HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
REGULAR MEETING

AGENDA

DATE: **Tuesday, September 8, 2026**

TIME: **5:00 p.m.**

LOCATION: **5055 Walnut Drive, Eureka, CA**

The HCSD Boardroom is open to the public during the meeting's open session. This meeting is also held by video/teleconference, per CA Govt Code § 54953(b). If a member of the public cannot attend in person and would like to speak on an agenda item, including Public Participation, please join via Zoom (zoom.us) by entering Meeting ID 843 3214 5989 and Passcode 015177. Access may also be via telephone by dialing 1-669-900-9128.

A. ROLL CALL

Directors: Benzonelli, Gardiner, Hansen, Matteoli, Ryan

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of September 8, 2026, Meeting Agenda — *Pgs. 1-2*
2. Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 11, 2026 — *Pgs. 3-5*

D. REPORTS

1. General Manager

   a) District Update — *Pgs.7-8*

2. Finance Department

   a) July 2026 Budget Report — *Pgs. 9-18*
   b) August 2026 Check Register — *Pgs. 19-23*
   c) FY 2026 Q4 Investment Report — *Pgs. 25*

3. Legal Counsel

4. Director Reports

E. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The public may comment on items not on the agenda. Please use the information above to participate via Zoom. The Board requests that speakers state their name and where they are from and limit their communications to 3 to 5 minutes. After all oral communications, the Board or staff may briefly respond to comments with information; however, the Brown Act prohibits discussion of matters not on the published agenda. Matters requiring discussion or action will be placed on the agenda of a future meeting.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Conduct a Public Hearing and Consider Adoption of Resolution 2026-09: Adopting the Initial Study & Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Hoover Street Lift Station Flood Protection Project *Pgs. 27-98*
2. Consideration of Appointing an Ad Hoc Committee to Conduct the 2026 General Manager Annual Review *Pgs. 99*

G. ADJOURNMENT

Next Res: 2026-10
Next Ord: 2026-01

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Robert Christensen at (707) 443-4558, ext. 210, or by email at asm@humboldtcsd.org. Notification 48 hours before the meeting will enable the District to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility for this meeting (28 CFR 35.102–35.104, ADA Title II).

Pursuant to CA Govt §54957.5(a), any public record writings relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the Board of Directors, not otherwise exempt from public disclosure, are available for public inspection upon request at the District offices located at 5055 Walnut Drive, Monday through Friday during regular business hours.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

The Humboldt Community Services District Board of Directors met in regular session at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 11, 2026, at 5055 Walnut Drive, Eureka, California, and on Zoom.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Hansen called the meeting to order at 5:01 pm. Present upon roll call: Directors Benzonelli, Hansen, Gardiner, Matteoli, and Ryan. Staff in attendance: General Manager Williams (GM) and Finance Manager Montag (FM), and Administrative Services Manager/Board Secretary Christensen (ASM)

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President Hansen invited those present to join in the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of August 11, 2026, Meeting Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting July 28, 2026

IT WAS MOVED BY DIRECTOR MATTEOLI, SECONDED BY DIRECTOR BENZONELLI, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 11, 2026, CONSENT CALENDAR. MOTION CARRIED UPON THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: BENZONELLI, GARDINER, HANSEN, MATTEOLI, RYAN
NOES: NONE

D. REPORTS

1. General Manager

   a) District Update

   GM reported on progress for the Shady Lane Steel Main Replacement (SMR), which will include installing a new fire hydrant. The Automated Meter Replacement (AMR) program has installed 1,225 meters since May, enabling the District to meet the 40% penetration goal. The GM attended a town hall hosted by Senator Mike McGuire on the potential for a Super El Niño this winter. Three candidates have filed for the two open board seats that will appear on the general election ballot in November. The August 25 meeting is canceled, and the Board's next meeting will be September 8, 2026.

   Director Gardiner acknowledged the work of the AMR team and the Construction Crew on the Shady Lane SMR project. Director Gardiner also noted that he observed the temporary dam at the Hoover Sewer Lift Station. Director Ryan

referenced an article in the Times-Standard by Dr. Lori Dengler about the upcoming El Niño season.

2. Finance Manager

   a) July 2026 Check Register

   FM reviewed the Check Register and highlighted payments of note, including: A purchase of 300 additional automated meters; a payment to GHD for the Hoover Sewer Lift Station flood protection project; and a payment to Corning Ford for the purchase of a 2026 Ford F-350 to replace the District's Unit #2, a 2012 Diesel Ford F-350.

3. Legal Counsel

   No report.

4. Director Reports

   No report.

E. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No public comment.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Consideration of Authorization for the General Manager to Execute a Contract with Bartle Wells and Associates for a Water/Wastewater Rate Study

   GM summarized the joint solicitation for a rate study consultant that occurred with the City of Eureka. Five proposals were received from qualified firms. Bartle Wells Associates scored the highest overall and ranked first among HCSD staff. Bartle Wells' proposal was $4,000 less than the second-ranked firm. The cost for the District's rate study will be $109,600. The study will commence in July 2027 and will be budgeted for in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2028 budget.

   Director Gardiner provided a handout with items for the District to consider requesting of the Consultants. Director Gardiner requested the record reflect the following:

   - Review of the 2023 Rate Study
   - Review of Capital Improvement Program completion
   - How grants affect ratepayer costs
   - Reserve comparisons
   - Options for financing capital improvements
   - A triage of future capital projects

- Board review of assumptions that are used in the rate-setting process
- Alternative options to the recommended rate proposals
- Provide rate increase amounts in a dollar amount and percentage amount
- Review how connection and capacity charges are set.
- A review of how wholesale water and wastewater costs are passed on to ratepayers
- A breakdown of how assumptions are determined for costs determined by outside agencies.
- A review of existing debt and the costs associated with debt incurred from future capital projects.
- Provide an understandable financial model for Board Members
- Provide proposed rate increases to the public with an understandable explanation
- Provide the Board time to review the final recommendations.

Director Ryan noted that many of the requests were included in the proposal. Director Ryan also noted that the District's water supply is significant and that the District should consider how potential future demands for water by AI data centers could adversely affect it. Director Ryan noted that the District should work with other local agencies to prioritize water supply for residents, agriculture, and traditional native uses. Director Ryan also requested that low-income ratepayers be included in the evaluation of customer equity.

There was no public comment.

IT WAS MOVED BY DIRECTOR GARDINER, SECONDED BY DIRECTOR MATTEOLI, TO AUTHORIZE THE GENERAL MANAGER TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH BARTLE WELLS AND ASSOCIATES FOR A WATER/ WASTEWATER RATE STUDY. MOTION CARRIED UPON THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: BENZONELLI, GARDINER, HANSEN, MATTEOLI, RYAN
NOES: NONE

G. ADJOURNMENT

Without further business, **IT WAS MOVED BY DIRECTOR BENZONELLI, SECONDED BY DIRECTOR RYAN,** TO ADJOURN. MOTION CARRIED UPON THE FOLLOWING ROLL CALL VOTE.

AYES: BENZONELLI, GARDINER, HANSEN, RYAN MATTEOLI
NOES: NONE

THE BOARD ADJOURNED ITS REGULAR MEETING OF August 11, 2026, AT 5:28 P.M.

_____
Submitted, Board Secretary

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Humboldt Community Services District

Dedicated to providing high quality, cost effective water and sewer service for our customers

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Terrence Williams, General Manager

DATE: September 4, 2026

SUBJECT: General Manager Report for September 8, 2026 Board Meeting

---

CSDA Humboldt Chapter

As you know, HCSD is a member of the California Special District Association (CSDA), and I am a founding member of the Humboldt Chapter of CSDA. I have participated with the local chapter since my days with Redway CSD, and have continued my involvement despite HCSD not being a CSDA member. Once HCSD joined CSDA last year, the other local chapter participants appointed me Chapter President.

This year, the CSDA Humboldt Chapter had several notable highlights. We hosted the Humboldt County Planning Director who presented on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment. We advanced solutions regarding trespass enforcement that some agencies are experiencing on their public lands. We decided to establish a Humboldt Area Chapter website. A letter was drafted to the County regarding the cost of County road projects to local water utilities. Also, we held the first annual Humboldt Area Chapter Barbeque.

Figure 1: Picture shows utility workers, managers, and elected officials from Humboldt area special districts (and a few cities) enjoying a barbecue at the Hubmoldt Bay Municipal Water District's Park 1 gazebo.

The barbecue was a huge success. Two HCSD employees, Mike Briggs and Chris Armstrong, held a friendly cook-off. Forty-five people RSVP'd, and over sixty showed up from special districts (and some cities) across Humboldt County. After all the votes were tallied, the two chefs tied perfectly with 37 votes each (some people must have voted more than once). I think the real winners were all of us who got to enjoy a delicious meal, and the special districts of the Humboldt area who had an opportunity to build networks and support one another.

Utility Worker Solicitation

Following the solicitation for a utility worker to fill a vacancy in the Maintenance Department, 30 people applied and 7 were interviewed. An offer. has been accepted, and I look forward to introducing the employee to you after the pre-employment process is completed and the employee has been onboarded.

Utility Services Planner Solicitation

The District has scheduled initial interviews for the Utility Services Planner position on September 10 with six qualified candidates. The District’s goal is for a new employee to start in November 2026.

HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
BUDGETARY STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
FOR ENTIRE DISTRICT

July 2026

	Budgeted 2026-27	Current Month-to-Date	Actual Year-to-Date	Budgeted Year-to-Date	Y.T.D. Variance Actual to Budget	% Variance	Note
OPERATING REVENUE							
Metered Water Sales	7,458,000	643,899	643,899	621,500	22,399	3.6	
Sewer Service Charges	9,968,000	738,385	738,385	830,667	(92,281)	(11.1)	1
Water & Sewer Construction Charges	35,000	3,566	3,566	2,917	650	22.3	
Account Charges	135,000	13,033	13,033	11,250	1,783	15.8	
Inspection Charges	1,500	-	-	125	(125)	(100.0)	2
Reimbursable Maintenance Charges	1,700	-	-	142	(142)	(100.0)	2
Miscellaneous	-	84	84	-	84	-	2
TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE	17,599,200	1,398,967	1,398,967	1,466,600	(67,633)	(4.6)	
NON-OPERATING REVENUE							
Capital Connection Charges	125,000	7,259	7,259	10,417	(3,157)	(30.3)	2
Interest/General	530,000	49,432	49,432	44,167	5,265	11.9	3
Discounts Earned	-	977	977	-	977	-	2
Sales:Fixed Assets/Scrap Metal	600	-	-	50	(50)	(100.0)	2
Bad Debt Recovery	1,000	-	-	83	(83)	(100.0)	2
Property Taxes & Assessments	450,000	-	-	37,500	(37,500)	(100.0)	2
TOTAL NON-OPERATING REVENUE	1,106,600	57,669	57,669	92,217	(34,548)	(37.5)	2
TOTAL DISTRICT REVENUE	18,705,800	1,456,636	1,456,636	1,558,817	(102,181)	(6.6)	
OPERATING EXPENSES							
Wages Direct	2,125,058	137,737	137,737	177,088	39,352	22.2	
Benefits: PERS	863,940	429,895	429,895	71,995	(357,900)	(497.1)	4
Group Ins	1,563,100	108,026	108,026	130,258	22,232	17.1	
Workers Comp Ins	32,000	-	-	2,667	2,667	100.0	
FICA/Medicare	163,700	10,569	10,569	13,642	3,073	22.5	
Misc Benefits	1,800	59	59	150	91	60.6	
Total Wages and Benefits	4,749,598	686,286	686,286	395,800	(290,486)	(73.4)	4
Less: wages & ben charged to Capital Proj.	(750,000)	(33,451)	(33,451)	(62,500)	(29,049)	46.5	
Total Operating Wages and benefits	3,999,598	652,836	652,836	333,300	(319,536)		
Water Purchase HBMWD	1,270,000	108,251	108,251	105,833	(2,418)	(2.3)	
Water Purchase Eureka	913,000	91,335	91,335	76,083	(15,252)	(20.0)	5
Sewage Treatment Operations & Maint.	1,942,500	186,265	186,265	161,875	(24,390)	(15.1)	6
Water/Sewer Analysis	15,000	-	-	1,250	1,250	100.0	
Supplies/ Construction	150,000	15,527	15,527	12,500	(3,027)	(24.2)	7
Supplies/ Office-Administration	15,000	869	869	1,250	381	30.5	
Supplies/ Engineering	2,500	-	-	208	208	100.0	
Supplies/ Maintenance	100,000	18,648	18,648	8,333	(10,315)	(123.8)	8
Invoicing	70,000	6,186	6,186	5,833	(353)	(6.1)	
Temporary Labor	56,500	9,593	9,593	4,708	(4,885)	(103.8)	9
Repairs & Maintenance/Trucks	75,000	9,481	9,481	6,250	(3,231)	(51.7)	10
Equipment Rental	2,500	-	-	208	208	100.0	
Building & Grounds Maintenance	35,000	5,995	5,995	2,917	(3,078)	(105.5)	11
Electrical Power	500,000	40,956	40,956	41,667	711	1.7	
Street Lights	80,000	6,462	6,462	6,667	205	3.1	
Telephone	18,000	1,307	1,307	1,500	193	12.9	
Postage	2,500	-	-	208	208	100.0	
Freight	900	-	-	75	75	100.0	
Chemicals	17,500	1,320	1,320	1,458	139	9.5	
Liability Insurance	160,000	41,966	41,966	13,333	(28,633)	(214.7)	12
Legal	46,000	169	169	3,833	3,664	95.6	
Accounting	20,000	-	-	1,667	1,667	100.0	
Engineering	2,000	-	-	167	167	100.0	

HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
BUDGETARY STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
FOR ENTIRE DISTRICT

July 2026

	Budgeted 2026-27	Current Month-to-Date	Actual Year-to-Date	Budgeted Year-to-Date	Y.T.D. Variance Actual to Budget	% Variance	Note
Other Professional Services	70,000	-	-	5,833	5,833	100.0	
Bank Service Charges	24,000	2,076	2,076	2,000	(76)	(3.8)	
Transportation	90,000	8,463	8,463	7,500	(963)	(12.8)	13
Office Equip. Maintenance	4,350	320	320	363	43	11.7	
Computer Software Maintenance	67,500	45,967	45,967	5,625	(40,342)	(717.2)	14
Memberships & Subscriptions	44,500	4,301	4,301	3,708	(592)	(16.0)	
Bad Debts & Minimum Balance Writeoff	20,000	-	-	1,667	1,667	100.0	
Conference & Continuing Ed	30,000	1,370	1,370	2,500	1,130	45.2	
Certifications	8,000	50	50	667	617	92.5	
State/County & LAFCO Charges and Charge	70,000	-	-	5,833	5,833	100.0	
Hydraulic Water Model Maintenance	2,000	-	-	167	167	100.0	
Human Resources	17,000	1,105	1,105	1,417	311	22.0	
Miscellaneous	20,000	-	-	1,667	1,667	100.0	
Director's Charges	12,500	550	550	1,042	492	47.2	
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	9,973,348	1,261,367	1,261,367	831,112	(430,255)	(51.8)	
LONG TERM DEBT PAYMENTS							
2012 CIP & Refi.	177,600	88,800	88,800	14,800	(74,000)	(500.0)	15
2014 Wastewater Revenue Bonds	484,825	-	-	40,402	40,402	100.0	
TOTAL LONG TERM DEBT PAYMENTS	662,425	88,800	88,800	55,202	(33,598)	(60.9)	
CAPITALIZED EXPENDITURES							
Vehicles, Rolling Stock & Equipment	195,000	69,783	69,783	16,250	(53,533)	(329.4)	16
Building, Yard & Paving Improvements	345,000	-	-	28,750	28,750	100.0	
Capital Improvements Water	2,915,000	443,203	443,203	242,917	(200,286)	(82.5)	16
Capital Improvements Sewer	2,810,833	76,947	76,947	234,236	157,289	67.1	
Engineering & Studies	15,000	-	-	1,250	1,250	100.0	
TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	6,280,833	589,933	589,933	523,403	(66,531)	(12.7)	16
OTHER							
City of Eureka Projects:							
Treatment Plant	3,824,000	-	-	318,667	318,667	100.0	
TOTAL City of Eureka Projects	3,824,000	-	-	318,667	318,667	100.0	
Interfund Transfers In	-	-	-				
Interfund Transfers Out	-	-	-				
BUDGET SURPLUS (DEFICIT)	(2,034,806)	(483,465)	(483,465)	(169,567)	(313,898)	(185.1)	

HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
SUMMARY BUDGETARY STATEMENT OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES
FOR ENTIRE DISTRICT

July 2026

	Budgeted 2026-27	Current Month-to-Date	Actual Year-to-Date	Budgeted Year-to Date	Y.T.D. Variance Actual to Budget	% Variance
OPERATING REVENUE & EXPENSES						
TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE	17,599,200	1,398,967	1,398,967	1,466,600	(67,633)	(4.6)
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	(9,973,348)	(1,261,367)	(1,261,367)	(831,112)	(430,255)	(51.8)
NET SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) FROM OPERATIONS	7,625,852	137,600	137,600	635,488	(497,888)	(78.3)
NON-OPERATING REVENUE & EXPENSES						
TOTAL NON-OPERATING REVENUE	1,106,600	57,669	57,669	92,217	(34,548)	(37.5)
TOTAL LONG TERM DEBT SERVICE	(662,425)	(88,800)	(88,800)	(55,202)	(33,598)	(60.9)
SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) BEFORE CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	8,070,027	106,468	106,468	672,502	(498,838)	(74.2)
HCSD CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES	(6,280,833)	(589,933)	(589,933)	(523,403)	(66,531)	(12.7)
CITY of EUREKA PROJECT REIMBURSEMENT	(3,824,000)	-	-	(318,667)	318,667	100.0
NEW DEBT ISSUE						
NET INTERFUND TRANSFERS IN/OUT		-	-			
BUDGET SURPLUS (DEFICIT)	(2,034,806)	(483,465)	(483,465)	(169,567)	(313,898)	(185.1)

HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
BUDGETARY STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
Water Fund

July 2026

	Budgeted 2026-27	Current Month-to-Date	Actual Year-to-Date	Budgeted Year-to-Date	Y.T.D. Variance Actual to Budget	% Variance
OPERATING REVENUE						
Metered Water Sales	7,458,000	643,899	643,899	621,500	22,399	3.6
Water Construction Charges	20,000	3,566	3,566	1,667	1,900	114.0
Account Charges	80,000	7,429	7,429	6,667	762	11.4
Inspection Charges	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reimbursable Maintenance Charges	1,500	-	-	125	(125)	(100.0)
Miscellaneous	-	48	48	-	48	-
TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE	7,559,500	654,941	654,941	629,958	24,983	4.0
NON-OPERATING REVENUE						
Water Capital Connection Charges	50,000	5,597	5,597	4,167	1,430	34.3
Interest/General	205,000	17,534	17,534	17,083	450	2.6
Discounts Earned	-	557	557	-	557	-
Sales:Fixed Assets/Scrap Metal	300	-	-	25	(25)	(100.0)
Bad Debt Recovery	500	-	-	42	(42)	(100.0)
Other Non-Operating Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NON-OPERATING REVENUE	255,800	23,688	23,688	21,317	2,371	11.1
TOTAL DISTRICT REVENUE	7,815,300	678,629	678,629	651,275	27,354	4.2
OPERATING EXPENSES						
Wages Direct	998,777	62,582	62,582	83,231	20,650	24.8
Wages & Benefits: Allocated	982,426	260,991	260,991	81,869	(179,122)	(218.8)
Benefits: PERS	90,350	5,944	5,944	7,529	1,585	21.1
Group Ins	449,000	23,887	23,887	37,417	13,530	36.2
Workers Comp Ins	15,000	-	-	1,250	1,250	100.0
FICA/Medicare	76,850	4,782	4,782	6,404	1,622	25.3
Misc Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Wages and Benefits	2,612,403	358,185	358,185	217,700	(140,485)	(64.5)
Less: wages & ben charged to Capital Proj.	(390,000)	(18,347)	(18,347)	(32,500)	(14,153)	43.5
Total Operating Wages and benefits	2,222,403	339,838	339,838	185,200	(154,638)	(83.5)
Water Purchase HBMWD	1,270,000	108,251	108,251	105,833	(2,418)	(2.3)
Water Purchase Eureka	913,000	91,335	91,335	76,083	(15,252)	(20.0)
Water Analysis	15,000	-	-	1,250	1,250	100.0
Supplies/ Construction	75,000	11,787	11,787	6,250	(5,537)	(88.6)
Supplies/Office-Administration	4,000	-	-	333	333	100.0
Supplies/ Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/ Maintenance	50,000	12,269	12,269	4,167	(8,102)	(194.5)
Temporary Labor	23,250	1,871	1,871	1,938	66	3.4
Repairs & Maintenance/Trucks	37,500	5,404	5,404	3,125	(2,279)	(72.9)
Equipment Rental	1,250	-	-	104	104	100.0
Building & Grounds Maintenance	11,000	4,117	4,117	917	(3,200)	(349.1)
Electrical Power	290,000	25,861	25,861	24,167	(1,695)	(7.0)
Freight	300	-	-	25	25	100.0
Chemicals	17,500	1,320	1,320	1,458	139	9.5
Liability Insurance	-	1,518	1,518	-	(1,518)	-
Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Professional Services	5,000	-	-	417	417	100.0
Transportation	50,000	4,824	4,824	4,167	(657)	(15.8)
Office Equip. Maintenance	500	-	-	42	42	100.0
Computer Software Maintenance	35,000	26,087	26,087	2,917	(23,170)	(794.4)
Memberships & Subscriptions	3,000	2,772	2,772	250	(2,522)	(1,008.7)
Bad Debts & Minimum Balance Writeoff	10,000	-	-	833	833	100.0
Conference & Continuing Ed	15,000	-	-	1,250	1,250	100.0
Certifications	3,000	50	50	250	200	80.0
State/County & LAFCO Charges and Charges	65,000	-	-	5,417	5,417	100.0
Hydraulic Water Model Maintenance	2,000	-	-	167	167	100.0
Human Resources	6,000	104	104	500	396	79.1
Miscellaneous	-	-	-	-	-	-
General & Admin Expense Allocation	315,900	34,393	34,393	26,325	(8,068)	(30.6)

HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
BUDGETARY STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
Water Fund

July 2026

	Budgeted 2026-27	Current Month-to-Date	Actual Year-to-Date	Budgeted Year-to-Date	Y.T.D. Variance Actual to Budget	% Variance
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	5,440,603	671,802	671,802	453,384	(218,419)	(48.2)
LONG TERM DEBT PAYMENTS						
Davis-Grunsky Loan	-	-	-	-	-	-
					-	-
TOTAL LONG TERM DEBT PAYMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
CAPITALIZED EXPENDITURES						
Capital Improvements Water	2,915,000	438,591	438,591	242,917	(195,675)	(80.6)
TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	2,915,000	438,591	438,591	242,917	(195,675)	(80.6)
INTERFUND TRANSFERS IN	-	-	-	-	-	
BUDGET SURPLUS (DEFICIT)	(540,303)	(431,764)	(431,764)	(45,025)	(386,739)	(858.9)

HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
BUDGETARY STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
Sewer Fund

July 2026

	Budgeted 2026-27	Current Month-to-Date	Actual Year-to-Date	Budgeted Year-to-Date	Y.T.D. Variance Actual to Budget	% Variance
OPERATING REVENUE						
Sewer Service Charges	9,968,000	738,385	738,385	830,667	(92,281)	(11.1)
Sewer Construction Charges	15,000	-	-	1,250	(1,250)	(100.0)
Account Charges	55,000	5,604	5,604	4,583	1,021	22.3
Inspection Charges	1,500	-	-	125	(125)	(100.0)
Reimbursable Maintenance Charges	200	-	-	17	(17)	(100.0)
Miscellaneous	-	36	36	-	36	-
TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE	10,039,700	744,026	744,026	836,642	(92,616)	(11.1)
NON-OPERATING REVENUE						
Sewer Capital Connection Charges	75,000	1,662	1,662	6,250	(4,588)	(73.4)
Interest/General	225,000	23,417	23,417	18,750	4,667	24.9
Discounts Earned	-	420	420	-	420	-
Sales:Fixed Assets/Scrap Metal	300	-	-	25	(25)	(100.0)
Bad Debt Recovery	500	-	-	42	(42)	(100.0)
Other Non-Operating Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NON-OPERATING REVENUE	300,800	25,499	25,499	25,067	433	1.7
TOTAL DISTRICT REVENUE	10,340,500	769,525	769,525	861,708	(92,184)	(10.7)
OPERATING EXPENSES						
Wages Direct	680,019	39,919	39,919	56,668	16,749	29.6
Wages & Benefits: Allocated	982,426	260,991	260,991	81,869	(179,122)	(218.8)
Benefits: PERS	61,500	3,446	3,446	5,125	1,679	32.8
Group Ins	290,900	19,286	19,286	24,242	4,956	20.4
Workers Comp Ins	10,000	-	-	833	833	100.0
FICA/Medicare	52,350	3,050	3,050	4,363	1,313	30.1
Misc Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-
					-	-
Total Wages and Benefits	2,077,195	326,692	326,692	173,100	(153,593)	(88.7)
Less: wages & ben charged to Capital Proj.	(300,000)	(13,695)	(13,695)	(25,000)	(11,305)	45.2
Total Operating Wages and benefits	1,777,195	312,997	312,997	148,100	(164,897)	(111.3)
Sewage Treatment: Operating & Maint.	1,942,500	186,265	186,265	161,875	(24,390)	(15.1)
Sewer Analysis	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/ Construction	75,000	3,740	3,740	6,250	2,510	40.2
Supplies/ Office-Administration	3,500	-	-	292	292	100.0
Supplies/ Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/ Maintenance	50,000	6,379	6,379	4,167	(2,212)	(53.1)
Temporary Labor	23,250	1,411	1,411	1,938	526	27.1
Repairs & Maintenance/Trucks	37,500	4,077	4,077	3,125	(952)	(30.5)
Equipment Rental	1,250	-	-	104	104	100.0
Building & Grounds Maintenance	7,000	288	288	583	295	50.6
Electrical Power	105,000	7,481	7,481	8,750	1,269	14.5
Freight	300	-	-	25	25	100.0
Chemicals	-	-	-	-	-	-
Liability Insurance	-	1,146	1,146	-	(1,146)	-
Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Professional Services	5,000	-	-	417	417	100.0
Transportation	40,000	3,639	3,639	3,333	(306)	(9.2)
Office Equip. Maintenance	350	-	-	29	29	100.0
Computer Software Maintenance	28,000	19,680	19,680	2,333	(17,346)	(743.4)
Memberships & Subscriptions	3,000	1,529	1,529	250	(1,279)	(511.6)

HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
BUDGETARY STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
Sewer Fund

July 2026

	Budgeted 2026-27	Current Month-to-Date	Actual Year-to-Date	Budgeted Year-to-Date	Y.T.D. Variance Actual to Budget	% Variance
Bad Debts & Minimum Balance Writeoff	10,000	-	-	833	833	100.0
Conference & Continuing Ed	15,000	-	-	1,250	1,250	100.0
Certifications	4,000	-	-	333	333	100.0
State/County & LAFCO Charges and Charges	5,000	-	-	417	417	100.0
Human Resources	4,000	79	79	333	255	76.4
Miscellaneous	-	-	-	-	-	-
General & Admin Expense Allocation	315,900	34,393	34,393	26,325	(8,068)	(30.6)
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	4,452,745	583,103	583,103	371,062	(212,041)	(57.1)
LONG TERM DEBT PAYMENTS						
2014 Wastewater Revenue Bonds	484,825	-	-	40,402	40,402	100.0
2012 CIP & Refi.	177,600	88,800	88,800	14,800	(74,000)	(500.0)
					-	-
TOTAL LONG TERM DEBT PAYMENTS	662,425	88,800	88,800	55,202	(33,598)	(60.9)
CAPITALIZED EXPENDITURES						
Vehicles/Rolling Stock/Capital Equipment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Building, Yard& Paving Improvements	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Improvements Sewer	2,810,833	72,336	72,336	234,236	161,900	69.1
Engineering & Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	2,810,833	72,336	72,336	234,236	161,900	69.1
OTHER						
City of Eureka Projects:						
Treatment Plant	3,824,000	-	-	318,667	318,667	100.0
TOTAL OTHER	3,824,000	-	-	318,667	318,667	100.0
BUDGET SURPLUS (DEFICIT)	(1,409,503)	25,286	25,286	(117,459)	142,745	121.5

HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
BUDGETARY STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
General Fund

July 2026

	Budgeted 2026-27	Current Month-to-Date	Actual Year-to-Date	Budgeted Year-to-Date	Y.T.D. Variance Actual to Budget	% Variance
OPERATING REVENUE						
Interest (will be allocated to w/s @ y/e)	100,000	8,482	8,482	8,333	148	1.8
Miscellaneous	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE	100,000	8,482	8,482	8,333	148	1.8
NON-OPERATING REVENUE						
Property Taxes	450,000	-	-	37,500	(37,500)	(100.0)
Insurance Rebate	-	-	-	-	-	-
Miscellanious Income	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NON-OPERATING REVENUE	450,000	-	-	37,500	(37,500)	(100.0)
TOTAL DISTRICT REVENUE	550,000	8,482	8,482	45,833	(37,352)	(81.5)
OPERATING EXPENSES						
Wages Direct	446,262	35,236	35,236	37,189	1,953	5.3
Benefits: PERS	712,090	420,505	420,505	59,341	(361,164)	(608.6)
Group Ins	823,200	64,854	64,854	68,600	3,746	5.5
Workers Comp Ins	7,000	-	-	583	583	100.0
FICA/Medicare	34,500	2,737	2,737	2,875	138	4.8
Misc Benefits	1,800	59	59	150	91	60.6
Total Wages and Benefits	2,024,852	523,390	523,390	168,738	(354,653)	(210.2)
Less: wages & ben charged to Capital Proj.	(60,000)	(1,409)	(1,409)	(5,000)	(3,591)	71.8
Less: Allocated to Water and Sewer Funds	(1,964,852)	(521,981)	(521,981)	(163,738)	358,244	(218.8)
Total Unallocated Wages and Benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/ Construction	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies/ Administration	7,500	869	869	625	(244)	(39.1)
Supplies/ Engineering	2,500	-	-	208	208	100.0
Supplies/ Maintenance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Invoicing	70,000	6,186	6,186	5,833	(353)	(6.1)
Temporary Labor	10,000	6,311	6,311	833	(5,477)	(657.3)
Repairs & Maintenance/Trucks	-	-	-	-	-	-
Equipment Rental	-	-	-	-	-	-
Building & Grounds Maintenance	17,000	1,590	1,590	1,417	(173)	(12.2)
Electrical Power	105,000	7,614	7,614	8,750	1,136	13.0
Street Lights	80,000	6,462	6,462	6,667	205	3.1
Telephone	18,000	1,307	1,307	1,500	193	12.9
Postage	2,500	-	-	208	208	100.0
Freight	300	-	-	25	25	100.0
Liability Insurance	160,000	39,302	39,302	13,333	(25,969)	(194.8)
Legal Services	46,000	169	169	3,833	3,664	95.6
Accounting	20,000	-	-	1,667	1,667	100.0
Engineering	2,000	-	-	167	167	100.0
Other Professional Services	60,000	-	-	5,000	5,000	100.0
Bank Service Charges	24,000	2,076	2,076	2,000	(76)	(3.8)
Transportation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Office Equip. Maintenance	3,500	320	320	292	(28)	(9.7)
Computer Software Maintenance	4,500	201	201	375	174	46.5
Memberships & Subscriptions	38,500	-	-	3,208	3,208	100.0
Bad Debts & Minimum Balance Writeoff	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conference & Continuing Ed	-	1,370	1,370	-	(1,370)	-
Certifications	1,000	-	-	83	83	100.0
State/County & LAFCO Charges and Charges	17,000	-	-	1,417	1,417	100.0

HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
BUDGETARY STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
General Fund

July 2026

	Budgeted 2026-27	Current Month-to-Date	Actual Year-to-Date	Budgeted Year-to-Date	Y.T.D. Variance Actual to Budget	% Variance
Human Resources	10,000	922	922	833	(89)	(10.6)
Miscellaneous	-	-	-	-	-	-
Director's Charges	12,500	550	550	1,042	492	47.2
General & Admin Expense Allocation	(631,800)	(68,786)	(68,786)	(52,650)	16,136	(30.6)
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	80,000	6,462	6,462	6,667	205	3.1
CAPITALIZED EXPENDITURES						
				-		
Vehicles/Rolling Stock/Capital Equipment	195,000	79,006	79,006	16,250	(62,756)	(386.2)
Building, Yard & Paving Improvements	345,000	-	-	28,750	28,750	100.0
Engineering & Studies	15,000	-	-	1,250	1,250	100.0
TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	555,000	79,006	79,006	46,250	(32,756)	
INTERFUND TRANSFER OUT		-	-	-		
BUDGET SURPLUS (DEFICIT)	(85,000)	(76,987)	(76,987)	(7,083)	(69,903)	986.9

Humboldt Community Services District
Notes
July 2026

Note 1 - Sewer service Revenue Revenue

Sewer income less than budgeted due to rate increase being effective 8/1. Revenue increase will be effective for future months and is expected to be in line with budget. Water revenue is not below budget due to higher custoemr water consumption typical for summer months.

Note 2 - Non Operating and Miscellaneous Revenue

Non-operating, Construction/Capacity Charges and Miscellaneous income occurs occasionally throughout the year, and at the very end of the fiscal year.

Note 3 - Interest Income

Increase in Interest Income due to continued performance with funds held in CA CLASS JPA investment pool being better than expected.

Note 4 - PERS

CalPERS UAL Payment submitted as lump sum instead of as monthly payments. Submitting annual PERS UAL payment as lump sum instead of in monthly installements provides the District with ~$11,000 in cost savings.

Note 5 - Water Purcahse - City of Eureka

Increased purchase volume of water in July due to typical increased water usage in Summer. Total for entire year is expected to be in line with budgeted amount.

Note 6 - Sewage Treatment Operations & Maint.

Budget for Sewage treatment originally set based on estimate since info from City had not yet been received. Actual charges have now been recevied and are 15% higher than budgeted. This overage is offset by the previous year Sewage Treatment costs being lower than origianlly budgeted, so is therefore not expected to have a negative affect on District finances.

Note 7 - Supplies/Construction

Overage due to normal increase in Construction activity during summer months. Expected to reduce in non-summer months, and total annual expenditures projected to be in line with budjeted amount.

Note 8 - Supplies/Maintenance

Overage due to normal increase in Maintenance activity during summer months as well as annual costs for tank inspection. Expected to reduce in non-summer months, and total annual expenditures projected to be in line with budjeted amount.

Note 9 - Temp Labor

Overage due to temp labor utilized during summer months. Temp labor usage is expected to be reduced in subsequent months. Total annual expenditure projected to be in line with budgeted amount

Note 10 - Repairs & Maintenance/Trucks

Overage due to oil change/inspecitons done on multiple vehicles in July. Subsequent month will have lower expenduitures. Total expenditures for the year are projected to be in linme with budgeted amount.

Note 11 - Building and Grounds Maintenance

Overage due to repairs to services after meter isntallations. Such expenses not expected to recur. Subsequent months are expected to reduce and total for year is projected to be in line with budgeted amount

Note 12 - Liability Insurance

Liability insurance for full year piad in July. Expected amount for full year is expected to be in line with budgeted amount

Note 13 - Transportation

Increased fuel purcahses in July due to increased Maintenance and Construciton acitvity typical for Summer months. Expcetd to redcue in subsequent months. Total for year projected to be in line with budget.

Note 14 - Computer Software Maintenance

Maintenance/Licencing fees for computer sofwtare is paid in annual charges paid near beginning of Fiscal Year. Expenditures for the fiscal year are expected to be in line with budget.

Note 15 - Debt Service

Loan Payments are made throughout the year. Total expenditres by the end of the year will match budget amounts.

Note 16 - Capital Improvements

Capital improvement project expenditures are paid as projects progress. July amount included purcahse of Meters installed during summer and purchase of repalcement vehicle Unit #2 (Ford F350).

Note 11 - CIP

District has received $457,437.97 in Grant funds in FY 2026. $402,972.09 towards Walnut EQ Repair project and $54,468.88 towards Hoover Flood Protection project. GM and FM are cotniuing to purse and submit grant funding.

Accounts Payable

Checks by Date - Detail by Check Date

User: FM
Printed: 9/3/2026 11:35 AM

Humboldt Community Services District
5055 Walnut Drive – Eureka CA 95503
PO Box 158 – Cutten CA 95534 (707) 443-4558

Check No	Vendor No / Invoice No	Vendor Name / Description	Check Date / Reference	Check Amount
59077	C160	Cal-Pac Machine & Hyrdaulics	08/07/2026	
	181234	cat loader repair and service		14,270.77
			Total for Check Number 59077:	14,270.77
59078	M560	The Mitchell Law Firm LLP	08/07/2026	
	11395	LEGAL SERVICES - MAY 2026		240.00
			Total for Check Number 59078:	240.00
59079	P251	Pape Machinery Inc	08/07/2026	
	MM 373875 S	new 1' digging bucket for excavator		1,740.00
			Total for Check Number 59079:	1,740.00
59080	A072	Accurate Drug Testing Services	08/07/2026	
	16022	DOT TESTING / DR		35.00
			Total for Check Number 59080:	35.00
59081	A410	AGB	08/07/2026	
	H26-2597	Prevent Maint of EES Earthquake Monitoring Sy		2,756.45
			Total for Check Number 59081:	2,756.45
59082	B284	Badger Meter Inc	08/07/2026	
	80244196	Beacon Mbl Hosting - JULY		524.43
			Total for Check Number 59082:	524.43
59083	C036	Corporate Payment Systems	08/07/2026	
	038732	TK/Murphys - Working Lunch - Construction Fo		57.00
	17490	MM/Microsoft - Projects for KR		30.00
	215905044	MM/Hotel rooms Petaluma training - Chuch, Bra		198.96
	215905044	MM/Hotel rooms Petaluma training - Chuch, Bra		115.11
	309756167	TK/Craigslist - USP Solicitation		40.00
	3997047	MM/Toner for Cust svc printer		79.35
	4123709015	TK/Go Daddy Web Domain Renewal		23.19
	50615	MM/Microsoft - Exchange Email		130.20
	5318522801	TK/Hyatt Regency Newport Beach - TKW GM S		1,056.16
	6355451	TK/Amazon - Office Chair Slip Covers		248.00
	64098	MM/Microsoft - Exchange Email		0.41
	767938	TK/JMM CSM3 Fee		255.00
	789592	JM/E-waste		44.80
	95179	MM/DRI Crash Plan		39.96
	9813079	TK/Amazon - USB Adapter		7.22
	B202770797978	TK/CWEA - TEST REFUND NA		-205.00
			Total for Check Number 59083:	2,120.36
59084	C180	Canon Solutions America Inc.	08/07/2026	

Check No	Vendor No / Invoice No	Vendor Name / Description	Check Date / Reference	Check Amount
	6016724560	UseTaxRecoveryFee/OfficeCopier 04.19.26 - 07		2.42
	6016724560	Office/Black Copies WXD03492- 04.19.26 - 07.		9.40
	6016724560	Office/Color Copies WXD03492- 04.19.26 - 07.		45.89
			Total for Check Number 59084:	57.71
59085	C302	Robert Christensen	08/07/2026	
	32336	RENNER GAS - UNIT#9 - RETURNING FRO!		13.00
			Total for Check Number 59085:	13.00
59086	C495	Colantuono, Highsmith, Whatley, PC	08/07/2026	
	71376	SPECIAL LEGAL SERVICES - JUNE 2026		105.00
			Total for Check Number 59086:	105.00
59087	E043	Eel River Transportation & Salvage	08/07/2026	
	127007	REMOVAL & SALVAGE OF UTILITY CRANI		223.15
			Total for Check Number 59087:	223.15
59088	E484	Cooney Parris and Rieke Corp	08/07/2026	
	870940/1	Concrete mix 60 - HERRICK PRESSURE SEW		35.24
			Total for Check Number 59088:	35.24
59089	G150	Gaynor Telesystems Inc.	08/07/2026	
	SUB4047.0726	Fees and Surcharges - 07.15.26 - 08.14.26		83.79
	SUB4047.0726	Cloud Subscription Charges - 07.15.26 - 08.14.2		333.84
			Total for Check Number 59089:	417.63
59090	H010	Keenan Supply	08/07/2026	
	S015118092.001	8" Swing Check		4,961.25
	S015118092.001	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# S015118092		-90.00
	S015146942.001	yard replacment stock		2,970.60
	S015146942.001	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# S015146942		-53.89
	S015146986.001	BRASS ANGLE METER VLV, GRIP RING AC		1,099.05
	S015146986.001	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# S015146986		-19.94
	S015146986.002	YARD STOCK - BRASS PVC COMPXMIP CP		627.80
	S015146986.002	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# S015146986		-11.39
	S015155127.001	RUBBER METER GASKETS		223.45
	S015155127.001	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# S015155127		-4.05
	S015155133.001	#1 STOCK - PVC ELBOWS, PVC CPLGS, PVC		72.10
	S015155133.001	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# S015155133		-1.31
	S015155244.001	Myrtle/Mitchell part returns- S015062255.001, S		-2,840.01
	S015158613.001	Parts / supplies for shady lane SMR replacment -		23,214.30
	S015158613.001	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# S015158613		-426.93
	S015158613.002	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# 2015158613		-6.58
	S015158613.002	Parts and supplies for shady lane SMR replacme		362.80
	S015168318.001	HERRICK SWR RPR - GRIP RING ACCY PK,		1,406.98
	S015168318.001	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# S015168318		-25.52
	S015181171.001	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# S015181171		-3.09
	S015181171.001	3/4 RUBBER METER GASKET, 3/4 WATER M		170.50
	S015186794.001	HERRICK SWR RPR, HYMAX GRIP CPLG, M		1,936.73
	S015186794.001	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# S015186794		-35.13
	S015201174.001	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNTS NOT PREVIOUSI		-740.30
	S015202697.001	3/4 RUBBER METER GASKETS		223.45
	S015202697.001	PROMPT PAY DISCOUNT - INV# S015202697		-4.05
			Total for Check Number 59090:	33,006.82

