

---

## CHAPTER 5.0

### CEQA REQUIRED CONCLUSIONS

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this chapter discusses significant irreversible changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts that could result from implementation of the Proposed Project.

#### **5.1 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

##### **5.1.1 IRREVERSIBLE UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

CEQA requires that significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the Proposed Project be considered. The CEQA Guidelines describe three distinct categories of significant irreversible changes: 1) changes in land use that would commit future generations; 2) irreversible changes from environmental accidents; and 3) consumption of nonrenewable resources, such as conversion of agricultural lands, loss of access to mining reserves, and use of nonrenewable energy sources.<sup>1</sup>

The Proposed Project would modify the existing Runway Safety Areas (RSAs) so that facilities may operate under compliance with applicable Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations. As such, the Proposed Project would allow for the continued operation of existing uses and would not result in changes in land use on the project site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in land use changes that would commit future generations.

No significant irreversible environmental damage, such as the result of an accidental spill or explosion of hazardous materials, is anticipated due to implementation of the Proposed Project. Any potential impacts from hazardous materials would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures.

The Proposed Project would not result in a significant increase in the consumption of nonrenewable resources. Although construction of the Proposed Project would require the use of energy, including energy produced from nonrenewable resources, the construction activities would be temporary and would not require substantial amounts of energy. Operations at Jack McNamara Field (CEC or the Airport) would remain similar to existing activities and would not result in additional consumption of energy sources.

##### **5.1.2 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS**

A project is considered growth-inducing if it would directly or indirectly foster substantial economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing in the surrounding environment.<sup>2</sup> Removing obstacles to population growth, such as major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant, could result in population increases that tax existing facilities and may require construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Examples of projects likely to have significant growth-inducing impacts include extensions or expansions of infrastructure systems beyond what is needed to serve

---

<sup>1</sup> CEQA Guidelines, 2010, § 15126.2(c).

<sup>2</sup> CEQA Guidelines, 2010, § 15126.2(d).

project-specific demand, and development of new residential subdivisions or industrial parks in areas that are only sparsely developed or are undeveloped. Population growth alone is not assumed to be necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

The Proposed Project would bring the existing Airport runways into compliance with FAA airport design standards, allowing the continued operation of the Airport, and would not facilitate undesirable development intensification on nearby or adjacent sites. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in direct population growth, because it does not include the construction of housing units. The construction-related jobs associated with the Proposed Project would be expected to be filled by local laborers and would not contribute to indirect population growth. The Proposed Project would not result in the extension of utilities or roads into undeveloped areas, and would not directly or indirectly lead to the development of greenfield sites in the surrounding area.

## **5.2 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT**

CEQA defines cumulative impacts as “two or more individual effects, which, when considered together, are considerable, or which can compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluate potential environmental impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. These impacts can result from the Proposed Project alone, or together with other projects. The CEQA Guidelines state: “The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.”<sup>3</sup>

### **5.2.1 PROJECTS CONSIDERED IN THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS**

#### **5.2.1.1 Past Projects**

This section describes the past projects considered in the cumulative impact analysis, which includes projects within the Generalized Study Area (GSA) that were proposed for development from 2006 through the present and for which the construction has been completed.

There are four recent past projects that were completed on the Airport, including construction of the Air Rescue Fire Fighting (ARFF) Facility, marking/sealing of both runways, installation of security fencing, and obstruction removal on Runways 17 and 29. Each of these projects is further described below.

- **ARFF Facility.** A 3,300-square-foot building to accommodate the ARFF vehicle was completed in October 2007. It includes two vehicle bays, watch room, storage room, restroom, and small locker room. A Categorical Exclusion (CatEx) was approved in May 2006. The ARFF facility has been sited to provide maximum visibility from the facility watch room to the Airport runways and taxiways. Parking was allocated adjacent to the ARFF to accommodate six vehicles.

<sup>3</sup> CEQA Guidelines, 2010, § 15355.

