

Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

Minor Subdivision DN915LLC Commercial Development Minor Subdivision

1/31/2025





Prepared By
Del Norte County
Community Development Department
Planning Division
981 H Street, Suite 110
Crescent City, California 95531

www.co.del-norte.ca.us

This page intentionally left blank.

Contents

Project Information Summary	5
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	6
Determination	6
Environmental Checklist	7
1. Aesthetics	7
2. Agriculture and Forest Resources	8
3. Air Quality	8
4. Biological Resources	9
5. Cultural Resources	10
6. Energy	11
7. Geology and Soils	11
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	12
9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	13
10. Hydrology and Water Quality	14
11. Land Use and Planning	15
12. Mineral Resources	15
13. Noise	15
14. Population and Housing	16
15. Public Services	17
16. Recreation	17
17. Transportation	18
18. Tribal Cultural Resources	19
19. Utilities and Service Systems	19
20. Wildfire	20
21. Mandatory Findings of Significance	21
Mitigation Monitoring Plan	23

Exhibits and Appendices Follow

Project Information Summary

1. **Project Title:** Minor Subdivision DN915LLC Commercial Development
Minor Subdivision
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Del Norte County
Planning Commission
981 H Street, Suite 110
Crescent City, CA 95531
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Jessica Pollard
(707) 464-7254
Jpollard@co.del-norte.ca.us
4. **Project Location and APN:** 915 E. Washington Blvd, Crescent City, CA 95531
117-020-044
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Morton & Pitalo, Inc.
4302 Redwood Highway, Suite 200, San Rafael, CA 94903
6. **County Land Use:** General Commercial
7. **County Zoning:** C-3
8. **Description of Project:**

This project is a review of a minor subdivision of a 2-acre parcel into two parcels – one proposes to be .99 acres and the other proposes to be 1.01 acres. Both lots will then be developed with commercial (retail and restaurant) uses. The zoning, C-3 (central business), allows both proposed uses as primary permitted uses. The underlying general plan land use designation of General Commercial also allows both proposed uses.

There is no minimum parcel size in this zone district. Both public water and public sewer are available at the parcel and each proposed parcel meets the minimum lot width of 20'. Lot coverage in this zone district allows up to 100% of lot coverage however, because this parcel shares a property line with an R-1 (single family residential) zoned development (on the west side), following codified setbacks for siting commercial uses next to a residential zone district and requiring other mitigation to help ensure compatibility between the two land uses will be required.

The parcel is flat and mostly covered by grasses. No tree stands occur on the parcel and it was previously developed with a manufactured home sales and showroom business.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:**

As described, the parcel's west property line has both R-1 (single family residential) zoning and C-3 (central business) zoning. The residential development, which is south and west of the project parcel, is a senior living community. The C-3 zoned parcel is developed with a large building housing commercial and healthcare offices.

Immediately to the north sits more commercial/retail uses, Wal-Mart and Ace Hardware are across Washington Blvd. Sutter Coast Hospital is west of Ace Hardware. To the east and south of the project parcel is a large undeveloped parcel, also commercially zoned (C-3). Beyond that parcel to the east and south is Highway 101.

- 10. **Required Approvals:** Minor Subdivision– Del Norte County Planning Commission
- 11. **Other Approval (Public Agencies):** None. Divisions of the County Community Development Department will review for compliance with conditions of approval.
- 12. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?**

Native American tribes, traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area have been notified of the project application completion and the beginning of the AB 52 consultation period pursuant to PRC §21080.3.1. Notification of the beginning of the AB 52 consultation period was provided 4/3/2025. No requests for consultation pursuant to PRC §21080.3.1 were received.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" without mitigation as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. All mitigation measures are provided in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

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

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.

Jessica Pollard - Planner

5/8/25

Jessica Pollard

Date

Planner

Environmental Checklist

1. Aesthetics

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publically accessible vantage points). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a. N/A as there is no scenic vista at this location.
- b. N/A as there are no scenic resources at this location.
- c. N/A as this is an urbanized area that does not have scenic resources protections.

d. A less than significant impact is expected from an increase in light in the area from the proposed development. The project site sits across the county road from Wal-Mart which is a greater impact overall than the proposed commercial development at this site. The area is already lit with street lights as well.

2. Agriculture and Forest Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<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"/>

Discussion of Impacts

No forest land is impacted by this proposed project. No agricultural land use or activities occur in the project vicinity.