Check No	Vendor No / Invoice No	Vendor Name / Description	Check Date / Reference	Check Amount
59091	H500	Humboldt Co Planning Division	08/07/2026	
	1	APPLICATION FEE - MAPLE LANE F.H.		320.00
	1	INSPECTION DEPOSIT		500.00
			Total for Check Number 59091:	820.00
59092	H810	Humboldt Waste Management Auth	08/07/2026	
	971350	GREENWASTE - SELF-HAUL		9.75
			Total for Check Number 59092:	9.75
59093	I401	Industrial Electric Arcata Inc	08/07/2026	
	IN56938	Lock outs, Tags and Station		401.72
	IN57068	Invoice# IN57068: Float switches for new SLS i		1,351.99
	IN57132	Invoice# IN57132: 16 gauge wire for scada cabi		330.75
	IN57148	Invoice# IN57148: 3/4" conduit, straps, glue, fitt		57.58
	IN57159	Invoice# IN57159: Extra relay bases to have in s		119.90
	IN57210	Invoice# IN57210: SS enclosure, back panel, sw		8,875.37
	IN57210	Invoice# IN57210: SS enclosure, back panel, sw		8,875.37
	IN57210	Invoice# IN57210: SS enclosure, back panel, sw		8,875.37
	IN57210	Invoice# IN57210: SS enclosure, back panel, sw		8,875.36
	IN57210	Invoice# IN57210: SS enclosure, back panel, sw		8,875.37
	IN57210	Invoice# IN57210: SS enclosure, back panel, sw		8,875.37
	IN57214	Invoice# IN57214: 100Ft float switchs to replace		264.60
	IN57215	Invoice# IN57215: 100Ft float switch to replace		132.30
	IN57218	Invoice# IN57218: Electrical tape and		109.65
	IN57228	Invoice# IN57228: VFD cable for mounting disp		81.03
	IN57228	Invoice# IN57228: VFD cable for mounting disp		81.02
	IN57230	Invoice# IN57230: Lvl sensor for Chlorine at sou		136.65
	IN57253	Invoice# IN57253: 120VAC Relays and Bases fo		270.70
	IN57271	Invoice# IN57271: 1" SS Ball vlves for cumming		77.81
	IN57282	Invoice# IN57282: Current Transducer for Hoov		281.65
	IN57282	Invoice# IN57282: Current Transducer for Feilds		281.64
	IN57290	Invoice# IN57290: Electronically controlled ball		182.02
	IN57298	Invoice# IN57298: Test Prox sensor for chlorine		101.17
			Total for Check Number 59093:	57,514.39
59094	I525	Infosend	08/07/2026	
	313985	UB/Process and Mail/Bills - 07.07.26 final notic		99.09
			Total for Check Number 59094:	99.09
59095	J900	ACWA/Joint Powers Insurance Authority	08/07/2026	
	0000001406	CYBER LIABILITY ANNNUAL PREMIUM 07		2,664.00
			Total for Check Number 59095:	2,664.00
59096	K400	Kernen Construction	08/07/2026	
	37170	Herrick& Vance paving		454.69
			Total for Check Number 59096:	454.69
59097	M101	MapleService Inc.	08/07/2026	
	1389676	1094 VERNON ST - REPAIR MOEN FAUCET		667.19
	1389718	2955 ST JAMES PL - REPAIR 3/4 SVC LINE		925.31
	1389842	2896 LITTLE FAIRFIELD - REPAIR 3/4 SVC I		1,354.50
	1389858	1094 VERNON ST - MAINLINE STOPPAGE F		351.75
	6142298	829 WESTGATE DR - BROKEN SVC LINE RI		436.19
			Total for Check Number 59097:	3,734.94

Check No	Vendor No / Invoice No	Vendor Name / Description	Check Date / Reference	Check Amount
59098	M230	Mendes Supply Co	08/07/2026	
	M297531	PSCQcarbacticide 30gal/DrumDep		961.44
	M297533	PSCQcarbacticide 30gal/DrumDep		483.22
	M297792	DRUM DEPOSIT		-125.00
			Total for Check Number 59098:	1,319.66
59099	M348	Microbac Laboratories, Inc	08/07/2026	
	189356	Water Testing - Hexavalent Chromium		150.00
			Total for Check Number 59099:	150.00
59100	M450	Mission Linen	08/07/2026	
	526318471	Uniforms/Mats		431.72
	526352909	Uniforms/Mats		228.82
	526396285	Uniforms/Mats		431.03
	526436280	Uniforms/Mats		229.52
	526478657	Uniforms/Mats		428.94
			Total for Check Number 59100:	1,750.03
59101	M560	The Mitchell Law Firm LLP	08/07/2026	
	11713	LEGAL SVCS JUNE 2026		64.00
			Total for Check Number 59101:	64.00
59102	M780	Municipal Maintenance Equipmen	08/07/2026	
	051068	#18 rear door seal replacment		485.53
	051693	Replacment hose		190.32
			Total for Check Number 59102:	675.85
59103	R425	Redwood Marine	08/07/2026	
	420002	propane tanks filled		29.51
			Total for Check Number 59103:	29.51
59104	S750	Standard Insurance Company	08/07/2026	
	08012026	Short&Long Term Empl Disability 08.01.26 - 08		1,251.47
			Total for Check Number 59104:	1,251.47
59105	S850	Optimum	08/07/2026	
	08152026	Internet 07.24.26 - 08.23.26		453.72
			Total for Check Number 59105:	453.72
59106	T285	Thomas R. Bess	08/07/2026	
	5947	Herrick & Noe hot mix asphalt pavement		751.26
			Total for Check Number 59106:	751.26
59107	T935	Two Brothers Cathodic Services Inc	08/07/2026	
	1190	Cathodic protection systems check in/ yearly Ma		4,000.00
			Total for Check Number 59107:	4,000.00
59108	U090	USA of NoCal and Nevada	08/07/2026	
	1486362026	USA Annual Membership		2,557.34
			Total for Check Number 59108:	2,557.34
59109	U091	USA N Ca Nev Benefit of DS Board	08/07/2026	

Check No	Vendor No / Invoice No	Vendor Name / Description	Check Date / Reference	Check Amount
	148636USB26	CA Annual Fee Regulatory Costs 07.01.26 - 06.3		998.23
			Total for Check Number 59109:	998.23
59110	V700	Valley Pacific Petroleum Services Inc	08/07/2026	
	INV 26-033830	YARD FUEL		8,449.70
			Total for Check Number 59110:	8,449.70
59111	W872	Terrence Williams	08/07/2026	
	1	12 LUNCHES FROM IN-n-OUT - SEWER EM		148.18
			Total for Check Number 59111:	148.18
			Total for 8/7/2026:	143,441.37
			Report Total (35 checks):	143,441.37

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Humboldt Community Services District

Dedicated to providing high quality, cost effective water and sewer service to our customers

MEMORANDUM

For HCSD Board of Directors Regular Meeting of: September 8th 2026

AGENDA ITEM: **D.2.C**

TITLE: Investment performance report for 4th QTR FY 2026

PRESENTED BY: Michael Montag, Finance Manager/District Treasurer

---

HCSD's working capital, capital improvement reserves, and debt payment reserves are held in FDIC-insured demand deposit accounts at Umpqua Bank, and US Bank. District Investment funds are held with the County of Humboldt Investment Pool, California CLASS JPA Investment Pool, and a Certificate of Deposit at Redwood Capital Bank. As of June 30, 2026, the District had cash deposited in the following:

Umpqua Bank Checking Account:	$ 583,275.54
U.S. Bank Checking Account:	$ 2,782,047.58
County of Humboldt Treasury:	$ 1,695,466.97
California CLASS JPA Investment Pool:	$ 15,593,405.84
Redwood Capital Bank Certificate of Deposit:	$ 2,029,322.12

Interest earned for the all quarters of FY 2026 for the investment funds are listed in the table below (checking accounts are not interest-bearing). For comparison purposes, the State of California LAIF (Local Agency Investment Fund) rates are also included in the table.

Investment Source	FY 2026 Beginning Balance	1st QTR Investment Returns	2nd QTR Investment Returns	3rd QTR Investment Returns	4th QTR Investment Returns	2026 Return % Annualized
County of Humboldt	$1,109,466.75	$8,352.34	$9,753.37	$10,558.87	$13,248.69	3.22%
CA CLASS JPA	$13,030,456.07	$142,215.34	$136,300.32	$141,693.93	$142,820.18	4.03%
Redwood Capital Bank (CD)	$2,002,000	N/A	N/A	$10,833.33	$16,488.79	3.33%
LAIF	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.00%

Per California Government Code Section 53646, I certify that the District's investments are in conformity with the District's investment policy and that there is sufficient cash flow liquidity to meet the next six months estimated expenditures.

_____

Michael Montag
Finance Manager, Humboldt Community Services District

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

AGENDA REPORT

For HCSD Board of Directors Regular Meeting of: September 8, 2026

AGENDA ITEM: **F.1**

TITLE: Conduct a Public Hearing and Consider Adoption of Resolution 2026-09: Adopting the Initial Study & Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Hoover Street Lift Station Flood Protection Project

PRESENTED BY: Terrence Williams, General Manager

Recommendation:
Adopt Resolution 2026-09, adopting the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration and authorizing the General Manager to file a Notice of Determination.

Summary:
The Hoover Street Lift Station is located at the north end of Hoover Street in the Myrtletown area of unincorporated Humboldt County, adjacent to Eureka Slough and Humboldt Bay. This low-lying location is subject to tidal inundation that will worsen with sea-level rise. During king tide events the site has experienced flooding that has resulted in sewage discharge to Eureka Slough.

Modeling based on the Eureka Slough sea-level rise adaptation study projects that by 2080, a relatively common high-tide event could inundate the site with approximately 3.7 feet of water, and a 100-year coastal flood could produce approximately five feet of flooding at the lift station.

The Hoover Street Lift Station Flood Protection Project (Project) is proposed to protect this critical sewer lift station from current and future coastal flood risk. The project is funded through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES).

As part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance process, the District commissioned an Initial Study (IS). The Initial Study evaluated the Project against the full range of environmental factors identified in the CEQA Guidelines checklist, including aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems, among others.

The Initial Study identified potentially significant impacts in four resource areas that require mitigation to be reduced to a less-than-significant level:

- Air Quality: Construction-generated fugitive dust (PM10) could result in a potentially significant impact absent controls. Mitigation Measure AQ-1 requires implementation of standard air pollution control measures during construction.
- Biological Resources: The Project has the potential to affect nesting birds, special-status fish, and jurisdictional wetlands adjacent to the site. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 require protection measures for special-status, migratory, and nesting birds; protection measures for special-status fish during construction; avoidance and minimization measures to protect adjacent wetlands; and compensation for any unavoidable loss of wetlands.
- Cultural Resources: Ground-disturbing construction activities could encounter previously unidentified archaeological resources or human remains. Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2 require cultural resource monitoring and defined protocols for inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources or human remains.
- Geology and Soils: Excavation could encounter unknown paleontological resources. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires protocols for the inadvertent discovery of paleontological resources during construction.

With incorporation of these mitigation measures, all potentially significant impacts identified in the Initial Study would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The Initial Study further concludes, under the Mandatory Findings of Significance analysis, that the Project would not substantially degrade habitat or wildlife populations, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts when viewed together with other past, current, or reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity, and would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Because the Project's potentially significant impacts can be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level through feasible mitigation measures that the Project proponent has agreed to implement, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is the appropriate CEQA document for the Project, rather than an Environmental Impact Report.

The IS/MND was circulated for public review for a period of thirty days, from August 6, 2026 to September 5, 2026, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15105. At the time of this writing, no public comments had been received during the public comment period. A copy of the IS/MND is available on the District's website under Public Notices for review.

https://humboldtcsd.org/public-notices

Fiscal Impact:
There is no cost associated with adopting the IS/MND

HCSD RESOLUTION NO. 2026-09

A RESOLUTION OF THE HUMBOLDT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS ADOPTING THE INITIAL STUDY AND PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE HOOVER STREET LIFT STATION FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT

WHEREAS, the Humboldt Community Services District (herein referred to as the District) is a local government agency formed and operating in accordance with Section §61000 et seq. of the California Government Code; and

WHEREAS, the Hoover Street Sewer Lift Station project site is located in the 1100 Block of Hoover Street, Eureka, CA, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 014-182-010 ("the Project Site"); and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) dated July 30, 2026 was prepared for the Project pursuant to Section 15071 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, a Notice of Intent was circulated on August 6 for a period of no less than 30 days pursuant to Section 15072 of the CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, as of September 3, 2026, no comment letters were received, resulting in no substantive changes that required recirculation of the IS/MND pursuant to Section 15073.5 of the CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the IS/MND prepared for the Project concluded that the Project will have less than significant impacts on the environment with the implementation of mitigation measures as set forth in the IS/MND, attached hereto; and

WHEREAS the ISNB/MND and all supporting documentation are in the custody of Humboldt Community Services District located at 5055 Walnut Drive in Eureka, CA; and

WHEREAS a Notice of Public Hearing was circulated in accordance with Section 65854 of the California Government Code; and

WHEREAS, the Humboldt Community Services District is the approving authority of the Project and has the discretion to approve, modify, or disapprove the recommendation; and

WHEREAS, all legal prerequisites to adopt the foregoing resolution have occurred; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Directors, at its duly noticed public hearing on September 8, 2026, has considered all information related to this matter, including supporting reports by District Staff, and any information provided during public meetings; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the Humboldt Community Services District as follows:

- The Board of Directors hereby finds that the facts set forth in the recitals to this Resolution are true and correct, and establish the factual basis for the Board of Directors' adoption of this Resolution.
- Based on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration incorporated herein by reference, the Project will have a less than-significant impact on the environment with the implementation of mitigation measures set forth in the IS/MND. Made part of the conditions of approval for projects on the Project Site.
- Given the foregoing, the Board of Directors hereby adopts, as its own, the findings necessary to adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the Hoover Street Lift Station Flood Protection Project, attached hereto.
- This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED this 8th day of September 2026, on the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

_____
Michael Hansen, Board President

ATTEST:

_____
Robert Christensen, Board Secretary

Hoover Street Lift Station Flood Protection Project

Initial Study & Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration

Humboldt Community Services District

July 30, 2026

→ The Power of Commitment

Initial Study & Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration

Hoover Street Lift Station Flood Protection Project

Prepared for:

Humboldt Community Services District
5055 Walnut Drive
Eureka, CA 95503

T 707-443-4550 | **E** twilliams@humboldtcsd.org | **humboldtcsd.org**

Prepared by:

718 3rd Street
Eureka, CA 95501, United States
T 925-849-1022 | **E** Madalyn.Pierson@ghd.com | **ghd.com**

© GHD 2026

Contents

1. Project Information 1
- 1.1 CEQA Requirements 1
- 1.2 Background, Need, and Purpose 1
- 1.3 Project Goals 2
- 1.4 Project Location 2
- 1.5 Project Elements 2
  - Flood Protection Structure 3
  - Utility Modifications 3
  - Site Drainage 3
  - Wetland Restoration 4
- 1.6 Project Construction 4
  - Construction Schedule 4
  - Construction Activities and Equipment 4
  - Site Access 5
  - Traffic and Access Control 5
  - Stockpiling and Staging 5
  - Vegetation Removal 5
  - Groundwater Dewatering 5
- 1.7 Site Restoration and Demobilization 5
- 1.8 Maintenance and Operation 5
- 1.9 Regulatory Permits, CEQA, and NEPA 5
- 1.10 Compliance with Existing Regulations and Standard BMPs 6
  - Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan 6
  - Implementation of Geotechnical Design Recommendations 6
- 1.11 Tribal Consultation 6

2. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected 7

3. Environmental Analysis 8
- 3.1 Aesthetics 8
- 3.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources 10
- 3.3 Air Quality 12
- 3.4 Biological Resources 17
- 3.5 Cultural Resources 24
- 3.6 Energy Resources 26
- 3.7 Geology and Soils 28
- 3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 32
- 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 37
- 3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality 40
- 3.11 Land Use and Planning 43
- 3.12 Mineral Resources 44
- 3.13 Noise 45

3.14 Population and Housing....49
3.15 Public Services....50
3.16 Recreation....51
3.17 Transportation....52
3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources....53
3.19 Utilities and Service Systems....54
3.20 Wildfire....56
3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance....58
4. Report Preparers....60
4.1 Lead Agency....60
4.2 GHD....60
5. References....61

Table index

Table 3.3-1 Annual Construction Regional Pollutant Emissions....15
Table 3.3-2 Daily Construction Regional Pollutant Emissions....15
Table 3.4-1 Wetlands Within the Delineated Area....20
Table 3.4-2 Temporary and Permanent Wetland Impacts....21
Table 3.8-1 County CEQA GHG Emissions Thresholds....32
Table 3.8-2 Consistency Analysis Between Project and 2022 Scoping Plan....34
Table 3.13-1 Humboldt County Land Use Noise Compatibility Standards....46
Table 3.13-2 Typical Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment Used During Project Construction (Caltrans 2020)....47

Appendices

Appendix A Figures
Figure 1: Vicinity Map
Figure 2: Project Study Boundary
Figure 3: Project Overview
Appendix B CalEEMod Modeling Information and Results
Appendix C Biological Resources Technical Memorandum
Appendix D Web Soil Survey

1. Project Information

Project Title	Hoover Street Lift Station Flood Protection Project
Lead Agency Name & Address	Humboldt Community Services District 5055 Walnut Drive Eureka, CA 95503
Contact Person & Phone Number	Terrence Williams, General Manager, Humboldt Community Services District 707-443-4550 twilliams@humboldtcsd.org
Project Location	Eureka, CA
General Plan Land Use Designation	Natural Resources (NR) Residential/ Low Density (RL)
Zoning	Residential Single Family (RS-5) Coastal Wetland Area Regulations (W) Archaeological Resource Area Outside Shelter Cove (A)

1.1 CEQA Requirements

This project is subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The lead agency is the Humboldt Community Services District (HCSD). The purpose of this Initial Study is to analyze potential environmental impacts and provide a basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or a Negative Declaration. This Initial Study is intended to satisfy the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC], Div 13, Sec 21000-21177), and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sec 15000-15387). CEQA encourages lead agencies and applicants to modify their projects to avoid significant adverse impacts.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(d) provides the following content requirements for Initial Studies:

1. A description of the project including the location of the project;
2. An identification of the environmental setting;
3. An identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix, or other method, provided that entries on a checklist or other form are briefly explained to indicate that there is some evidence to support the entries;
4. A discussion of the ways to mitigate the significant effects identified, if any;
5. An examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls; and
6. The name of the person or persons who prepared or participated in the Initial Study.

1.2 Background, Need, and Purpose

The Hoover Street Lift Station Flood Protection Project (Project) is proposed by the HCSD to protect a critical sewer lift station in Eureka, California, from increasing coastal flood risks. The Project is funded by the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and administered by the California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES).

The lift station is located at the north end of Hoover Street adjacent to Eureka Slough at a ground elevation of approximately 9 to 10 feet (North American Vertical Datum of 1988; NAVD88). This low-lying location is vulnerable to

tidal inundation, especially under future sea-level rise (SLR) conditions. During high tide events (i.e. king tides), the lift station has experienced flooding which has resulted in sewage discharge into Eureka Slough. Flood modeling based on the Eureka Slough SLR adaptation study (ESA et al. 2021) found that by the year 2080 (with approximately 2.4 feet of SLR, per the Ocean Protection Council Intermediate scenario) even a relatively common high tide event (approximately two-year return interval) could inundate the site with approximately 3.7 feet of water, while a 100-year coastal flood could produce on the order of five feet of flooding at the lift station. These projections assume that still-water tidal flooding is the dominant flood source at the site (the contribution of fluvial flows in Eureka Slough is negligible). As sea levels continue to rise, the frequency and depth of flooding at the lift station would increase, potentially causing severe damage and service interruptions.

The purpose of the Project is to mitigate flood risk and ensure the continued operation of the Hoover Street lift station during extreme coastal flood events. Multiple flood protection alternatives were evaluated during preliminary design to identify an approach that would meet long-term flood protection objectives while minimizing impacts to surrounding wetlands and existing infrastructure.

By constructing a dedicated flood protection structure, the Project would safeguard the wastewater infrastructure from the one percent annual-chance (100-year) tidal flood under year 2080 SLR conditions, thereby reducing the likelihood of sewage service outages, environmental contamination, and costly damage to public infrastructure. Environmental sensitivities are an important consideration in Project design and permitting because the Project is a small, developed public utility site bordered by tidal wetlands that connect to Eureka Slough.

1.3 Project Goals

Project goals include:

– Goal 1: Protect the lift station from current tidal flooding
– Goal 2: Protect the lift station from future extreme tidal flood events driven by sea level rise and climate change
– Goal 3: Maintain operational reliability and public health protection for the Project's useful life

1.4 Project Location

The Project is in unincorporated Humboldt County within the Myrtletown U.S. Census Designated Place at the northern terminus of Hoover Street, adjacent to Eureka Slough and Humboldt Bay (**Appendix A – Figure 1** and **Figure 2**). It abuts Eureka Slough to the north and west and the Eureka Pentecostal Church to the southeast.

The HCSD service area is located within the central and southern portions of the greater Eureka area and includes several unincorporated communities adjacent to Eureka. Eureka is approximately 6.5 miles south of Arcata and approximately 3.5 miles southeast of the community of Manila.

The Project is located entirely within the coastal zone. Project elements are entirely within state coastal zone jurisdictions. Project elements within the coastal zone are regulated by the Humboldt Bay Area Local Coastal Plan (LCP) and the California Coastal Commission (CCC).

