

## 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems

This section evaluates the potential impacts related to utilities and service systems with implementation of the project.

- Potential impacts to surface water quality are addressed in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality.

### 4.14.1 Existing Setting

The following sections on water, wastewater, and storm drainage are excerpted from the Peninsula Community Services District (PCSD) Formation Management Plan prepared by SHN (SHN 2017). The PCSD, which was formerly the Samoa Peninsula Fire Protection District, will provide typical municipal type services related to streets and street lighting, parks and recreation, wastewater collection and treatment, water distribution, and storm drainage.

#### Water

The Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District (HBMWD) provides wholesale and retail water services to the Samoa Peninsula. HBMWD maintains two separate pipeline systems delivering treated drinking water and untreated raw water to its customers in the area. The untreated raw water is currently supplied to industrial users on the peninsula. With the town of Samoa, the treated water system will change to an individually metered system. Currently, HBMWD also provides retail water service to individual residential and commercial customers in the Fairhaven area.

In both the communities of Fairhaven and Finntown, residential and small business/industrial customers along with the Coast Guard station are provided domestic water through a distribution system and individual metered services owned and operated by HBMWD. The domestic system is served by a 12-inch diameter, concrete-lined transmission pipe that is routed down the peninsula and then looped through a 27-inch diameter, steel pipeline under Humboldt Bay. The steel line under the bay was constructed in the 1970s. The Fairhaven and Finntown distribution lines were also constructed in the 1970s, and are primarily polyvinyl chloride (PVC) with several asbestos-cement (AC) sections.

HBMWD also supplies raw (untreated) water to some of the industrial properties on the peninsula. These include the former LP Samoa Pulp Mill (currently RMT II, and owned by HBHRCD) and the former Simpson Fairhaven Pulp Mill (presently the Fairhaven Business Park and the DG Fairhaven Biomass Power Plant). The raw water transmission line is a 42-inch diameter, concrete-lined corrugated pipeline that ends approximately due east of the DG Fairhaven power plant. Historically, this line served pulp mills on the peninsula; however, the majority of the industrial demand has since subsided.

#### Wastewater

The only central sewer treatment system on the Samoa Peninsula is within the town of Samoa. There are two separate systems serving the existing houses. One system provides sewer collection, transport, treatment, and disposal to the majority of the houses and buildings. The second system provides sewer collection, transport, treatment, and disposal to approximately 25 homes and the Women's Club located along Sunset Avenue. Currently, the Samoa Pacific Group (SPG) owns,

operates, and maintains both of the existing wastewater systems, which includes three large holding tanks, conveyance piping, pumping, a large holding reservoir/pond, and disposal percolation basin.

All residential and commercial/business properties within the communities of Fairhaven and Finntown are served through onsite, individual septic tank and leachfield systems that are each property owner's responsibility. The North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) has indicated that physical conditions that exist on the peninsula (high groundwater, coarse sandy soils, and small residential lots) make it infeasible for septic system discharges to meet water quality objectives set forth in the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region. Active industrial properties are served by onsite wastewater treatment systems.

### **Stormwater**

The peninsula is made up of typically well-drained soils (coarse sands) and topographic features that do not require addressing runoff issues. No formal storm systems, other than a few drainage ditches on some of the industrial properties, are located between the railroad tracks and Humboldt Bay. Some of these industrial areas have storm drain catch basins and underground piping, most of which is not formally mapped, and are owned and operated by private property owners.

### **Solid Waste**

Solid waste and recyclables pickup within the Samoa Peninsula is collected by Recology, which also has a recycling plant on the Samoa Peninsula. The County, through Humboldt Waste Management Authority (HWMA), has been trucking its solid waste approximately 175 miles to two out-of-county landfills. One third of this waste is shipped to Dry Creek Landfill near Medford, Oregon under a long-term contract. The remaining two thirds of solid waste is hauled to the Anderson landfill located near Redding, California. Dry Creek Landfill's projected operational life exceeds 100 years under any scenario. The Anderson Landfill is located at 18703 Cambridge Road in Anderson, California. The land owner is Waste Management of California, Inc a subsidiary of Waste Management, Inc. The landfill's maximum permitted throughput is 1,850 tons per day. The remaining capacity is 11,914,025 cubic yards. The estimated closure date is 2055 (Shasta County 2008). Together, these two landfills would allow the County to meet its landfill disposal needs over the next 20 years.

### **Energy**

Electricity is provided to the Samoa Peninsula by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). Power is transmitted in the project area through 115 kilovolt (kV) lines from the source to the PG&E substation located in Fairhaven. The power is then converted to be suitable for distribution via 12 kV overhead lines. Electricity is distributed via private lines, and each structure has its own meter.

