City of Arcata

Initial Study and Negative Declaration

For the Reusable Bag Ordinance

Prepared for the:

City of Arcata

By:

Humboldt Waste Management Authority

Updated July 1, 2013 by City of Arcata

Table of Contents

	PAGE
Project Summary	3
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	4
Determination	
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts	5
Aesthetics	
Agriculture and Forestry Resources	8
Air Quality	9
Biological Resources	11
Cultural Resources	13
Geology and Soils	13
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	14
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	15
Hydrology and Water Quality	16
Land Use and Planning	19
Mineral Resources	19
Noise	19
Population and Housing	20
Public Services	20
Recreation	21
Transportation and Traffic	22
Utilities and Service Systems	23
Mandatory Findings of Significance	
References	25

INITIAL STUDY and CHECKLIST

PROJECT: City of Arcata Reuseable Bag Ordinance

LEAD AGENCY: City of Arcata Environmental Services Department

736 F Street Arcata, CA 95521

LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON:

Mark Andre, Environmental Services Director Environmental Services Department

Phone: (707) 822-8184

Email: eservices@cityofarcata.org

THIS INITIAL STUDY and CHECKLIST PREPARED BY:

Humboldt Waste Management Authority 1059 W Hawthorne Street Eureka, CA 95501 707-268-8680

Updated July I, 2013 - City of Arcata 736 F Street Arcata, CA 95521 707-822-8184

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Arcata (Figure 1)

PROPERTY OWNERS: Various

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: The project occurs throughout the City and potentially includes areas zoned residential, commercial, industrial, light industrial, agricultural, natural resource areas, and state and federal lands.

ZONING DESIGNATION: The project occurs throughout the City and potentially includes areas zoned residential, commercial, industrial, light industrial, agricultural, natural resource areas, and state and federal lands.

PARCEL NUMBERS: Various

SURROUNDING LAND Uses: City of Arcata, Unincorporated County of Humboldt and nearby Cities of Eureka and Blue Lake, with areas composed of residential, commercial, industrial, light industrial, agricultural, natural resource, and state and federal lands.

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project consists of an ordinance promoting the use of reusable shopping bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee (\$0.10) on recyclable paper bags in the City of Arcata. In lieu of the single use bags, consumers may chose to provide their own bag or elect to purchase a single use recyclable paper bag for a fee that is clearly identified on the sales receipt. The retailer will retain this fee which reflects the cost of the single use recyclable paper bag. Certain low income exemptions and other provisions are included within the model ordinance language.

The proposed Draft Ordinance is attached, and would do the following:

- Promote the use of reusable bags by prohibiting the distribution of single use plastic bags at the point of sale by certain identified retailers, while exempting plastic or paper "produce, meat, or bulk food" bags.
- Require supermarkets, pharmacies, large stores, convenience food stores and as defined to provide their customers with only reusable bags or recyclable paper bags with a minimum of 40% post consumer recycled materials, while exempting "produce, meat, or bulk food" bags.
- Require supermarkets, pharmacies, large stores and convenience food stores as defined to charge customers that purchase a recyclable paper bag a pass through charge of \$ (0.10) for that bag, with these charges to be retained by the retailer for their own use, exempting "produce, meat, or bulk food" bags. Any charge for a bag or bags must appear clearly on the register receipt provided to the customer.
- An Effective Ordinance implementation date of February 1, 2014 period before a penalty can be assessed.

Ordinance language will include exemptions for low income programs such as Women, Infants, and Children Supplemental Nutrition Program (WIC) and the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program administered by the state of California.

The enforcement provisions of this ordinance would be the responsibility of the Director, Environmental Services Department. Any violation of the Ordinance is subject to the recovery of administrative penalties pursuant to California Government Code, Section 53069.4.

