

Attachment F  
**ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS**

---

**CITY OF CRESCENT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Commission Members: Kirk Roberts, Chairperson**

**Rick Nolan, Vice-Chairperson • Ron Gastineau • Blake Inscore • Joseph Aliotti**

*Incorporated April 13, 1854*

*web: [www.crescentcity.org](http://www.crescentcity.org)*

**Regular Meeting**

**Thursday, October 11, 2012**

**5:30 p.m.**

**Board Chambers, 981 "H" Street, Suite 100, Crescent City, CA**

**MINUTES**

**I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL.**

Vice-Chair Nolan called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**Commissioners present:** Gastineau, Inscore, and Vice-Chair Nolan

**Commissioners absent:** Aliotti and Chairman Roberts

**Others present:** Associate Planner Eric Taylor and Planning Commission Secretary Robin Patch

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT - *The following citizen addressed the Commissioners:***

Ron Phillips – Rural Human Services (RHS) – due to the CDGB funding made available to RHS, there is a need for more storage space for the food. Mr. Phillips stated that what is needed is a 20' refrigerator and 20' dry storage container. Since there are no ordinances in place to regulate this, he asks for his request to be an agenda item for an upcoming meeting. *Planner Taylor stated that staff will do research, write a report and bring it back to the Commission for further discussion on allowing it or not.* Mr. Phillips stated that come the first of the year, they will need more storage space.

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of August 9, 2012.

On a motion by Commissioner Inscore, seconded by Commissioner Gastineau and carried unanimously, the Planning Commission of the City of Crescent City approved the regular meeting minutes of August 9, 2012, as presented.

**IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. Project:** ER12-01 Environmental Review for the Front Street Redesign project.

**Applicant:** City of Crescent City **Location:** Front Street from A Street to L Street

**APN:** N/A

Associate Planner Taylor reported to the Commission regarding the necessary requirements for this project; it has been published for public comment; and to date there were no comments in the period required (or at all); this is for the approval of the negative declaration.

On a motion by Commissioner Gastineau, seconded by Commissioner Inscore, and carried unanimously on a 3-0 polled vote, the Planning Commission of the City of Crescent City approved the negative declaration of project ER12-01, Front Street Redesign.

## V. REGULAR ITEMS

**A. Project:** AR12-10 Architectural Review for the construction of a 6463 square foot retail auto parts store located in the General Commercial (C2) District.

**Applicant:** Autozone Inc. **Location:** NWC of Cooper Avenue and Highway 101 **APN:** 118-360-15

Associate Planner Taylor explained what is allowed on this piece of property; it meets all the requirements for the location. The parking space requirement is 25 spaces; however, there is only room for 20. Planner Taylor told the applicant that if the plan is approved, it will be with the requirement to have 25 spaces, and he advised the applicant to come back to the Commission for a reduction of spaces requirement. He further explained that the applicant will have a garbage bin that will lock with a block walls around it, a pole sign which will be 16' high located on the highway. There was an architectural review; and no additional comments came out of the meeting. Due to the size of the company that is requesting this store, it is understood that they have a lot of experience in building these properly. The conditions of approval are as follows: file after the 10 day period to file for exemption of the CEQA requirement, to come back to the Commission for the reduction of parking, 6' cement wall around garbage, and to get permit for sign, water quality permits, discharge permits to be obtained as required. Planner Taylor went over the plans with the Commission and described them in detail and what requirements have already been met by Auto Zone.

Commissioner Gastineau asked when will they be shovel ready; Planner Taylor advised it is unknown at this time, however they are working with an Engineer and will find out soon, all depends on the winter we'll have. Vice-Chair Nolan asked about access to the site coming thru Auto Zone, is it necessary to have an additional turn off from Cooper needed; Planner Taylor stated that they have an access easement therefore no additional driveways are necessary.

On a motion by Commissioner Inscore, seconded by Commissioner Gastineau, and carried unanimously on a 3-0 polled vote, the Planning Commission of the City of Crescent City approved the AR12-10 Architectural Review for the construction of a 6463 square foot retail auto parts store located in the General Commercial (C2) District.

## VI. REPORTS, CONCERNS, REFERRALS

Planner Taylor reported to the Commissioners the recent Beachfront Park Master Plan Workshop for which several members of the public attended and provided input. In regards to Top Blue Marine, he went and noted they had drains leading to the storm drains; he explained to them that they cannot allow anything to go into the storm drains. Planner Taylor reported that funding was awarded for the RV Park, notification from the EDA was received and there is a conceptual plan, but will go out to an outside consultant for a finalized one. He stated that the old Burl shop should be coming down soon – the asbestos report came back in and it has a small amount on the roof, the fire department will be burning it down soon after the asbestos is contained.

