

**INITIAL STUDY AND PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

**For
Dinsmore, Garberville, and Rohnerville
Airport Master Plan Reports**

HUMBOLDT COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

August 24, 2007



Prepared by:

Humboldt County Public Works Department
1106 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501



PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Dinsmore, Garberville, and Rohnerville Airport Master Plan Reports

Humboldt County, California

August 24, 2007

Lead Agency

County of Humboldt
1106 Second Street
Eureka, CA 95501
(707) 445-7421

Contacts:

Jacquelyn Hulsey, Airport Manager
Hank Seemann, Environmental Services Manager

Project Description

The Aviation Division of the County of Humboldt Public Works Department manages six airports including airports located in Dinsmore (D63), Garberville (O16), and Rohnerville (FOT). The County is updating the airport master plans, which will be formally adopted by the County Board of Supervisors. Previous to the current updates, the most recent comprehensive master plan study for each airport was completed in 1993. Airport master plans are planning documents that analyze historical and forecasted airport activity, assess facility design, and present concepts for possible future facility enhancements and improvements. The projects described in the master plans focus on enhancement of existing facilities and relatively minor expansions of the airport footprints. The environmental aspects of these projects are generally expected to be minimal.

Project Location

The Dinsmore Airport is located approximately one-quarter mile east of the town of Dinsmore. The Garberville Airport is located two miles southwest of the town of Garberville. The Rohnerville Airport is located three-quarter miles south of the city of Fortuna.

Determination

The Public Works Department has prepared an Initial Study for this project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and expects to determine from this study that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1.0 BACKGROUND	1
2.0 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT	2
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING	3
4.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	4
5.0 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES	6
6.0 EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS AND APPROVALS	7
7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM	10
8.0 POTENTIAL IMPACTS (DISCUSSION OF CHECKLIST RESPONSES)	23
REFERENCES	26

ATTACHMENTS

- 1 Project Location Maps
- 2 Dinsmore Floodplain Map
- 3 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Species Reports
- 4 California Natural Diversity Database Reports
- 5 Conceptual Development Plans

1.0 BACKGROUND

The Aviation Division of the Public Works Department manages six airports including three general aviation airports located in Dinsmore, Garberville, and Rohnerville. Maps for these three airports are included in Attachment 1.

1.1 Facility Locations and Descriptions

Dinsmore Airport (D63)

The Dinsmore Airport is located approximately one-quarter mile east of the town of Dinsmore. The airport property occupies 23 acres and is equipped with one runway (9-27), and six tie-downs. Vehicle access to the airport is from State Route 36, which runs along the airport's northern boundary. Dinsmore Airport is shown on the Dinsmore 7.5-minute USGS quadrangle map (Section 3, Township 1 North, Range 5 East).

Garberville Airport (O16)

The Garberville Airport is located two miles southwest of the town of Garberville. The airport property occupies 51 acres and is equipped with one runway (18-36), 17 hanger units, 30 tie-downs, a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) remote transmitter-receiver building, and a county storage yard. Vehicle access to the airport is from Sprowel Creek Road via Highway 101. Garberville Airport is shown on the Garberville 7.5-minute USGS quadrangle map (Section 26, Township 4 South, Range 3 East).

Rohnerville Airport (FOT)

The Rohnerville Airport is located three-quarter miles south of the city of Fortuna. The airport property occupies 203 acres and is equipped with one runway (11-29), 20 hangar units, 20 tie-downs, pilot lounge, and a facility for the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) fire attack base. Vehicle access to the airport is from Airport Road via Drake Hill Road and Highway 101. Rohnerville Airport is shown on the Fortuna 7.5-minute USGS quadrangle map (Section 13, Township 2 North, Range 1 West).

1.2 Project Need

Airport master plans are planning documents that analyze historical and forecasted airport activity; assess facility design; and present concepts for possible future facility enhancements and improvements. Airport master plans provide the overall framework within which individual projects are planned, designed, and constructed over a timeframe of approximately 20 years. The most recent comprehensive master plan study for each airport was completed in 1993.

