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APPROVAL OF A PROPOSAL BY THE CITY OF EUREKA TO EXPEND $458,000 FROM ITS HUMBOLDT BAY FUND FOR DREDGING OF THE SMALL CRAFT HARBOR AND THE EDA DOCK AND APPROVAL OF A MAINTENANCE DREDGING PERMIT

APPLICANT:
City of Eureka
Attn: Ray Shipley, Acting City Manager
531 K Street
Eureka, California 95501

BACKGROUND:

Under Chapter 225, Statutes of 1945, and as subsequently amended, the Legislature granted with minerals reserved certain tide and submerged lands to the City of Eureka for such purposes as a harbor and related activities, marine-oriented uses, public recreation and many other specific uses.

Among other things, the grant requires that the State Lands Commission approve any capital expenditure in excess of $250,000 (Chapter 1086, Statutes of 1970). The City has now applied to the Commission to expend approximately $458,000 from its Humboldt Bay Fund, "Reserve for Dredging," for dredging the Small Craft Harbor and the area immediately adjacent to the EDA Dock.

PROJECT:

The Small Craft Harbor area and the vicinity adjacent to the EDA Dock have become heavily silted and are in need of dredging. The City does not perform dredging of the Humboldt Bay on an ongoing basis, and consequently does not have a...
dredge in the Bay for its use. In addition, the most significant cost of a project is mobilization of a dredge from another area. The Nehalem River Dredging Company presently has its equipment in the Bay for a private contract and is able to perform the required dredging for the City within the limits of its budget.

Bids were solicited and received for the project, and on July 21, 1987, the City Council approved the project and awarded the contract to Nehalem River Dredging Company contingent upon the City obtaining all required approvals and permits for the project. The contract is for a period of 120 days, beginning in mid-August 1987. The estimated cost to finance the project, including permit application fees, dredging, surveyor fees, and dump fees to be paid to the disposal site owner, is $457,789. This amount is within the budget restrictions.

A maximum volume of 66,000 cubic yards of minerals other than oil, gas and geothermal will be dredged from the subject areas to improve navigation. The spoils will be deposited on a previously used, approved upland disposal site. Humboldt County has issued a Use Permit (CUP 53-86) for the site.

**TERMS OF THE PROPOSED DREDGING PERMIT:**

**Initial Period:** One year beginning August 21, 1987.

**Royalty:** No royalty for public benefit project.

**PREREQUISITE CONDITIONS, FEES AND EXPENSES:**

Filing fee has been received. The dredging and disposal activities shall be conducted consistent with the recommendations of the Department of Fish and Game.

**STATUTORY AND OTHER REFERENCES:**

A. P.R.C.: Div. 6, Parts 1 and 2; Div. 13.

B. Cal. Adm. Code: Title 2, Div. 3; Title 14, Div. 6.

AB 884: 01/07/88.

(REVISED 08/19/87)
OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION:

1. A Negative Declaration was prepared and adopted and a permit issued by the County of Humboldt for the use of the upland disposal site. The State Lands Commission's staff has reviewed such document and believes that it complies with the requirements of the CEQA.

2. The City of Eureka, as grantee, has determined that this activity is exempt from the requirements of the CEQA, as a categorical exempt project. The project is exempt under Class 4, Minor Alterations to Land, 14 Cal. Adm. Code 15304(g).


3. Based on staff's review of the City's financial records, it appears that the City has sufficient revenues and plans to implement the project. The proposed project is compatible with those uses set forth in the grant and appears to be in the best interests of the public. Staff recommends that the Commission approve the expenditure of tideland trust funds for the dredging of the City's Small Craft Harbor and the vicinity adjacent to the EDA Dock.

4. Staff recommends that no royalty be assessed for this project because of the resulting public navigational benefits and because the City must pay for the disposal of the spoils. It is staff's belief that, because the City must pay for disposal, the spoils are valueless. Therefore, a waiver of the royalty charge is consistent with Commission dredging policy, where royalty is not charged for offshore disposal.