1.5 Project Elements

Project elements are shown in **Appendix A – Figure 3** and include:

– Flood protection structure
– Utility modifications
– Site drainage
– Wetland restoration

Flood Protection Structure

The central component of the Project is a steel sheet pile floodwall encircling the Hoover Street lift station. The wall would be constructed of PZ-series interlocking sheet piles, which are approximately 18 inches thick and would be driven roughly 20 feet into the ground to reach competent soil layers and to cutoff under seepage. Above ground, the wall would be a maximum of eight feet above grade, varying with site topography, to achieve a uniform top elevation of 16 feet NAVD88. At the highest ground (around 16 feet NAVD88) near the site entrance, the wall would taper to meet existing grade, thus tying into natural high ground and preventing floodwater from flowing behind the wall. The enclosed area would protect not only the main lift station structure but also an adjacent sewer manhole that was identified as a low point vulnerable to flooding (approximately eight feet elevation). By encompassing both structures and the access road entrance, the floodwall would form a continuous barrier against coastal floodwaters.

Utility Modifications

Utility modifications include shifting the eastern manhole west and realigning sewer and water lines within the access road and installing two new fittings on the existing force mains to facilitate temporary bypass pumping during construction.

Eastern Manhole Relocation

The inlet manhole to the east of the site would be relocated approximately 65 feet west to reduce impacts of the Project to tidal wetlands and to provide the necessary area for mitigation activities that would be completed on-site. The associated gravity sewers entering the existing manhole would be relocated to provide gravity flow through the new manhole.

Hoover Street Gravity Main and Water Service Realignment

An existing 12-inch vitrified clay pipe gravity sewer and two-inch water service feeding into the lift station from the south along Hoover Street would be realigned to be within the center of the access road. The sheet pile wall would run parallel to the sewer main on the west side of the access road, roughly along the existing curb line. This results in approximately two to three feet of clearance between the pipes and the piles. Given the age and material of the vitrified clay pipe sewer line, there is a risk of damage during the sheet pile installation. In addition, the pipes would be located on the exterior side of the proposed sheet pile floodwall where the bank drops off steeply, making future access difficult. Maintaining the current alignment would also require penetrating through the sheet pile wall. Realigning the pipes to the center of the access road would eliminate the risk of damaging the pipe during construction, provide future access to the pipe, and eliminate pipe penetration from the wall design. The existing and new alignment for the pipes would be trenched to allow for access. During trenching, any excavated material would be stockpiled on-site for eventual backfill and compaction once the new pipes are laid.

Bypass Pumping Connections

Two new fittings would be installed on the existing force mains to facilitate temporary bypass pumping during construction, as well as for future maintenance activities and emergency operations. Installation of the fittings would require localized excavation adjacent to the existing force mains, including areas outside the previously surveyed disturbance footprint. Any newly disturbed areas would be conservatively assumed to contain jurisdictional wetlands and would be mitigated on-site.

Site Drainage

With the installation of the sheet pile wall, precipitation falling on the site would be trapped behind the wall that would have previously drained to Humboldt Bay through Eureka Slough. To drain the site during heavy precipitation events, a perimeter valley gutter and drop inlets would be installed to drain the site to the lift station sewer system. The existing paved and grassed areas within the flood wall would be graded and repaved to promote drainage to the new

perimeter valley gutter. An additional valley gutter would be installed at the top of the access road to prevent runoff from the adjacent church parking lot entering the site.

Because the lift station is adjacent to Eureka Slough, direct discharge of site precipitation would route untreated runoff to a sensitive receiving water and introduce additional coastal permitting and water quality compliance burden. Routing captured on-site water to the sanitary system would convey it to the existing permitted treatment facility prior to discharge, minimizing environmental impact.

Wetland Restoration

The Project is designed to mitigate all wetland impacts on-site (**Appendix A – Figure 3**). The area surrounding the existing eastern manhole can be characterized as an elevated gravel pad with mowed grass which is boarded by low-lying wetland drainage channels. After the manhole is relocated, the gravel fill would be removed and restored to match the existing adjacent wetlands with grading and planting in coordination with regulatory agencies. Temporary construction impacts to wetlands would be restored in-place to equal or improved conditions.

1.6 Project Construction

Construction Schedule

Construction of the proposed Project would take approximately 6 months over the course of one construction season and is anticipated to start in May 2027 and end in October 2027. Construction start date depends on release of FEMA grant funding for the Project. Construction would need to take place during the summer months to reduce the risk of tidal flood events and high sanitary sewer flows occurring during construction. The anticipated construction duration for the major work components is as follows:

1. Flood protection sheet pile wall – 6 weeks
2. Utility modifications – 6 weeks
3. Site drainage – 6 weeks
4. Wetland restoration – 6 weeks

Construction Activities and Equipment

Construction would primarily include site preparation such as removal of vegetation, followed by excavation, grading, pile driving, and hauling. Water from legal sources would be used for dust control and compaction and revegetation. All construction activities would be accompanied by both temporary and permanent erosion and sediment control measures. Project construction would include the following activities:

– Clearing and grubbing – To clear work areas;
– Excavation – To access existing utility pipes for realignment and to install new fittings for the pumping connections;
– Pile driving – To install a new steel sheet pile floodwall;
– Hauling – Transport of existing road base, pavement, excavation, and other excess materials off-site; transport of imported material to the Project Area (e.g., pipes, manholes, fittings necessary for pipe installation, pipe bedding, and sheet piles).

Equipment required for construction would include tracked excavators, backhoes, dump trucks, bobcats, concrete trucks, and pick-up trucks. It is not anticipated that any temporary utility extensions, such as electric power or water, would be required for construction.

Site Access

Access to the Project Area would be from U.S. 101 via Myrtle Avenue and Hoover Street in Eureka, using the existing access road at the end of Hoover Street. Direct site access would occur via the existing access road at the end of Hoover Street. Construction and maintenance vehicles would use this established access route for the duration of Project activities. Following construction, site access would remain unchanged, and the access road would be retained in its current configuration.

Traffic and Access Control

Construction-related traffic would be limited to equipment mobilization to the Project Area and daily personnel travel. During the pipe realignment construction, the Hoover Street areas affected by the Project would be closed to traffic.

Stockpiling and Staging

Construction stockpiling and staging areas would occur within the mapped upland portions of the Project Area or within adjacent paved areas. Within the stockpiling and staging area, standard erosion control best management practices (BMPs) would be utilized to prevent soil, materials, and hazardous materials from impacting the environment.

Vegetation Removal

Project work areas are largely unvegetated, and vegetation removal would be limited to minor vegetation removal such as minor mowing and minor brush removal. No trees would be removed. To minimize potential impacts on birds, if feasible, vegetation would be removed prior to March 15 or after August 15 to avoid the nesting bird season.

Groundwater Dewatering

Groundwater dewatering is generally not expected to be required. However, if needed, temporary groundwater dewatering would involve pumping water out of a trench or excavation. Groundwater would typically be pumped to a settling pond, Baker tanks (or other similar type of settling tank), or into a dewatering bag. Dewatering water may also be percolated back into the ground (in uplands) or used for dust control and compaction, revegetation irrigation, or discharged to sanitary sewer.

1.7 Site Restoration and Demobilization

Following construction, the contractor would demobilize and remove equipment, supplies, and construction waste. The disturbed areas along the Project alignment would be restored to pre-construction conditions.

1.8 Maintenance and Operation

Following construction, lift station infrastructure would be maintained and operated by the HCSD. The Project has been designed to minimize long-term operational and repair costs.

Maintenance of the sewer and water pipelines would consist of periodic inspection and occasional cleanout to remove accumulated sediment and debris.

1.9 Regulatory Permits, CEQA, and NEPA

HCSD is the CEQA lead agency for the Project. An Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is the proposed CEQA pathway.

The Project Area is within the county and state jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone. A consolidated coastal development permit would be required from the CCC.

A wetland delineation has been completed for the Project (**Appendix C**). The Project would impact three-parameter wetlands; therefore, permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineering (USACE) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), and a corresponding Water Quality Certification from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) under Section 401 of the CWA would be required. Impact analysis specific to one- and three-parameter wetlands can be found in the CEQA Initial Study and Biological Resources Technical Memorandum (**Appendix C**) prepared for the Project.

The Project does not involve any waterways or impacts to riparian habitat; thus, a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife would not be required. Similarly, the Project is not expected to require consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service/NOAA Fisheries, because potential impacts to federal special status plants, fish, or wildlife species are not anticipated.

1.10 Compliance with Existing Regulations and Standard BMPs

The Project would abide by the following regulations and industry-accepted BMPs to reduce or avoid potential adverse effects that could result from construction or operation of the Project. In addition to these BMPs, mitigation measures are presented in the analysis sections in Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis, to reduce potentially significant environmental impacts below a level of significance. The Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program would include these actions to ensure implementation.

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

The Project would not require a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) because the Project Area is under 1-acre. Sediment and erosion control measures would be implemented to minimize soil loss and off-site transport during construction. Runoff would be managed using features such as sediment basins, silt traps, and stabilized construction entrances to reduce erosion, prevent sediment discharge, and avoid tracking mud onto public roadways.

Implementation of Geotechnical Design Recommendations

The Project would be designed and constructed in compliance with site-specific recommendations made in the Geotechnical Report (Crawford and Associates 2026). This would include design in accordance with recommendations for earthwork, such as site clearing, cut/fill slopes, subgrade preparation, material for fill, compaction requirements, trenches, and foundations. The geotechnical recommendations would be incorporated into the final plans and specifications for the Project and would be implemented during construction.

1.11 Tribal Consultation

Pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1, the HCSD contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to obtain a list of tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Project Area. The NAHC identified the Blue Lake Rancheria, Bear Band of Rohnerville Rancheria, and the Wiyot Tribe. HCSD issued tribal notification letters to these tribes on May 29, 2026; however, no responses have been received to date. Additional outreach efforts are documented in the Archaeological Survey Report (ASR), as discussed in Section 3.5 (Roscoe and Associates 2025).

2. 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” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages:

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

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION would be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there would 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 would be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed 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 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 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.

_____ _____

Terrence Williams, Date

General Manager – Humboldt Community Services District

3. Environmental Analysis

3.1 Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in PRC Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public view of the site and its surroundings? (Public Views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or night-time views in the area?				X

Views of the Project Area are limited to the Eureka Slough, the Eureka Pentecostal Church, and adjacent residences and are not considered to have exceptional scenic quality. Views of vegetation and the Eureka Slough are visible from some locations in Eureka.

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (No Impact)

A scenic vista is generally defined as a view that offers remarkable scenery or a broad, visually significant view of the natural landscape. The Humboldt County General Plan identifies scenic vistas primarily from U.S. 101, coastal access points, beaches, and state park lands (Humboldt County 2017).

No designated or recognized scenic vistas occur within or in the vicinity of the Project Area. The Project is located at a small, developed public utility site at the terminus of Hoover Street, surrounded by low-density residential development and tidal wetlands associated with Eureka Slough. Existing views of the site are limited and are not considered to have exceptional scenic quality.

The Project includes construction of a steel sheet pile floodwall that would extend approximately 8 feet above grade to protect the existing lift station from tidal flooding. While the wall would represent a new vertical feature, it would be constructed within an already developed utility site on a lower elevation and would not obstruct or degrade any recognized scenic vista. The site is not a scenic vista, nor does it contain or provide access to scenic vantage points. Therefore, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, and no impact would result.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (No Impact)

The Project is not located on, near, or within view of a designated state scenic highway. U.S. 101 is eligible for scenic highway designation; however, it is not designated in the Project vicinity (Caltrans 2026). No impact would result.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public view of the site and its surroundings? (Public Views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The Project Area is non-urbanized per the definition in PRC Section 21071. Proposed actions would not conflict with Humboldt County zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Construction and operation of the Project would not substantially alter the visual character of the site or its surroundings. The proposed sheet pile floodwall would be relatively low in height, finished to blend with the surrounding industrial and utility setting, and would not introduce tall or visually dominant features that would block or screen public views. Following construction, disturbed areas would be restored, and the site would remain consistent with its existing utility use.

Public views of the Project Area are limited and occur primarily from the terminus of Hoover Street, adjacent residential properties, and from Eureka Slough, which is occasionally used for recreation such as kayaking. Views toward the slough provide a localized visual experience of coastal wetland vegetation and open water; however, these views are not identified as designated scenic resources or protected scenic vistas under the Humboldt County General Plan. Public views are those experienced from publicly accessible vantage points and, in this case, are limited in extent and continuity. The Project is located within a small, developed utility site characterized by existing infrastructure, maintained access areas, and adjacent low-lying wetlands. The visual character of the area is therefore already influenced by utilitarian features rather than pristine or highly scenic conditions.

The Project would construct a steel sheet pile floodwall approximately 8 feet in height around the lift station. From certain vantage points, particularly for recreational users such as kayakers traveling along Eureka Slough, the wall would introduce a new vertical element along the shoreline edge. In these localized views, the floodwall may partially interrupt the visual continuity of the slough by creating a defined boundary between the developed utility site and the adjacent wetland and open water areas.

However, this effect would be limited in scope and scale for the following reasons:

– The floodwall would be located within an existing developed utility footprint and would not extend across or into the slough itself.
– Views from the waterway are transient and limited to a short segment adjacent to the Project site, and do not constitute long, uninterrupted scenic corridors.
– The surrounding setting already includes development and infrastructure, and the addition of the floodwall would be consistent with the existing utility character.

While the wall may locally alter the visual experience for recreational users on Eureka Slough by introducing a more defined and engineered edge, it would not substantially degrade the overall visual character or quality of public views in the area. The Project would not conflict with applicable zoning or policies governing scenic quality and would remain consistent with the existing visual context of the site and its surroundings.

Therefore, although the Project may introduce minor, localized changes to views from Eureka Slough, including partial segmentation of visual continuity for recreators such as kayakers, these changes would not rise to the level of a substantial degradation of visual character or public views. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or night-time views in the area? (No Impact)

The Project does not include any new streetlights or other lighting elements. Night-time construction would not occur. No proposed Project elements would cause substantial new sources of glare. No impact would result.

3.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by PRC section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
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?				X

The Project Area is adjacent to the Eureka Slough in Eureka. There are no agricultural or forestry land uses within the Project Area.

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland)? (No Impact)

The Department of Conservation (DOC)'s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program has not been completed for Humboldt County. Therefore, lands within the Project Area have not been formally analyzed by the DOC to determine if they meet the criteria for being designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

For this analysis, "Agricultural Soils" and "Prime Agricultural Soils" designations via the Humboldt County WebGIS online mapping tool were utilized, which is based on soils data from the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). According to the Humboldt County WebGIS, the Project Area does not include Agricultural Soils or Prime Agricultural Soils (Humboldt County 2026a). The Project would not remove agricultural land from production or result in a change in land use, as there is no such land presently under agricultural use within the Project Area. No impact would result.

b) Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act Contract? (No Impact)

There are no agricultural zoning or active Williamson Act contracts within the Project Area (Humboldt County 2026b). Zoning within the Project Area is discussed in Section 3.11 (Land Use and Planning). Therefore, construction and operation of the Project would have no effect on agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts because none exist within the Project Area. No impact would result.

c, d) Conflict with Forest Land Zoning or Convert Forest Land? (No Impact)

There are no forest lands, timberland, or land zoned Timberland Production in the Project Area; therefore, no forest land or timberland would be converted to non-forest or non-timberland use. Zoning within the Project Area is discussed in Section 3.11 (Land Use and Planning). No impact would result.

e) Convert Farmland or Forest? (No Impact)

There are no other changes in the existing environment caused by the Project that would result in conversion of farmland or forest land in or adjacent to the Project Area. No impact would result.

3.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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?		X		
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?		X		
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X		
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

The Project is located within the Humboldt County portion of the North Coast Air Basin (Air Basin) which is managed by the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD). The NCUAQMD monitors air quality, enforces local, state, and federal air quality regulations for counties within its jurisdiction, inventories and assesses the health risks of Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs), and adopts rules that limit pollution.

For construction emissions, the NCUAQMD has indicated that emissions are not considered regionally significant for projects whose construction would be relatively short in duration, lasting less than one year. For Project construction lasting more than one year or involving above average construction intensity in volume of equipment or area disturbed, construction emissions may be compared to the stationary source thresholds (NCUAQMD 2019). Construction would occur in one season and would occur in May 2027 and end in October 2027. Emissions related to construction were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2022.1.1.44 and are discussed below (also see **Appendix B – CalEEMod Modeling Information and Results**).

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

This impact relates to consistency with an adopted attainment plan. The NCUAQMD is responsible for monitoring and enforcing local, state, and federal air quality standards. Humboldt County is designated 'attainment' for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Humboldt County is designated attainment for all California Ambient Air Quality Standards except PM_{10} (designated as "non-attainment" for the State's PM_{10} standard).

PM_{10} refers to inhalable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 10 microns. PM_{10} includes emission of small particles that consist of dry solid fragments, droplets of water, or solid cores with liquid coatings. The particles vary in shape, size, and composition. PM_{10} emissions include unpaved road dust, smoke from wood stoves, construction dust, open burning of vegetation, and airborne salts and other particulate matter naturally generated by ocean surf. Therefore, any use or activity that generates airborne particulate matter may be of concern to the NCUAQMD. The proposed Project would create PM_{10} emissions in part through vehicles coming and going to the Project Area and the construction activity associated with the Project.

To address non-attainment for PM_{10}, the NCUAQMD adopted a Particulate Matter Attainment Plan in 1995. This plan presents available information about the nature and causes of PM_{10} standard exceedances and identifies cost-effective control measures to reduce PM_{10} emissions to levels necessary to meet California Ambient Air Quality Standards. However, the NCUAQMD states that the plan, "should be used cautiously as it is not a document that is required in order for the District to come into attainment for the state standard" (NCUAQMD 2021). Therefore,

compliance with applicable NCUAQMD PM_{10} rules is applied as the threshold of significance for the purposes of analysis. NCUAQMD Rule 104 Section D, Fugitive Dust Emissions, is applicable to the Project.

Rule 104, Section D – Fugitive Dust Emissions is used by the NCUAQMD to address non-attainment for PM_{10}. Pursuant to Rule 104 Section D, the handling, transporting, or open storage of materials in such a manner, which allows or may allow unnecessary amounts of particulate matter to become airborne, is not permitted. Reasonable precautions are required to be taken to prevent particulate matter from becoming airborne, including, but not limited to covering open bodied trucks when used for transporting materials likely to give rise to airborne dust and the use of water during the grading of roads or the clearing of land.

During Project earth moving activities, fugitive dust (PM_{10}) would be generated. The amount of dust generated at any given time would be highly variable and is dependent on the size of the area disturbed at any given time, amount of activity, soil conditions, and meteorological conditions. Unless controlled, fugitive dust emissions during construction of the shared use pathway could be a potentially significant impact; therefore, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would be incorporated to comply with NCUAQMD's Rule 104 Section D.

Operation of the Project would not include the handling, transporting, or open storage of materials in which particulate matter may become airborne. Due to the absence of handling, transport, or open storage of materials that would generate particulate matter, operation of the Project is not expected to conflict with NCUAQMD's Rule 104 Section D. No impact from operation of the Project would result.

Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 would reduce the potential impact related to PM_{10} fugitive dust by requiring implementation of BMPs.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Measures to Reduce Air Pollution

The contractor shall implement the following measures during construction:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., staging areas, soil piles, active graded areas, and excavations) shall be watered two times per day or as required by site conditions and current weather patterns.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using street sweepers at least once per day, or as needed to alleviate dust and debris on the roadway.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour, unless the unpaved road surface has been treated for dust suppression with water, rock, wood chip mulch, or other dust prevention measures.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, the Project would not conflict with applicable air plans. This impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation incorporated.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

The Project's potential to generate a significant amount of criteria pollutants of concern during Project construction and operation is assessed in this section. As noted above, Humboldt County is designated non-attainment for the state's PM_{10} standard. The County is designated attainment for all other state and federal standards. Potential impacts of concern will be exceedances of state or federal PM_{10} standards. Localized PM_{10} is of concern during construction because of the potential to emit fugitive dust during earth-disturbing activities.

Construction

Localized PM_{10}

The Project would include clearing and grubbing, excavation activity, and hauling materials. Generally, the most substantial air pollutant emissions would be dust generated from site clearing and trenching, and hauling materials to and from the Project Area. If uncontrolled, these emissions could lead to both health and nuisance impacts. Construction activities would also temporarily generate emissions of equipment exhaust and other air contaminants. The Project's potential impacts from equipment exhaust are assessed separately below.

The NCUAQMD does not have formally adopted thresholds of significance for fugitive, dust-related particulate matter emissions above and beyond Rule 104, Section D which does not provide quantitative standards. For the purposes of analysis, this document uses the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) approach to determining significance for fugitive dust emissions from Project construction. The BAAQMD bases the determination of significance for fugitive dust on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented. If all appropriate emissions control measures recommended by BAAQMD are implemented for a project, then fugitive dust emissions during construction are not considered significant. BAAQMD recommends a specific set of "Basic Construction Measures" to reduce emissions of construction-generated PM_{10} to less than significant. Without incorporation of these Basic Construction Measures, the Project's construction-generated fugitive PM_{10} (dust) would result in a potentially significant impact.