2.0 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

2.1 Summary of CEQA

Development projects within the state of California are subject to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The purpose of the CEQA legislation is to ensure that adverse environmental impacts associated with development projects are identified and mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. CEQA has procedural requirements intended to promote interagency coordination, encourage public participation, prevent avoidable significant impacts, and disclose actions by public agencies.

The first step under CEQA is for the public agency to determine if a proposed action is a “project” as defined in CEQA. If the proposed action is a project, the public agency determines whether the project is exempt from further review by statute or pursuant to a categorical exemption. For each non-exempt project, an Initial Study is prepared to identify the environmental impacts and determine whether the identified impacts are significant. Documentation of the Initial Study typically takes the form of a checklist which presents categories of possible environmental impacts. The agency assesses whether the project would create no impacts, less than significant impacts, impacts that are less than significant with mitigation measures, and potentially significant impacts for which mitigation is not feasible. Explanatory text is provided, as applicable, to support the assessment for each environmental category.

If there is no substantial evidence that a project may cause a significant effect on the environment, the Initial Study is followed by a Negative Declaration. A Negative Declaration is a formal notice by the lead agency (the public agency principally responsible for evaluation of the project) that the project will have no significant environmental impacts. If potential significant impacts are identified but can be reduced to a level of insignificance through project revisions or mitigation measures, a Mitigated Negative Declaration is issued.

If all significant environmental impacts cannot be feasibly mitigated to a level of insignificance, or if the project is controversial due to factual considerations, CEQA requires preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). EIRs contain more substantial documentation than Initial Studies, and formal alternatives to the proposed project must be evaluated.

2.2 Applicability for Airport Master Plans

Airport master plans provide the general framework for airport enhancements and provide the basis for the airport layout plans (ALPs). The selection of individual projects for implementation during the planning period (approximately 20 years) will depend on a variety of factors including FAA requirements, user demand, and funding availability. Although adoption of the airport master plans does not constitute approval of specific projects and does not have a legally binding effect on future discretionary decisions, the master plans influence future actions on specific projects which have the potential for

resulting in physical changes in the environment. Therefore, adoption of the master plans by the County Board of Supervisors is considered a “project” under CEQA subject to analysis for potentially significant environmental impacts.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 Dinsmore Airport

Water/Hydrology

The nearest surface waters to the airport are a small tributary creek (280 feet southeast) and the Van Duzen River (600 feet south). Runoff from the airport collects in two small drainages (which include swale- and ditch-like portions) and is conveyed from north to south toward the Van Duzen River. Each drainage flows through a culvert underneath the runway. A portion of the airport is located within the 100-year floodplain (Attachment 2).

Biology

The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service lists four species of plants, fish, birds, and mammals as threatened or endangered for the Dinsmore 7.5-minute USGS quadrangle (Attachment 3). The California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Database indicates a total of eight special status species for the Dinsmore quadrangle map (Attachment 4). Based on these species’ specific habitat needs, the airport is not likely to contain suitable habitat for any of the species.

Cultural Resources

A review of the cultural resources data bank maintained by the Natural Resources Division of the Humboldt County Public Works Department revealed no recorded archaeological resources at the Dinsmore Airport.

3.2 Garberville Airport

Water/Hydrology

The nearest surface waters to the airport are Connick Creek (340 feet north) and the South Fork of the Eel River (520 feet southeast). A drainage ditch is located parallel to and approximately 60 feet west of the runway. The drainage ditch flows north to Connick Creek, which flows into the South Fork of the Eel River. The ditch includes portions that are concrete-lined and portions that are vegetated.

Biology

The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service lists five species of plants, fish, birds, and mammals as threatened or endangered for the Garberville 7.5-minute USGS quadrangle (Attachment 3). The California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Database indicates a total of four special status species for the Garberville quadrangle map (Attachment 4). Based on these species’ specific habitat needs, the airport is not likely to contain suitable habitat for any of the species.