APPROVALS OBTAINED:

Humboldt County, United States Army Corps of Engineers, and California Water Quality Control Board.
EXHIBITS:  
A. Location Map.  
B. Negative Declaration

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION:

1. CONCUR WITH THE DETERMINATION BY THE CITY OF EUREKA THAT THE ACTIVITY IS EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CEQA PURSUANT TO 14 CAC 15601 AS A CATEGORICAL EXEMPT PROJECT, CLASS 4, MAINTENANCE DREDGING, 14 CAC 15104(g).

2. FIND THAT THE CITY OF EUREKA HAS SUFFICIENT REVENUES FOR THE PROPOSED DREDGING PROJECT.

3. FIND THAT THE PROJECT IS AN ALLOWABLE USE OF THE CITY'S GRANTED LANDS AND THE REVENUES GENERATED THEREFROM.


5. FIND THAT THIS APPROVAL DOES NOT AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF ANY FUNDS DERIVED FROM THE SETTLEMENT OF LAND TITLE TO COVER THE COSTS OF THE PROPOSED DREDGING.

6. AUTHORIZE STAFF TO ISSUE TO THE CITY OF EUREKA A MAINTENANCE DREDGING PERMIT TO ALLOW DREDGING, A MAXIMUM VOLUME OF 66,000 CUBIC YARDS OF MATERIAL FOR ONE YEAR AT THE CITY'S SMALL CRAFT HARBOR AND DISPOSAL AT AN APPROVED UPLAND SITE. SUCH PERMITTED ACTIVITY IS CONTINGENT UPON APPLICANT'S COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE PERMITS, RECOMMENDATIONS OR LIMITATIONS ISSUED BY FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES. ROYALTY TO BE WAIVED BECAUSE OF THE RESULTING PUBLIC BENEFIT AND BECAUSE THE SPOILS ARE VALUELESS.

(REVISED 08/19/87)
State Clearinghouse
400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA  95814

RE: Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for LOUISIANA-PACIFIC
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

Attached are ten (10) copies of the Negative Declaration for the
referenced application for which Humboldt County is the Lead
Agency.

This material is being submitted to the State Clearinghouse pursuant to California Administrative Code Section 15161.5. Said Section requires public agencies to submit their Draft Environmental Impact Reports and Negative Declarations to the State Clearinghouse for review by State Agencies having jurisdiction as a Responsible Agency. The State Agencies known by Humboldt County to be Responsible Agencies for the referenced application are listed below.

The review period set by the Humboldt County Planning Department for review of the attached Negative Declaration is 30 days effective as of 3/30/07

Sincerely,
THOMAS D. CONLON
PLANNING DIRECTOR

By: [Signature]
Linda Goff Bayens
Planner II

Responsible State Agencies: "Solid Waste, Regional Water Quality Control Board;
California Department of Fish and Game; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Humboldt Bay Harbor;
Recreation Conservation District; California Coastal Commission; and State Lands Commission

cc: Applicant
**NOTICE OF COMPLETION AND ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TRANSMISSION FORM**

**Project Title:** LOUISIANA-PACIFIC CUP/JDP

**Lead Agency:** Humboldt County Planning Department  
**Contact Person:** Linda Goff Evans  
**Address:** 3015 "H" Street  
**City:** Eureka  
**County:** Humboldt  
**Zip:** 95501  
**Phone:** (707) 445-7541

**PROJECT LOCATION**  
**County:** Humboldt  
**City/Community:** Samoa  
**Dr. Amendments' Parcel No.:** 401-031-02  
**Section:** 15 & 16  
**Township:** SN  
**Range:** 1W

**Within 2 miles:** State Highway 255  
**City:** Eureka  
**County:** Humboldt  
**City/Community:** Samoa

---

**DOCUMENT TYPE**  
1. Local Action Type  
2. Development Type

**A. HOP**  
**B. New Element**  
**C. General Plan Amendment**  
**D. Master Plan**  
**E. Supplement/Revisions to Coastal Plan**  
**F. Community Plan**  
**G. Redevelopment**  
**H. Territorial Plan**  
**I. Special Plan**  
**J. Special District Plan**  
**K. Proposed Land Use**

**Supplemental Document**  
1. Draft EIR  
2. Final EIR  
3. Joint Document  
4. Final Document  
5. Cross Street: Vance Avenue & Highway 255  
6. Rail-Sector NNP  
7. Watershed Humboldt Bay