The Basic Construction Measure controls recommended by the BAAQMD are incorporated into Mitigation Measure AQ-1. These controls are consistent with NCUAQMD Rule 104 Section D, Fugitive Dust Emission and provide supplemental, additional control of fugitive dust emissions beyond that which would occur with Rule 104 Section D compliance alone. Therefore, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, the Project would result in a less than significant impact for construction period PM_{10} generation and would not violate or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Construction Criteria Pollutants

The NCUAQMD does not have established CEQA significance criteria to determine the significance of impacts that would result from projects such as the proposed Project; however, the NCUAQMD does have criteria pollutant best available control technology (BACT) thresholds for new or modified stationary source projects proposed within the NCUAQMD's jurisdiction. For construction emissions, the NCUAQMD has indicated that emissions are not considered regionally significant for projects whose construction would be of relatively short duration, lasting less than one year. NCUAQMD has indicated that it is appropriate for lead agencies to compare proposed construction emissions that last more than one year to its BACT thresholds for stationary sources identified in Rule 110(E)(1), which are:

– Nitrogen Oxides – 40 tons per year
– Reactive Organic Gases – 40 tons per year
– PM_{10} – 15 tons per year
– Carbon Monoxide – 100 tons per year

CalEEMod version 2022.1.1.44 was used to estimate air pollutant emissions from Project construction (**Appendix B**). Construction of the Project is expected to begin in 2027 and would be completed within one construction season. Detailed material hauling volumes were provided by the Project's design team. The Project's estimated construction emissions are presented in **Table 3.3-1** and **3.3-2** for annual and daily emission rates, respectively. As shown in the tables, the Project would not exceed the NCUAQMD's thresholds of significance. Therefore, the Project's construction emissions are considered to have a less than significant impact.

Table 3.3-1 Annual Construction Regional Pollutant Emissions

Parameter	Annual Emissions (tons/year)			
	ROG	NOx	CO	PM_{10}
Project Construction (2027)	0.2	1.5	1.3	<0.1
NCUAQMD Stationary Source Thresholds	40.0	40.0	100	15.0
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No

Table 3.3-2 Daily Construction Regional Pollutant Emissions

Parameter	Average Daily Emissions (pounds/day)			
	ROG	NOx	CO	PM_{10}
Project Construction (2027)	1.1	8.0	7.1	0.4
NCUAQMD Stationary Source Thresholds	50.0	50.0	500.0	80.0
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No

Operation

Following construction, the Project would not include any stationary sources of air emissions. Vehicle trips associated with operation and maintenance of the proposed Project would include maintenance and monitoring as described in Section 1.8 and would be consistent with the maintenance and monitoring of the existing wastewater infrastructure. The Project would not result in substantial long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants. Therefore, Project-generated operational emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is in non-attainment. The Project's contribution to a cumulative impact would be less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated)

Sensitive receptors are people who may be at heightened risk of adverse health effects from exposure to air pollution, including children, the elderly, individuals with preexisting medical conditions, and those who exercise outdoors regularly. Sensitive receptor locations generally include places where these populations may congregate or where the public may be present, including residences, schools, community resource centers, childcare facilities, parks, playgrounds, health care facilities, hospitals, nursing homes, live-in housing, any building housing a business open to the public, and other locations identified by an air district board or the California Air Resources Board (California Health and Safety Code Section 42705.5(a)(5)). Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project Area include nearby residential uses and the Eureka Pentecostal Church. The church is located approximately 100 feet from the Project Area, while the nearest residence is located approximately 300 feet away.

Project construction activities would result in temporary emissions of criteria air pollutants and TACs, including diesel particulate matter from construction equipment and fugitive dust (PM_{10}) generated during ground-disturbing activities. Diesel particulate matter has been identified as a toxic air contaminant with potential carcinogenic health effects, and therefore is typically evaluated when considering impacts to nearby sensitive receptors. However, the potential for adverse exposure depends on the intensity, duration, and proximity of emission sources relative to receptor locations. Construction activities associated with the Project would occur over a single construction season and would be temporary in nature, with relatively low equipment intensity and limited duration at any one location. Activities would occur across the Project Area and along portions of Hoover Street associated with utility realignment, which would limit the duration of emissions exposure at any individual receptor. Additionally, pollutant concentrations from construction equipment are subject to dispersion and dilution with distance, and emissions typically decrease substantially within short distances from the source under typical atmospheric conditions.

As demonstrated by CalEEMod modeling results presented above, construction emissions would be below applicable air district thresholds of significance and would not result in substantial localized concentrations of criteria pollutants. In addition, implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce fugitive dust and equipment exhaust emissions through standard BMPs, including watering exposed surfaces and minimizing idling, consistent with NCUAQMD requirements. Taken together, the limited duration, relatively small scale of construction activities, dispersion of emissions, and required emission control measures indicate that the Project would not expose nearby sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction. Therefore, the potential construction-related impact would be less than significant.

Following construction, the Project would not include any stationary sources of air emissions or new mobile source emissions that would result in substantial long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants. Therefore, Project operation would not expose nearby sensitive receptors to substantial levels of pollutants. The potential operation-related impact would be less than significant.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (Less Than Significant Impact)

Implementation of the Project would not result in major sources of odor. The Project involves improvements to an existing wastewater lift station; however, it would not result in the generation of objectionable odors. Minor odors from the use of equipment during construction activities would be intermittent and temporary and would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance. Therefore, the Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The impact would be less than significant.

3.4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		X		
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
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?		X		
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?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X		
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?				X

A Biological Resources Technical Memorandum was prepared to assess baseline environmental conditions within the Project Area and is included as **Appendix C**. The study evaluates the potential for any special status plants, wildlife species, sensitive natural communities (SNCs), or aquatic resources to occur. The Biological Study Area (BSA), or the area directly or indirectly impacted by the proposed Project, encompasses a 500-feet buffer around the Project Area.

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? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

Special Status Plant Species

Special status plant species include those listed as endangered, threatened, or as candidate species by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), and/or under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Plant species on the California Native Plant Society's California Rare Plant Ranking (CRPR) Lists 1A, 1B, 2A, and 2B are also considered eligible for state listing as endangered or threatened pursuant to the California Fish and Game Code (FGC); the CDFW has oversight of these special status plant species as a trustee agency. As part of the CEQA process, such species should be considered, as they meet the definition of Threatened or Endangered under Sections 2062 and 2067 of the California FGC. There are occasions where CRPR List 3 or 4 species might be considered of special concern particularly for the type locality of a plant, for populations at

the periphery of a species range, or in areas where the taxon is especially uncommon or has sustained heavy losses, or from populations exhibiting unusual morphology.

A reconnaissance survey was conducted on October 18, 2024. No rare plants were observed in the site visit, and no suitable habitat was observed (**Appendix C**). Vegetation within the Project Area is actively maintained and mowed regularly, severely limiting habitat suitability for species status plant species.

Based on nearby occurrence records, no special status plants have moderate or high potential to occur within the Project Area (**Appendix C**). Vegetation is regularly mowed and there is no suitable habitat for special status plants. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

Special Status Mammals

No special status mammal species were observed in the Project Area during a reconnaissance level survey conducted on October 18, 2024 (**Appendix C**). Habitat within the Project Area was generally poor for wildlife species as it is actively maintained and mowed regularly. No trees exist within the Project Area, and an aggregate ground layer limits any ground nesting. Therefore, a less than significant impact could occur.

Special Status, Migratory, and Nesting Birds

A reconnaissance survey was conducted on October 18, 2024. No trees exist within the Project Area, and an aggregate ground layer limits any ground nesting.

Due to the lack of suitable habitat within the BSA, no special status bird species have a moderate or high potential to occur (**Appendix C**).

Although no special status or protected migratory birds were observed nesting within the BSA during surveys, suitable nesting habitat is present in the Project vicinity. Trees located near the Project Area, as well as trees along the adjacent roadway near the church, may support nesting birds. If native migratory birds are nesting in the BSA, or within 500 feet during construction activities, these protected migratory birds could be potentially displaced from habitat, resulting in a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce the potential impact to special status and protected migratory and nesting birds.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Protect Special Status, Migratory, and Nesting Birds

Ground disturbance and vegetation clearing will be conducted, where feasible, during the fall and/or winter months and outside of the avian nesting season (which is generally assumed to occur between March 15 – August 15) to avoid any direct effects to special status and protected birds. Ground disturbance and vegetation clearing that cannot be confined to the fall and/or winter outside of the nesting season, will require that a qualified biologist conduct pre-construction surveys within the vicinity of the BSA, to check for nesting activity of native birds and to evaluate the site for presence of raptors and special status bird species. The biologist will conduct at minimum a one-day pre-construction survey within the seven-day period prior to vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities. If ground disturbance and vegetation removal work lapses for seven days or longer during the nesting season, a qualified biologist will conduct a supplemental avian pre-construction survey before Project work is reinitiated.

If active nests are detected within the construction footprint, or within 500 feet of construction activities, the biologist will flag a buffer around each nest. Construction activities will avoid nest sites until the biologist determines that the young have fledged, or nesting activity has ceased. If nests are documented outside of the construction (disturbance) footprint, but within 500 feet of the construction area, buffers will be implemented as needed. In general, the buffer size for common species will be determined on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the CDFW and, if applicable, with USFWS. Buffer sizes will take into account factors such as (1) noise and human disturbance levels at the construction site at the time of the survey and

the noise and disturbance expected during the construction activity; (2) distance and amount of vegetation or other screening between the construction site and the nest; and (3) sensitivity of individual nesting species and behaviors of the nesting birds.

If active nests are detected during the survey, the qualified biologist will monitor all nests at least once per week to determine whether birds are being disturbed. Activities that might, in the opinion of the qualified biologist, disturb nesting activities (e.g., excessive noise), will be prohibited within the buffer zone until such a determination is made. If signs of disturbance or distress are observed, the qualified biologist will immediately implement adaptive measures to reduce disturbance. These measures may include, but are not limited to, increasing buffer size, halting disruptive construction activities in the vicinity of the nest until fledging is confirmed or nesting activity has ceased, placement of visual screens or sound dampening structures between the nest and construction activity, reducing speed limits, replacing and updating noisy equipment, queuing trucks to distribute idling noise, locating vehicle access points and loading and shipping facilities away from noise sensitive receptors, reducing the number of noisy construction activities occurring simultaneously, and/or reorienting and/or relocating construction equipment to minimize noise at noise sensitive receptors.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, potential impacts to special status and protected migratory birds would be less than significant.

Special Status Amphibian and Reptile Species

No special status amphibian or reptile species were observed in the Project Area during reconnaissance level surveys on October 18, 2024; however, focused herpetological surveys were not conducted in the Project Area. There is no suitable aquatic or riparian habitat within or adjacent to the Project Area (**Appendic C**). Therefore, the potential for these species to occur is low, and impacts would be less than significant.

Special Status Fish

No special status fish species or aquatic habitat that could support fish species are present within the Project Area. However, small portions of the BSA intersect with the Eureka Slough, which is federally-designated Essential Fish Habitat for Groundfish, Coho Salmon, and Chinook Salmon.

The BSA includes the shoreline margin of Eureka Slough. All excavation and trenching would occur during low tide, and no in-water work is proposed; however, dewatering may be required due to groundwater seepage into trenches.

There is no potential for aquatic species to occur within the Project Area, but indirect impacts could occur to the BSA and the adjacent Eureka Slough. Without erosion and sediment controls implemented from a SWPPP, construction-related runoff could enter Eureka Slough and adversely affect aquatic species. In addition, encroachment into the slough during construction could result in potentially significant impacts to special status fish species. While direct impacts are avoided, the potential for indirect impacts remains without proper protective measures.

Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would reduce the potential impact to special status fish.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Protect Special Status Fish

The following shall be implemented to protect special status fish:

- Temporary exclusion fencing will be installed along the shoreline near planned areas of ground disturbance, if any, to limit inadvertent disturbance near aquatic habitat. The temporary exclusion fencing will be shown in the final 100% construction plan set.
- Equipment maintenance or refueling will not occur within 100 feet of the Eureka Slough shoreline.
- Erosion control shall be installed for work in tidal drainages to avoid post construction turbidity inputs into the Eureka Slough. Erosion control measures shall be shown on the final 100% construction plan set.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2 requires practicable avoidance and protection measures for special status fish during construction, thereby reducing any potential impacts. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, potential impacts to special status fish would be less than significant.

Special Status Invertebrates

No species identified in the Biological Technical Memorandum (**Appendix C**) have a moderate or high potential to occur within the Project Area. The Project Area is primarily composed of regularly maintained non-native grasses and forbs with low habitat value.

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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (No Impact)

SNCs are habitats and plant communities designated by the CDFW and identified in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and the California Sensitive Natural Communities List. These communities are classified at the alliance and association levels based on vegetation types associated with California's ecological sections, with alliances and associations ranked S1 through S3 considered sensitive. As documented in the Biological Resources Technical Memorandum (**Appendix C**), no SNCs or Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) occur within the Project Area. Wetland features are present within the Project Area; however, these areas are characterized primarily by *Distichlis spicata* (coastal salt grass) and other native species, and do not meet the criteria for SNC designation. No impact would occur.

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? (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated)

A wetland delineation was completed for the Project on October 18, 2024, to determine the extent of wetlands and other waters within the Project Area based on hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology using methods and indicators outlined in the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys and Coast Region (USACE 2010). The Project Area falls within the Coastal Zone; therefore, coastal wetlands and three-parameter wetlands were documented and are shown in **Appendix A – Figure 3**.

The Project Area contains three, three-parameter wetlands (**Table 3.4-1**, **Appendix C**).

Table 3.4-1 Wetlands Within the Delineated Area

Aquatic Resource Name	Wetland Type	Location (lat/long) of polygon center	Aquatic Resource Size (square feet)
Wetland 1	3-par emergent wetlands	Northern edge of the Project Area located within a visible subsidence from the main Project site, composed largely of Coastal Salt Grass	75
Wetland 2	3-par emergent wetlands	Northern edge of the Project Area located within a visible subsidence from the main Project site, composed largely of Coastal Salt Grass	80
Wetland 3	3-par Palustrine drainage ditch	Southwestern edge of the Project Area	40
Total Wetlands in Project Area			**195**

Temporary and permanent impacts to delineated wetlands are summarized in **Table 3.4-2**. Impacts to wetlands would result in a potentially significant impact.

Table 3.4-2 Temporary and Permanent Wetland Impacts

Impact Type	Total Within Project Area (square feet)	Temporary Impact (square feet)	Permanent Impact (square feet)
Three-Parameter Wetlands	970	635	120

Impacts would result from construction activities associated with the wastewater collection system improvements, including relocation of an existing manhole, realignment of the associated pipeline, and installation of bypass pumping connections. Two new fittings would be installed on the existing force mains to facilitate temporary bypass pumping during construction and to support future maintenance and emergency operations. Installation of the fittings would require localized excavation adjacent to the existing force mains, including areas outside the previously surveyed disturbance footprint. Any newly disturbed areas would be conservatively assumed to contain jurisdictional wetlands and would be mitigated on-site. Therefore, impacts to wetlands would be potentially significant.

Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2 would reduce the potential impact to wetlands.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Avoidance and Minimization Measures to Protect Adjacent Wetlands

The following avoidance and protection measures shall be implemented for Waters of the U.S. and Waters of the State adjacent to areas of planned disturbance that will not be impacted (filled or excavated) during Project construction:

- Impacts to wetlands/waters shall be avoided or minimized to the greatest extent feasible in the final design plans.
- Adjacent wetlands shall be clearly identified in the final construction documents (100% design plan set).
- Suitable perimeter control measures, such as silt fences, or straw wattles shall be placed below all construction activities at the edge of surface water features to intercept sediment before it reaches the waterway. These measures shall be installed prior to any clearing or grading activities.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Compensate for Loss of Wetlands

The HCSD shall avoid fill and conversion of seasonal wetlands and waters, to the extent feasible. If fill cannot be avoided, the Project shall compensate for the loss of seasonal wetland habitat to ensure there is no net loss in wetlands. The HCSD shall compensate for impacts to identified wetlands through restoration, rehabilitation, and/or creation of wetland at a ratio of no less than 1:1 and to the satisfaction of jurisdictional agencies.

A Habitat, Mitigation, and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) shall be prepared in coordination with the NCRWQCB, the USACE, and the CCC. The HMMP shall be acceptable to the regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands and waters and include the following elements: mitigation ratios, description and size of the restoration or compensatory area, site preparation and design, plant species, planting design and techniques, maintenance activities, irrigation requirements, success criteria, monitoring schedule, and remedial measures. Three-parameter wetland mitigation shall occur on-site. The HMMP shall be implemented by the HCSD.

The HCSD shall also compensate for impacts to other waters by obtaining required permits from the USACE, the NCRWQCB, and the CCC, and shall be received prior to the start of any on-site construction activity. The HCSD shall ensure any additional measures outlined in the permits are implemented.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3 and BIO-4, impacts to wetlands would be less than significant.

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? (No Impact)

Wildlife corridors refer to established migration routes commonly used by resident and migratory species for passage from one geographic location to another. Maintaining the continuity of established wildlife corridors is important to: (a) sustain species with specific foraging requirements, (b) preserve a species' distribution potential, and (c) retain genetic diversity among many wildlife populations. Therefore, resource agencies consider wildlife corridors to be a sensitive resource.

No Essential Connectivity Areas have been identified within the BSA, and the nearest is approximately 20 miles east (CDFW 2026a). However, habitat adjacent to the BSA has the potential to function as a riparian corridor for bird species. Shrub cover along the roads may facilitate the movement of songbird species, provide nesting habitat, and provide cover from predator species by acting as a hedgerow. Although these features facilitate connectivity, this is a highly disturbed area by vehicular traffic along Hoover Street, which can negatively influence reproductive success. Residential roads may also be barriers to certain species' movement.

The BSA is in a developed setting and does not occur within a mapped regional wildlife corridor or Natural Landscape Block identified by the California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project (CDFW 2026a). While limited hydrologic connectivity to Eureka Slough is present via localized drainage or tidally influenced features, the BSA does not provide a functional terrestrial or aquatic movement corridor, and the Project would not impede use of nearby habitats for movement or nursery functions. The Project does not include any elements that would impede migration of native resident or migratory fish. The Project also does not include any elements that would result in new barriers to terrestrial wildlife movement. The existing fence around the lift station would remain unchanged, and the proposed flood wall would extend approximately eight feet above grade. The Project would not interfere with the migration of birds, bats, or other species. No impact would result.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

The Project is located within the Humboldt Bay Area Plan of the Humboldt County LCP (Humboldt County 2022). The Humboldt Bay Area Plan identifies land uses and standards by which development would be evaluated within the Coastal Zone as defined by the California Coastal Act. The indicated uses and standards adopted by Humboldt County, and certified by the CCC, are in conformance and satisfy the policies and requirements for coastal land use contained in the California Coastal Act and other related legislation. Humboldt Bay Area Plan Section 3.30 describes the Natural Resources Protection Policies and Standards. The Humboldt Bay Area Plan defines ESHAs as "any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare, including locally rare, or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments." Humboldt Bay Area Plan Chapter 3 identifies the following environmentally sensitive habitats within the Humboldt Bay Planning Area:

- Wetlands and estuaries, including Humboldt Bay and the mouth of the Mad River
- Vegetated dunes along the North Spit to the Mad River and along the South Spit
- Rivers, creeks, gulches, sloughs and associated riparian habitats, including Mad River Slough, Ryan Slough, Eureka Slough, Freshwater Slough, Liscom Slough, Fay Slough, Elk River, Salmon Creek, and other streams
- Critical habitats for rare and endangered species listed on state or federal lists

The Project is not located on the North or South Spit and does not contain dune habitat, and it is not located within areas defined as critical habitat (**Appendic C**). However, the Project is located adjacent to Eureka Slough and contains wetlands. As wetlands located within the Project Area would not be significantly impacted by the Project with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, BIO-3, and BIO-4, the Project would not conflict with any policies in the Humboldt Bay Area Plan. Therefore, impacts to wetlands would be less than significant with mitigation.

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? (No Impact)

Currently there is not an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans that cover the Project Area (CDFW 2026b). No impact would result.

3.5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

Impact analysis related to cultural resources is based on the ASR prepared for the Project (Roscoe and Associates 2025). The study area in this section is termed the Area of Potential Effect (APE).

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? (No Impact)

The archaeological investigation identified no historic properties or historical resources (as defined in PRC Section 15064.5(a)) within the APE. Records searches of the California Historical Resources Information System archival research, aerial photos, and pedestrian survey confirmed that the APE was undeveloped until construction of the lift station in the early 1970s and does not qualify as a historical resource (Roscoe and Associates 2025). Therefore, the Project would not result a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to PRC Section 21084.1 (Roscoe and Associates 2025).

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated)

Seven Wiyot archaeological sites were reported within 0.5 miles of the APE. No resources are documented in the direct APE; however, several sites are in very close proximity (within 100 feet). Within the APE, pedestrian field surveys conducted by Roscoe and Associates did not yield artifacts, features, sites or other archaeological cultural resources (Roscoe and Associated 2025). Because of historical development in this area, archaeological resources may not be observable during surface survey, and the extent of previously recorded resources may not be known.

Native American tribes and individuals and the NAHC were contacted by Roscoe and Associates to discuss the proposed Project. This correspondence resulted in recommendations for monitoring all excavation work related to this Project. The Wiyot Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) recommended that a tribal monitor be present during construction activities in specific locations within the Project Area. The ASR suggests working with the Wiyot Tribe to develop a monitoring plan that identifies postimplementation recording requirements, how discoveries would be addressed, and how collections would be curated or reburied. Coordination between the lead agency, the applicant, and the Wiyot Tribe was recommended prior to construction to confirm monitoring scope and procedures.

Although no archaeological resources were identified, the potential for inadvertent discovery during construction could result in a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 would reduce the potential impact to archaeological resources or human remains by requiring a cultural monitor and providing procedures that shall be taken in the event of inadvertent discovery.

Mitigation Measure CR-1: Cultural Monitoring and Inadvertent Archaeological Discoveries

The HCSD will retain a qualified cultural resource monitor who is approved by the Wiyot Tribe to monitor ground disturbing activities related to this Project in areas the Tribes deem culturally sensitive, specifically any ground disturbance within 100 feet of a recorded site.