Cultural Resources

A review of the cultural resources data bank maintained by the Natural Resources Division of the Humboldt County Public Works Department revealed no recorded archaeological resources at the Garberville Airport.

3.3 Rohnerville Airport

Water/Hydrology

The nearest surface waters to the airport are an unnamed tributary (2,000 feet east) and the Van Duzen River (one mile south).

Biology

The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service lists seven species of plants, fish, birds, and mammals as threatened or endangered for the Fortuna 7.5-minute USGS quadrangle (Attachment 3). The California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Database indicates a total of twelve special status species for the Fortuna quadrangle map (Attachment 4). Based on these species' specific habitat needs, the airport is not likely to contain suitable habitat for any of the species.

Cultural Resources

A review of the cultural resources data bank maintained by the Natural Resources Division of the Humboldt County Public Works Department revealed no recorded archaeological resources at the Rohnerville Airport.

4.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following sections describe the specific improvement projects described in the airport master plans. Conceptual development plans which depict the locations of the proposed projects are included in Attachment 5.

4.1 Dinsmore Airport

Existing Aviation Facilities (2006-2011)

A runway rehabilitation and reconstruction project to improve the runway surface and include new marking was designed in 2007. The project is exempt under CEQA Section 15301(c) (existing facilities) and Section 15304(h) (minor alteration to land). Construction is proposed for 2008.

Other improvements include ramp rehabilitation and reconstruction with new tiedowns and anchors, storm drain improvements on the west side of the airport, enhance the existing windsock and segmented circle, and upgrading the existing fencing and gates.

Phase I (2012-2017)

Phase I development would be conducted on the southwest side of the airport and would include hangers, apron, tiedowns, access road, and two exit taxiways that would serve the

new apron. Supporting facilities would include an access road, vehicle parking, and installation of security fencing.

Summary: The projects described in the Dinsmore Airport Master Plan include enhancement of existing facilities and relatively minor expansion. The environmental aspects of these projects are generally expected to be minimal.

4.2 Garberville Airport

Phase I (2006-2012)

Phase I development includes replacement of the existing airport perimeter fencing. The proposed project will replace the existing fence with a six-foot high chain link fencing and controlled access gates.

Phase I improvements focus on the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the airport's core area, including reconfiguration and marking of the existing tiedown, apron and taxilane, site work for new hangers, and possible relocation of the fuel island. Runway rehabilitation and reconstruction will include new runup areas at each runway end. Another project consists of converting 3,190 feet of open storm drains within the Runway Safety Area (RSA) to covered (underground) drains.

Phase II (2013-2019)

Phase II development would be conducted on the northeast side of the airport and would include extension of the existing apron to the north and two new access taxiways to connect the apron to the main taxiway. A combination of tiedown parking positions and new aircraft storage units would be constructed. Space for a new fixed base operator (FBO) along with parking for 18-20 vehicles would also be provided.

Phase III (2020-2026)

Phase III development would be conducted on the west side of the airport and would include construction of new apron and hangers and a taxiway system connected to the runway. A new access road off Briceland road, automobile parking, and security fencing would also be installed.

Summary: The projects described in the Garberville Airport Master Plan include enhancement of existing facilities and relatively minor expansion. The environmental aspects of these projects are generally expected to be minimal.

4.3 Rohnerville Airport

Phase I (2006-2011)

Projects to reconstruct and rehabilitate the runway and taxiway surface and upgrade the runway and taxiway lighting were designed in 2007. These projects are exempt under CEQA Section 15301(c) (existing facilities) and Section 15304(h) (minor alteration to land). Construction is planned in 2007 (lighting) and 2009 (reconstruction/rehabilitation), respectively.

Other Phase I projects focus on improvements to the core building area and include extending the existing tiedown apron to the west to provide 14 additional tiedowns; construction of a single taxiway linked to the existing parallel taxiway and an exit taxiway; and expanding the transient apron near the existing fuel island, which would require the removal of five tiedowns and one portable hanger.