**DOCUMENT TYPE**  
1. Local Action Type  
2. Development Type

**A. HOP**  
**B. New Element**  
**C. General Plan Amendment**  
**D. Master Plan**  
**E. Supplement/Revisions to Coastal Plan**  
**F. Community Plan**  
**G. Redevelopment**  
**H. Territorial Plan**  
**I. Special Plan**  
**J. Special District Plan**  
**K. Proposed Land Use**

**Supplemental Document**  
1. Draft EIR  
2. Final EIR  
3. Joint Document  
4. Final Document  
5. Cross Street: Vance Avenue & Highway 255  
6. Rail-Sector NNP  
7. Watershed Humboldt Bay

---

**DOCUMENT TYPE**  
1. Local Action Type  
2. Development Type

**A. HOP**  
**B. New Element**  
**C. General Plan Amendment**  
**D. Master Plan**  
**E. Supplement/Revisions to Coastal Plan**  
**F. Community Plan**  
**G. Redevelopment**  
**H. Territorial Plan**  
**I. Special Plan**  
**J. Special District Plan**  
**K. Proposed Land Use**

**Supplemental Document**  
1. Draft EIR  
2. Final EIR  
3. Joint Document  
4. Final Document  
5. Cross Street: Vance Avenue & Highway 255  
6. Rail-Sector NNP  
7. Watershed Humboldt Bay

---

**PROJECT ISSUES DISCUSSED IN DOCUMENT**

**1. Aesthetic/Visual**  
**2. Agricultural Land Use**  
**3. Air Quality**  
**4. Archeological/Historical**  
**5. Coastal Zone**  
**6. Economic**  
**7. Fire Hazards**  
**8. General Industrial (NI)**  
**9. Geologic/Geophysical**  
**10. Historical Resource**  
**11. Hydrology/Geohydrology**

**9. Institutional/State Parks**  
**10. Land Use Patterns**  
**11. Local Services**  
**12. Marine/Estuarine**  
**13. Public Services**  
**14. Public Health**  
**15. Septic Systems**  
**16. Social**  
**17. Soil Erosion/Siltation**  
**18. Soil Type/Soil Quality**

**19. Solid Waste Disposal**  
**20. Solid Waste Management**  
**21. Toxic/Non-Toxic**  
**22. Traffic/Circulation**  
**23. Traffic Engineering**  
**24. Water Supply**  
**25. Water Quality**  
**26. Water Resources**

**27. Wetlands/Riparian**  
**28. Wildlife/Fish**  
**29. Wildlife Protection**  
**30. Wildlife Habitat**  
**31. Wildlife/Habitat**  
**32. Wildfire Management**  
**33. Wind Erosion/Siltation**  
**34. Woodlands**

**35. Woodlands Management**  
**36. Zoning**

---

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** An application for a Use Permit and a Coastal Development Permit for the disposal of 66,000 cubic yards of dredged sand and silt from Humboldt Bay on an approximately 23 acre parcel. The fill will be an average of 3 feet in height on the site.

---

**SIGNATURE OF LEAD AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE:** [Signature]  
**Date:** 3/27/67

**NOTE:** Clearances will be made for identification numbers for all new projects. If a PER number already exists for a project (e.g., from a Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill it in.
Explanations of "Yes" and "Maybe" responses

Items 5, 6, 9, 12. Drainage patterns, runoff, water quality, and habitat.

Finding:

The proposed project may have an effect on drainage patterns, permeability, runoff and water quality. Staff believes that the significance of these potential impacts could be mitigated through conditions that require setbacks from wetland and dune hollow areas and require the applicant to obtain a waste discharge permit from the Regional Quality Control Board.

Explanation:

The initial study submitted by the applicant indicates that the site consists primarily of dune sands and previously spoiled materials. While the percolation rates of dune sands are typically high, no specific information was provided concerning the existing rate of percolation or the expected changes resulting from the proposed dredge spoils on the site. Staff believes that there could be potential impacts through percolation, runoff, and soil permeability to adjacent wetlands/dune hollows. Such impacts could be mitigated by requiring conditions that the applicant submit hydrologic information, obtain a waste discharge permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and maintain sufficient setback from the wetland/dune hollow resource area to provide an adequate buffer area.