The HCSD will contact the THPO from the Wiyot Tribe or their functional equivalent to set up and implement a cultural monitoring contract when a construction schedule has been determined. Advanced coordination with the qualified cultural monitor is required. The HCSD shall provide written verification for compliance with this mitigation measure. If cultural or historic-era resources are encountered during construction activities, the contractor on-site shall cease all work in the immediate area and within a 66-foot buffer of the discovery location. A qualified archaeologist, as well as the THPO for the Wiyot Tribe shall be contacted to evaluate the discovery and, in consultation with the HCSD, develop a treatment plan in any instance where significant impacts cannot be avoided.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 would reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level during construction because a plan would be implemented to require a cultural monitor, address discovery of unanticipated archaeological resources, and to preserve and/or record those resources consistent with appropriate laws and requirements.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated)

Archaeological resources are not expected to be present within the APE; however, inadvertent discovery of human remains may still occur. In the event human remains are encountered during construction, impacts would be potentially significant. Mitigation Measure CR-2 would be implemented to reduce the potential impact to related to the unanticipated discovery of human remains.

Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-2 would reduce the potential impact to archaeological resources or human remains by establishing procedures that shall be followed in the event of inadvertent discoveries.

Mitigation Measure CR-2: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains

If human remains are discovered during Project construction, work will stop at the discovery location, within 66 feet, and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie human remains (PRC, Section 7050.5). The Humboldt County Coroner will be contacted to determine if the cause of death must be investigated. If the Coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, it is necessary to comply with State laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC, PRC, Section 5097). The Coroner will contact the NAHC. The descendants or most likely descendants of the deceased will be contacted, and work will not resume until they have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work for means of treatment and disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods, as provided in PRC Section 5097.98.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-2 would reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level during construction because a plan would be implemented to address the discovery of unanticipated human remains and to preserve and/or record those resources consistent with applicable laws and regulatory requirements.

3.6 Energy Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?		X		
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

Construction of the Project would involve a variety of earthwork and construction processes involving the use of heavy equipment as discussed in Section 3.3 (Air Quality). Construction would require the use of fuels, primarily gas, diesel, and motor oil. Construction emissions were estimated using CalEEMod version 2022.1.1.44 and were estimated to be approximately 273 metric tons of carbon dioxide ($MTCO_2e$) from all construction activities (**Appendix B**). The Project's construction emissions equal 9.1 $MTCO_2e$ per year when annualized over the assumed 30-year lifespan of the Project. Peak travel associated with Project construction would consist of approximately 38 vehicular round trips per day, and construction equipment would remain staged in the Project Area once mobilized. Excess soils and construction materials would be stored on-site within previously designated staging areas only. Excess soils may be re-used on-site for backfill and finished grading. Excess soils would not remain stockpiled on-site once the Project is complete. The contractor may haul additional excess soils off-site for legal use at other permitted sites.

The consumption of energy resources during construction would be reduced through the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 (Measures to Reduce Air Pollution). Equipment idling times would be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes or less (as required by Mitigation Measure AQ-1). Because construction would not encourage activities that would result in the use of large amounts of fuel and energy in a wasteful manner, and the incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1would reduce idling time, impacts related to the inefficient use of construction-related fuels would be less than significant with mitigation.

Operation of the Project would include maintenance and monitoring as described in Section 1.8 and would be consistent with maintenance and monitoring of the existing stormwater infrastructure. Operation and maintenance of the Project would not generate additional vehicle trips nor result in an increase in energy use above existing conditions. The potential for wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources would be less than significant with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (No Impact)

The Project was evaluated for consistency with applicable state, regional, and local plans adopted for the purpose of promoting renewable energy, energy efficiency, and climate change mitigation. Based on this review, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct any such plans.

At the county level, the 2025 Humboldt County Regional Climate Action Plan establishes goals and strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through energy efficiency, electrification of equipment and operations, reduced reliance on fossil fuels, and modernization of infrastructure to support cleaner energy systems (Humboldt County 2025). Key strategies include improving energy efficiency in existing and new facilities, electrifying transportation and industrial operations where feasible, and supporting infrastructure investments that enable a transition to lower

emission energy sources. The Project elements are consistent with these regional strategies and would not impede their implementation.

In addition to policy consistency, the Project would be subject to and required to comply with the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (California Code of Regulations Title 24) and related provisions of the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen), which are primary statewide mechanisms for implementing energy efficiency and electrification goals. Compliance with these mandatory standards ensures that new and modified buildings and systems associated with the Project would meet or exceed state energy efficiency requirements, further supporting alignment with adopted plans. Therefore, no impact would result.

3.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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?				X
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii. Seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv. Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
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?				X
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?				X
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?				X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		

The Project Area is generally flat with regional geology likely influenced by seismic activity as a result of the relatively close proximity of the Mendocino Triple Junction to the Project. A spur of the Mad River Fault Zone is located approximately 8.28 miles northeast of the Project, and a spur of the Little Salmon Fault Zone is located approximately 6.5 miles south of the Project Area as mapped by the California Geological Survey (CGS 2026). Review of historical aerial photographs indicates that most of the Project Area has historically been part of Eureka Slough.

The Project Area is predominantly composed of Hydraquents mucky silt loam with strong salinity and zero to one percent slopes. A small portion of the southern extent consists of the Iepoil–candymountain complex with slopes ranging from two to fifteen percent, as well as the Hookton–Tablebluff complex with slopes between two and nine percent (**Appendix D**). The hydraquents mucky silt loam consists of mucky silt loam from the ground surface to approximately 13 inches below ground surface, underlain by mucky silty clay loam to 51 inches, with deeper mucky silt loam extending to about 79 inches below ground surface. Soils formed in estuarine deposits are very poorly drained, strongly saline, and influenced by a shallow water table and frequent flooding.

a.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. (No Impact)

According to the California Geological Survey, there are no earthquake fault zones in the Project Area or vicinity. The closest fault zone is the Fickle Hill Fault, in the Mad River Fault Zone, located in Arcata approximately 5.4 miles north of the Project Area (CGS 2026). Thus, there is no risk of the Project to cause potential substantial adverse effects from the rupture of a fault. No impact would result.

a.ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The Project is situated within a seismically active area close to several seismic sources capable of generating moderate to strong ground motions. Because the Project is located within a seismically active area, the probability that strong ground shaking associated with large magnitude earthquakes would occur during the design life of the Project is high.

The Project Area is in proximity to numerous Quaternary faults located in both the onshore and offshore areas, including the Cascadia subduction zone, Gorda plate, and shallow upper plates (e.g., Mad River and Little Salmon fault zones). The Mendocino fault zone and San Andreas fault also have the potential to generate strong ground motion in the Project Area. The Humboldt County coast is a highly active tectonic region that has been subjected to numerous earthquakes of low to moderate strength and occasionally to very strong earthquakes. Seismicity in the region is attributed primarily to the Mendocino Triple Junction, the interaction between the Pacific, Gorda, and North American plates. The Project would be an isolated and contained flood protection improvement within an existing developed utility site and would not directly or indirectly increase exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from strong ground shaking. Thus, a less than significant impact would result.

a.iii, aiv, c, d) Liquefaction, landslides, or otherwise unstable soils? (No Impact)

Liquefaction is a phenomenon involving loss of soil strength and resulting in fluid mobility through the soil. Liquefaction typically occurs when loose, uniformly sized, saturated sands or silts are subjected to repeated shaking in areas where the groundwater is less than 50 feet below ground surface. In addition to the necessary soil and groundwater conditions, the ground acceleration must be high enough, and the duration of the shaking must be sufficient for liquefaction to occur. The Project is in a mapped liquefaction hazard zone (Humboldt County 2026c). However, the Project does not contain elements that would be substantially impacted by liquefaction and would not directly or indirectly increase exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from liquefaction. Therefore, no impact would occur.

The Project Area is located below a steep slope and has the potential for landslides. The floodwall design would be consistent with the Project's geotechnical recommendations. As a result, landslides within or near the Project Area are unlikely to occur, and the Project would not increase the potential for hazards as a result of a landslide. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Expansive soils, which can undergo shrink/swell behavior due to changes in moisture content, are present within portions of the Project Area. Soils with a Plasticity Index (PI) greater than 12 are generally considered expansive (Caltrans 2023). NRCS mapping indicates that the Hookton–Tablebluff complex contains relatively high clay content (approximately 27.6%) but exhibits a PI of 10.8, indicating low to moderate expansion potential. In contrast, the lepoil–candymountain complex has a recorded PI of approximately 15.4 with a clay content of about 23.2%, indicating a moderate potential for expansion (**Appendix D**). Although some soils within the Project Area exhibit characteristics associated with expansiveness, the overall geologic conditions do not indicate a substantial risk of liquefaction, landsliding, or other forms of unstable soils. Compliance with standard engineering design and construction practices would ensure soil stability. Therefore, no impact would occur.

The Project would be designed and constructed in conformance with the site-specific recommendations contained in the geotechnical report prepared for the Project and any subsequent Project-related geotechnical reports (Crawford and Associates 2026). Project adherence to geotechnical design recommendations during construction and operation

would result in a no impact in hazards caused by the Project due to landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

The Project Area is comprised of predominantly comprised Hydraquents mucky silt loam, and a small portion of the southern extent of the Project Area is comprised of lepoil–candymountain complex at depths less than seven feet from the surface (**Appendix D**). Construction activities, including excavation, grading, soil compaction, and operation of heavy machinery would disturb soil and have the potential to cause erosion. Erosion and sediment control provisions prescribed in the Humboldt County Municipal Code would be required to be implemented as part of the Project. Erosion prevention measures would include silt traps, straw wattles, soil stabilization controls, and site watering for controlling dust. Measures would be designed to stabilize soils and minimize the potential transport of sediment to receiving waters during and post construction. Implementation of BIO-3 would reduce potential soil erosion impacts from construction. The impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

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? (No Impact)

The Project includes modifications to the wastewater collection system, consisting of the relocation of an existing manhole, realignment of the associated pipeline, and installation of two new force main fittings to support temporary bypass pumping during construction. The Project would not utilize septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, soil suitability for such systems is not applicable and no impact would occur.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

Paleontological resources are the remains or traces of prehistoric animals and plants. Paleontological resources, which include fossil remains and geologic sites with fossil-bearing strata are non-renewable and scarce and are a sensitive resource afforded protection under environmental legislation in California. Under California PRC § 5097.5, unauthorized disturbance or removal of a fossil locality or remains on public land is a misdemeanor. State law also requires reasonable mitigation of adverse environmental impacts that result from development of public land and affect paleontological resources (PRC § 30244).

It is unlikely that Project construction would impact potentially significant paleontological resources because most of the Project occurs in relatively newly deposited alluvium. However, the possibility of encountering a paleontological resource during construction cannot be completely discounted; therefore, the impact related to the potential disturbance or damage of previously undiscovered paleontological resources, if present, is potentially significant.

Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce the potential impact of construction activities on unknown paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level by addressing the discovery of unanticipated buried resources and preserving and/or recording those resources consistent with applicable laws and requirements.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources

In the event that fossils are encountered during construction (i.e., bones, teeth, or unusually abundant and well-preserved invertebrates or plants), construction activities shall be diverted away from the discovery within 50 feet of the find, and a professional paleontologist shall be notified to document the discovery as needed, to evaluate the potential resource, and to assess the nature and importance of the find. Based on the scientific value or uniqueness of the find, the paleontologist may record the find and allow work to continue, or recommend salvage and recovery of the material, if it is determined that the find cannot be avoided. The paleontologist shall make recommendations for any necessary treatment that is consistent

with currently accepted scientific practices. Any fossils collected from the area shall then be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution where they will be properly curated and preserved.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce the potential impact of construction activities on unknown paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level by addressing the discovery of unanticipated paleontological resources and preserving and/or recording those resources consistent with applicable laws and requirements.

3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X

Evaluating climate impacts under CEQA can be challenging because global climate change is inherently a cumulative problem. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are regulated and evaluated in California through a comprehensive framework of state law, CEQA requirements, and adopted regional and local climate plans.

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The Project is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of NCUAQMD. The NCUAQMD have not adopted regulations regarding the evaluation of GHG emissions in a CEQA document and has not established CEQA significance criteria to determine the significance of impacts regarding GHGs. Therefore, the following analysis focuses on the Humboldt Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP) GHG thresholds related to specific project design elements. Implementation of the Project would incrementally add to overall greenhouse gas emissions in the region. Construction GHG emissions are a one-time release and are, therefore, not typically expected to generate a significant contribution to global climate change.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5, a project that is consistent with a qualified GHG reduction plan, such as the RCAP, may rely on that plan for CEQA streamlining and would not result in a significant GHG impact. This involves determining consistency with land use and zoning designations, as well as consistency with the County's CEQA GHG Emissions Streamlining Checklist. The County has also adopted CEQA GHG thresholds to evaluate whether future development projects may have significant greenhouse gas impacts. These thresholds apply when a project cannot demonstrate consistency with the RCAP and therefore requires a project-specific GHG analysis. Thresholds and summarized in **Table 3.8-1** below.

Table 3.8-1 County CEQA GHG Emissions Thresholds

Project Type	New Residential	New Non-Residential	New Mixed-Use[1]
Urban	5.28 MT CO_2e per full-time equivalent employee	5.28 MT CO_2e per full-time equivalent employee	3.37 MT CO_2e per service person[2]
Rural	2.38 MT CO_2e per resident	5.30 MT CO_2e per full-time equivalent employee	3.30 MT CO_2e per service person

Notes: MT CO2e = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.
1: GHG emissions from new mixed-use development would count against the total remaining GHG emissions budget for both new residential and new non-residential development rather than as a function of the number of new service people expected in 2030. This avoids double counting.
2: The service population is equal to the residential population plus the number of full-time equivalent employees.

As described in Section 3.11, Land Use and Planning, the Project is consistent with the land use and zoning regulations. The Project is also consistent with the RCAP for purposes of CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 and would not result in a significant GHG impact on this basis.

Additionally, construction GHG emissions were modeled over an assumed 30-year Project lifespan and added to operational emissions. Based on CalEEMod modeling (attached as **Appendix B**), Project construction activities would result in a small, temporary increase in GHG emissions, including exhaust emissions from on-road trucks, worker commute vehicles, and off-road heavy-duty equipment. Construction would require clearing, earthmoving, and delivery equipment, as used for similar projects, and which have been accounted for in the State's emission inventory and reduction strategy for both on and off-road vehicles. Construction emissions were estimated using CalEEMod version 2022.1.1.44 and were estimated to be approximately 273 $MTCO_2e$ from all construction activities. The Project's construction emissions equal 9.1 $MTCO_2e$ per year when annualized over the assumed 30-year lifespan of the Project. For purposes of applying the thresholds in Table 3.8-1, the Project is most appropriately characterized as a new non-residential infrastructure improvement because it would modify and protect an existing public wastewater utility facility. The new non-residential threshold is expressed in MT CO_2e per full-time equivalent employee. However, the Hoover Street lift station is an unmanned facility and would not create new permanent employment or require full-time on-site staffing. Following construction, the site would only be occupied intermittently during routine inspection, maintenance, and repair activities, consistent with existing operation of the facility. Because the Project would not add full-time equivalent employees, the per-employee non-residential threshold is not directly applicable as a measure of ongoing operational emissions. Operational GHG emissions would therefore remain limited to occasional maintenance vehicle trips and would not represent a substantial new source of GHG emissions. Accordingly, the Project would be consistent with the RCAP and would not exceed or conflict with the new non-residential GHG threshold identified in Table 3.8-1. Therefore, the Project's GHG emissions would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (No Impact)

The Project was evaluated for consistency with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, including the RCAP (Humboldt County 2025). Projects that are consistent with the RCAP would not conflict with the County's ability to achieve its GHG reduction targets. The Project would not interfere with implementation of the RCAP because it does not introduce new development, population growth, or operational characteristics that would conflict with the land use assumptions, emissions reduction strategies, or performance targets established in the plan. As discussed in Section 3.11, the Project is consistent with applicable land use designations and zoning and maintains the existing public utility use. The Project involves improvements to an existing, unmanned wastewater lift station and would not generate additional employment, vehicle trips beyond intermittent maintenance, or long-term operational emissions. Furthermore, the Project does not conflict with or obstruct any RCAP measures related to energy use, transportation, land use, or infrastructure planning. As such, it is consistent with the RCAP. Therefore, the Project would not result in a significant impact related to GHG emissions, and impacts would be less than significant.

The California Air Resource Board (CARB) 2022 Scoping Plan identifies a path to meet the SB 32 GHG emission reduction goals, as well as reducing anthropogenic GHG emissions to 85% below 1990 levels by 2045, and achieving carbon neutrality by 2045 or earlier, consistent with Assembly Bill 1279 (AB 1279). The 2022 Scoping Plan includes measures to move to a zero-emissions (decarbonized) transportation sector and phasing out the use of natural gas in residential and commercial buildings. The 2022 Scoping Plan would also reduce emissions of short-lived climate pollutants and includes mechanical CO_2 removal and carbon capture and sequestration actions, as well as natural working lands management and nature-based strategies. The plan's measures are identified in Table 2-2 and Table 2-3 of the 2026 Scoping Plan. The measures are statewide and programmatic in nature. The 2022 Scoping Plan is largely advisory, as CARB does not directly regulate many of the sectors identified by the plan's measures.

The 2022 Scoping Plan states that local action by municipalities can support and amplify efforts to reduce GHGs. Local government decisions play a critical role in supporting state-level measures to contain the growth of GHG emissions associated with the transportation system and the built environment. Local actions, provided in Appendix D of the 2022 Scoping Plan, are not required by statutory or gubernatorial direction, and are not binding, but contain guidance and information regarding actions that other jurisdictions may choose to take that complement the 2022

Scoping Plan measures. However, the 2022 Scoping Plan measures are broad policy and regulatory initiatives that would be implemented at the state-level and do not relate to the construction and operation of individual projects such as the Project.

Project construction would cause a temporary increase in GHGs; however, as discussed above, Project emissions would not exceed the identified emission thresholds. The Project is analyzed for consistency with the 2022 Scoping Plan in **Table 3.8-2**. As shown in the table, the Project is consistent with the actions for the Scoping Plan scenario outlined in the 2022 Scoping Plan for AB 32 GHG inventory sectors. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with SB 32, AB 1279, or the 2022 Scoping Plan and would result in no impact.

Table 3.8-2 Consistency Analysis Between Project and 2022 Scoping Plan

Scoping Plan Sector and Action	Consistency/Applicability Determination
GHG Emissions Reductions Relative to the SB 32 Target – 40% below 1990 levels by 2030.	**Not Applicable.** This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by the Project or lead agency.
Smart Growth / Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) – VMT per capita reduced 25% below 2019 levels by 2030, and 30% below 2019 levels by 2045.	**Not Applicable.** This is a statewide measure and VMT reduction goal that is not applicable to all individual projects due to regional variations and growth projections. Additionally, the Project would not generate new or increased operational trips.
Light-duty Vehicle (LDV) Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEVs) – 100% of LDV sales are ZEV by 2035.	**Not Applicable.** This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by the Project or lead agency. However, the standards would be applicable to the light-duty vehicles that would access the Project Area during construction and operation.
Truck ZEVs – 100% of medium-duty (MDV)/HDV sales are ZEV by 2040 (AB 74 University of California Institute of Transportation Studies report).	**Not Applicable.** This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by the Project or lead agency.
Aviation – 20% of aviation fuel demand is met by electricity (batteries) or hydrogen (fuel cells) in 2045. – Sustainable aviation fuel meets most or the rest of the aviation fuel demand that has not already transitioned to hydrogen or batteries.	**Not Applicable.** This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by the Project or lead agency. The Project does not involve an aviation uses.
Ocean-going Vessels (OGV) – 2020 OGV At-Berth regulation fully implemented, with most OGVs utilizing shore power by 2027. – 25% of OGVs utilize hydrogen fuel cell electric technology by 2045.	**Not Applicable.** The Project does not involve OGV.
Port Operations – 100% of cargo handling equipment is zero emission by 2037. – 100% of drayage trucks are zero emission by 2035.	**Not Applicable.** The Project does not involve a port.
Freight and Passenger Rail – 100% of passenger and other locomotive sales are ZEV by 2030. – 100% of line haul locomotive sales are ZEV by 2035. – Line haul and passenger rail rely primarily on hydrogen fuel cell technology, and others primarily utilize electricity.	**Not Applicable.** The Project does not involve freight or passenger rail.
Oil and Gas Extraction – Reduce oil and gas extraction operations in line with petroleum demand by 2045.	**Not Applicable.** The Project does not involve oil or gas extraction.
Petroleum Refining	**Not Applicable.** The Project does not involve or petroleum refining.