Phase II (2012-2017)

Phase II projects include the design and construction of two new aprons within the southeast portion of the airport. Access roads for the aprons and fencing and gates would be constructed. The north apron would be designed for private development including six hangers to accommodate larger aircraft (wingspans ranging from 40 to 60 feet). The south apron would include construction of T-hangers or tiedowns to accommodate smaller single-engine aircraft. A taxilane would be constructed to connect the new apron area to the existing taxilane.

Phase II projects include the construction of a 100-foot by 100-foot hanger, apron, two taxilanes, and extension of the existing partial taxiway within the southeast portion of the airport. The two new taxiways would connect the apron area to the end of the existing partial taxiway and future extended taxiway. The extended part of the new taxiway would connect to the existing full length parallel taxiway. An exit taxiway would be constructed which would cross the parallel taxiway and connect northeast of Runway 29.

Phase III (2018-2025)

Phase III projects include the construction of aircraft storage units and supporting facilities within the northeast portion of the airport. New corporate and T-hangers, two aprons, a new taxiway, and access roads would be constructed. Supporting facilities would include a wash rack, vehicle parking, and security fencing.

Summary: The projects described in the Rohnerville Airport Master Plan include enhancement of existing facilities and relatively minor expansion. The environmental aspects of these projects are generally expected to be minimal.

5.0 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

5.1 General

Airport projects are designed based on current FAA standards. Earthwork activities are often specified based on the current State of California Department of Transportation Standard Specifications. Standard construction practices for Public Works Department projects include the following:

- Erosion control measures should be applied throughout construction of the project. Project-specific requirements are detailed in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan or Water Pollution Control Program (see Section 5.2).

- Soil exposure should be minimized through the use of temporary best management practices (BMPs), ground cover, and stabilization measures. A curtain of filter fabric fence should be placed along the perimeter of work areas and stockpile areas to control surface runoff. Exposed dust-producing surfaces should be watered regularly. Special care should be taken while working near waterways or drainage ditches to prevent inappropriate discharges.
- Equipment should be monitored regularly for leaks. In the event of an identified leak, the leak should be contained and the equipment should be taken off site for repair. Spilled material should be managed appropriately.
- Upon completion of construction, all disturbed areas should be seeded and mulched.
- Debris and surplus material should be taken off site for appropriate disposal.
- Project work should comply with the terms and conditions of any applicable environmental permits.

5.2 Cultural Resources

If buried archaeological resources are encountered during ground disturbing activities, all work near the find will be temporarily halted and a qualified archaeologist will be consulted to determine the finds significance and appropriate treatment. If human remains are encountered during construction, the County coroner will be contacted immediately. If the Coroner determines that the remains are likely those of a Native American, he or she must contact the California Native American Heritage Commission. The Heritage Commission will consult with the most likely Indian descendents from the area to determine appropriate treatment of the remains.

6.0 EXPECTED ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS AND APPROVALS

6.1 CEQA and NEPA

This Initial Study will serve as the environmental compliance document under CEQA for the projects described within the master plans. The County and other state and local agencies will be able to reference this Initial Study when taking action on a related project.

FAA considers the potential environmental impacts of proposed FAA approvals and FAA-funded airport actions and airport layout plans in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1E (Policies and Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts). Actions taken by FAA in relation to the master plans may require compliance with the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). Many airport development projects are eligible for a categorical exemption under NEPA. FAA uses an Environmental Evaluation Form for Documented Categorical Exclusions to document a project's eligibility for the categorical exemption.

6.2 Endangered Species

Federal agencies are required under the Endangered Species Act to consider potential effects to federally listed threatened and endangered species when taking action on a project. Projects described in these master plans are expected to either have no effect or no adverse effect on listed species. Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service is not expected to be required.