Item 35. Existing marine traffic.

Finding:

The proposed dredge spoils disposal will have no direct effect on marine traffic, however, the dredging activity that precedes the need to dispose of the spoils will maintain channels utilized for marine trafficking purposes.

Explanation:

Staff believes that the dredging activities, over which the County has no direct permit jurisdiction, will serve to maintain existing marine traffic channels within Humboldt Bay. Since the dredge spoils disposal is a necessary part of dredging activities, and the County does have jurisdiction over the dredge spoils site through the Use Permit and the Coastal Development Permit process, staff believes that the impacts on marine traffic will be positive in maintaining current channels.
Item 36. Solid waste disposal.

Finding:
The proposed dredge spoils disposal is a solid waste disposal activity. The Humboldt Bay Area Plan identifies specific sites for dredge spoils disposal, but does not identify the subject parcel among those sites. Staff believes the project will not negatively impact the Bay Plan's identified dredge spoils disposal sites in that the subject parcel has already been used for dredge disposal activities in the past.

Explanation:
Staff believes that continued and expanded use of an existing dredge spoils disposal site with appropriate conditions to protect the identified resources, is otherwise consistent with a comprehensive view of the Bay Plan and will not adversely affect the ability to use the spoils disposal sites identified in the plan.
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
OF: Louisiana Pacific
FOR: Conditional Use Permit and Coastal Development Permit

FILE NO. AP 401-031-32

ON THE BASIS OF THE FINDINGS DESCRIBED AND EXPLAINED IN THE ATTACHED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, THE FOLLOWING DETERMINATION HAS BEEN MADE:

NEGATIVE DECLARATION □ There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment.

CONDITIONAL NEGATIVE DECLARATION X Conditions described in the attached material have been added to the proposed project by or with the agreement by the Applicant to avoid or mitigate to a point of insignificance the potentially significant environmental effects of the project, and there is no substantial evidence that the project as conditioned may have a significant effect on the environment.

DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT □ There is substantial evidence that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment.

3/27/27 (Date)
By: [Signature]
For: Thomas D. Conlon
Planning Director
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## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

WILL THE PROPOSED PROJECT HAVE AN EFFECT ON:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exposure to wildfire or forest fire?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unstable geologic conditions or exposure to geologic hazards?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exposure to pedologic (soil) hazards that present foundation and structural problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exposure to hydrologic hazards such as flooding, ponding or tidal wave?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Drainage patterns or the course or flow of floodwaters?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Soil permeability or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Soil erosion by wind or water?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Siltation, deposition or erosion of a water bed or channel?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Surface or ground water quality?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Amount, course or flow of any surface water body?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Amount or recharge rate of ground waters?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Any habitat for plants, fish or wildlife?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Migration or movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Acreage or productivity of agricultural land?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Acreage or productivity of commercial timber land?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Use of any mineralogic, petrologic or pedologic resource?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Any archaeological or paleontological site or resource?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Any resource, object or structure of special recreational, educational or cultural significance to the public or a social or ethnical group?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Access to, or use of any area held in trust for the public?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Any scenic vista or view open to the public?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Use of-fuel or energy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Ambient air quality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Air movement, moisture content or temperature?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Ambient noise levels for adjoining areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Solar access for any adjoining properties?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Level of illumination or reflection of light and glare onto other properties?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Ground vibration?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Level of electromagnetic interference or high frequency radiation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Exposure to toxic, volatile, flammable or other hazardous substances? Previous wood waste spills?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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30. Emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans?  

31. Patterns of land use of the area?  

32. Location, distribution or density of the human population of an area?  

33. Housing supply, or pressure for additional housing?  

34. Patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?  

35. Traffic load on existing transportation facilities, including facilities for vehicular, marine, rail and air traffic?  