Commissioner Gastineau asked for the status of the old Ice Plant and the new hotel; Planner Taylor said they have removed Ice Plant as they said they would. Commissioner Gastineau also asked about Ocean Front Lodge; Planner Taylor stated an amended permit was approved, however no construction started yet.

Commissioner Inscore asked if Top Blue Marine will have things completed in 30 days; Planner Taylor stated that they are hopeful, but it's up in the air; especially with the current situation of the Tri-Agency.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Crescent City Planning Commission, Vice-Chair Nolan adjourned the meeting at 5:56 pm to the regular meeting on November 8, 2012.

**ATTEST:**

---

Robin Patch, Planning Commission Secretary

**Crescent City Planning Commission**  
**October 11, 2012**  
**Staff Report**

**Agenda Item# IV.A.**

**Application #: ER12-01**

**Project:** Environmental Review for the Front Street Redesign Project  
**Applicant:** City of Crescent City  
**Site Address:** Front Street between A Street and L Street      **APN:** N/A  
**Lot Size:** N/A      **Project Size:** +/- 211,000 square feet  
**General Plan Land Use:** N/A  
**Zoning:** N/A

**Surrounding Zoning/Uses:** North: C-W/commercial/residential; East: C-2/commercial; South: Open Space/Beachfront Park; West: CZ-CW/Commercial

**Background & Project Description:**

The City of Crescent City has prepared the Front Street Redesign project plans which were presented to the Planning Commission in March of 2012. The Front Street Redesign project includes narrowing the street to a two lane roadway, adding additional parking on the south side of the street, a roundabout at A Street, public art and landscaping. The proposed project is subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act and a Negative Declaration (State Clearing House # 2012082082) has been prepared for the project (refer to attached Negative Declaration for further details). The Negative Declaration and a Notice of Intent were sent to the State Clearing House for review by state agencies the review period ended on September 25, 2012, no state agencies submitted comments (refer to attached letter from the State Clearing House for further details). The public review period began on August 25, 2012 and ended on September 25, 2012. The City did not receive any comments from the public.

**Environmental Determination:**

A Negative Declaration was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines §15070), which covers projects that meet the following criteria:

- (a) The initial study shows that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, or
- (b) The initial study identifies potentially significant effects, but:
  - (1) Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, agreed to by the applicant before a proposed mitigated negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur, and
  - (2) There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.

**Recommended Findings:**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission make the following findings:

- 1. The project as proposed will not have a significant effect on the environment.
- 2. No one from the public or a state agency submitted any comments during the review period.

**Recommended Actions:**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take the following actions:

1. Open the public hearing to receive comments on the project.
2. Adopt the recommended findings.

**Attachments:** A) Letter from State Clearing House  
B) Notice of Intent  
C) Notice of Completion  
D) Initial Study/Negative Declaration



EDMUND G. BROWN JR.  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE of PLANNING AND RESEARCH  
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT



KEN ALEX  
DIRECTOR

September 26, 2012

Eric Taylor  
Crescent City  
377 J Street  
Crescent City, CA 95531

Subject: Front Street Redesign  
SCH#: 2012082082

Dear Eric Taylor:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on September 25, 2012, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan  
Director, State Clearinghouse

**Document Details Report  
State Clearinghouse Data Base**

**SCH#** 2012082082  
**Project Title** Front Street Redesign  
**Lead Agency** Crescent City

---

**Type** Neg Negative Declaration  
**Description** The project site consists of the entire length of Front Street from A Street to K Street in Crescent City, CA. The project consists of the reconstruction of Front Street. The street will be narrowed from a four lane to a two lane street and off street parking will be added along the south side of the street. Other project components include landscaping, public art, a roundabout at A Street and sidewalks and crosswalks.

