

Initial Study and Draft Negative Declaration

Wetherell Minor Subdivision of Agricultural Prime Land MS2601C

June 15, 2026



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 4

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected 6

Determination..... 6

Environmental Checklist 7

1. Aesthetics..... 7

2. Agriculture and Forest Resources 7

3. Air Quality 8

4. Biological Resources..... 8

5. Cultural Resources 9

6. Energy 10

7. Geology and Soils 11

8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions 12

9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials 12

10. Hydrology and Water Quality 13

11. Land Use and Planning..... 14

12. Mineral Resources 14

13. Noise 14

14. Population and Housing..... 15

15. Public Services..... 15

16. Recreation 16

17. Transportation 16

18. Tribal Cultural Resources 17

19. Utilities and Service Systems 18

20. Wildfire..... 18

21. Mandatory Findings of Significance 19

Mitigation Monitoring Plan..... 20

Exhibits and Appendices Follow

Project Information Summary

- 1. Project Title:** Wetherell Minor Subdivision of Agricultural Prime Land
MS2601C
- 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:** Karina Timmer
(707) 464-7254
k.timmer@co.del-norte.ca.us
- 4. Project Location and APN:** 8280 and 8300 Bailey Rd.
Crescent City, CA 95531
APNs 105-020-002 and 105-020-003
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Richard Wetherell
8300 Bailey Road
Crescent City, CA 95531
- 6. County Land Use:** Agricultural Prime, Resource Conservation Area
- 7. County Zoning:** Agriculture Exclusive (AE), Resource Conservation Area Farmed Wetland (RCA-2-FW), Resource Conservation Area Riparian (RCA-2-R), General Resource Conservation Area (RCA-1)
- 8. Description of Project:**

The proposed project consists of a subdivision of an approximately 184.1-acre parcel located within the Agricultural Exclusive (AE) and Resource Conservation Area (RCA) zoning districts into two separate parcels. The project site is located at 8280 and 8300 Bailey Road in Del Norte County, California.

The proposed subdivision would create the following parcels:

- **Parcel 1:** Approximately 56.9 acres (40.0 acres AE, 16.9 acres RCA)
- **Parcel 2:** Approximately 127.2 acres (99.5 acres AE, 27.7 acres RCA)

The purpose of the subdivision is to separate the existing farmhouse from the existing dairy barn, while maintaining the long-term agricultural viability of both resultant parcels. Both parcels would contain at least 40 acres of Agricultural Exclusive land, consistent with the minimum parcel size required by the zone district. The remaining acreage consists of Resource Conservation Area zoning districts, including General Resource Conservation Area and Designated Resource Conservation Area (Farmed Wetland and Riparian). The subdivision would allow one parcel to be sold while retaining the farmhouse parcel under family ownership.

The property is currently developed with the single-family residence (farmhouse), two manufactured homes used for farmworker housing, a detached garage, a dairy barn, and a 100-foot diameter manure tank. Following subdivision, the residential structures and detached garage would be located on Parcel 1, while the dairy barn and manure tank would be located on Parcel 2.

The residential structures and dairy barn are currently served by separate onsite wastewater treatment systems (four systems total). Each system would remain located on the parcel it serves following subdivision. One existing water well currently serves the residences and dairy barn. Following subdivision, no well would be located on Parcel 1, which contains the residential structures. Therefore, a shared well agreement is proposed to continue providing water service to both parcels. Three additional agricultural wells are located on the property and would remain on Parcel 2 following subdivision.

Access to both parcels would be via Bailey Road, an existing county-maintained road that terminates approximately 191 feet southeast of the subject property. A 30-foot-wide easement recorded in the property grant deed extends from the parcel entrance southeasterly approximately 200 feet to the northern boundary of the county road.

Under the current zoning ordinance, the existing parcel could potentially be subdivided into a maximum of four parcels. County private rural road standards are based on potential subdivision capacity rather than number of parcels currently proposed, and require a minimum 50-foot-wide road right-of-way. The applicant has stated that the location of resource areas, existing structures, and leach fields makes compliance with the 50-foot standard infeasible. Accordingly, the applicant has requested a modified road improvement standard allowing a 30-foot-wide right-of-way from the southern portion of the existing parcel northward. No modification request has been submitted for the existing 30-foot easement located south of the parcel, as the applicant has received an offer to widen that to 50 feet.