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

DETERMINATION. On the basis of this initial evaluation:

1. I find that the project **could not** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **X NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

2.	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
3.	I find the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
4.	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.	
5.	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have 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.	
Sign	nature Mark Andre 7-26-17 Date	
_		

Mark Andre - Environmental Services Director

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact". The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how

- they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced, as discussed below).
- 5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identity the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

CHECKLIST OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ISSUES:

1.	AESTHETICS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				Х
(d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X

Impact Analysis-Explanation of checklist judgments

1. (a through d)

No Impact: The proposed project is a comprehensive ordinance designed to increase consumer use of reusable bags by banning singe use plastic bags *and* imposing a fee on recyclable paper bags, thereby reducing the use of *both* single-use plastic *and* single use paper bags.

While single use bags area disposed of in the trash and recycled, single use bags are also a source of litter in Arcata's environment. City employees remove debris which includes single use bags from catchments and storm grates throughout Arcata on a regularly basis. Non-profit groups holding cleanup days in City natural areas, the Arcata Marsh and Arcata Community Forest also encounter and collect littered film plastic and paper shopping bags. The North Coast Environmental Center Coastal Clean Up events also recover littered plastic bags. The recent Waste Characterization Study conducted by Humboldt Waste Management Authority found that 0.3% or 222 tons of overall county waste, (an estimated 27 tons of the City of Arcata's total waste) are made up of film plastic bags discarded into the waste stream for landfill disposal. Recycling rates for film plastic are estimated by the USEPA and the film plastics industry to be approximately 5% nationally and statewide. It is reasonable to extend this recycling rate for film plastic bags to the City of Arcata. Specific waste stream figures and recycling rates for kraft paper bags are not separated out, but are included in overall totals for single use recyclable paper of all types.

When improperly discarded, film plastic bags create a significant eyesore throughout the City. Littered plastic bags, due to their durability and light weight, are easily airborne by wind, often ending up entangled in brush and caught on fences. Because they are usually white (and therefore visible) and are difficult to collect, plastic bags constitute a greater aesthetic nuisance than some other types of litter. The adoption of a reusable bag ordinance that prohibits the distribution of these single use film plastic bags at the point of sale would reduce the amount of plastic bags that become litter and thus improve visual aesthetics. Single use bags constructed of kraft paper are also improperly discarded and enter the environment, but absorb moisture and typically break down more quickly in the moist north coast environment. Though undesirable, the litter from recyclable paper bags creates less visual impact

overall. The proposed fee for recyclable paper bags will also reduce the amount of paper bags distributed in Arcata further reducing the potential for these bags to impact the area's aesthetics.

Studies in both Los Angeles and San Francisco indicate that single use plastic bags, because they take so long to break down, are a significant component of litter. Additionally studies done by the City of San Jose to assess the impact of San Jose's Bring Your Own Bag Ordinance was successful at affecting community norms towards shopping with reusable bags and reducing single-use plastic bag litter in City creeks and streets. To measure the impact of San Jose's ordinance on litter reduction, the City conducted litter surveys of trash collected from creeks and rivers, storm drain catch basins, and neighborhood sidewalks. Litter surveys of creeks were conducted over a standardized length of 300 feet and along streets and sidewalks for a length of 100 feet. Trash collected during litter surveys was sorted and characterized to establish what percentage of the litter found in the environment was singleuse plastic bags. Similarly, storm drain catch basins, retrofitted with trash capture screens, were repeatedly sampled in order to establish an accumulation rate for plastic bags into the storm drain system. The study found that the ordinance had an observable effect on the reduction of plastic bags in the environment. The various litter surveys demonstrated a reduction in bag litter of approximately 89 percent in the storm drain system, 60 percent in the creeks and rivers, and 59 percent in City streets and neighborhoods, when compared to data collected from 2010 and/or 2011 (pre-ordinance) to data from 2012 (post-ordinance).

Therefore this project will not adversely affect any scenic vistas, damage or degrade scenic resources, degrade existing visual character, or create a new source of substantial light or glare.