- **Runway Slurry Seal.** A slurry seal and restriping project was completed for both runways to prevent further decay of the existing pavement, and to provide the FAA standard markings necessary for operational purposes. The CatEx was approved in June 2007, and the project was completed in October 2007.
- **Security Fencing.** This project consisted of the installation of automated gate equipment, actuators, and loop detectors for the sliding entrance and exit gates to the general aviation area of the Airport. Automating the gates provided for increased security by limiting access to the general aviation and air operations areas of the Airport through the use of key pad combination systems. This project also included the installation of a 10-foot-high chain-link fence, topped with two feet of barbed wire, along the northern section of the Airport from the ocean to Riverside Drive (approximately 10,800 linear feet of 10-foot fencing), and six-foot-high chain-link fence topped with two feet of barbed wire connecting two sections of existing chain-link fence off Washington Boulevard. The CatEx was approved in June 2006 and the initial phase of the project was completed in 2007. The final project of Security Perimeter Fencing was separated into two phases. Phase 1 included the installation of 2,800 feet of 10-foot-high chain link fencing from the northwest corner of the property to the Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Radio Range (VOR) facility located at midfield of Runway 17/35. This phase of permanent fencing was completed in September 2009. The last 3,000 feet of permanent fencing from the VOR to North Pebble Beach Drive awaits Coastal Commission permitting. A temporary fence along this boundary was installed on Airport to restrict deer and elk activity on or near the runway.
- **Obstruction Removal on Runways 17 and 29.** Annual inspections by safety inspectors for both California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Division of Aeronautics and the FAA for Part 139 certification have identified the need to remove the trees and brush in the approach zones of Runways 17 and 29 to comply with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77. Trees and brush have, over time, grown up into the protected airspace of approach zones and clear zones along Runways 17 and 29. The majority of the trees and brush are on Airport property, although a small number of trees are on private property adjacent to the Airport. The CatEx was approved in June 2006, and the project was partially completed in November 2008. An additional phase of this project will be undertaken following completion of a new obstruction survey.

One past project was completed off-Airport within the GSA.

- **Hidden Creek Apartments.** The project included the construction of 81 units of various sizes of low-income housing on a 5.87-acre parcel adjacent to the Walmart located east of Summer Lane, off of Washington Boulevard. All housing units are located within 10 two-story buildings approximately 27 feet in height. A mitigated negative declaration document was completed in 2006, with appropriate mitigation measures to comply with CEQA. Construction began in spring of 2008, and was completed in 2009.

---

### 5.2.1.2 Current and Future Projects

The following section describes current and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the GSA. These projects include Airport-related projects, including the construction of a new terminal building and overlay of both the runways.

- **Security Perimeter Fencing, Western Boundary.** This project is scheduled to be undertaken in 2012 and would involve the installation of the last portion of the approximately 3,000 linear feet of 10-foot chain-link fencing from the VOR transmitter along the border of Point St. George and the Airport boundary to North Pebble Beach Drive. The new perimeter fence was designed to meet FAA standards, thereby improving security and reducing the potential for runway incursions by deer, elk, and other animals.
- **Obstruction Removal on Runways.** Annual inspections by safety inspectors for both Caltrans Division of Aeronautics and the FAA for Part 139 certification have identified the need to top and remove the trees and brush in the approach zones of the Airport's runways to comply with FAR Part 77 requirements. Trees and brush have, over time, grown up into the protected airspace of the runway approach zones and clear zones. The majority of the trees and brush are on Airport property, although a small number of trees are on property adjacent to the Airport. The CatEx was approved in June 2006 and approximately 50 percent of the project was completed. Completion of the remainder of this project is pending determination of future funding and applicable permitting.
- **Elk Valley Rancheria Gaming Facility.** The Elk Valley Rancheria Gaming Facility project would be located at Martin Ranch, located approximately five miles southeast of the Airport, along U.S. Highway 101. The Elk Valley Rancheria project would consist of development of a destination resort on a 203.5-acre property placed into federal trust status. The project would include the construction of a 40,000-square-foot casino/bingo facility, a 156-room hotel, a 20,000-square-foot conference center, 1,250 parking spaces, utility improvements, grading for building pads and parking lots, and roadway improvements. The Final Environmental Impact Statement was completed in October 2006 and mitigation is being developed as a part of the environmental clearance process. However, as of June 2010, no construction date had been identified due to permitting delays.
- **Walmart Expansion.** The Walmart expansion project site is located in unincorporated Del Norte County, approximately 2.5 miles east of the Airport, at the northeastern corner of 900 E. Washington Boulevard and its intersection of Summer Lane. The project consists of an 87,035-square-foot expansion to an existing 77,828-square-foot Walmart store. The project would require the acquisition of two small parcels (3.09 acres and 0.4 acre) that are currently vacant and undeveloped, and the incorporation of a 1.18-acre existing undeveloped out-parcel. The EIR was recertified on August 12, 2008, with mitigation measures in compliance with CEQA. Construction activities are expected to last 9 to 12 months, beginning in autumn 2010/winter 2011.