6.3 Permits

Prior to implementation of the specific projects described in the master plans, the following permits and approvals may be required:

- Projects involving a discharge of fill or dredged material into a jurisdictional water of the U.S. require a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under the Clean Water Act.
- Projects that require a Section 404 permit also require a water quality certification from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board in accordance with Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. In addition, projects involving a discharge into water of the state or a discharge that could impact a water of the state are also subject to general waste discharge requirements from the Water Quality Control Board.
- Projects involving placement of fill in a waterway or disturbance of vegetation located within the 100-year floodplain may require a streambed alteration agreement from the California Department of Fish & Game.
- Projects involving clearing, grading, and other disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation whether the total disturbed soil area is more than one acre are required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and obtain coverage under a storm water permit. Projects that disturb less than one acre are required to develop a Water Pollution Control Program.

Neither Dinsmore, Garberville, nor Rohnerville airport is located within the coastal zone, and therefore coastal development permits will not be required.

During the design process for individual projects, each project will be evaluated to determine whether any environmental permits are required. Based on the existing conceptual design, the following permits are anticipated:

Dinsmore

A stormwater permit will be required if the disturbed soil area for any project exceeds one acre.

Projects conducted on the southwest corner of the airport could affect a drainage that discharges to the Van Duzen River. These projects would not likely require a permit

from the Corps of Engineers or Department of Fish & Game, but may require coverage under the Water Quality Control Board general waste discharge requirements.

Garberville

A stormwater permit will be required if the disturbed soil area for any project exceeds one acre.

The storm drain project involves the conversion of an open ditch to a buried pipe. The ditch includes portions that are concrete-lined and portions that are vegetated. Vegetated ditches can display wetland characteristics (hydrology, vegetation, soils) if regularly inundated, and although man-made and highly disturbed, may provide some biotic and hydrologic function, primarily as ephemeral aquatic habitat for invertebrates and amphibians and as a source of filtration for surface runoff. This project would not likely require a permit from the Corps of Engineers or Department of Fish & Game, but may require coverage under the Water Quality Control Board general waste discharge requirements. The drainage ditch habitat is not high quality, and mitigation for filling of the ditch, if required, can likely be performed on site.

Rohnerville

A stormwater permit will be required if the disturbed soil area for any project exceeds one acre.

7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: **Dinsmore (D63), Garberville (O16), and Rohnerville (FOT) Airport Master Plan Reports**

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
**Humboldt County Public Works Department
1106 Second St
Eureka CA 95501-0579**

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: **Hank Seemann, (707) 445-7741**

4. Project Location: **Humboldt County**

5. Project Sponsor's Name/Address: **Same**

6. General Plan Designation: **D63- AL20, O16- PF, FOT- PF**

7. Zoning: **D63- U, O16- AV, FOT- AV**

8. Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The proposed project consists of updating the Master Plans for the Dinsmore, Garberville, and Rohnerville Airports. The plans provide guidance for improvements at the airports for approximately 20 years.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting. Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

The airports are surrounded by rural residential, agricultural, and undeveloped land.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

Federal Aviation Administration

Note: **FOT-** Rohnerville
 D63- Dinsmore
 O16- Garberville

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below could be potentially affected by this project:

Aesthetics	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Public Services
Agricultural Resources	Hydrology and Water Quality	Recreation
Air Quality	Land Use and Planning	Transportation/Traffic
Biological Resources	Mineral Resources	Utilities and Service Systems
Cultural Resources	Noise	Mandatory Findings of
Geology and Soils	Population and Housing	Significance

DETERMINATION

On the basis on 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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A 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 significant effect(s) 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, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated.” An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but must analyze only the effect that remains to be addressed.