---

**Lead Agency Contact**

**Name** Eric Taylor  
**Agency** Crescent City  
**Phone** (707) 464-9506 x236 **Fax**  
**email**  
**Address** 377 J Street  
**City** Crescent City **State** CA **Zip** 95531

---

**Project Location**

**County** Del Norte  
**City** Crescent City  
**Region**  
**Lat / Long** 41° 7.5' 8.17" N / 124° 1.96' 5.38" W  
**Cross Streets** A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K Streets  
**Parcel No.**  
**Township** 16N **Range** 1W **Section** 29 **Base** HB&M

---

**Proximity to:**

**Highways** Hwy 101  
**Airports** Del Norte County  
**Railways**  
**Waterways** Elk Creek, Crescent City Harbor  
**Schools** Crescent Elk  
**Land Use** Public Facility

---

**Project Issues** Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Flood Plain/Flooding; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Sewer Capacity; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Wetland/Riparian; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

---

**Reviewing Agencies** Resources Agency; California Coastal Commission; Department of Fish and Game, Region 1E; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 1; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 1; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; State Lands Commission

---

**Date Received** 08/27/2012 **Start of Review** 08/27/2012 **End of Review** 09/25/2012



377 J STREET

CRESCENT CITY, CALIFORNIA 95531-4025

Administration/Finance: 707-464-7483  
Utilities: 707-464-6517

Public Works/Planning: 707-464-9506  
FAX: 707-465-4405

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT  
A NEGATIVE DECLARATION**  
California Environmental Quality Act

**PROJECT-** Front Street Redesign Project

**LOCATION/ADDRESS-** Front Street from A Street to L Street.

**APPLICATION NUMBERS-** 2012-020

**APN(s)** N/A

**GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION AND ZONING-** Public Facility

**DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT-** The project site consists of the entire length of Front Street from A Street to K Street in Crescent City, CA. The project consists of the reconstruction of Front Street. The street will be narrowed from a four lane to a two lane street and off street parking will be added along the south side of the street. Other project components include landscaping, public art, a roundabout at A Street and sidewalks and crosswalks.

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING –** The project area is surrounded by commercial development to the north, west and east and Beachfront Park to the South. The majority of the project site is paved.

**DECLARATION**

Based on the initial study dated August 22, 2012 staff has determined:

- X This project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered rare or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.
- X This project does not have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

- X This project does not have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of the individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of current projects and the effects of probable future projects.)
- X This project will not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

The aforementioned findings are contingent upon the following mitigation measures (if indicated) which have been incorporated into this project:

- See attached mitigation measures.      X None required

### **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

From August 25, 2012 through September 25, 2012, the public and all affected agencies are hereby invited to review the negative declaration and Initial Study and submit written comments. Such comments may be submitted prior to or during the Commission's hearing(s).

### **PUBLIC HEARING DATES**

Planning Commission Meeting  
5:30 pm- Thursday, October 11, 2011  
981 H Street (Board Chambers)  
Crescent City, CA 95531

### **DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY**

The Negative Declaration and Initial Study and other supporting environmental documents are available for public review at the City of Crescent City, Public Works department, located at 377 J Street, City Hall between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

### **NEGATIVE DECLARATION PREPARED BY**

City of Crescent City	Contact: Eric Taylor
377 J Street	Title: Associate Planner
Crescent City, CA 95531	Telephone: (707) 464-9506
	Fax: (707) 465-4405

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ August 22, 2012

# Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613  
 For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

**SCH #2012082082**

**Project Title:** Front Street Redesign

Lead Agency: City of Crescent City Contact Person: Eric Taylor  
 Mailing Address: 377 J Street Phone: 707-464-9506 ext 236  
 City: Crescent City Zip: 95531 County: Del Norte

**Project Location:** County: Del Norte City/Nearest Community: Crescent City  
 Cross Streets: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K Streets Zip Code: 95531  
 Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): 41 ° 750 ' 817 " N / -124 ° 196 ' 538 " W Total Acres: 8  
 Assessor's Parcel No.: N/A Section: 29 Twp.: T16N Range: R1W Base: Humboldt  
 Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 101 Waterways: Elk Creek, Crescent City Harbor  
 Airports: Del Norte County Railways: N/A Schools: Crescent Elk

**Document Type:**

CEQA:  NOP  Draft EIR NEPA:  NOI Other:  Joint Document  
 Early Cons  Supplement/Subsequent EIR  EA  Final Document  
 Neg Dec (Prior SCH No.)  Draft EIS  Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Mit Neg Dec Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Local Action Type:**

General Plan Update  Specific Plan  Rezone  Annexation  
 General Plan Amendment  Master Plan  Prezone  Redevelopment  
 General Plan Element  Planned Unit Development  Use Permit  Coastal Permit  
 Community Plan  Site Plan  Land Division (Subdivision, etc.)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Development Type:**