Existing land uses and agricultural operations on the property would continue following approval. Any future development on either resultant parcel would require separate review and approval.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:

The parcel is bounded on the north, south, and west by prime agricultural land. These parcels are mostly flat and grassy, and are used for cow grazing and other similar agricultural purposes. The eastern parcel boundary is defined by the Smith River, and a levee system along the river.

10. Required Approvals: Minor Subdivision and Modified Road Improvement Standard – Del Norte County Planning Commission

11. Other Approval (Public Agencies): Modified Road Improvement Standard – Del Norte County Board of Supervisors

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 DATE HERE. No requests for consultation pursuant to PRC §21080.3.1 were not 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.

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

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Date

Position Title

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

- a. This project would have no foreseeable impact on scenic vistas.
- b. This project would have no foreseeable impact on scenic resources.
- c. The project would not degrade the existing visual character or public views of the site and its surroundings.
- d. The project does not propose any development which would create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect views.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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))?	☐	☐	☐	☒

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

- This project does not propose converting farm land to non-agricultural use.
- This project complies with the existing zoning for agricultural use. Each proposed parcel will maintain at least 40 acres of land zoned Agricultural Exclusive, which is the minimum required for the zone district.
- No forest land or timberland is located on this parcel.
- No forest land or timberland is located on this parcel.
- This project proposes the division of a single 184-acre agricultural parcel into two parcels, which will continue to meet the minimum lot size for the zone district. No other development is proposed as part of this subdivision.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

- This project would have no foreseeable impacts on the implementation of an air quality plan.
- 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 the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD) Rules and Regulations.
- This project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations.
- This project would have no foreseeable impacts in increasing any emissions.

4. Biological Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

		with Mitigation Incorporated		
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a.-f. The project subdivides a large agricultural parcel and does not proposed any additional development, nor does it set the proposed parcels up for future development. On non-resource lands, a typical subdivision would demonstrate the current or future potential for development of the parcels by establishing the feasibility of water and sewage disposal, grading and drainage, and other issues. On resource lands, although residential development could occur in the future, the historic and current use has been, and is, agricultural. Although limited residential development could occur in the future, the primary intent of agricultural exclusive zoning is the protection of agricultural land against encroachment by other uses. Since there is no proposed development in this application, no biological resources would be impacted. Relevant biological resources would be assessed for at the time a development application is submitted.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred 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 developed 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.

Mitigation Measure CULT-1

An inadvertent discovery condition shall be added to the Coastal Development Permit stating that in the event of archeological or cultural resources are encountered during construction, work shall be temporarily halted and a qualified archaeologist, local tribes, and the County shall be immediately contacted. Workers shall avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist, in collaboration with the local tribes has evaluated the situation and provided appropriate recommendations. Project personnel shall not collect any resources.

Timing/Implementation: Ongoing

Enforcement: County Community Development Department

Monitoring: N/A

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a. The project would have no foreseeable impacts on increasing wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy use since no development is proposed as part of this application.

b. This project does not conflict with nor obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

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.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a. The project would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects involving earthquakes, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction, or landslides. The project does not propose any development that would increase the risk of loss, injury, or death on the property.

b. Since no development is proposed, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

c. The project is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable and one that would be negatively impacted by this subdivision.

d. The project area is not located on expansive soil as defined in the 1994 Uniform Building Code.

e. The property consists of resource lands that do not necessitate the need to analyze soils for wastewater disposal systems. There are currently XXX sewage disposal systems on the parcel, each serving an individual building. No development is proposed that would utilize additional wastewater disposal. If development is proposed in the future necessitating additional wastewater disposal, soils will be analyzed at that time.

f. The project area is not known to contain a unique paleontological resource or geologic feature.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a. The project would not create significant impacts to the environment from greenhouse gas emissions. No greenhouse gas emissions would be created as a result of this subdivision.