PG&E also provides natural gas to commercial users on the Samoa Peninsula through a pipeline under Humboldt Bay that begins near 14th Street in Eureka and ends south of Samoa near Bay Street. Residences in the project area do not currently have natural gas service. Many homes instead have propane tanks, which are serviced by AmeriGas.

## 4.14.2 Regulatory Framework

### Federal

#### ***Clean Water Act***

The Clean Water Act (CWA) establishes the basic structure for regulating discharges of pollutants into waters of the United States and regulating quality standards for surface waters. Under the CWA, the U.S. EPA has implemented pollution control programs such as setting wastewater standards for industry and water quality standards for all contaminants in surface waters. The CWA made it unlawful to discharge any pollutant from a point source (direct discharge) into navigable waters. The U.S. EPA's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program controls direct and non-point discharges through the NCRWQCB (see Regional regulatory below).

### State

#### ***California Integrated Waste Management Act***

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Public Resources Code Division 30), enacted through Assembly Bill (AB) 939 and modified by subsequent legislation, required all California cities and counties to implement programs to divert waste from landfills (Public Resources Code Section 41780). Compliance with AB 939 is determined by the Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery (Cal Recycle), formerly known as the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). Each county is required to prepare and submit an Integrated Waste Management Plan for expected solid waste generation within the county to the CIWMB. The Act also requires each city to prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element for achieving a solid waste diversion goal of 25 percent by January 1, 1995, and 50 percent by January 1, 2000. In 2012, the unincorporated area of Humboldt County met or exceeded the waste diversion mandate of 50 percent set by the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Humboldt County 2017a). CalRecycle has set an overall statewide diversion rate target of 75 percent by 2020.

### Regional and Local

#### ***North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board***

The NCRWQCB develops and enforces water quality objectives and implementation plans that safeguard the quality of water resources in its region, including Humboldt County. In accordance with California Water Code Section 13263, the State's RWQCBs are authorized to issue Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) as well as periodically review self-monitoring reports submitted by the discharger, and perform independent compliance checking.

The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program was established in the CWA to regulate industrial and municipal discharges to surface waters of the United States. NPDES permit regulations have been established for broad categories of discharges including point source municipal waste discharges and nonpoint source stormwater runoff. A NPDES permit is required when proposing to, or discharging of waste into any surface water of the state. The NCRWQCB implements the NPDES permit program at the local level.

### **County of Humboldt General Plan**

The following Humboldt County General Plan policies are applicable to the proposed project.

**Policy WR-P11. County Facilities Management.** Design, construct, and maintain County buildings, roads, bridges, drainages, and other facilities to minimize erosion and the volume of sediment in stormwater flows.

**Policy WR-P35. Implementation of NPDES Permit.** Implement and comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) Permit issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to the designated portions of the County.

**Policy WR-P44. Storm Drainage Impact Reduction.** Develop and require the use of Low-Impact Development (LID) standards consistent with Regional Water Board requirements to reduce the quantity and increase the quality of stormwater runoff from new development and redevelopment projects in areas within the County's MS4 boundary or as triggered under other Regional Water Board permits. For all other watersheds, develop storm drainage development guidelines with incentives to encourage LID standards to reduce the quantity and increase the quality of stormwater runoff from new developments.

#### 4.14.3 Evaluation Criteria and Thresholds of Significance

For the purpose of this EIR, the evaluation criteria and significance thresholds summarized below are used to determine if the project would have a significant effect related to utilities and service systems. The following questions are from CEQA Guidelines' Appendix G Environmental Checklist Section XVIII. Would the project:

- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
  - An increase in wastewater volume or strength exceeding existing treatment capacity.
- Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
  - Inadequate water supply or sewer capacity to serve the project.
- Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
  - Inadequate storm water drainage capacity to serve the site.
- Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
  - Inadequate water supply capacity or infrastructure to serve the needs of the project.
- 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?
  - Inadequate sewer capacity to serve the project and future needs of the PCSD.
- Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
  - Inadequate regional landfill capacity to serve the project.

- Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?
  - Non-compliance with applicable solid waste diversion regulations.

#### 4.14.4 Methodology

Potential impacts on utilities are analyzed based on the potential for the proposed project to affect the wastewater, water, stormwater, and solid waste facilities during construction or operation, as indicated in the thresholds above.

#### 4.14.5 Impact Analysis

**Impact UTI-1: Would the project exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.**

This impact analysis addresses CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist item XVIII.a) identified in Section 4.14.3.