Residential: Units \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_  
 Office: Sq.ft. \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_ Employees \_\_\_\_\_  Transportation: Type Arterial Roadway  
 Commercial: Sq.ft. \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_ Employees \_\_\_\_\_  Mining: Mineral \_\_\_\_\_  
 Industrial: Sq.ft. \_\_\_\_\_ Acres \_\_\_\_\_ Employees \_\_\_\_\_  Power: Type \_\_\_\_\_ MW \_\_\_\_\_  
 Educational: \_\_\_\_\_  Waste Treatment: Type \_\_\_\_\_ MGD \_\_\_\_\_  
 Recreational: \_\_\_\_\_  Hazardous Waste: Type \_\_\_\_\_  
 Water Facilities: Type \_\_\_\_\_ MGD \_\_\_\_\_  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Issues Discussed in Document:**

Aesthetic/Visual  Fiscal  Recreation/Parks  Vegetation  
 Agricultural Land  Flood Plain/Flooding  Schools/Universities  Water Quality  
 Air Quality  Forest Land/Fire Hazard  Septic Systems  Water Supply/Groundwater  
 Archeological/Historical  Geologic/Seismic  Sewer Capacity  Wetland/Riparian  
 Biological Resources  Minerals  Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading  Growth Inducement  
 Coastal Zone  Noise  Solid Waste  Land Use  
 Drainage/Absorption  Population/Housing Balance  Toxic/Hazardous  Cumulative Effects  
 Economic/Jobs  Public Services/Facilities  Traffic/Circulation  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:**

Public facility

**Project Description:** *(please use a separate page if necessary)*

The project site consists of the entire length of Front Street from A Street to K Street in Crescent City, CA. The project consists of the reconstruction of Front Street. The street will be narrowed from a four lane to a two lane street and off street parking will be added along the south side of the street. Other project components include landscaping, public art, a roundabout at A Street and sidewalks and crosswalks.

Note: The State Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.

# Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with and "X".  
If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "S".

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Resources Board              | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Historic Preservation                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Boating & Waterways, Department of          | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Public School Construction                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Emergency Management Agency      | <input type="checkbox"/> Parks & Recreation, Department of                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Highway Patrol                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Pesticide Regulation, Department of                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans District # _____                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utilities Commission                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Division of Aeronautics            | <input type="checkbox"/> Regional WQCB # _____                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Planning                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Agency                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Central Valley Flood Protection Board       | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Recycling and Recovery, Department of     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy          | <input type="checkbox"/> S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm.           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission               | <input type="checkbox"/> San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns. Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Colorado River Board                        | <input type="checkbox"/> San Joaquin River Conservancy                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation, Department of                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Corrections, Department of                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Lands Commission                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Delta Protection Commission                 | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Clean Water Grants                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education, Department of                    | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Quality                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy Commission                           | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Rights                                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region # <u>1</u>    | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food & Agriculture, Department of           | <input type="checkbox"/> Toxic Substances Control, Department of             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources, Department of                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Services, Department of             | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Services, Department of              | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing & Community Development             |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native American Heritage Commission         |  |

**Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)**

Starting Date August 25, 2012 Ending Date September 25, 2012

**Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):**

Consulting Firm: _____	Applicant: _____
Address: _____	Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____	City/State/Zip: _____
Contact: _____	Phone: _____
Phone: _____	

Signature of Lead Agency Representative: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 8/22/12

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.



---

377 J STREET CRESCENT CITY, CALIFORNIA 95531-4025

---

Administration/Finance: 707-464-7483  
Utilities: 707-464-6517

Public Works/Planning: 707-464-9506  
FAX: 707-465-4405

### CEQA Initial Study / Negative Declaration

**Project Title:** Front Street Redesign

**Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Crescent City  
377 J Street  
Crescent City, CA 95531

**Project Location:** Front Street, Crescent City CA 95531

**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** N/A

**General Plan Designation:** N/A

**Zoning:** N/A

**Contact Person:** Eric Taylor, Associate Planner

**Phone Number:** 707-464-9506

**Date Prepared:** August 22, 2012

**Public Review Period:** August 25, 2012 to September 25, 2012



# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

**Project Description:** The project site consists of the entire length of Front Street from A Street to L Street in Crescent City, CA. The project consists of the reconstruction of Front Street. The street will be narrowed from a four lane to a two lane street and off street parking will be added along the south side of the street. Other project components include landscaping, public art, a roundabout at A Street and sidewalks and crosswalks.

**Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:** The City of Crescent City is located within Del Norte County. US Route 101 passes through the City. The City has developed with a grid street pattern and relatively traditional residential and commercial use types and construction. The project site is developed with Front Street and sidewalks curbs and gutters. South of the project site is open space in the form of Beachfront Park, north of the project area is developed with commercial buildings and public parking lots. West and east of the project site are developed with roads.

**The surrounding land uses include:**

- East: Highway 101 & Commercial buildings
- South: Beachfront Park
- North: Commercial buildings and public parking
- West: Mix of residential and commercial buildings

**Other public agencies whose approval/review is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

- Unified North Coast Air Quality Management District
- City of Crescent City Public Works Department
- California Coastal Commission
- California Department of Fish & Game

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

## Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist and corresponding discussion on the following pages.

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

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

## DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Planner's Signature:

Date: August 22, 2012

Planner's Printed Name: Eric Taylor

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project includes the installation of street lights along Front Street. Currently there are street lights on Front Street; the existing lights will be replaced with more efficient lighting that will be downward cast to prevent nighttime glare in the surrounding area. Therefore, it is anticipated that this project would not increase the amount of nighttime glare (a, b, c, d).

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><b>2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.</p> <p>In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

According to the Crescent City General Plan Policy Document the site is not zoned for agricultural uses and is not in an agricultural preserve, and is not designated as Prime Farmland. The project site is located in urban development in incorporated Crescent City. Given the above, impacts associated with this topic are considered to be less than significant and no further analysis or mitigation relative to this topic is required. (a, b, c, d, e)

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>3. AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District regulates air quality with respect to development projects within the City of Crescent City. NCUAQMD staff was consulted about the proposed project and they indicated that the area is in non attainment for PM10 which is particulate matter (dust, dirt, smoke). BMP's such as watering the project area to keep down dust will be implemented. The District is in attainment for all Federal standards. Therefore, the impacts are considered to be less than significant. (a, b, c, d, e)

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife-nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project will utilize an existing roadway which has been developed for several years. Vegetation in the project area consists of street trees and non native grass used a lawn area. The project site is not located within or adjacent to any wetland habitat or ESHA's. It is not anticipated that the project would impact biological resources in any way. (a, b, c, d, e, f)

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in ? 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to ? 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A records check of the subject property was conducted by North Coast Information Center staff on August 6, 2012 (Taylor 12-02). The records search indicated that there have not been any archaeological surveys conducted in the project site. However, the records check uncovered two previous surveys that were conducted in the vicinity which did not result in the identification of any archaeological or historic sites. The records search did mention that there were recorded historic resources in the vicinity but did not mention what those were.

Given that the project area consists of a paved roadway there is little expectation that any intact cultural or historic resources will be uncovered during construction. The project site contains no known paleontological resources or unique geologic sites. No human remains are likely to be encountered due to the fact that the property is made up of reclaimed tidal lands. In the event that archaeological remains or artifacts are uncovered during any construction or landscaping activities, work shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist shall survey the site. The archaeologist shall submit a report with recommendations on the disposition of the site. Disposition may include, but is not limited to, excavation and documentation, capping the site, or leaving the site in an open space area. The recommendations of the archaeologist shall be incorporated in the project.

Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code outlines procedures to be followed in the event that any human remains are found. (a, b, c, d)

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</b>				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The potential for fault surface rupture at the site is therefore remote. Based upon information associated with construction in this area, the risk of liquefaction at the site is considered to be low and mitigation is not required with respect to this item. Severe erosion typically occurs on moderate slopes of sand and steep slopes of clay subjected to concentrated water runoff. These topographic conditions do not exist at the site. Thus, the site is not susceptible to erosion. Site soils were evaluated by a qualified engineer in order to ensure compliance with building code requirements relative to satisfactory soil conditions for support of the proposed development. Roadways and parking areas shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the most current applicable Building Codes (a, b, c, d, e).

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project</b>				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) recommendations with respect to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) are broad in their scope and address a wide range of industries and GHG emission sources. The City has determined that the project does not, as proposed, conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Therefore, given the City's existing and proposed sustainability, energy use, and green building efforts, in conjunction with minimal additional emissions anticipated as a result of the project, there would be consistency with State and regional recommendations for addressing greenhouse gas emissions, therefore a less than significant impact is anticipated with respect to this item. (a, b)

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and as a result would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project will not require long-term storage, treatment, disposal, or transport of significant quantities of hazardous materials.

The proposed project will not be located on or near a hazardous materials site based on a review of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Calsites Database and Cortese List.