3. Air Quality

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a. The project site is located within the North Coast Air Basin. The North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD) has established rules and regulations that govern allowable thresholds for criteria and other pollutants in Del Norte County. A technical report completed by ESA for the project applicant and entitled “915 E Washington Boulevard Del Norte County, CA Air Quality Technical Report” has determined that this project will not conflict with the thresholds outlined by NCUAQMD.

b. Del Norte County is an “attainment” designated county and is not governed by “non-attainment” state or federal air quality standards. The air standards that Del Norte County falls under are outlined in NCUAQMD Rules and Regulations.

c-d. The ESA analysis assumed construction would occur for up to one year and that it would begin as early as the first quarter of 2025. ESA acknowledged that if construction started any later than first quarter 2025, construction emissions “would be lower than those estimated in this technical report due to the use of a more energy-efficient and cleaner burning construction vehicle fleet mix, pursuant to State regulations that require vehicle fleet operators to phase-in less polluting trucks. As a result, should project construction commence at a later date than analyzed in this technical report, air quality impacts would be lower than the impacts disclosed herein.”

According to ESA’s report, fugitive dust emissions that have the potential to impact sensitive receptors will be controlled using best practices during the different phases of construction (e.g. covering open bodied trucks removing demolished debris, using water or other soil stabilizing solutions to control construction traffic related dust, etc.) “Construction contractors are required to comply with the applicable provision of NCUAQMD Rule 104.” NCUAQMD Rule 104 regulates fugitive dust emissions.

ESA determined that the greatest potential for Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) emissions would occur from construction related heavy duty equipment that would generate diesel particulate matter (DPM). Using applicable modeling software and enlisting conservative/worst-case inputs, ESA determined that “construction–related daily emissions for criteria and precursor pollutants (VOC, NOx, CO, SOx, PM10, and PM2.5) would be below NCUAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, Impacts related to regional construction emissions would be less than significant.”

Future commercial operational emissions were also analyzed as part of ESA’s study using applicable modeling. “The net increase in operational-related daily emissions [...] for the criteria and precursor pollutants (VOC, NOx, CO, SOx, PM10, and PM2.5) would be substantially below the NCUAQMD thresholds of significance. Therefore, Project-related operational emissions would result in a less than significant impact.”

“The Project would consist of commercial uses and are not expected to result in other emissions or introduce substantial sources of odors and is not associated with any land uses or operations that are associated with odor complaints. The Project’s construction and operations would not result in other emission or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and impacts would be less than significant.”

4. Biological Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b) 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a. No impact to habitat or special status species is anticipated from this project. The area is developed all around by intensive land uses. The parcel was used previously as a commercial operation.
- b. There is no riparian habitat present on the parcel.
- c. There are no wetlands located on or within 100’ of this parcel.
- d. No impact to resident or migratory fish or wildlife is anticipated from this project.
- e. There is no local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources at this project site.
- f. No conflicts with conservation plans are anticipated due to this project.

5. Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

outside of dedicated cemeteries?				
----------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Discussion of Impacts

a-c. No cultural resources are known to exist on-site. The County records were searched for known cultural sites in the general project vicinity, and none were identified. The project is located on a previously heavily disturbed site. Notice was provided to the two tribes traditionally culturally affiliated with the project area and no comment was given with regard to cultural resources. Additionally, cultural staff from the Tolowa-Dee-ni’ Nation is a voting member of the County Environmental Review Committee which reviews projects and makes CEQA recommendations. While resources are not known to exist on-site, the possibility of an inadvertent discovery is always possible during construction or other implementation activities associated with the project. In this case, mitigation measures included as CULT-1 assigned to the project will ensure that any resources located on-site will be properly treated as to not cause a significant impact.

6. Energy

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a. Cost savings from using best practices regarding energy consumption during construction and operation are self-motivational. Although it is certain that some waste occurs in every commercial operation, the impacts from failing to use best practices 100% of the time are anticipated to be less than significant.

b. No conflict with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency is anticipated. The project applicant plans to contribute to regional renewable energy goals by incorporating electric vehicle charging stations into the design of the development.

7. Geology and Soils

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a-f. The site is not on a known earthquake fault. The parcel is flat and level and is surrounded by similar elevation parcels. Soils in the area are not known to be unstable, expansive or prone to liquefaction. No septic system is proposed at this location as public sewer is available and hookups to the system are required. No known unique paleontological or geologic features are at this site.