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 all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Hank Seemann

Signature

Hank Seemann

Printed Name

August 24, 2007

Date

For

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				FOT, D63, O16
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				FOT, D63, O16
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			D63, O16	FOT
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			FOT	D63, O16
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
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?				FOT, D63, O16
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				FOT, D63, O16
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				FOT, D63, O16
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				FOT, D63, O16

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			FOT, D63, O16	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				FOT, D63, O16
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				FOT, D63, O16
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				FOT, D63, O16
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				FOT, D63, O16
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				FOT, D63, O16
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?				FOT, D63, O16

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				FOT, D63, O16
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				FOT, D63, O16
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?				FOT, D63, O16
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?				FOT, D63, O16
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?				FOT, D63, O16
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?				FOT, D63, O16
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				FOT, D63, O16
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			FOT	D63, O16

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			FOT, D63, O16	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				FOT, D63, O16
iv) Landslides?				FOT, D63, O16
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				FOT, D63, O16
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?				FOT, D63, O16
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				FOT, D63, O16
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				FOT, DIN, O16
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?			FOT, D63, O16	
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?			FOT, D63, O16	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				FOT, D63, O16
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				FOT, D63, O16
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				FOT, D63, O16
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				FOT, D63, O16
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				FOT, D63, O16
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				FOT, D63, O16
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			FOT, DIN, O16	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				FOT, D63, O16

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				FOT, O16, D63
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			FOT, D63, O16	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			FOT, D63, O16	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				FOT, D63, O16
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				FOT, D63, O16
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			D63	FOT, O16
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?				FOT, D63, O16
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?				FOT, D63, O16
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				FOT, D63, O16

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				FOT, D63, O16
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				FOT, D63, O16
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				FOT, D63, O16
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?				FOT, D63, O16
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?				FOT, D63, O16
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				FOT, D63, O16
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			FOT, D63, O16	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			FOT, D63, O16	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			FOT, D63, O16	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				FOT, D63, O16
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				FOT, D63, O16
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				FOT, D63, O16
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				FOT, D63, O16
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
a) Fire protection?				FOT, D63, O16
b) Police protection?				FOT, D63, O16
c) Schools?				FOT, D63, O16

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Parks?				FOT, D63, O16
e) Other public facilities?				FOT, D63, O16
XIV. RECREATION.				
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?				FOT, D63, O16
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?				FOT, D63, O16
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				FOT, D63, O16
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				FOT, D63, O16
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				FOT, D63, O16
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				FOT, D63, O16
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				FOT, D63, O16

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				FOT, D63, O16
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				FOT, D63, O16
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				FOT, D63, O16
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				FOT, D63, O16
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			FOT, D63, O16,	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				FOT, D63, O16
e) 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 provider's existing commitments?				FOT, D63, O16
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				FOT, D63, O16
g) Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				FOT, D63, O16

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				FOT, D63, O16
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.			FOT, D63, O16	
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				FOT, D63, O16

8.0 POTENTIAL IMPACTS (DISCUSSION OF CHECKLIST RESPONSES)

As part of the environmental analysis conducted for this project, 17 environmental factors were initially considered for potential impacts as mandated by CEQA. The proposed project was determined to have no impacts associated with the following nine environmental factors:

- Agricultural Resources
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic

These factors are not discussed further. The eight factors with potential impacts are discussed below.

8.1 Aesthetics

(c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

D63, O16– Fencing along the perimeter of airports is typically six feet high and constructed of chain link fence with barbed wire at the top. The projects to upgrade fencing along the perimeter of the airports will have a minor change on the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings (Less than Significant Impact).

(d) New source of light or glare

FOT – The project to upgrade the existing runway and taxiway lighting system will not substantially increase the amount of light or glare coming from the site. Day or nighttime views will not be adversely affected by the project (Less than Significant Impact).

D63, O16– The Dinsmore and Garberville airport projects will not create new sources of light or glare, views in the area will not be adversely affected (No Impact).

8.2 Air Quality

(b) Air quality standards

FOT, D63, O16- Humboldt County is in attainment with Federal standards for particulate matter less than 10 microns in size (PM10), but not State standards. The project may

produce small amounts of dust and particulate matter during construction activities, but not at a level that will significantly contribute to PM10. Temporary local impacts due to dust and equipment exhausts will be managed using standard abatement practices as specified in the contract documents. Exposed surfaces will be sprayed (lightly) with water as needed to control the suspension of dust and particulate matter (Less Than Significant Impact).