- **Summer Park Apartments.** The project would include the construction of 162 apartments in 20 two-story buildings on an undeveloped 10.13-acre parcel. A total of 161 units will be designated for affordable housing needs and one unit will be used as housing by the onsite manager. The manager's unit will be in a community building that would include an office, a laundry room, a meeting room, public restrooms, a kitchen, and a community room for activities and games. The project would be located west of the Hidden Creek Estates off Summer Lane near Washington Boulevard. A mitigated negative declaration document was adopted in February 2009, with appropriate mitigation measures to comply with CEQA. The first phase of the project (81 units) will be constructed when and if the developer receives State Tax Credits, anticipated in fall 2010. Construction is estimated to begin in spring 2011.
- **Storage/Office Facilities.** The project includes development of a 6,000-square-foot building that would be used for storage and office space related to a construction business. Access would be from an existing driveway off of Standard Veneer Road (cross of Lake Earl Drive). A small drainage area located near the southern property line would be protected with a 25-foot buffer. A mitigated negative declaration document was adopted in August 2008, with appropriate mitigation measures to comply with CEQA. However, approval of the project was appealed to the California Coastal Commission (CCC) with an anticipated delay of one to two years, potentially postponing the project to 2012.
- **Proposed New Terminal Project.** The terminal project would construct a new terminal building and related facilities (i.e., parking lot, access road, aircraft apron, infrastructure/utilities) at the Airport. The size of the terminal building is based on projected peak hour passenger loads through the year 2016. An Environmental Assessment has been prepared in support of the project and a final decision on the project has yet to be issued. The CCC has issued a Letter of Intent to issue a Coastal Development Permit with conditions. It is anticipated that construction will begin in 2012.
- **Runway Pavement Strengthening.** Both runways and taxiways at the Airport will require an asphalt overlay in the near future. This project is anticipated to be completed in the next five years (Year of Funding: 2015).
- **California Coastal Trail.** The project would construct approximately two miles of the California Coastal Trail, including construction of water front bike lanes, safe road crossings, trail signage, and improved public parking for public access. The project would be located along Pebble Beach Drive in Del Norte County. A categorical exemption was approved on June 6, 2008. This project is under construction, but its completion is dependent on final funding from the state.
- **Coasta Norte Mixed-Use Building.** The project would demolish the existing vacant medical clinic building and construct a three-story building with one additional floor of underground parking, for a gross floor area of 98,755 square feet. The project would consist of 44 residential units (unspecified mixture of condominiums and timeshares or vacation rentals), an approximately 1,500-square-foot medical/professional office, and an approximately 700-square-foot sales office. The project would be located at the intersection of Second Street and A Street. A mitigated negative declaration was adopted in December 2008, with appropriate mitigation

measures to comply with CEQA. On June 12, 2009, the North Coast District of the CCC approved with modifications the Local Coastal Plan Amendment for the Coasta Norte Project.

- **Harbor Center Tract.** JHP, LLC, the landowner, received approval of a resubdivision from the CCC on August 8, 2008. The project was approved by the County in 2006 and subsequently appealed to the CCC by a local environmental organization. The CCC found substantial issue with the County's approval and called for a *de novo* (new) review of the project. The CCC-approved project includes the resubdivision of a 54-acre portion of a 134-acre parcel into 94 parcels, including three open space lots, 67 lots for single family detached homes, and 24 lots for townhomes. The project is located at 2400 Lake Earl Drive, approximately two miles northeast of Crescent City. The project has been placed on hold due to current economic conditions, and pending completion of a sewer line extension anticipated for completion in spring/summer 2011.