8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a. Although according to the EPA, “the use of gases for refrigeration and cooling in buildings” contribute to indirect greenhouse gas emission from the commercial and residential sectors, the project will have a less than significant impact on the generation of greenhouse gas emissions. The project is a small commercial subdivision where a total of less than 12,000 sq. ft. of commercial space will ultimately be developed.

b. The project will not impact an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 Section 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 or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) 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"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a. The impact is expected to be less than significant. Although restaurants and retail development have the potential to use hazardous materials, especially cleaning products, the use, transport, and storage of those substances is minimal.

b. Although there is some risk of accidental release of hazardous materials (especially cleaning products), the risk is deemed to be less than significant.

c. There are no schools (existing or proposed) within ¼ mile of the proposed project site.

d. The proposed project site is not on a list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

e. The Del Norte County Airport is more than 2 miles away from the project site.

f. This proposed project will not impair implementation or interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

g. The project is located within a local response area and census designated urban area and not at risk of exposing people or structures to loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

10. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional source of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable ground water management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a. Del Norte County’s Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance requires developments like this proposed minor subdivision and commercial development to comply with water efficiency standards. The applicant will be required to provide detailed landscape and erosion and runoff control plans prior to issuance of the development permit.

b. Del Norte County is in the Smith River Plain Groundwater Basin of the North Coast Hydrologic Region. This basin is considered “very low” priority because of the adequate rainfall and groundwater available. Even in “dry” years, Del Norte County does not struggle for water. The basin has no known groundwater management plans, groundwater ordinances, or basin adjudications. Impact to water supply from this project would be less than significant.

c i-iv. The area is already developed and has a subsurface drainage (storm water system). The parcel involved is only approximately one acre in size. The ground in the area is relatively flat and level. Prior to the issuance of the building permit, plans for low impact development standards for stormwater and runoff will be required. The area is not in a flood hazard area.

d. This project is not located within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone and not subject to inundation.

e. Del Norte County is in the Smith River Plain Groundwater Basin of the North Coast Hydrologic Region. This basin is considered “very low” priority because of the adequate rainfall and groundwater available. Even in “dry” years, Del

Norte County does not struggle for water. The basin has no known groundwater management plans, groundwater ordinances, or basin adjudications. Impact to water supply from this project would be less than significant.

11. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a. This project will not physical divide an established community.
- b. This project is not in conflict with any land use policy, plan or regulation.

12. Mineral Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<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"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a-b. No known mineral resources are located at the project site.

13. Noise

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

groundborne noise levels?				
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a. Construction noise will temporarily increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity. Sensitive receptor sites (residential development west/southwest) and Sutter Coast Hospital (west) of the parcel are more likely to be impacted by noise. According to the “Noise and Vibration Technical Report” conducted by ESA, the project impact during construction would be less than significant since construction would take place in accordance with Del Norte County’s allowable construction hours (between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday).

Off-site construction noise would also occur during the development phase. Off-site construction noise would consist of haul and delivery trucks. Because that traffic would not occur during outside of the allowable construction times in Del Norte County’s Code, and are estimated to only cause a “barely perceptible” increase above ambient noise levels, this activity would constitute a less than significant impact on noise levels. (“Noise and Vibration Technical Report” by ESA for 915 E Washington Boulevard, Del Norte County).

Permanent increases in ambient noise levels for the daily operation of the proposed development were also assessed by ESA in the technical report. Those increases (from fixed mechanical equipment like HVAC, automobile operations, loading, unloading and refuse collection, drive through order boards, off-site traffic increases, etc.) would not exceed allowable thresholds under Del Norte County’s local regulations according to the analysis. Del Norte County Community Development Staff will be requiring mitigations measures to ensure the sensitive receptors in the residential development that shares the project’s western boundary line will see as few noise impacts as practical. See Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2 at the end of this document.

- b. ESA’s analysis of groundborne vibration concluded that although construction activities can generate groundborne vibrations, the project’s proposed construction activities would generate groundborne vibration at a level that would be less than significant.

- c. The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or airport land use plan. The project would have no impact.

14. Population and Housing

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

Discussion of Impacts

- a. This project will not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area. This is not a residential project but a small scale commercial project.
- b. There is no development currently at the site. No displacement of existing people will occur.

15. Public Services

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

Discussion of Impacts

- a. The project is located inside the urban services boundary with adequate fire and police services. The project has been designed with appropriate fire and EMS access in mind. There are no schools near the project site that would be physically impacted. There are no parks within proximity to the site that would be physically impacted.

16. Recreation

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a. There are no neighborhood parks in this area.
- b. There are no recreational facilities planned or required as a part of this project.

