development in the vicinity, result in adverse cumulative impacts to the provision of public services. *The development of the project and other projects in the vicinity would be incremental and would not trigger the need for the expansion of public services facilities or directly and adversely affect response times for police, fire and emergency medical services. Furthermore, all projects would be required to comply with all fire code standards, incorporate police department recommendations after project review, contribute a fair-share payment for student impact fees, and provide publicly accessible open spaces.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
N. Recreation		
N-1: 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. *The proposed project would not affect the existing ratio of park space per 1,000 residents, so deterioration would not likely occur.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
N-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. *The construction of the recreational facilities, including the bike path and wetland preserve, would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
O. Transportation		
O-1: 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). *Project-generated traffic, absent mitigation, would degrade level of service at six intersections: Broadway at Wabach/Fairfield, Koster at Wabash, Fourth Street at C Street, 5th Street at C Street, Broadway at Hawthorne, and Broadway at Henderson. Under 2010 conditions, the Koster/Wabash intersection is expected to operate at LOS E during the p.m. peak hour, and the project trips are anticipated to result in more than 5 seconds of additional delay.* *In addition, average speeds on Broadway would be reduced with the addition of project traffic.*	**Mitigation Measure O-1a:** The project applicant and construction contractor(s) shall develop a construction management plan for review and approval by the City's Engineering Department and Caltrans. The plan shall include at least the following items and requirements to reduce traffic congestion during construction: 1. A set of comprehensive traffic control measures shall be developed, including scheduling of major truck trips and deliveries to avoid peak traffic hours, detour signs if required, lane closure procedures, signs, cones for drivers, and designated construction access routes. Prior to approving plans for mitigation on U.S. 101, Caltrans requires that all construction activities include an assessment of the potential for traffic congestion. This is accomplished through lane closure analysis	*Less-than-Significant with the exception of the intersection of Koster & Wabash which would be Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
O. Transportation (cont.)		
O-1 (cont.)	showing the times of day and days of the week that lanes can be closed to traffic. Excepting extraordinary circumstances, lane closures are authorized at times of the day and on days of the week where the interruptions, closures, and activity is least likely to cause unacceptable congestion using the same level of service criteria as used for assessing project traffic impacts. 2. If construction activities result in unacceptable traffic congestion, flaggers shall supplement approved traffic control plans to ensure that traffic moves through the construction zone with minimal delays. 3. The Construction Management Plan shall identify haul routes for movement of construction vehicles that would minimize impacts on motor vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic, circulation, and safety, and specifically to minimize impacts to the greatest extent possible on streets in the project area. The haul routes shall be approved by the City and Caltrans 4. The Construction Management Plan shall provide for notification procedures for adjacent property owners and public safety personnel regarding when major deliveries, detours, and lane closures would occur. 5. The Construction Management Plan shall provide for accommodation of bicycle flow, particularly along First Street and Waterfront Drive. 6. The Construction Management Plan shall provide for monitoring surface streets used for haul routes so that any damage and debris attributable to the haul trucks can be identified and corrected by the project applicant. **Mitigation Measure O-1b:** The project applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans and shall cause to be completed the following modifications at the intersection of Broadway and Wabash Avenue/Fairfield Street: 1. Close northbound Fairfield Street access to Wabash Avenue and Broadway approximately 40 feet south of the intersection, and post signs on northbound Fairfield at Del Norte advising motorists that traffic is “LOCAL ACCESS ONLY – NO ACCESS TO BROADWAY OR WABASH AVENUE”. Closure should be accomplished by extending the east curb of Fairfield to the street centerline, and posting a “DO NOT ENTER” sign at the closure.	