## **5.2.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS BY TOPIC AREA**

For the purposes of this cumulative impacts analysis, the relevant geographical area for consideration of cumulative impacts is the GSA, unless otherwise noted within a particular topic area below.

### **5.2.2.1 Aesthetics**

The Proposed Project would have no impact to scenic vistas or resources, and any impacts associated with lighting would be related to construction, temporary in nature, and less than significant. Accordingly, the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative aesthetic impacts would be less than significant and not cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of the cumulative projects described above would result in changes to visual quality through construction of new commercial, industrial, and residential development; installation of fencing; and changes to landscaping through vegetation removal. However, these projects are primarily located in or adjacent to developed areas and would be generally consistent with the visual quality and character of these areas. Accordingly, the permanent cumulative impacts to aesthetics would not cumulatively considerable, and therefore would be less than significant.

### **5.2.2.2 Air Quality**

The Proposed Project would have no operational impacts to air quality, and temporary construction-related impacts to air quality would be less than significant. Accordingly, the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts would be less than significant and not cumulatively considerable.

The cumulative projects would result in cumulative air quality impacts. Temporary construction-related impacts (primarily from fugitive dust and vehicle emissions) and operations impacts (primarily from vehicle emissions) could result from implementation of these projects. The construction is relatively small in scope and scale and is located throughout the GSA. The air basin is in full attainment for all criteria pollutants under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, and in attainment for all criteria pollutants except particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter under the California Ambient Air Quality Standards. Therefore, it is not likely that the cumulative projects would result in significant cumulative air

quality impacts. Accordingly, the permanent cumulative impacts to air quality would not be cumulatively considerable, and therefore would be less than significant.

### 5.2.2.3 Biological Resources

Prior to mitigation, the Proposed Project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts on special-status wildlife and plant species and their habitats. The Proposed Project would permanently remove approximately 17.929 acres of breeding and foraging habitat for the northern red-legged frog, a California Department of Fish and Game species of special concern. An additional 21.60 acres of upland dispersal habitat for this species would be temporarily impacted as a result of project construction. Additionally, habitats used by other locally occurring special-status wildlife species, including white-tailed kite, northern harrier, and cackling goose, would be permanently removed. The Proposed Project would result in removal of 0.33 acre of habitat for three plant species: two California Native Plant Society (CNPS) List 1B species, the short-leaved evax (*Hesperevax sparsiflora* var. *brevifolia*) and dune phacelia (*Phacelia argentea*); and one CNPS List 2 species, Del Norte buckwheat (*Eriogonum nudum* var. *paralinum*).

Implementation of cumulative projects would result in development of vacant open lands; however any impacts to biological resources would be mitigated and it is unlikely that cumulative impacts would occur. Between 2005 and 2008, four projects were completed at the Airport, including construction of the ARFF Facility, marking and sealing of both runways, installation of security fencing, and removal of encroaching vegetation on Runways 17 and 29. None of these projects resulted in loss of special-status species or critical habitats. The installation of portions of security fencing along Point St. George and the coast occurred in localized areas of natural vegetation and wetlands, but the fenceline construction areas and a 30-foot-wide work zone was surveyed in advance by qualified biologists and no special-status species or critical habitats were identified in the construction footprint for the installation of fencing. The installation of fences or any of the other recent past projects at the Airport did not contribute to a cumulative loss of special-status species or critical habitats. Another project, the Hidden Creek Apartments, was completed in 2009, following approval of a CEQA mitigated negative declaration document in 2006. As part of the environmental documentation process, a biological assessment was also completed for this project. The biological assessment indicated that no special-status species or critical habitats were identified in the project area. The last phase of installation of security perimeter fencing will involve completing the 3,000-foot-long chain-link fence from the VOR transmitter along the border of Point St. George to North Pebble Beach Drive and the Airport. While localized areas of natural vegetation and wetlands would be temporarily disturbed, the actual area of permanent impact by the fenceline itself will be very limited. The fenceline alignment and a 30-foot-wide work zone around the alignment were surveyed by qualified biologists and no special-status species or critical habitats were identified in the project area.