2.AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES. (In				
determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California				
Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997)				
prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional				
model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.) In				
determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland,				
are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to				
information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including				
the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy	Potentia	Less than		
Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology	lly	Significant		
provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources	Signific ant	With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	
Board.) Would the project:	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	No Impact
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		Ш		X
Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-				
agricultural use? 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 Public Resources Code section 12220(g)),				
timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section				X
4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
by Government Code Section 31104(g)):	ı			

	ult in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to forest use?		X
to t	olve other changes in the existing environment which, due their location or nature, could result in conversion of mland, to non-agricultural use?		x

2(a through e)

No Impact: Implementation of the *Reusable Bag Ordinance* does not involve development or conversion of land use and will not have any potentially significant impacts related to Agricultural Resources including the Arcata Community Forest, agricultural lands in the Arcata bottoms, or other identified agricultural or woodland areas within the City of Arcata.

3.	AIR QUALITY. (Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.) <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
(b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
(c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			x	
(d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
(e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Impact Analysis-Explanation of checklist judgments

3(a and b)

No Impact: The proposed project is a comprehensive ordinance designed to increase consumer use of reusable bags by banning plastic bags *and* imposing a fee on single use recyclable paper bags, thereby reducing the use of *both* single-use plastic *and* paper bags. This project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of an applicable air quality plan or violate any air quality standards of the City of Arcata.

3 (c)

Less than Significant Impact: The adoption of a Reusable Bag Ordinance that includes a fee for recyclable paper bags by the City of Arcata should result in a decrease in the amount of both single use plastic and paper bags. The proposed Ordinance is a comprehensive plan to increase consumer use of reusable bags by banning plastic bags *and* imposing a fee on using paper bags, thereby reducing the use of *both* single-use plastic *and* paper bags.

It has been documented that the manufacturing, transportation, and ultimate disposal of a paper bag can result in more emissions when compared to a single-use plastic bag. If the proposed ordinance were to cause an increase in use of paper bags it could result in increased use of energy and thus increase emissions at power generating plants and possibly from truck transportation of heavier, bulkier paper bags to supply the bag needs of retailers in the City of Arcata. However data from the July 2012 Los Angeles County website on LA County's plastic bag ban shows that "the Ordinance has so far resulted in a 95% reduction in overall single use bag usage (both plastic and paper), which includes eliminating all single use plastic bags and a significant reduction of over 30% in paper bag usage."

After Washington D. C. imposed a charge of \$0.05 on both paper and plastic bags Safeway stores reported a 60% decline in both paper and plastic bags distributed at its DC stores. Studies done by the City of San Jose found that their Bring Your Own Bag Ordinance was successful at affecting community norms and reducing single-use bags. San Jose observed shoppers at a variety of store types, including grocery stores, pharmacies, and general retailers in different San José neighborhoods both before and after implementation of the BYOB Ordinance. Observation records show that reusable bag use increased greatly following the implementation of the ordinance, from almost 4 percent of bags observed to approximately 62 percent of bags observed. In addition, the percentage of customers that chose not to use a bag, and instead carry items by hand, more than doubled. The overall impact was that the average number of single-use bags used per customer decreased from 3 bags to 0.3 bags per visit following the implementation of the ordinance. Results from store observations reflect that the ordinance has had the intended effect of reducing the use of single-use bags.

Life Cycle Assessment studies have shown that a switch away from both single use plastic and paper bags would decrease consumption of non-renewable energy sources, atmospheric acidification and ground level ozone formation, reduce water consumption, GHG emissions and water eutrophication. Other studies have shown that a ban on plastic bags significantly reduces litter and associated aesthetic impacts and shopping bag waste generation.

Based on these findings the City's proposed Reusable Bag Ordinance should also result in residents using either their own bags and or choosing no bag before opting to purchase single use recyclable paper bags for a fee. This will reduce demand for paper bags and their manufacture and transport.

In addition single use recyclable paper bags do replace single use plastic bags on a one to one basis, since a bag constructed of paper tends to hold a greater volume of goods than its plastic counterpart. A study commissioned by the film plastics industry has estimated that for 1,500 plastic bags, it would take only 1,000 paper bags to replace them. The larger capacity of paper bags coupled with the experience of communities who have instituted similar ordinances (customers are choosing reusable bags or to forgo any bag) will decrease the numbers of both single use plastic and single use recyclable paper bags being manufactured and supplied to retail outlets in the City of Arcata.