The project itself includes conveyance, treatment, and disposal improvements to an approved wastewater treatment facility. The improvements are designed to meet the requirements of, and would be permitted by, the NCRWQCB. During operation, the project would allow for existing (Short-Term phase) and future (Long-Term phase) uses within the project area to connect to the Approved Samoa WWTF, as improved by the project. An NPDES permit application has been submitted to the NCRWQCB by the SPG for the Approved Samoa WWTF. With implementation of the project, the NPDES permit would be amended to handle the additional flows associated with the effluent from Fairhaven and Finntown. Discharge of treated effluent would be disposed of in accordance with all requirements in the amended permit. As the project would be consistent with NCRWQCB waste discharge requirements, it is not anticipated that the project would exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the NCRWQCB. The project impact would be **less than significant**.

*Significance*                      *Less than Significant*

**Mitigation**                      **None Required**

**Impact UTI-2: Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.**

This impact analysis addresses CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist item XVIII.b) identified in Section 4.14.3.

The project would install a wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system, including improvements at the Approved Samoa WWTF, the impacts of which are evaluated throughout this document (see other resource sections of Chapter 4 or Table 1-1 [Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures]). The project itself would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities outside of those included as part of the project and analyzed in this document. The project would

have **no impact** from the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities as no such facilities would be required.

*Significance* *No Impact*

**Mitigation** **None Required**

**Impact UTI-3: Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.**

This impact analysis addresses CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist item XVIII.c) identified in Section 4.14.3.

The project's collection and disposal system improvements would be constructed within existing roadways and would not result in an increase in impervious surfaces. Project improvements at the Approved Samoa WWTF would increase the amount of impervious surfaces within the WWTF site. However, stormwater at the Approved Samoa WWTF would divert to on-site stormwater facilities with implementation of the Approved Samoa WWTF. The Approved Samoa WWTF stormwater facilities would accommodate the additional runoff for the projects proposed improvements to the Approved Samoa WWTF. Therefore, no additional stormwater facilities or expansion of new stormwater facilities would be required. There would be **no impact** from the construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities as none are required.

*Significance* *No Impact*

**Mitigation** **None Required**

**Impact UTI-4: Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed.**

This impact analysis addresses CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist item XVIII.d) identified in Section 4.14.3.

### **Construction**

Project construction may utilize a minimal amount of water for dust suppression, cleaning of construction equipment, mixing of concrete, or meeting other construction-related needs. Water use during the construction phase would be intermittent, last up to 12 months, and would cease with completion of construction. No new or expanded entitlements would be required to accommodate water use during construction. The impact would be **less than significant**.

### **Operation**

Minimal potable water will be required for personnel use at the facility. Recycled water will be used for operation and maintenance of the facility. The project's Long-Term phase would remove an existing restriction to residential development of 62 residential infill lots. Water is provided to the Samoa Peninsula

by the HBMWD. According to the HBMWD's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, serving all of its customers will require less than 20 percent of its 85,000 acre feet per year entitlement in 20 years. Growth projected to occur by 2040 in areas served by HBMWD is not expected to require significant expansion of existing water supply facilities (Humboldt County 2017a). The infill development of 62 units are assumed to be developed under the Humboldt General Plan, the environmental effects of which were analyzed within the certified General Plan EIR, which found impacts to water supplies to be less than significant. Therefore the existing entitlements would be sufficient to serve the project and no new or expanded entitlements would be required. The project's impact during operation would be **less than significant**.

**Summary**

Limited water may be required for construction-related needs during the construction phase of the project; however, use would be temporary and no new water supplies would be needed. Construction impacts to water supply would be **less than significant**. The project would not increase demand for potable water and the water needs of the 62 residential infill lots that would be allowed to connect to the Approved Samoa WWTF under the Long-Term phase was previously evaluated in the Humboldt County General Plan EIR. No new or expanded entitlements would be needed. Impacts to water supply would be **less than significant**.

*Significance* *Less than Significant*

**Mitigation** **None Required**

**Impact UTI-5:** **Would the project 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.**

This impact analysis addresses CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist item XVIII.e) identified in Section 4.14.3.

The project would install wastewater collection and disposal systems, and improvements to the Approved Samoa WWTF. The project facilities would allow for the conveyance and treatment of effluent generated by existing (Short-Term phase) and potential future infill development (Long-Term phase), consistent with HBAP and zoning, to connect to the Approved Samoa WWTF. As detailed within Section 3.5.2, Design Flow and Treated Effluent Standards, the project is designed, and would be constructed, to adequately handle the flow from the existing development that would be allowed to connect under the Short-Term phase, as well as infill development under the Long-Term phase. The impact would be **less than significant**.