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
O. Transportation (cont.)		
O-1 (cont.)	2. Modify the Broadway and Wabash signal to account for the elimination of northbound Fairfield access. **Mitigation Measure O-1c:** The project applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans and shall cause to be completed the following modifications at the intersection of Broadway and Hawthorne Street: 1. Install a new signal and intersection improvements (see #3 below) at Broadway and Hawthorne Street. 2. Install a southbound left turn and westbound right turn overlap signal phase (no southbound U-turns allowed). 3. Widen Hawthorne Street to provide two westbound right turn lanes and one westbound through/left lane. The cross-section for Hawthorne Street shall be 58 feet wide (including 6-foot sidewalk) from 175 east of Broadway to Broadway. Transition to the widened section should start at Fairfield Street, and the six-foot sidewalk should also extend from Broadway to Fairfield Street. An advisory sign must be posted to northbound motorists on Fairfield Street south of Hawthorne Street saying “NO ACCESS TO WABASH AVENUE OR BROADWAY AHEAD – USE HAWTHORNE STREET TO BROADWAY” with a left arrow. **Mitigation Measure O-1d:** The project applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans and shall cause to be completed the following improvements at Broadway and Henderson Street: 1. Convert Henderson Street to one-way westbound traffic from Fairfield Street to Broadway and provide for one westbound through/right lane and two westbound left turn lanes to southbound Broadway from Henderson Street. Remove southbound left turns to eastbound Henderson Street by closing the southbound left turn lane and modifying the signal indications. Retain the all-way stop at Fairfield and Henderson Streets 2. Convert the Henderson Street and Broadway signal to allow simultaneous eastbound left turns with westbound left turns. 3. Post a “NO LEFT TURN” sign for southbound Broadway and a “NO RIGHT TURN” sign for northbound Broadway at Henderson Street and post “ONE-WAY” signs on Henderson Street.	

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
O. Transportation (cont.)		
O-1 (cont.)	**Mitigation Measure O-1e:** The project applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans and shall cause to be completed the following signal-coordination improvements along the U.S. 101 corridor: 1. Install signal interconnect on U.S. 101 so that all signals along the corridor are in one system, from V Street at Fourth and Fifth Streets to the K-Mart signal and Broadway signal near Bayshore Mall. This would be accomplished by installing conduit and cable from Broadway and Henderson to Broadway and Wabash, Fourth Street at Broadway from Broadway and Sixth to E Street, and Fifth Street at Broadway from Broadway and Sixth to E Street. 2. Develop and implement optimized signal coordination timing on U.S. 101 from Fourth and Fifth Streets at Myrtle to Broadway, and on Broadway from Fourth Street to the K-Mart driveway signal near Bayshore Mall. A monitoring system would be set up to the satisfaction of Caltrans District 1 and City of Eureka traffic signal operations personnel. **Mitigation Measure O-1f:** The project applicant shall post guide signs within the Marina Center parking lot directing motorists to southbound U.S. 101 via Waterfront Drive, or to the east and north in downtown and along U.S. 101, via project access drives on Second and Third Streets. **Mitigation Measure O-1g:** The project applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans and shall cause to be completed the following modifications at Broadway and Harris Streets: 1. Provide appropriate guide signs to advise southbound Broadway motorists to turn left at Harris Street to go east up the hill on Harris Street. 2. Install a signal at Harris Street and Broadway to provide protected southbound left turns from Broadway to eastbound Harris Street. This signal shall interconnect the north Bayshore Mall driveway signal and coordinate at all times except evenings and early morning hours to be determined by timing plans to coordinate signals along U.S. 101. 3. Lengthen the southbound left-turn lane to 300 feet in length. This does not affect the existing northbound left turn striping into Victoria Place (private drive).	

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
O. Transportation (cont.)		
O-1 (cont.)	4. Provide funds for private signage to the Bayview Motel at Fairfield Street and Henderson Street for both northbound and southbound motorists. 5. Shift the two southbound through lanes and southbound left turn lane at least 6 feet to the west for an appropriate distance to provide for adequate left turning radius for STAA trucks making a southbound left turn to eastbound Harris Street. **Mitigation Measure O-1h:** The project applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans and shall cause to be completed improvements necessary to prohibit southbound left turns from Broadway to eastbound Seventh Street, and instead, shift these turns to the southbound left turn lane at Washington Street. Guide signs shall be posted, that return motorists to eastbound Seventh Street by turning left onto Summer Street, than east at Seventh Street. **Mitigation Measure O-1i:** The project applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from the City of Eureka and shall cause to be installed an all-way stop at Fairfield and Hawthorne Street. **Mitigation Measure O-1j:** The project applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from the City of Eureka and shall cause to be installed a southbound left-turn lane and northbound right-turn lane on Waterfront Drive at the project access driveway. **Mitigation Measure O-1k:** The project applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans and shall cause to be completed the following improvements at Broadway and Washington Street: 1. Install east and westbound left turn lanes on Washington Street. 2. Modify the traffic signals at Broadway at Washington Street and Broadway at 14th Street to operate with protected-permissive phasing for the left turn movements on Broadway.	