The site is not located in either the Clear Zone or the Approach Safety Zone of a public use airport. The project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, as roads in the area would remain open. Nothing in the public record would indicate a significant wildfire hazard exists on the site. (a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h)

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project would not violate nor be inconsistent with Federal, State or local water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, because the City is served by a municipal water supply and sewer disposal system. This project would not have a significant impact on ground water supplies or quality, as the project does not propose the use of a well. As the applicant must comply with all mandated regulations related to storm water discharge, there will be no significant impacts associated with storm water quality and quantity as a result of the proposed project.

According to the 2008 FEMA Flood Insurance Map of this area, the proposed project area is located in Zone VE. The project is located in an area that could be impacted by tsunami waters. The proposed project does not include the erection of any commercial or residential structures. Furthermore, the City does have a Tsunami evacuation plan to move people away from the inundation zone and the City will continue to

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

participate in Tsunami evacuation drills and education programs to inform people of the risk of Tsunami inundation near the coastline. (a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j)

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10.	<b>LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project includes reconstructing and upgrading of Front Street to make it a safer street for pedestrians and to meet the goals of the Visitor and Local Commercial land use designation by creating support for regional retail and visitor-serving uses. The Front Street project is specifically called out in Chapter 3 Transportation and Circulation of the Crescent City General Plan Policy Document.

As mentioned in Section 4 (Biological Resources), no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans apply to the project site. (a, b, c)

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>11. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not in an area containing any known mineral resources. Neither the City's General Plan EIR or General Plan Policy Document has designated the site as a mineral resource area. No mining or other mineral extraction activities occur on the site. The project would not have an impact on mineral resources. (a, b)

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12.	<b>NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

A temporary increase in noise levels in the project area is expected during the construction phase. In order to minimize the impact on the surrounding area construction will be limited to daytime hours. However, it is anticipated that traffic calming created by the project will decrease the permanent ambient noise levels. The proposed project is not located in an airport land use plan area. Therefore, impacts from noise are less than significant (a, b, c, d, e, f).

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project will reduce the size of the existing roadway by two lanes. The project will not expand the existing use in any way. Furthermore, no housing will be removed and relocation of residents is not necessary (a, b, c). This impact is considered to be less than significant.

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>14. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project includes the reconstruction of an existing roadway. The road will be reduced in size from a four lane to a two lane street. The surrounding area is already built out with commercial and residential structures and streets. Therefore the project as by itself or cumulatively will not create new development or an increase in population. The project will not have an impact on any public services (a,b,c,d).

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15.	<b>RECREATION</b>				
a)	Would the project 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

As noted in Section 14 (Public Services), the project will not generate an increase in housing or population beyond the typical 2% annual increase the City currently experiences (a, b). Therefore, there will not be a need to increase the size of or create new recreational facilities. Furthermore, the project will not negatively impact existing recreational facilities.

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:</b> Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is to convert the existing four lane road into a two lane road with off street parking along the south side of the street. The redesigned street will have a traffic calming effect, parking will be separated by a median for safety and crosswalks will be shorter with the reduction of lanes.

The redesign project for Front Street is listed in Section 3 Traffic and Circulation of the Crescent City General Plan Policy Document as a proposed transportation improvement. Front Street is also identified in table 2-3 of Section 3 as a Street containing class I & III bicycle routes which are included in the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with local and regional transportation plans. There will be no impact (a,b,c,d,e,f).

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b> Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project area is served by a recently upgraded Municipal Treatment Plant. The plant has the capacity to meet all of the community Waste Water needs for the next 20 years. The project site is already developed with a storm water system. The proposed project will not require the use of any water or wastewater facilities to service the street. It is anticipated that debris will be generated from the construction portion of the project. Debris will be limited in amount and all debris will be recycled or transported to the Del Norte Transfer station for proper disposal. Therefore, impacts are considered to be less than significant (a, b, c, d, e, f, g).

# DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>18.</b>	<b>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wild-life population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The impacts of the project are less than significant, and are not cumulatively considerable.

## REPORT PREPARATION AND REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

This section identifies those involved in the preparation of this document as well as the sources used.

### PREPARERS OF THE REPORT

#### Lead Agency:

City of Crescent City

Planning Department; Contact Eric Taylor

377 J Street

Crescent City, CA 95531

Phone: (707) 464-9506

### REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

1. City of Crescent City Municipal Code
2. City of Crescent City General Plan Policy Document
3. City of Crescent City General Plan EIR
4. Applicant's written statement and application submittal.
5. California Department of Toxic Substances Control. Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List. [www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese\\_List.cfm](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List.cfm).