*Significance* *Less than Significant*

**Mitigation** **None Required**

**Impact UTI-6: Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.**

This impact analysis addresses CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist item XVIII.f) identified in Section 4.14.3.

**Construction**

Construction would generate a small amount of debris which would be hauled away to an approved transfer station and/or landfill. Because no significant structure demolition that would generate waste is proposed during construction of the proposed project, the temporary impact due to construction of the project on existing landfill capacity would be minor and temporary. The project’s impact on landfill capacity during the construction phase would be **less than significant**.

**Operation**

Once the project is operational, solids would accumulate in the SBR tanks, which would then be treated. Treated solids would be hauled off-site and disposed of at the Anderson Landfill. It is anticipated that the project would generate four 5 cubic-yard-truckloads of solids per year, including the Short-Term and Long-Term phase, that would be trucked to the Anderson Landfill. As of 2017, the Anderson Landfill had a remaining capacity of about eight million tons and a daily permit disposal of about 1,018 tons/day. The Anderson Landfill is not expected to reach capacity until 2036 (Humboldt County 2017b). Based on the project’s annual waste anticipated to be generated and the available capacity at the landfill, the Anderson Landfill would be able to serve the project during the project operation. The project’s operational impact on landfill capacity would be **less than significant**.

**Summary**

The minor and temporary impact to landfill capacity during construction would be **less than significant**. Solids created during the operational phase of the project would be hauled to the Anderson landfill, which has a capacity large enough to be able to accept waste from the project during operation. Operational impacts would also be **less than significant**.

*Significance*                      *Less than Significant*

**Mitigation**                      **None Required**

**Impact UTI-7: Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.**

This impact analysis addresses CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist item XVIII.g) identified in Section 4.14.3.

Other than the 20 cubic yards of solids produced each year, the project would not generate much in the way of solid waste. The project would comply with all state and local statutes related to solid waste, including the proper disposal of solids. This would include compliance with the Humboldt Waste Management Authority’s recycling, hazardous waste, and composting programs in the county

that are enacted to comply with AB 939. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any statues or regulations and **no impact** would occur.

*Significance*            *No Impact*

**Mitigation**            **None Required**

#### 4.14.6 Cumulative Impacts

**Impact: UTI-C-1: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative impact related to utility or service systems.**

The geographic area for cumulative utility and service systems impacts consists of the area within the PCSD of the Samoa Peninsula. As summarized in Impacts UTI-2, UTI-3, and UTI-7, the project would not require new or expanded water, wastewater, or stormwater facilities, or conflict with solid waste regulations. Therefore, the project could not contribute to a cumulative impact.

Under Impact UTI-1, the project would have a less-than-significant impact with regard to exceeding wastewater treatment requirements. Of the cumulative projects listed in Table 4-1, the STMP and Coast Seafoods project also could discharge via the same ocean outfall as the project. However, both projects would be subject to waste discharge requirements imposed by the NCRWQCB through the NPDES permit process, as well as on-going monitoring and permit renewal requirements. Because both projects would be required to abide by the same regulations, there would not be a significant cumulative impact to which the project would contribute.

With regard to Impact UTI-4, there would be little to no change in water use with implementation of the project improvements. Although the project would allow, under the Long-Term phase, development to proceed on 62 infill lots, water supply for this growth was evaluated in the Humboldt County General Plan EIR which found impacts on water supply to be less than significant. The project would not substantially contribute to a cumulative impact with regard to water supply.

With regard to Impact UTI-5, the project is being designed, and would be constructed, to adequately handle the flow from both the Short-Term and Long-Term phases, and does not include development beyond the capacity of the wastewater treatment facility. The Approved Samoa WWTF has been designed to accommodate buildout of the STMP. The remaining projects listed in Table 4-1 are upgrades or expansions of existing facilities and would not tie in to the Approved Samoa WWTF. The project would not substantially contribute to a cumulative impact with regard to wastewater capacity.

*Significance*            *Less than Cumulatively Considerable (Less than Significant)*

**Mitigation**            **None Required**

#### 4.14.7 References

- Humboldt County. 2017a. Humboldt County General Plan for the Areas Outside the Coastal Zone. October 23.
- Humboldt County. 2017b. Humboldt County General Plan Update Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report. April 19.
- SHN. 2017. Management Plan Peninsula CSD Formation, prepared for County of Humboldt and Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation, and Conservation District. March.
- Winzler & Kelly. 2008. Community Infrastructure & Services Technical Report, prepared for County of Humboldt Community Development Services Department. July.