36. Public works facilities for water, sewer, storm water drainage and solid waste disposal? Not in planned dredge disposal site  

37. Public services for fire and police protection, education, recreation and other government services?  

38. Social services for health and welfare?  

39. Utilities for communications, or power and natural gas?  

DOS THE PROJECT: Yes  Maybe  No  

(Attach explanations of all answers)  

40. Have effects or potential effects which will cause or contribute to significant impact (in terms of substantial adverse change) on any of the following:  

(a) risk of people to personal health hazards, either directly or indirectly; or  

(b) risk of people and property to physical hazards; or  

(c) the number or diversity of any species of plant or animal; or
February 3, 1987

County of Humboldt
Planning Department
3015 "H" Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Attention: Linda Evans, Planner II

SUBJECT: Louisiana-Pacific Corp. C.U.P.
AP# 401-031-32

This is to transmit the information requested in your letter dated December 30, 1986, and received January 7, 1987. Responses are given to your correspondingly numbered requests as follows:

1. A specific dredging disposal area Construction Plan has been prepared on a 1"=100' horizontal scale and a 2' contour interval. This plan shows specific detail in regard to dune hollows, existing and proposed improvements, and final grade elevations. The dredged spoils will be transported to the diked area via a pipeline through the existing 36" steel casing under Vance Avenue and the railroad. A return line will be constructed by extending the existing 8" PVC culvert under the railroad westerly per the plans.

2. A copy of Coastal Development Permit 1-85-04 and corresponding Staff Report is transmitted herewith.

3. AP# 401-031-32 is the remainder of the original patented parcel after acquisitions by the Railroad, County of Humboldt and State of California. I have included a copy of the original 1867 "Letters of Patent" and the 1972 Deed for the most recent acquisition by the County of Humboldt.

4. a) The Dredging Disposal Area Construction Plan includes the total site volumes which are shown for each diked area. The listed volumes may not be achieved during the currently planned project; however, the total volumes are expected to be deposited on or before the year 1992.
4.b) The materials are bay silts and sands which have no demonstrated toxicity to offsite people, plants or animals when properly deposited within containment dikes as proposed in this project.

4.c) The proposed project site appears to be the most logical local site in consideration of its historical use as a dredging disposal area. It is rather fully impacted by past filling and grading. Potential future uses of the site include any and all uses for which it is zoned.

4.d) There are no other known dredge disposal sites in this area of the peninsula. The nearest permitted historical site is located some 3 miles southerly at the Eureka Municipal Airport property.

4.e) The area surrounding the proposed disposal site is under the ownership and control of the applicant. All dredged materials will be deposited behind containment dikes and, therefore, should not affect offsite plant and animal life. The Louisiana-Pacific Corp. properties are served by the HEMWD community water system, and no groundwater withdrawals are planned for this area. Saline effluent will percolate to the groundwater table and return by subsurface flow to Humboldt Bay. Any possible effluent in excess of the naturally absorbed water will be piped via a clarified return line to Humboldt Bay. The dredging Contractor will be responsible for complying with the provisions of these plans and all permits issued thereon. The Engineering staff at Louisiana-Pacific Corp. will inspect these operations for compliance.

4.f) A 100 foot naturally vegetated buffer is provided on the north, west and south sides of the disposal site. A 50 foot buffer is provided toward the east. The natural topography and vegetation will be sufficient to screen and soften the dike profile. Experience has shown that the dredged materials revegetate naturally and, therefore, no specific active revegetation effort will be necessary.
4.g) It is felt that the project, as currently proposed, conforms to the intent of the Humboldt County Solid Waste Management Plan.

Please feel free to call with any questions on these matters.

Very truly yours,

VROMAN ENGINEERING

[Signature]

Trueman Vroman
Principal Engineer

TV/ch

cc: Jim Littlefield, Louisiana-Pacific Corp.
ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Title: Dredging Spoils Disposal

Location: New Navy Base Road North of Samoa, California

Assessor's Parcel Number(s): AP# 401-031-32

Date: November 17, 1986

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Describe briefly details and purpose of the project. If the project involves a variance, conditional use or rezoning, indicate clearly why the application is required. For larger projects indicate proposed scheduling or incremental development. Include a description of the beneficial effects of the project.

The project involves the disposal of up to 66,000 cubic yards of dredged sand and silts from the Wright Schuchart and Harbor development southwest of the Eureka Small Boat Basin and the Louisiana-Pacific Corporation Samoa Cargo Dock.

The disposal parcel is within the County Coastal permit area and is zoned MG.

This activity is a conditional use in the MG zone.