The proposed Terminal Replacement Project at the Airport would result in disturbance to potential western lily (*Lillium occidentale*) habitat; however, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) concurred with the FAA determination that the project would not likely adversely affect this species. Mitigation of the potential western lily habitat disturbance will be implemented as part of the Terminal Replacement Project. The proposed Terminal Replacement project could also disturb upland habitat for the northern

red-legged frog (*Rana aurora*), a California species of concern. The Border Coast Regional Airport Authority is incorporating mitigation as part of this project to reduce any impacts to these resources.

The Walmart Expansion Project would require the acquisition of two adjacent undeveloped parcels. However, the Walmart Expansion Project site does not contain suitable habitat for any federally listed threatened or endangered species. Furthermore, the project site includes no habitat for the northern red-legged frog, with only marginally suitable habitat located off site.

The Elk Valley Rancheria Gaming Facility is located in a semi-rural setting, subject to cattle grazing and nearby roads and residences. The proposed project area contains annual grassland/pasture habitat, which presents limited resources for wildlife and is currently subject to disturbance from grazing. USFWS concurred with the Bureau of Indian Affairs determination that the proposed project may affect but would not likely adversely affect the western lily and endangered tidewater goby. Mitigation measures to avoid impacts to protected species include preconstruction surveys and establishment of construction area buffers.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, and WL-1, discussed in Chapter 3, would include offsite replacement of wetlands and habitat impacted by the Proposed Project, reducing any impacts to a less-than-significant level. Because the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative biological resource impacts would be mitigated, these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and any impacts would be less than significant.

#### **5.2.2.4 Cultural Resources**

It is unlikely that the Proposed Project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts to cultural resources, because these resources have not been identified within the area of potential effect for the Proposed Project. However, if these resources were disturbed as a result of project construction, and mitigation were not implemented, a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts to cultural resources could occur.

The construction of the cumulative projects could result in cultural resources impacts through the disturbance of known and unknown cultural resources during excavation and earth moving activities. However, appropriate mitigation identified as part of the environmental clearance process, including implementation of industry standard best management practices, would minimize impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1, CR-2, CR-3, and CR-4, discussed in Chapter 3, would provide for worker training and appropriate monitoring of cultural resources by the appropriate professionals. Mitigation would reduce any impacts to a less-than-significant level. Because the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative cultural resource impacts would be mitigated, these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be less than significant.

#### **5.2.2.5 Greenhouse Gases**

The Proposed Project would have no operational impacts to greenhouse gases, and temporary, construction-related emissions of greenhouse gases would be less than significant. Accordingly, the



---

Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative greenhouse gas impacts would be less than significant and not cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of the cumulative projects would result in greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operation-related activities. The construction of new commercial and residential uses where none exist currently would result in increased vehicle emissions. However, each cumulative project would be required to mitigate for emissions as part of their environmental clearance. Accordingly, the permanent cumulative impacts to greenhouse gases would not be cumulatively considerable, and therefore would be less than significant.

#### **5.2.2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

It is unlikely that the Proposed Project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts to hazards and hazardous materials, because these resources have not been identified within the Proposed Project area. However, if these resources were produced or disturbed as a result of project construction, and mitigation were not implemented, a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts to hazards and hazardous materials could occur.

Construction and operation of the cumulative projects has the potential to expose people or the environment to hazardous materials through accidental spills, disposal of hazardous waste, or the release of known or unknown hazardous materials in soil or groundwater. However, with the federal, state, and local regulatory requirements that are in place for management of hazardous waste and materials, and with the mitigation required, the cumulative projects would not result in cumulatively significant impacts.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HZ-1 and HZ-2, discussed in Chapter 3, would provide for development of a hazardous substances control plan, and notification of the appropriate Del Norte County staff if hazardous materials were produced or inadvertently discovered as a result of project construction activities. Mitigation would reduce any impacts to a less-than-significant level. Because the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be mitigated, these impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be less than significant.