O-2: Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. *Humboldt County has not established a county congestion management agency. Therefore, there are no levels of service standards established by such an agency.*	None Recommended.	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
O. Transportation (cont.)		
O-3: 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. *The Marina Center project would have no impact on air traffic patterns; the nearest airport is the Eureka Municipal Airport, which is just over 2 miles away on the Samoa Peninsula.*	None Recommended.	*No Impact*
O-4: Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). *While the higher traffic volumes generated by the proposed project would increase the potential for safety conflicts, it is not expected that project traffic would increase the accident rate itself. After implementation of identified mitigation measures, all but one of the study intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service and would be expected to reduce accidents by about 15 percent.*	**See Mitigation Measures O-1a through O-1k.**	*Less-than-Significant*
O-5: Result in inadequate emergency access. *The combination of new and more direct routes between Broadway and Waterfront Drive coupled with good internal circulation would enable effective emergency service. With implementation of the identified transportation improvements, average speeds along U.S. 101 are expected to be adequate to accommodate emergency vehicle access needs.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
O-6: Result in inadequate parking capacity. *The maximum demand for parking would be less than the provided spaces, with the exception of at times in the month of December.*	**Mitigation Measure O-6a:** The project applicant shall develop a parking management plan that provides a mechanism that would direct employees to park off-site (in available on-street parking spaces in the area) during periods of peak parking demand in December.	*Less-than-Significant*
O-7: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks). *The potential future operation of a freight or passenger line along the western property boundary would cause safety and access concerns. Development of the proposed project would increase the demand for transit to the site. With the implementation of mitigation measures, these potential impacts would be Less-than-Significant. Additionally, pedestrian and bicycle access and parking would be provided in accordance with adopted policies and mitigation measures proposed.*	**Mitigation O-7a**: The project applicant shall work with the North Coast Railroad Authority to maintain adequate right-of-way along the rail corridor in anticipation of future rail service through the site. **Mitigation O-7b**: The project applicant shall work with the North Coast Railroad Authority and, if the Authority anticipates future use of the railroad right-of-way, the applicant shall pay to install pavement markings and warning signs at the project driveway on Waterfront Drive where the railroad tracks cross the driveway throat. Pavement markings and warning signs shall conform to	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
O. Transportation (cont.)		
O-7 (cont.)	standards set forth in the *Manual on Uniform Transportation Devices* (FHWA, 2004). The driveway shall include crossing gates and a median. Because the project site is in a quiet zone, the median would prevent drivers from going around the crossing arm onto the tracks, and thus the trains are not required to blow their horns when crossing the roadway. The crossing arms would also prevent pedestrians and bicyclists from venturing onto the tracks when a train is coming. **Mitigation O-7c**: The project applicant shall provide smooth pavement transition over the railroad tracks so that bikes and wheelchair users are not in danger of losing their balance or getting wheels stuck between the rails and the pavement. The crossing of the tracks shall be perpendicular. **Mitigation O-7d**: The project applicant shall work with the Eureka Transit Authority to reinstate the bus stop at Koster and Washington Streets and improve the bus stop at Seventh and California Streets, including paying their fair-share to enhance amenities of the stop (i.e., shelter, bench, and signage). **Mitigation O-7e**: The project applicant shall provide eight bicycle parking spaces per 10,000 gross square feet of retail space and placement shall be in accordance with guidelines set forth in Appendix B of the *2004 Regional Bicycle Transportation Plan Update* (Humboldt County).	
O-8: Contribute to adverse cumulative increases in traffic at local intersections in the project area. *Under 2025 Cumulative plus Project Conditions, four signalized study intersections would operate at an unacceptable level of service during the p.m. peak hour. The intersections at Broadway / 14th Street, Broadway / Wabash-Fairfield Streets, Broadway / Henderson Street, and Broadway / Bayshore Mall driveway would all operate at LOS E during the p.m. peak hour.*	**Mitigation Measure O-8a:** An encroachment permit shall be obtained from Caltrans and the project applicant shall install the following improvements: The outbound (egress) from the project site to Broadway shall be closed off at both the Fourth and Sixth Street exits, and signs shall be installed on the project site to divert the outbound traffic to Waterfront Drive, then south to Hawthorne Street at Broadway, or to Second and Third Streets at Broadway; and This mitigation measure shall be completed before the intersections exceed the acceptable LOS, which in this case is estimated to occur when southbound through volumes on Broadway at 14th Street average at least 1,700 vehicles per hour during the p.m. peak hour.	*Significant and unavoidable.*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