8.3 Geology and Soils

(a.i) Rupture of a known fault as delineated on the Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map

FOT – The proposed project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault as delineated on the most recent Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Map. The airport is located 1.5 miles west of the nearest Alquist Priolo Special Study area (Less Than Significant Impact).

D63, O16– The Dinsmore and Garberville airports are not in study areas mapped on the Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Map. The master plan projects are not expected to expose people or structures to potential adverse effects involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault (No Impact).

(a.ii) Strong seismic ground shaking

FOT, D63, O16– The entire region is at risk of strong ground shaking. Existing building standards will ensure that potential impacts are less than significant (Less Than Significant Impact).

8.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

(a) Routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials

FOT, D63, O16- Fuel is routinely used at the airports; standard procedures for proper transport and handling methods are in place to avoid any significant hazards to the public or the environment from these activities (Less Than Significant Impact).

(b) Release of hazardous materials into the environment

FOT, D63, O16– Standard procedures for proper transport and handling methods are in place to avoid accidents involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment (Less Than Significant Impact).

8.5 Hydrology and Water Quality

(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

FOT, D63, O16– The Van Duzen River is on the State Water Resources Control Board 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies for sediment. The South Fork of the Eel River is listed as impaired for sediment and temperature. Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL's) were established in December 1999 for both rivers. Storm water runoff during construction will be managed using standard management practices to avoid contributing sediment and runoff from the airports to these rivers (Less Than Significant Impact).

(d) Alter existing drainage patterns or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff resulting in flooding.

FOT, D63, O16– Phase I improvements at the Garberville airport include converting open storm drainage ditches into covered, underground storm drains. Projects at each airport could result in increased surface area of impermeable surfaces and increase the amount of surface runoff. All projects will be designed to the appropriate standards in order to avoid substantially increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site (Less Than Significant Impact).

(e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff

FOT, D63, O16– Projects at each airport have the potential to increase the amount of impervious surfaces which could create an increase in runoff water. Storm water drainage systems will be designed to provide adequate capacity for runoff water and will not create or contribute water which would provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff (Less Than Significant Impact).

(h) Place structures within the 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows

D63 – The Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Hazard Map shows the edge of the 100-year flood boundary crossing a small portion of the southwest corner of the existing runway. The proposed project may place structures in the flood hazard area, however these structures will be designed as to not impede or redirect flood flows (Less Than Significant Impact).

FOT, O16– The proposed project is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area (No Impact).

8.6 Noise

(c) Permanent increase in ambient noise levels

FOT, D63, O16- Increased usage of the airports would have the potential for permanent increases in ambient noise levels due to increased air traffic. Increases in airport usage would be periodic and are not expected to be significant (Master Plan Reports, Chapter

2), therefore increases in ambient noise levels are not expected to be significant (Less Than Significant Impact).

(d) Temporary increase in ambient noise levels

FOT, D63, O16- The project will result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity during construction. Noise increases will be generated by heavy construction equipment traveling to and from, and working on the project site. Temporary increases in ambient noise levels will be managed using standard abatement practices as specified in the contract documents (Less Than Significant Impact).

(e) Expose people to excessive noise levels

FOT, D63, O16- Airport usage, types of aircraft, and number of flights per day are not expected to increase significantly (Master Plan Reports, Chapter 2) (Less Than Significant Impact).

8.7 Utilities and Service Systems

(c) Construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities

FOT, D63, O16– Construction of new facilities at the airports will require the expansion of existing storm water facilities. The projects will be designed in accordance with the applicable standards so that potential impacts to the environment are not significant (Less Than Significant Impact).

8.8 Mandatory findings of significance

(b) Cumulatively considerable impacts

The impacts associated with the proposed project are not considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. (Less Than Significant Impact).

REFERENCES

Mead & Hunt. July 2006. Dinsmore Airport Master Plan Report.

Mead & Hunt. July 2006. Garberville Airport Master Plan Report.

Mead & Hunt. July 2006. Rohnerville Airport Master Plan Report.