#### **5.2.2.7 Hydrology/Water Quality**

The Proposed Project would have no operational impacts to hydrology and water quality, and any impacts to these resources associated with project construction would be temporary, construction-related, and less than significant. Accordingly, the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts would be less than significant and not cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of the cumulative projects could result in hydrology and water quality impacts. New construction on greenfield sites, including the Elk Valley Rancheria Gaming Facility, Summer Park Apartments, Storage/Office Facilities, and the Harbor Center Tract, would result in the development of additional impervious surfaces and alteration of drainages. Development of the Terminal Replacement Project at the Airport could also impact these resources due to construction activities, as well as the creation of new aircraft apron, parking areas, and other impermeable surfaces that could affect hydrology. Construction activities, including land grading activities and operations activities involving hazardous materials, could affect water quality. However, mitigation measures developed as part of the

environmental clearance processes for these projects would be anticipated to reduce potential cumulative impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, the permanent cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality would not be cumulatively considerable, and therefore would be less than significant.

#### **5.2.2.8 Land Use/Planning**

The Proposed Project would have no land use or planning impacts. It would not divide an established community, conflict with applicable plans, or affect public services in such a way that new or physically altered governmental facilities would be required. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts.

#### **5.2.2.9 Noise**

The Proposed Project would have no operational impacts to noise, and any construction-related noise impacts would be temporary and less than significant. Accordingly, the Proposed Project's contribution to noise impacts would be less than significant and not cumulatively considerable.

Although the construction of the cumulative projects could result in temporary noise level increases in the immediate vicinity of projects, these impacts would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Operational noise levels resulting from the cumulative projects could also be mitigated as needed on a project-by-project basis, and would not result in significant cumulative impacts in the GSA. Accordingly, the permanent cumulative impacts to noise would not be cumulatively considerable, and therefore would be less than significant.

#### **5.2.2.10 Recreation**

The Proposed Project would have no recreation impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not contribute to cumulative recreation impacts.

#### **5.2.2.11 Coastal Resources**

The Proposed Project would not conflict with policies of the Local Coastal Program (LCP).

Furthermore, it is unlikely that the cumulative projects located in the coastal zone would result in impacts to coastal resources through inconsistencies with the policies of the county's LCP. The majority of the cumulative projects within the GSA would not affect coastal resources because they are located outside the coastal zone. Those projects that would affect coastal resources would be required to implement mitigation measures, identified in their environmental review process, which would reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

#### **5.2.2.12 Wetlands**

Implementation of the Proposed Project would require the placement and compaction of fill material in wetland areas within the proposed RSAs. The Proposed Project would result in the take of 16.098 acres of potential U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdictional wetlands, or 17.929 acres of potential CCC jurisdictional wetlands.

Of the cumulative projects described above, only the Hidden Creek Apartments Project, Elk Valley Rancheria Gaming Facility, and the Terminal Replacement Project affect wetlands. The Hidden Creek Apartments Project included development of a bridge crossing a small creek beyond the edge of the project site and resulted in disturbance to 2,800 square feet of USACE jurisdictional wetlands due to construction activity. Mitigation included creation of 2,800 square feet of wetlands out of adjacent upland habitat, minimizing wetlands impacts associated with this project.

The Elk Valley Rancheria Gaming Facility would avoid impacts to USACE jurisdictional wetlands, but would disturb approximately 0.31 acre of wetlands under CCC jurisdiction. However, project design features combined with mitigation would minimize any impacts to wetlands associated with this project.

The proposed Terminal Replacement Project at the Airport would result in disturbance to approximately 0.182 acre of USACE/CCC jurisdictional wetlands. However, construction of the Terminal Replacement Project would be covered under a nationwide permit (Nationwide Permit No. 39), because the area of disturbance would be less than 0.5 acre in size. In accordance with Nationwide Permit No. 39, wetlands effects would be mitigated in accordance with the requirements of 40 Code of Federal Regulations 230, Section 404(b)(1), *Guidelines for Specification of Disposal Sites for Dredged or Fill Material*.

Because the above-described impacts to wetlands are relatively minute in nature and would be fully mitigated, they would not contribute to cumulative wetland impacts in combination with those associated with the Proposed Project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure WL-1, discussed in Chapter 3, would reduce impacts to wetlands to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation measure would address both the permanent onsite loss of wetlands as a result of the Proposed Project and also the temporary reduction in wetland area within Del Norte County that would result between the time of impact and the successful completion of mitigation. Because the Proposed Project's contribution to cumulative wetlands impacts would be mitigated, these impacts would be less than significant and not cumulatively considerable.

*This page intentionally left blank.*