O. Transportation (cont.)		
O-8 (cont.)	**Mitigation Measure O-8b:** An encroachment permit shall be obtained from Caltrans and the project applicant shall pay its fair share contribution for the installation of the following improvements: 1. Three southbound lanes shall be striped on Broadway from Vigo Street to the northern Bayshore Mall driveway at Harris Street; 2. The existing southbound right-turn lane into the northern driveway of Bayshore Mall just south of Harris Street shall be converted from an exclusive right-turn lane to a shared-through-right turn lane; and 3. The improvements above shall be completed before the intersections and roadway segments exceed the acceptable LOS, which in this instance shall occur when southbound through volumes on Broadway at 14th Street average at least 1,700 vehicles per hour during the p.m. peak hour	
P. Urban Decay		
P-1: Result in urban decay in the Retail Trade area. *The proposed project and its associated infrastructure improvements would eliminate the conditions for urban decay.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
P-2: In conjunction with other development, result in urban decay in the area. *While a competing general merchandise and home improvement store in Fortuna would divert sales from Eureka, there does not appear to be any cumulative impact from the project and other proposed or approved projects that would result in physical deterioration considered prevalent and substantial in the community.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
Q. Utilities and Service Systems		
Q-1: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. *Given that the capacity exists to serve anticipated project's wastewater demands, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities. Wastewater from the proposed project would have characteristics typical of municipal wastewater that is treated at the WWTP and would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements for the WWTP.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
Q. Utilities and Service Systems (cont.)		
Q-2: 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. *In accordance with the City of Eureka General Plan, the project applicant would be required to construct or finance any needed water system upgrades, including distribution, collection, and connection infrastructure in accordance with City of Eureka standards and adopted codes. New or expanded off-site utility facilities would not be required to serve the project.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
Q-3: 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. *Onsite drainage lines would be installed to convey stormwater from the site into the City's stormwater system, and runoff treatment measures would be incorporated to minimize any potential runoff increase. The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
Q-4: Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources (i.e., new or expanded entitlements are needed). *See Q-2, above.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
Q-5: 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. *See Q-1, above.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*
Q-6: Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. *The project's solid waste could be accommodated by the Anderson Landfill and would represent about 0.26 percent of the landfill's maximum permitted daily capacity. The project's estimated peak waste generation would be 5.1 tons per day, which would represent 0. 5 percent of Anderson Landfill's maximum permitted daily capacity.*	None Recommended	*Less-than-Significant*

TABLE II-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED MARINA CENTER PROJECT

POTENTIAL IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE *after any recommended mitigation measures*
Q. Utilities and Service Systems (cont.)		
Q-7: Violate any federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. *The project would comply with the provisions of the City of Eureka's 2008 Universal/Mandatory Collection Program Ordinance. In addition, adherence to the mitigation measures would reduce the potential project-related solid waste impact such that it would not contribute to the City of Eureka's existing noncompliance with AB 939.*	**Mitigation Measure Q-7a:** The project applicant shall assure that commercial and residential solid waste is disposed of in containers sized to adequately handle the volume of waste generated at the facility. **Mitigation Measure Q-7b:** The project applicant shall place waste receptacles of the appropriate size for the waste generated at all public open spaces. Special consideration shall be required for public events that would attract larger numbers of persons to the site. **Mitigation Measure Q-7c:** The project applicant shall provide suitable storage locations and containers for recyclable materials in or around proposed buildings. The containers shall be designed and constructed to protect soils, water resources, biological resources and all other aspects of the environment. **Mitigation Measure Q-7d:** The project applicant shall prepare and implement a recycling program to achieve at least a 50 percent diversion in waste generated from project operations through the use of recycling.	*Less-than-Significant*
Q-8: Together with other development in the vicinity adversely affect the availability of utilities and service systems. *The proposed project and other future development would be located in areas already served by utility infrastructure, and new or expanded off-site utility facilities would not be required. Furthermore, all developments would be required to comply with all standards of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, and water conservation measures and waste minimization efforts in accordance with City of Eureka requirements.*	**See recommended Mitigation Measures Q-7a through Q-7d.**	*Less-than-Significant*