17. Transportation

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision(b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a. According to the “Traffic Impact Study” (TIS), conducted by TJKM, the project would not result in any conflicts with applicable programs, plans, or policies addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Circulation on the project site is via internal streets that are generally 36 feet wide, with 30-foot corner radii. Pedestrian access and circulation are provided via new sidewalks on all internal streets and connecting to major roadways. The TIS concluded that the circulation system is adequate.
- b. TJKM conducted a VMT analysis for the proposed project. They followed the Del Norte Region SB743 Implementation plan, published in June 2020 for VMT guidance. The project falls under local-serving retail since the project is less than 50,000 square feet in size, and presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact
- c. TJKM evaluated traffic conditions at three study intersection during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours. The study intersection and their corresponding traffic controls are:
1. East Washington Boulevard and Summer Lane (Signal)
 2. East Washington Boulevard and Hwy 101 Southbound On/Off Ramps (One-Way Stop)
 3. East Washington Boulevard and Parkway Drive (Two-Way Stop)
- TJKM determined that all study intersections operate at acceptable levels of service during the a.m. and the p.m. peak hours.
- d. The project will have a less than significant impact on emergency access as the project site is located off E. Washington Boulevard, an, “arterial road”

18. Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a. No tribal cultural resources are known to exist on-site. The County records were searched for known cultural sites in the general project vicinity, and none were identified. The project is located on a previously heavily disturbed site. Notice was provided to the two tribes traditionally culturally affiliated with the project area and no comment was given with regard to cultural resources. Additionally, cultural staff from the Tolowa-Dee-ni’ Nation is a voting member of the County Environmental Review Committee which reviews projects and makes CEQA recommendations. While resources are not known to exist on-site, the possibility of an inadvertent discovery is always possible during construction or other implementation activities associated with the project. In this case, mitigation measures included as TRIB-1 assigned to the project will ensure that any resources located on-site will be properly treated as to not cause a significant impact.

19. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

a. Public water and sewer is available at Washington Blvd, which this parcel fronts on.

b. Del Norte County is in the Smith River Plain Groundwater Basin of the North Coast Hydrologic Region. This basin is considered “very low” priority because of the adequate rainfall and groundwater available. Even in “dry” years, Del Norte County does not struggle for water. The basin has no known groundwater management plans, groundwater ordinances, or basin adjudications. Impact to water supply from this project would be less than significant.

c. The City of Crescent City provides wastewater treatment for properties on the public sewer system in Del Norte County. The applicant has provided “will-serve” documentation to confirm capacity to serve this proposed project.

d. The project does not propose to generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.

e. The project will comply with federal, state and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Del Norte County Environmental Health Staff have reviewed the application material and are familiar with regulation regarding solid waste regulations for the type of development proposed.

20. Wildfire

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion of Impacts

- a. The project will have a less than significant impact on any emergency response or evacuation plans. Ingress and egress to the 101 highway/freeway northbound on-ramp is within 750’ of the proposed entrance to the parcel. Highway 101 northbound is an approved evacuation route for Tsunami evacuation in the Del Norte County Hazard Mitigation Plan.
- b. There are no slopes on the parcel or other factors that would exacerbate wildfire risk.
- c. No associated infrastructure that may exacerbate wildfire risk is planned at this parcel.
- d. The parcel is flat and level. Runoff would be easily controlled and directed in the event of a fire at the site.
- e. Best management practices for drainage and runoff would assist with limiting the impact of runoff that would expose people or structures to risks of downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, post-fire slope instability or drainage changes.

21. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project 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 a rare or endangered plant or animal 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which 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"/>

a-c. The 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 species to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Additionally, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable and does not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings directly nor indirectly.

Initial Study and Draft [Mitigated] Negative Declaration – Project Title and Type of Permit – Permit # – Date

Mitigation Monitoring Plan

Aesthetics

Mitigation Measure AES-1

A condition shall be placed on the development permit restricting on-site lighting be designed to minimize light pollution including specific requirements that all lighting on the project site be fully shielded and pointed downward. Lighting shall be LED with color temperatures less than 3,000 Kelvins.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to final inspection on the Building Permit

Enforcement: County Community Development Department

Monitoring: Building Permit inspection

Noise

Mitigation Measure NOI-1

A condition shall be placed on the subdivision entitlement and consequent building permit requiring drive through menu order boards to face perpendicular to the west property line so as to direct speaker noise away along the property line.

Mitigation Measure NOI_2

A condition shall be placed on the subdivision entitlement and consequent building permit requiring a noise buffering wall to be placed at the west property line to further attenuate noise due to drive through traffic and other noise producing operational activities at the project site.