Scoping Plan Sector and Action	Consistency/Applicability Determination
– CCS on majority of operations by 2030, beginning in 2028. – Production reduced in line with petroleum demand.	
Electricity Generation – Sector GHG target of 38 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent ($MMTCO_2e$) in 2030 and 30 $MMTCO_2e$ in 2035. – Retail sales load coverage. – 20 gigawatts (GW) of offshore wind by 2045. – Meet increased demand for electrification without new fossil gas-fired resources.	**Not Applicable.** This measure would apply to electricity providers. The Project is not an electricity provider.
New Residential and Commercial Buildings – All electric appliances beginning 2026 (residential) and 2029 (commercial), contributing to 6 million heat pumps installed statewide by 2030.	**Not Applicable.** The Project does not include new residential or commercial buildings.
Existing Residential Buildings – 80% of appliance sales are electric by 2030 and 100% of appliance sales are electric by 2035. – Appliances are replaced at end of life such that by 2030 there are 3 million all-electric and electric-ready homes – and by 2035, 7 million homes – as well as contributing to 6 million heat pumps installed statewide by 2030.	**Not Applicable.** This is a measure for the state to modify its requirements for appliance sales to affect energy efficiency of existing residential buildings. The Project would not include appliance manufacturing or sales, or continued use of existing residential buildings.
Existing Commercial Buildings – 80% of appliance sales are electric by 2030, and 100% of appliance sales are electric by 2045. – Appliances are replaced at end of life, contributing to 6 million heat pumps installed statewide by 2030.	**Not Applicable.** The Project would not include continued use or existing commercial buildings.
Food Products – 7.5% of energy demand electrified directly and/or indirectly by 2030; 75% by 2045.	**Not Applicable.** The Project does not include agricultural or mass food production.
Construction Equipment – 25% of energy demand electrified by 2030 and 75% electrified by 2045.	**Not Applicable.** Although the Project would involve the use of construction equipment, construction would occur in 2024, prior to the electrification goal. Additionally, the Project would not own the construction fleet used.
Chemicals and Allied Products; Pulp and Paper – Electrify 0% of boilers by 2030 and 100% of boilers by 2045. – Hydrogen for 25% of process heat by 2035 and 100% by 2045. – Electrify 100% of other energy demand by 2045.	**Not Applicable.** This measure would apply to the energy sources for pulp and paper manufacturers. The Project does not involve pulp or paper manufacturing.
Stone, Clay, Glass, and Cement – CCS on 40% of operations by 2035 and on all facilities by 2045. – Process emissions reduced through alternative materials and CCS.	**Not Applicable.** This measure would apply to the direct GHG emissions from CCS industries. The Project is not a CCS industry.
Other Industrial Manufacturing – 0% energy demand electrified by 2030 and 50% by 2045.	**Not Applicable.** This measure would apply to the energy sources for industrial manufacturers. The Project is not an industrial manufacturer.
Combined Heat and Power – Facilities retire by 2040.	**Not Applicable.** This measure would apply to the existing combined heat and power energy facilities. The Project is not a combined heat and power facility.
Agriculture Energy Use – 25% energy demand electrified by 2030 and 75% by 2045.	**Not Applicable.** The Project does not include agricultural production.
Low Carbon Fuels for Transportation – Biomass supply is used to produce conventional and advanced biofuels, as well as hydrogen.	**Not Applicable.** This measure would apply to bulk fuel providers. The Project is not a fuel provider.

Scoping Plan Sector and Action	Consistency/Applicability Determination
Low Carbon Fuels for Buildings and Industry – In 2030s blended in pipeline. – Renewable hydrogen blended in fossil gas pipeline at 7% energy (~20% by volume), ramping up between 2030 and 2040. – In 2030s, dedicated hydrogen pipelines constructed to serve certain industrial clusters.	**Not Applicable.** This measure would apply to natural gas utilities and energy providers. The Project is not an energy provider.
Non-combustion Methane Emissions – Increase landfill and dairy digester methane capture. – Some alternative manure management deployed for smaller dairies. – Moderate adoption of enteric strategies by 2030. – Divert 75% of organic waste from landfills by 2025. – Oil and gas fugitive methane emissions reduced 50% by 2030 and further reductions as infrastructure components retire in line with reduced fossil gas demand.	**Consistent.** The Project does not include a landfill or dairy. The Project would reduce construction waste with implementation of state mandated recycling and reuse mandates.
High GWP Potential Emissions – Low GWP refrigerants introduced as building electrification increases, mitigating HFC emissions.	**Not Applicable.** The Project does not include appliances that would use refrigerants.

Source of Scoping Plan Reduction Measures: CARB 2022

3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
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?		X		
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
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?				X
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?			X	
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X	

This section evaluates the potential for the Project to create hazards to the public or the environment through the use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. It also considers the presence of existing contamination, proximity to hazardous materials sites, and potential impacts related to emergency response, accidental releases, and wildfire risk.

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Less Than Significant)

Construction of the Project would include the transport and use of common hazardous materials inherent to the construction process, including petroleum products such as fuel and lubricants for construction equipment and vehicles, concrete curing compounds, and solvents for construction of Project improvements. These materials are commonly used during construction, are not acutely hazardous, and would be used in relatively small quantities.

Hazardous materials storage, handling, and transportation must comply with local, state, and federal laws. Hazardous materials used during construction of the Project would be subject to applicable regulations, including California Health and Safety Code Section 25531, Division 20, Chapter 6.5, and other standards enforced by the various departments and boards under the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA). The Project would be subject to Cal/EPA hazardous materials regulations consolidated under the state's Unified Program enforced by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), NCRWQCB, NCUAQMD, and the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). The Cal/EPA administers the Unified Program via

local Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPAs). The CUPA for Humboldt County is the Humboldt County Division of Environmental Health (HCDEH). The HCDEH Hazardous Materials Unit has jurisdiction over the Project Area and is tasked with local CUPA inspections and compliance. Project activities involving the transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials would be in accordance with established rules and regulations.

Worker exposure to hazardous materials is regulated by California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) and requires worker safety protections. Cal/OSHA enforces hazard communication regulations which require worker training and hazard information (signage/postings) compliance. In addition, hazard communication compliance includes procedures for identifying and labeling hazardous substances, communicating information related to hazardous substances storage, handling, and transportation; and preparation of health and safety plans to protect employees.

Project construction specifications would require the management of hazardous materials to comply with applicable laws, rules, and regulations. During Project construction, the contractor would be required to contain hazardous materials and avoid exposure to workers, the public, and the surrounding environment during construction. An appropriate facility would be utilized for legal disposal of any hazardous materials generated.

Project construction would not require implementation of stormwater management requirements during construction. Stormwater management requirements for addressing materials management would be required, including proper material delivery and storage, spill prevention and control, and management of concrete and other wastes, as described in Section 3.10 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

The established regulatory framework, BMPs, and requisite construction protocols provide appropriate risk mitigation and hazard protections; therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment from hazardous materials. Because the Project and its contractors would be required to comply with existing and future hazardous materials laws and regulations addressing the transport, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment during Project construction would be less than significant.

Following construction, operation of the Project would require intermittent maintenance and repair, which could involve hazardous materials. The operational risk posed by intermittent maintenance and repair of the lift station specific to hazardous materials is low. The potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment during Project operation would be less than significant.

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? (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated)

The Project would utilize heavy machinery to perform some construction-related tasks including grading, excavation, and transportation of materials. There is always the possibility when equipment is operating that an accident could occur, and fuel could be released onto the soil. Equipment on-site during construction would be required to have emergency spill cleanup kits immediately accessible in case of any fuel or oil spills. With implementation of BIO-2, equipment would not be refueled near the Humboldt Bay, Eureka Slough, or any perennial wetland. If equipment must be washed, it would be washed off-site. The potential impact would be less than significant.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (No Impact)

There are no existing or proposed schools located within 0.25-mile of the Project Area. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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? (No Impact)

Based on information contained in the SWRCB Geotracker website (SWRCB 2026) and DTSC EnviroStor website (DTSC 2026), there are no active sites within 1 mile of the Project Area. Based upon this information, it is unlikely that contamination present from adjacent or nearby sites would migrate into the Project Area. No impact would occur.

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? (Less Than Significant)

The Project is located within two miles of a public airport; however, it would not introduce new sensitive receptors or otherwise result in safety hazards or exposure to excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project Area. The Project involves minor modifications to existing infrastructure at an unmanned lift station that is only periodically accessed for operation and maintenance activities. The Project would not introduce permanent on-site employees, regular occupancy, or new land uses that would increase exposure to airport-related safety hazards or excessive noise, and it would not interfere with airport operations or applicable airport land use plans. Therefore, impacts related to airport safety and noise would be less than significant.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The Project Area is covered under the Humboldt County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). The Humboldt County EOP identifies the emergency response and evacuation policies and procedures for hazards related to earthquake, tsunami, extreme weather, flooding/flash flooding, landslides, transportation accidents, hazardous materials, interface wildlife fire, energy shortage, offshore toxic spill, civic disturbance, terrorist activities, and national security (Humboldt County 2015).

The Humboldt County EOP establishes a structure for Humboldt County Operation Area agencies to respond to large-scale emergencies requiring multiagency participation or activation of the Humboldt County Emergency Operations Center (Humboldt County 2015). Hazard mitigation and risk assessment strategies for Humboldt County Operation Area are formalized in the Humboldt County Operational Area Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP).

No temporary lane closures would be required. If temporary lane closures would be required, it would follow Humboldt County requirements, including Humboldt County encroachment permit conditions, for temporary roadway closures, including signage and public noticing requirements.

The Project would not impair implementation or physically interfere with the established Humboldt County EOP, or Humboldt County HMP. As the Project would not impair implementation of an emergency response plan or evacuation plan, the potential impact related to the temporary road closures during construction would be less than significant.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (Less Than Significant Impact)

As discussed in Section 3.20, Wildfire, the Project would not substantially increase wildfire risk or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fire. The Project involves improvements to an existing developed wastewater lift station that is unmanned and only periodically accessed for operation and maintenance activities. The Project would not introduce new residential uses, increase population or employment, create new ignition sources beyond temporary construction activities, or impair emergency access or evacuation. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

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

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? (Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)

Construction activities such as site clearing, grading, excavation, and material stockpiling, placement of aggregate base, and related construction activities could leave soils exposed to rain or surface water runoff that may carry soil contaminants (e.g., nutrients or other pollutants) into waterways adjacent to the site, degrade water quality, and potentially violate water quality standards for specific chemicals, dissolved oxygen, suspended sediment, or nutrients. The greatest potential Project impacts to water quality would result from sediment mobilization during construction. If not properly managed, construction activities could result in erosion, as well as the discharge of chemicals and materials to adjacent waterways. In such an instance, applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements could be violated, and polluted runoff could substantially degrade water quality in the local storm drain system. This impact is would be potentially significant.

Compliance with State Water Board Order No. 2022-0057 would be required which will regulate stormwater runoff from Project construction activities. Prior to ground disturbance, HCSD would obtain coverage under SWRCB Order No. 2022-0057, General Permit For Stormwater Discharges Associated With Construction And Land Disturbance Activities. In compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System requirements, a Notice of Intent would be prepared and submitted to the NCRWQCB prior to undertaking construction, providing notification and intent to comply with the State of California Construction General Permit. Additionally, implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3 would reduce construction-related water quality impacts by minimizing erosion,

sediment transport, and pollutants entering nearby surface waters. Thus, impacts related to construction would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

Following construction, operation and maintenance of the Project would not increase drainage or infiltration to Eureka Slough. Instead, site precipitation captured within the Project Area would be routed to the sanitary sewer system rather than discharged to Eureka Slough, thereby reducing direct runoff from the site to the slough. Therefore, operational impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The Project is in the Eureka Plain Groundwater Basin 1-099 (DWR 2004), which is not listed as a basin in Critical Conditions of Overdraft (DWR 2026). Contractor-supplied water would be used during construction for dust suppression on local roadways and work areas. Use of groundwater is not anticipated for construction of the Project, although some limited dewatering of excavations may be necessary. Similarly, the Project would not decrease groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater management. During construction, isolated and short duration groundwater dewatering may occur as needed. Dewatering would be small in scale and limited to shallow groundwater only. No impact would result during construction.

Following construction, the Project would not require groundwater use and would not increase population or employment that could indirectly raise groundwater demand. Accordingly, the Project would not reduce aquifer storage capacity or lower groundwater levels. In addition, the proposed flood protection structure would create a hydrologically isolated condition within the site. However, this isolation would not adversely affect regional groundwater recharge because precipitation falling within the area would be captured and conveyed to the sanitary sewer system rather than discharged to surrounding waters or allowed to infiltrate. As a result, the Project would not measurably alter groundwater recharge patterns or usage, and a less than significant impact to groundwater would occur.

c.i) 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 result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Less Than Significant Impact)

Implementation of the Project would result in minor alterations to existing drainage patterns within the footprint of the flood protection structure of the lift station. However, these changes would not substantially impede the movement of surface water because flows would continue to be conveyed around the Project Area. Limited on-site precipitation will be routed to the sanitary sewer. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Erosion protection measures would be implemented during construction to avoid impacts to water quality, including those related to siltation (see Hydrology and Water Quality Section (a), above). CWA Section 401, and CWA Section 404 permits would also be implemented, including measures to prevent erosion-related impacts during construction. Substantial on- or off-site erosion and siltation would not result; therefore, potential construction-related erosion and siltation impacts would be less than significant.

c.ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The Project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. The Project is designed to protect the lift station from flooding associated with high tide events, storm surges, and future sea level rise conditions.. Surface water within the Project Area would be routed to sewer systems without creating new flooding conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c.iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Less Than Significant Impact)

Grading would occur during summer and fall months when conditions are driest, to minimize the risk of rainfall during the construction period and stormwater runoff when graded soils are exposed. As discussed above in Hydrology and Water Quality Section (a), requirements of CWA Section 401, and CWA Section 404 permits would also be implemented, including measures to prevent polluted stormwater runoff during construction. A less than significant impact would occur.

Operationally, the Project does not include elements that would significantly alter topography and rates of stormwater runoff. A less than significant impact would occur.

c.iv) Impede or redirect flood flows? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The Project would not impede or substantially redirect flood flows. While minor modifications to site drainage would occur, general flow paths would be maintained, and water would continue to move around the Project Area without large obstructions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The Project Area includes areas located in the FEMA 100-year flood zone (**Figure 6** of **Appendix C**). Because portions of the Project Area overlap the FEMA 100-year flood zone, construction would not occur during flood conditions (see Section 1.6 – Construction Schedule). This would minimize the potential for a flood-related release of pollutants during construction. The Project does not include unsecured elements that could be mobilized during a flood event; therefore, construction-related impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, the Project is intended to protect the facility from floodwaters and reduce the potential for wastewater releases to the Eureka Slough.

The Project Area is not located near a larger isolated body of water that may be affected by a seiche. No impact from a seiche would result.

The Project Area is located within a mapped tsunami hazard zone (CGS 2026). However, the Project would not involve the routine use or long-term storage of substantial quantities of hazardous materials that could be released during a tsunami event. Construction-related materials would be limited in quantity, temporary in nature, and managed in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. In addition, the Project does not introduce new sources of hazardous pollutants that would be subject to release during inundation. Therefore, the potential for a tsunami event to result in a release of pollutants would be minimal, and impacts would be less than significant.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (No Impact)

The relevant water quality control plan is the NCRWQCB's Basin Plan, which establishes thresholds for key water resource protection objectives for both surface waters and groundwater (NCRWQCB 2025). HCSD would obtain coverage under SWRCB Order No. 2022-0057, General Permit For Stormwater Discharges Associated With Construction And Land Disturbance Activities, in addition to CWA Section 401 and CWA Section 404 permits. These regulatory and associated monitoring requirements would ensure a conflict with the Basin Plan does not occur. No impact would result.

3.11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

This section evaluates the potential impacts related to land use, as it applies to construction and operation of the Project. Land use within the Project Area consists of Residential Low Density (RL) and Natural Resources (NR) (Humboldt County 2026d). Zoning within the Project Area consists of Residential Single Family / Coastal Wetland and Archaeological Resource Area (RS-5-W/A) (Humboldt County 2026e).

a) Physically divide an established community? (No Impact)

The Project involves improvements to an existing utility facility and would not divide an established community. No impact would result.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (No Impact)

According to Humboldt County's Web GIS, the entirety of the Project is within the Coastal Zone and is designated as being within the primary permit jurisdiction of the Humboldt County LCP (Humboldt County 2026f). The Humboldt Bay Area Plan (2022) is the land use plan for this area, and the Humboldt County Coastal Zoning Code is the Implementation Plan, with the Humboldt County General Plan being advisory (Humboldt County 2017). The Project Area is within the State Jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone. A coastal development permit would be required from the CCC. The Project would be required to adhere to all requirements of the Permit.

Applicable policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects can be found throughout the Humboldt Bay Area Plan and Humboldt County General Plan. A review of the Humboldt Bay Area Plan and Humboldt County General Plan elements, and the policies and standards within, did not identify any inconsistencies with the proposed Project. Specifically, the Project is consistent with the following goal included in the Humboldt Bay Area Plan:

> *3.30 NATURAL RESOURCES PROTECTION POLICIES AND STANDARDS*
>
> **** 30240. (Part) Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.*

Agencies that regulate the filling of wetlands include the USACE and the NCRWQCB. Because the proposed Project would affect USACE and NCRWQCB jurisdictional wetlands, the HCSD would obtain the necessary permit(s) to comply with respective regulations including a CWA Section 404, and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. By implementing permit requirements and mitigation measures identified in the Section 3.4 – Biological Resources above, the Project would not conflict with any applicable federal and state wetland regulations. Additionally, the proposed Project would not permanently alter the existing land uses, their designations, or their zoning, and would not introduce new land uses or land use designations or zoning; therefore, no conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulation(s) would occur. No impact would result.

3.12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			X	
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?			X	

a, b) 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, or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The Project would require minor use of rock, gravel, sand, and other similar materials, but is not expected to have any significant impact on locally available minerals or mineral resources valuable to the region or the state. Additionally, the Project Area is also not designated by the Humboldt County General Plan or other local land use plans as having locally-important mineral resources within the Project Area (Humboldt County 2017). The impact would be less than significant.

3.13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in 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?			X	
b) Result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels?			X	
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?				X

Current noise conditions on and near the Project Area consists of the adjacent local roadways along the proposed alignment. Sensitive receptors are located within 30 feet of the Project Area, including the Eureka Pentecostal Church. Residential neighborhoods along Hoover Street are also located adjacent to the Project Area and could be affected by construction-related noise.

a) Result in 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? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The proposed Project is located within the jurisdiction of the Humboldt Bay Area Plan. However, the Humboldt Bay Area Plan does not provide noise thresholds. Therefore, the Humboldt County General Plan noise policies are applied to noise-related impact analysis.

Construction

Construction of the Project would result in a temporary noise increase associated with the use of construction equipment during a single construction season, commencing in May and concluding by approximately October. Construction noise, including the loudest activity associated with pile driving, would occur near the terminus of Hoover Street. The Project site is also located at a lower elevation than nearby sensitive receptors, which would reduce the potential for a direct noise path to adjacent residences and the Eureka Pentecostal Church. Construction activities associated with the Project would occur over a single construction season and would be temporary in nature, with relatively low equipment intensity and limited duration at any one location. Activities would occur across the Project Area and along portions of Hoover Street associated with utility realignment, which would limit the duration of noise generation at any individual receptor.

Construction activities would be limited to daytime work hours between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday with occasional work on Saturdays. Furthermore, Humboldt County has not established construction-related noise standards. Because the construction phase would be temporary and construction activities would be intermittent and limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., potential noise impacts generated during the construction phase would be less than significant.

Operation

The Humboldt County General Plan includes Standard N-S1, which indicates that the Land Use/Noise Compatibility Standards (**Table 3.13-1** below) must be used as a guide to ensure compatibility of land uses. Development may occur in areas identified as “normally unacceptable” if mitigation measures can reduce indoor noise levels to “Maximum Interior Noise Levels” and outdoor noise levels to the maximum “Normally Acceptable” value for the given land use category.

For measuring noise levels and setting noise standards, the County uses Table 13-C (**Table 3.13-1** below) of the Humboldt County General Plan, which stipulates that 60 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is the upper acceptable limit for residential units (outside measurement), and 85 CNEL is the upper acceptable limit for “public ROW” land uses. CNEL is a measure that describes the average noise exposure over a period of time.

Table 3.13-1 Humboldt County Land Use Noise Compatibility Standards

Land Use Category	Maximum Interior Noise Level	Clearly Acceptable Noise Standard (CNEL)	Normally Acceptable Noise Level (CNEL)	Normally Unacceptable Noise Level (CNEL)	Clearly Unacceptable Noise Level (CNEL)
Residential Single Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes	45	50-55	56-60	61-75	76+
Residential Multiple Family, Dormitories, Etc.	45	50-55	56-60	61-75	76+
Transient Lodging	45	50-65	66-70	71-80	81+
School Classrooms, Libraries, Churches	45	50-60	61-65	66-75	76+
Hospitals, Nursing Homes	45	50-60	61-65	66-75	76+
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Music Shells	35	-	50-60	61-70	71+
Sports Arenas, Outdoor Spectator Sports	-	50-60	61-65	66-75	76+
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	-	50-55	56-65	66-75	76+
Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Rec., Cemeteries	-	50-60	61-70	71-80	80+
Office Buildings, Personal Business & Professional	50	50-65	66-75	76-80	81+
Commercial: Retail, Movie Theaters, Restaurants	50	50-65	66-75	76-80	81+
Commercial: Wholesale, Some Retail, Ind, Mfg., Util.	-	50-70	71-80	81-85	86+
Manufacturing, Communications (Noise Sensitive)	-	50-55	56-70	71-80	81+
Livestock Farming, Animal Breeding	-	50-60	61-75	76-80	81+
Agriculture (except livestock), Mining, Fishing	-	50-75	76+	-	-
Public Right of Way	-	50-75	76-85	86+	-
Extensive Natural Recreation Areas	-	50-60	61-75	76-85	86+

Once constructed, the Project would not generate substantial operational noise, as all new components are static in nature and do not involve moving parts or equipment that would produce ongoing sound.. Therefore, operation would not result in noise levels exceeding the County's noise standards for residential units or public ROW land uses. No impact would result.

b) Result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels? (Less Than Significant Impact)

Humboldt County does not establish vibration limits; however, Caltrans recommends a vibration limit of 0.5 inches/second peak particle velocity (PPV) for buildings structurally sound and designed to modern engineering standards, 0.3 inches/second PPV for buildings that are found to be structurally sound but where structural damage is a major concern, and a conservative limit of 0.08 inches/second PPV for historic buildings or buildings that are documented to be structurally weakened. No known buildings that are documented to be structurally weakened or ancient adjoin the Project Area. Therefore, the 0.5 inches/second PPV limit would apply when considering the potential for groundborne vibration levels to result in a significant vibration impact.