b. The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

- a. The project would not cause a hazard to the public through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- b. The project would not cause a hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. The project would not create hazardous emissions or require the handling of hazardous waste.
- d. This project is not located on a site which is included on any list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. This project is not located near any airport or within an area covered by an airport land use plan.
- f. This project would not impair implementation of an emergency response plan.
- g. This project does not propose the development of residential parcels which would expose people and structures to significant loss as a result of potential for wildfire. The subdivision must comply with county regulations with regard to road standards and ingress/egress. In the future, if additional development is proposed, that would also be required to comply with these standards.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☐	☒
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	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable ground water management plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a-e. This project would have no impact on hydrology or water quality. Although the parcel is located in a FEMA special flood hazard area (zones AO and AE), the subdivision does not approve any development on these resource lands, and extensive analysis would be required in the future if proposals to further develop the properties were submitted. These parcels are expected to continue to be used as agricultural and parcels. No further development is currently proposed.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a. This project would have no impact with regard to dividing any communities.

b. This project would not cause any impacts related to a conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a-b. No mineral resources are known to exist onsite.

13. Noise

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

		Incorporated		
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a-c. This project would have no impacts on noise generation or on areas that are sensitive to noise generation. The property is located on resource lands designated primarily for agricultural use located well away from population centers. There is not an airport within 2 miles of the project site.

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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a-b. The project would not create the possibility of substantial population growth in the area. This project is located on resource lands and would not allow for the development of residences without further analysis.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

- a. The project would not result in substantial adverse impacts associated with the need for new or altered governmental facilities and/or public services. The site is located on designated agricultural land and development on a scale that would substantially increase the need of public services would generally not be allowed. Responsible agencies would have regulatory authority over conversion of agricultural lands to other uses. The project does not approve any development necessitating the need for increased public services.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

- a-b. The project does not impact existing recreational areas nor does it increase the need for additional recreational facilities. The subdivision creates one new parcel in on agricultural resource land.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision(b)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses	☐	☐	☐	☒

(e.g., farm equipment)?				
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a. Access to both proposed parcels would be via Bailey Road, an existing county-maintained road that terminates approximately 191 feet southeast of the subject property. A 30-foot-wide easement recorded in the property grant deed extends from the parcel entrance southeasterly approximately 200 feet to the northern boundary of the county road. Under the current zoning ordinance, the existing parcel could potentially be subdivided into a maximum of four parcels. County private rural road standards are based on potential subdivision capacity rather than number of parcels currently proposed, and require a minimum 50-foot-wide road right-of-way. The applicant has stated that the location of resource areas, existing structures, and leach fields makes compliance with the 50-foot standard infeasible. Accordingly, the applicant has requested a modified road improvement standard allowing a 30-foot-wide right-of-way from the southern portion of the existing parcel northward. The modified road improvement standard required approval from the Del Norte County Board of Supervisors. No modification request has been submitted for the existing 30-foot easement located south of the parcel, as the applicant has received an offer to widen that to 50 feet.

b-d. This project would not affect transportation facilities and does not increase any hazards. There are no sharp curves, incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access proposed as part of the project.

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	☐	☐	☐	☒
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.	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

- a. The project would have no foreseeable impacts on tribal cultural resources. A member of the Environmental Review Committee is a Native American representative and has not issued notice of any concern of resources on site. Further, an AB 52 tribal consultation has been sent to local tribes associated with the project area and no requests for consultations have been received by the lead agency.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) 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) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion of Impacts

a-e. The project would not have any impact on utilities and service systems. The project would not require the connection to public utilities. Existing development relies upon onsite wastewater treatment systems. There is one existing well that serves all current residential uses on the parcel. This well will continue to be the primary source of domestic water supply after the subdivision. To facilitate this,

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?				
--	--	--	--	--

Discussion of Impacts

a-d. The project site is located in a Local Responsibility Area for fire management. No uses are proposed which would place people or property at risk to the impacts of wildfire. The property is used for primarily agricultural purposes and a minor subdivision would not increase the risks of wildfire.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a. The project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment.

b. The project is a resource subdivision and no further development is proposed. The project does not have impacts that would be cumulatively considerable.

c. The project does not have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

Mitigation Monitoring Plan

Aesthetics

Mitigation Measure AES-1

A condition shall be placed on the coastal 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