The project is scheduled for completion in 1987 and would benefit safety, shipping and related construction associated with the Wright Schuchart and Harbor marine construction yard and Louisiana-Pacific Pulp loading functions.
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

TOPOGRAPHY AND GRADING:

The proposed project is shown on the plan sheet appended hereto which illustrates all features on and adjoining the dredged spoils disposal area.

The dredged sands and silts will be excavated utilizing a cutter suction dredge and disposed of by pipeline to the subject disposal area. The depth of fill will range from 0 to \( \frac{1}{2} \) feet with an average depth of 3 feet. The estimated quantities are 66,000 cubic yards.

The finished surfaces would be gently sloping to level terraces behind shallow dykes to retain the pumped materials. Excess water would be discharged by percolation.

The parcel has historically been utilized as a dredged spoils disposal area and is a fully impacted site. No erosion, landslide, creep, faulting, liquifaction or other geologic hazards have been identified on this site.

HYDROLOGY:

The parcel is comprised primarily of dune sands and previously spoiled materials. The natural percolation rates of the soils exceed the maximum rainfall intensities and thus no specific hydrologic considerations are necessary. There are no existing drainage features on the property.

LAND USE:

The past, present and future land use of the subject parcel is a spoils disposal area. There are no structures, natural resources nor significant vegetation on the subject property.

ROADS AND TRAFFIC:

The parcel is roughly bounded by State Highway 255 on the north, New Navy Base Road on the west, the Samos Community Access Road on the south and Vance Avenue on the east. The above routes have moderate to heavy traffic volumes excepting the affected portion of Vance Avenue, which has very light traffic.
VIEWSHED:

The existing view of the site from the adjoining access routes is of a naturally revegetating spoils disposal area. The northerly half of the parcel supports native low growth brush and grasses common to the peninsula dunes. The southerly half of the parcel is a near level graded plain with a sparse growth of native weeds and grasses. The views from the property are of dunes toward the north, south and west, and of Humboldt Bay toward the east.

NOISE:

The proposed project will generate construction equipment noise during the dyke construction phase of approximately one week's duration. Adjoining uses are located sufficiently remote to the work site as to provide a good distance buffer. Noise thus attenuated should not require any special mitigation measures.

OTHER PERMITS:

Permits will be required of the following agencies:
1) Regional Water Quality Control Board
2) County of Humboldt Grading Permit
3) Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation and Conservation District
4) Corps of Engineers
5) County of Humboldt Coastal Development Permit and Use Permit

Prepared by: Trueman Vroman

[Signature]

Date: 11/2/86
PROPOSED LOUISIANA PACIFIC COASTAL
DEV. PERMIT/USE PERMIT APPLICATION
AP#401-031-32
Samoa

WOODLEY ISLAND

Samoan

21

NORTHWEST
PROPOSED LOUISIANA PACIFIC COASTAL DEV./USE-PERMIT APPLICATION
AP#401-031-32 Samoa
NOTE: THERE IS NO DEED REFERENCE TO 401-031-29 BETWEEN PIERHEAD AND U.S. MEANDER LINE.
NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

TO: Office of Planning and Research  FROM: (Public Agency) 
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121 CITY OF EUREKA, 531 "K" Street 
Sacramento, CA 95814 Eureka, CA 95531

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

OFFSHORE OIL PRODUCTION MODULE ASSEMBLY YARD

Project Title

SCH 86010707 KEVIN HAMBLIN (707) 443-7331
State Clearinghouse Number Contact Person Telephone Number
(If submitted to Clearinghouse)

656 WEST WATERFRONT DRIVE
Project Location
Development and operate a coastal dependent industrial assembly yard.

Project Description

This is to advise that the CITY OF EUREKA CITY COUNCIL
(Lead Agency or Responsible Agency) 
has approved the above described project and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project __ will, __ will not, have a significant effect on the environment.

2. ___ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

   X A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

   The EIR or Negative Declaration and record of project approval may be examined at:
   Department of Community Development, Room 207, 531 "K" Street, Eureka, CA 95531

3. Mitigation measures __ were, __ were not, made a condition of the approval of the project.

4. A statement of Overriding Considerations ___ was, ___ was not, adopted for this project.

Date Received for Filing ____________ Signature ____________

Director of Community Development

MINUTE PAGE 2004