The noise and vibration the typical vibration levels that could be expected from construction equipment at a distance of 25 feet. Construction activities would involve the use of tracked excavators, backhoes, dump trucks, skid steers, concrete trucks, pickup trucks, and other conventional construction equipment. Pavement removal activities may require the temporary use of jackhammers, saws, grinders, or similar equipment capable of generating localized vibration. In addition, installation of the floodwall system at the lift station would require pile driving, which is the most intensive vibration-generating activity associated with the Project. As shown in **Table 3.13-2**, pile driving can generate vibration levels of approximately 0.644 inches per second PPV at 25 feet.

Table 3.13-2 Typical Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment Used During Project Construction (Caltrans 2020)

Equipment	PPV at 25 ft. (in/sec)	Approximate Lv at 25 ft. (VdB)
Vibratory Roller	0.210	94
Large Bulldozer	0.089	87
Pile Driver	0.644	94
Loaded trucks	0.076	86
Jackhammer	0.035	79
Small bulldozer	0.003	58

Vibration levels attenuate rapidly with increasing distance from the source due to geometric spreading and soil damping, resulting in substantially lower vibration levels at nearby receptors. Actual vibration levels would vary depending on site-specific factors such as soil characteristics, construction methods, equipment type, and activity duration. Construction of the Project would not involve blasting, explosives, or other extreme vibration-generating techniques. Although pile driving, vibratory compaction, and operation of heavy equipment would occur during construction, these activities would be temporary and intermittent.

The closest residence is located approximately 30 feet from anticipated construction activities. At that distance, vibration generated by a vibratory roller would remain below the 0.5 inches per second PPV threshold applicable to modern structures. The Eureka Pentecostal Church, another nearby sensitive receptor, is located approximately 110 feet from the lift station where pile driving activities would occur. Because groundborne vibration decreases substantially with distance, vibration levels at the church would be considerably lower than the 0.644 inches per second PPV estimated at 25 feet from a pile driver and would not be expected to result in structural damage. Given the temporary nature of construction activities, the setback distances between vibration-producing equipment and nearby receptors, and the rapid attenuation of groundborne vibration, Project construction would not expose nearby

structures or sensitive receptors to excessive vibration levels. Therefore, construction-related groundborne vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Following construction, operation of the Project would not introduce substantial sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. The Project consists of passive flood protection improvements intended to protect the lift station from flooding associated with high tides, storm surges, and sea level rise. The completed improvements would not generate groundborne vibration during normal operations. Although periodic maintenance or repair activities may occasionally require the temporary use of construction equipment, such activities would be infrequent, short-term, and limited in duration. Therefore, no operational impact would result.

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? (No Impact)

The Project Area is located approximately 1.0 mile southwest of Murray Field Airport and approximately 4 miles northeast of the Samoa Field Airport. The Project is not located within an airport land use plan. Therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project Area to excessive noise levels. No impact would result.

3.14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

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)? (No Impact)

The Project would not be growth-inducing and would not result in the creation of new homes or businesses, either directly or indirectly. While existing utilities would be modified as part of Project implementation, these modifications would not expand system capacity. Additionally, no new roads, utility extensions, or other infrastructure improvements would be constructed that could facilitate future residential or commercial development. The Project does not include any residential units that would directly induce population growth. Maintenance of Project elements is anticipated to be performed by local HCSD staff. No new employment opportunities would be directly or indirectly induced by implementation of the Project. Therefore, the Project would not induce substantial population growth and no impact would occur.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (No Impact)

The Project Area is already developed and is not used for residential purposes; therefore, no people or housing units would be displaced, and no replacement housing would be required.. No impact would result.

3.15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X

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 public services? (No Impact)

As discussed in Section 3.14, implementation of the Project would not induce population growth. The Project involves improvements to an existing facility, including the construction of a flood protection structure, relocation of a manhole, and realignment of the gravity main and water service. These improvements would not increase staffing needs, introduce new hazards, or modify the road system in a manner that would restrict emergency access. In addition, the Project would not introduce new or expanded land uses within the Project Area that would require increased demand for public services. Accordingly, the Project would not necessitate expanded fire or police protection, nor would it require new or altered public service facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios or response times. Therefore, no impact would occur.

3.16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) 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?				X
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

a) 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? (No Impact)

The Project would not increase use of the Eureka Slough, or other recreational facilities or parks, as it involves improvements to an existing facility, would not increase population, and would not be staffed except for periodic operation and maintenance activities. Therefore, no impact would result.

b) Include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (No Impact)

The Project does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore no impact would occur.

3.17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X	
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				X
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	

a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? (Less Than Significant Impact)

Construction would result in vehicle trips by construction workers and haul-truck trips for material off-haul and deliveries via U.S. 101 from the south to the Project Area at the end of Hoover Street. Construction-related traffic would be temporary, would vary on a daily basis, and would be distributed over the course of a workday and work week. An encroachment permit for temporary lane closures on Hoover Street may be required. Temporary lane closures would follow County requirements, including signage and public noticing requirements.

The Project would not modify existing transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities and would not conflict with applicable circulation plans, ordinances, or policies. Following construction, no increase in operational traffic would occur because the Project involves improvements to an existing facility. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? (No Impact)

Pursuant to SB 743 and the current CEQA Guidelines, evaluation of a project's potential transportation impact requires consideration of VMT, which refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. Projects that reduce or have no impact on VMT are presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact (OPR 2018). The Project would protect the sewer lift station from flooding associated with high tides, storm surges, and sea level rise, and would not result in an increase in vehicle trips following construction. There would be no impact.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (No Impact)

The Project would not change the geometry of the street or roadway network. Therefore, no potentially hazardous roadway design features would be introduced by the Project and no impact would occur.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Less Than Significant Impact)

Emergency access to the Project Area would be maintained during construction through traffic control measures, including controlled one-lane traffic, and would remain available throughout construction activities. Temporary lane closures on Hoover Street may be required. Temporary lane closures would follow County requirements for temporary roadway closures, including signage and public noticing requirements, and ingress and regress would be provided for emergency access. This would result in less than significant emergency access impacts. Existing provisions for emergency access would continue during operation of the Project. Therefore, no operational emergency access impacts would occur.

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historic resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1(k)?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the PRC section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the PRC section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.		X		

a,b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource? (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated)

CEQA requires lead agencies to determine if a proposed Project would have a significant effect on tribal cultural resources. The CEQA Guidelines define tribal cultural resources as: (1) a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that is listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, or on a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k); or (2) a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant according to the historical register criteria in PRC Section 5024.1(c), and considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

Under Assembly Bill (AB) 52, notification letters were sent to the Wiyot Tribe, Blue Lake Rancheria, and the Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria on May 29, 2026 (see Section 1.11, Tribal Consultation). Additional outreach efforts are documented in the ASR, as discussed in Section 3.5 (Cultural Resources). The Wiyot Tribe requested that a cultural resource monitor be present during ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project. In response, Mitigation Measure CR-1 would be implemented, requiring retention of a qualified cultural resource monitor approved by the Wiyot Tribe during ground disturbance in culturally sensitive areas. The measure also establishes procedures for coordination with the THPO, requires work stoppage and notification in the event of inadvertent discoveries, and provides for evaluation and treatment of any identified resources to ensure they are handled in accordance with applicable laws and tribal recommendations. Therefore, potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				X
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 provider's existing commitments?			X	
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?			X	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The proposed Project would include limited modifications to existing utility infrastructure, including the relocation of a manhole and the Hoover Street Gravity Main, a water service realignment, and installation of two new force main fittings to support temporary bypass pumping during construction. These improvements would not result in the expansion of utility capacity or the construction of new utility infrastructure. Existing water lines in proximity to the work area would be identified and protected during construction. A perimeter valley gutter, drop inlets, and related grading improvements within the site would collect stormwater runoff and convey it to the sanitary sewer system. The Project does not involve expanded wastewater or stormwater infrastructure. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? (No Impact)

The Project would not create an increased demand for domestic water service. The Project would require relatively small quantities of water during the construction phase (e.g., for dust control and concrete/asphalt applications). The Project's water demands would not be substantial and can be met by existing entitlements and resources. The Project would not result in the need for the construction of new water facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, no water supply impact would occur.

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 provider's existing commitments? (Less Than Significant)

The Project would not significantly increase wastewater because it is limited to improvements to an existing wastewater lift station. Stormwater within the Project Area would be routed to the sewer system which would marginally increase flows. A large 3-inch storm event over the isolated 0.1 acre would generate approximately 8,100 gallons of runoff. A 12-inch diameter sewer pipe has an internal storage capacity of approximately seven gallons per linear foot and conveys flow based on slope and hydraulic conditions. At typical design slopes, such pipes can transport several hundred to several thousand gallons per minute, indicating that relatively small stormwater volumes on the order of several thousand gallons would be conveyed rapidly and would not represent a substantial hydraulic load on the system. No expansion of wastewater treatment would be needed. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d, e) 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? Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The solid waste provider in the area is the Humboldt Waste Management Authority (HWMA). The Project is not expected to generate a significant increase in solid waste. The proposed Project would generate limited solid waste during construction and occasionally minimal waste during operation and maintenance. Construction solid waste would include the one-time temporary generation of construction waste associated with the proposed Project. Applicable recyclable construction materials (e.g., scrap metal, wood, concrete, glass) could be shipped to local businesses for reuse, with non-recyclable materials sent to the HWMA transfer station in Eureka or Samoa, California.

Solid waste collected as a part of the Project would be disposed of by the HWMA. HWMA trucks solid waste produced in the County to state licensed landfills located in Anderson, California and Medford, Oregon in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to solid waste disposal. These facilities have sufficient capacity to serve the Project's solid waste disposal needs; therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

3.20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
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?			X	
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?				X
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slop instability, or drainage changes?				X

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (Less Than Significant Impact)

A review of the Humboldt County EOP (Humboldt County 2015) and the Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning – County of Humboldt (CGS 2021) indicates that the proposed Project would not impair emergency response activities nor established evacuation routes. The Project would not block or alter any roads or pedestrian pathways within the Project Area. However, temporary traffic changes may occur during construction, such as short-term lane closures or access restrictions as described in Section 3.17. A less than significant impact would result.

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? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The Project Area is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area (SRA) or on lands classified as very high fire severity zones (Humboldt County 2026g 2026h). The Project Area is in a developed urban location and is in a relatively flat slough floodplain. Some grassland and other vegetation are present in the Project Area. The vegetated portions could be susceptible to wildfire during Project construction or operation due to accidental ignition, however, the slough vegetation would limit the potential for ignition due to its inherent wetland features. During construction, all hazardous materials and construction equipment would be appropriately used and stored pursuant to all required state and local regulations. The Project would not involve the use or storage of significant quantities of hazardous materials during operation that may be released if a wildfire occurred. Furthermore, the Project does not include any structures built for human occupancy. Due to the temporary nature of construction, the minimal amount of hazardous materials anticipated to be stored during the construction phase, the fact that the Project is located within an area of “moderate” fire risk, and that the Project does not provide any structures to be used for human occupancy, it is not anticipated to exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose users to pollutants. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

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? (No Impact)

The Project does not involve the construction or maintenance of infrastructure that would exacerbate fire risk or result in impacts to the environment. New roads for fire defense, expanded water sources, new power lines, or the construction of other utilities would not be required. Therefore, no impact would result.

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? (No Impact)

The Project Area is not within a low slope area of topography. If a wildfire were to occur, post-fire slope instability would be unlikely. The Project is not expected to result in significant drainage changes. Therefore, no impact would result.

3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Does the project:				
a) 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?			X	
b) 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)?			X	
c) Have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

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? (Less Than Significant Impact)

As evaluated in this Initial Study, the Project would not 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; reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

Mitigation measures are not required to reduce impacts related to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and tribal cultural resources. The impacts associated with the proposed Project analyzed in this Initial Study would not add appreciably to any existing or foreseeable future significant impact.

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)? (Less Than Significant Impact)

Cumulative impacts are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15355). Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time, and may arise from the combination of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects within a geographic area. CEQA requires that a Project's incremental contribution to these combined conditions be evaluated to determine whether the contribution is cumulatively considerable.

The geographic scope for cumulative analysis includes the surrounding vicinity where related development activities could contribute to shared environmental conditions such as traffic, air quality, noise, biological resources, and utilities demand. Review of available information, including coordination with the Humboldt County Planning Department and Humboldt County Department of Public Works, did not identify any past, current, or reasonably foreseeable projects within or near the Project Area that would result in overlapping environmental effects of a magnitude that would combine with the Project to create a cumulatively considerable condition. Smaller-scale residential infill and minor development activities were not included in the cumulative scenario because such projects typically result in negligible contributions to regional environmental conditions and are addressed through existing regulatory compliance requirements.

Operational impacts associated with the Project would be minimal and would not substantially increase demand on public services, infrastructure, or natural resources beyond existing capacity or adopted planning thresholds. Furthermore, adherence to applicable federal, State, and local regulations, as well as incorporation of mitigation measures identified in this Initial Study, would ensure that any Project-level impacts are reduced to a less than significant level prior to their contribution to cumulative conditions.

Based on the absence of nearby cumulative projects with substantial overlapping impacts, the limited scale and scope of the Project, and the implementation of regulatory requirements and mitigation measures, the Project's incremental contribution to cumulative environmental conditions would not be cumulatively considerable. Incremental impacts, if any, would be negligible, diffuse, and not measurable within the broader environmental setting. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Less Than Significant Impact)

The Project has been planned and designed to avoid significant environmental impacts. As discussed in the analysis throughout Section 3 of this Initial Study, the Project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse direct or indirect effects on human beings. The impact would be less than significant.

4. Report Preparers

4.1 Lead Agency

Terrence Williams, General Manager, Humboldt Community Services District

4.2 GHD

Madalyn Pierson, Environmental Scientist

Christian Hernandez, Environmental Scientist (Reviewer)

Nick Black, Project Engineer (Reviewer)

Christopher Wolf, Business Group Leader – Natural Resources & Impact Assessment (Reviewer)

5. References

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2022. 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 20206. EnviroStor Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese). Accessed: May 2026. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2023. Highway Design Manual (HDM). Available online: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/manual-highway-design-manual-hdm

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2026. State Scenic Highway Map. Available online: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways.

California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2004. Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118 Alluvial Groundwater Basins/Subbasins Humboldt County, California. Eureka Plain Groundwater Basin.

California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2026. Groundwater Basin Prioritization. Available online: https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/bp-dashboard/final/

California Geological Survey (CGS). 2026. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation. Accessed: May 2026. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2026a. Essential Connectivity Area-California Essential Habitat Connectivity. Accessed: May 2026. https://data-cdfw.opendata.arcgis.com/maps/CDFW::essential-connectivity-areas-california-essential-habitat-connectivity-cehc-ds620/explore?location=40.711361%2C-123.585823%2C9

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2026b. Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP). Accessed: May 2026. https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Planning/NCCP

Crawford and Associates, Inc. 2026. Geotechnical Report – Hoover Street Lift Station Flood Protection Project

Department of Toxic Substance Control. 2026. EnviroStor Map (EnviroStor). Accessed: May 2026. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=1060+Hoover+St%2C+Eureka%2C+CA+95501

Environmental Science Associates (ESA), GHD, Northern Hydrology & Engineering, Philip King and Kristina Kunkel, Redwood Community Action Agency. 2021. Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plan for Transportation Infrastructure and Other Critical Resources in the Eureka Slough Hydrographic Area, Humboldt Bay Trinity Associates

Humboldt County. 2015. Emergency Operations Plan. March. Available online at: https://humboldtgov.org/DocumentCenter/View/51861/Humboldt-County-Emergency-Operations-Plan-2015

Humboldt County. 2017. Humboldt County General Plan. October. Available online: https://humboldtgov.org/DocumentCenter/View/61984/Humboldt-County-General-Plan-complete-document-PDF

Humboldt County. 2022. Humboldt Bay Area Plan of the Humboldt County Local Coastal Program. March. Available online at: https://humboldtgov.org/DocumentCenter/View/50844/Humboldt-Bay-Area-Local-Coastal-Plan

Humboldt County. 2025. Humboldt Regional Climate Action Plan. May. Available online at: https://humboldtgov.org/2464/Humboldt-Regional-Climate-Action-Plan

Humboldt County. 2026a. Humboldt County WebGIS. Layers Accessed: Prime Agricultural Soils. Accessed: May 2026. https://webgis.co.humboldt.ca.us/HCEGIS2.0/

Humboldt County. 2026b. Humboldt County WebGIS. Layers Accessed: Williamson Act. Accessed: May 2026. https://webgis.co.humboldt.ca.us/HCEGIS2.0/

Humboldt County. 2026c. Humboldt County WebGIS. Layers Accessed: Area of Potential Liquefaction. Accessed: May 2026. https://webgis.co.humboldt.ca.us/HCEGIS2.0/

Humboldt County. 2026d. Humboldt County WebGIS. Layers Accessed: Land Use. Accessed: May 2026. https://webgis.co.humboldt.ca.us/HCEGIS2.0/

Humboldt County. 2026e. Humboldt County WebGIS. Layers Accessed: Zoning. Accessed: May 2026. https://webgis.co.humboldt.ca.us/HCEGIS2.0/

Humboldt County. 2026f. Humboldt County WebGIS. Layers Accessed: Coastal Zone. Accessed: May 2026. https://webgis.co.humboldt.ca.us/HCEGIS2.0/

Humboldt County. 2026g. Humboldt County WebGIS. Layers Accessed: Cal Fire SRA. Accessed: May 2026. https://webgis.co.humboldt.ca.us/HCEGIS2.0/

Humboldt County. 2026h. Humboldt County WebGIS. Layers Accessed: Fire Hazard Severity. Accessed: May 2026. https://webgis.co.humboldt.ca.us/HCEGIS2.0/

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB). 2025. Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region 2025 Basin Plan Amendment.

North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD). 2019. Personal Communication with J. Davis.

North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD). 2021. Air Quality Planning & CEQA. Available at: http://www.ncuaqmd.org/index.php?page=aqplanning.ceqa

Office of Planning and Research. 2018. Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA. December. Available online at: https://opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf

Roscoe and Associates. 2025. An Archaeological Survey Report for the Humboldt Community Services District Hoover Street Lift Station Flood Protection Project Eureka, Humboldt County, California. January. CLASSIFIED

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. (SMAQMD) 2021. SMAQMD Thresholds of Significance Table. Accessed May 2026. Available at https://www.airquality.org/residents/ceqa-land-use-planning/ceqa-guidance-tools

Sawyer, J.O., T. Keeler-Wolf, and J.M. Evans. 2009. A Manual of California Vegetation, Second Edition. California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, California, USA.

State Water Resource Control Board. 2026. GeoTracker. Accessed May 2026: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=1060+Hoover+St%2C+Eureka%2C+CA+95501

United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2010. Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region Version 2.0.

United States Census Bureau (US Census). 2020. Eureka City, California. Retrieved from: https://data.census.gov/all?q=eureka

Referenced Appendices may be found in the full digital version of the document at:
https://humboldtcsd.org/public-notices

A hard copy of the Initial Study & Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Hoover Street Lift Station Flood Protection Project and all appendices may be viewed at the District Office at:

5055 Walnut Drive
Eureka , CA 95503

Humboldt Community Services District

Dedicated to providing high quality, cost effective water and sewer service for our customers

AGENDA REPORT

For HCSD Board of Directors Regular Meeting of: September 8, 2025

AGENDA ITEM: **F.2**

TITLE: Consideration of Appointing an Ad-Hoc Committee to Conduct the 2026 General Manager Annual Review

PRESENTED BY: Michael Hansen, Board President

Recommendation:
Board President appoints a two-member Ad-Hoc Committee for the General Manager Annual Performance Evaluation

Summary:
The General Manager's six-year anniversary with the District was August 24th, 2026. In 2008, the Board adopted a procedure for conducting General Manager evaluations. The practice of the Board has been:

- The Board President appoints a two-member Ad-Hoc Committee to evaluate performance, consider a salary increase, set goals, and provide direction for the subsequent year.
- The Ad-Hoc Committee and General Manager prepare draft evaluations.
- The Ad-Hoc Committee and General Manager discuss the draft evaluations. The Ad Hoc Committee will finalize a draft evaluation to present to the Board.
- During a regularly scheduled board meeting, the board meets with the General Manager in a closed session to finalize and approve the evaluation.

This year, the Board has requested, and staff recommends, that the Board engage a consultant to assist with the annual review process. A consultant with experience in public-sector executive evaluations can review the District's current process, provide an objective framework for the evaluation, assist the Board in identifying appropriate performance criteria, and facilitate the evaluation process.

During his tenure, the General Manager received a performance review after his first six months and upon completion of his first, second, and fifth years working for the District. The following Board Members have previously served on the ad Hoc Committee.

6 months:	Alan Bongio, Gregg Gardiner
1 year:	Gregg Gardiner, Michael Hansen
2 year:	Gregg Gardiner, Michael Hansen
3 year:	No Review
4 year:	Heidi Benzonelli, Joe Matteoli
5 year:	Heidi Benzonelli, Joe Matteoli

Fiscal Impact:
None. Potential cost associated with retaining a consultant to assist with the review .