A review of city records indicates that there are a little over 100 licensed retail businesses with a potential to provide customers with single-use carry out bags from a point of sale. There are four large supermarkets and one large pharmacy among these retail businesses. Two of the markets, Wildberries and the Arcata Co-Op, already have successful programs in place supplanting the distribution of single use plastic and paper carry out bags for their customers. The remaining three businesses are believed to be among the high volume users of single use bags in the city. Many of the other retailers and

restaurants are much smaller in size, with lower volume sales, and correspondingly lower potential to distribute single-use bags in significant numbers. A preliminary 2013 survey of these establishments shows that many already do not use single use plastic bags (50 surveys, 35 returned, 28 do not provide single use plastic bags).

Based on the above information the proposed ordinance should reduce use of both single use plastic and recyclable paper bags with a shift to reusable bags resulting in a reduction in energy consumption with a corresponding reduction in air emissions. It is therefore noted that this project should not conflict or obstruct air quality management guidelines or goals.

3 (d and e)

No Impact: This project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or cause the creation of objectionable odors.

4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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 Wildlife 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
(c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, 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?				х
(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

Impact Analysis: Explanation of checklist judgments

4. (a through f)

No Impact: This project consists of adoption of an ordinance that would encourage the use of reusable bags by banning the distribution of single use plastic bags and requiring a fee for recyclable paper bags at point of sale at certain identified retailers. As discussed in *Section 1 – Aesthetics*, the proposed prohibition and fee would serve to reduce litter from paper and plastic bags in the nearby environment,

including riparian, estuary, and marine habitats in or near the City of Arcata. This project will not negatively impact federally protected wetlands or habitat areas or substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. The project as proposed, by reducing litter and the negative impacts to water resources associated with litter and plastics that do not readily decompose, will provide a protective or beneficial impact and is consistent with federal, state and local policies protecting biological resources. The proposed project does not conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other local or regional conservation plan involving the city.

Levels of debris in both the ocean and land-sea interface are of growing concern. Various types of debris are known to have adverse effects on marine species. Of particular concern is debris from plastics which never fully degrade. Recent studies show plastics are consumed by organisms at all levels of the food web. Some pesticides and other hydrophobic compounds are known to adhere to plastics suspended in the water column. Ingestion and entanglement are two other problems associated with all types of marine debris. Types of marine debris of particular concern are abandoned/discarded fishing gear, balloons, plastics and Styrofoam, and consumer goods (e.g.: 6-pack beverage rings, beverage bottles, and plastic shopping bags). Marine debris originates from both land and ocean sources, with approximately 80% coming from land based sources according to U.S. government studies.

A streamlined environmental assessment of shopping bag alternatives was conducted by Hyder in 2007, illustrating that there was a diversity of impacts spread over several criteria. The life cycle of plastic bags manufactured from HDPE and LDPE were shown to have the greatest likelihood of impact to marine species due to extended degradation time. Conversely, bags manufactured of kraft paper such as recyclable paper bags were shown to have the least impact on marine resources. The Hyder study was conducted in Australia, and included transport distances and end-of-life assumptions that may not fully parallel or be representative of single use bag practices in California.

The proposed ordinance and resulting reduction of single use shopping bags, both paper and plastic, within the City of Arcata, a coastal city, is likely to have some benefit on improving water quality and removing potential hazards from the marine environment.

This project would not result in substantial adverse effect, directly or indirectly through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate sensitive or special species by California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Ordinance adoption would not result in adverse effects to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities that have been identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations published by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The adoption of a Reusable Bag Ordinance is expected to have an overall beneficial effect on species and habitats found within and surrounding the City of Arcata.

In summary, no impacts to biological resources are anticipated.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

	Less than Significant		
Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

(a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?		X
(b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X
(c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X
(d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X

5. (a through d)

No Impact: The project consists of an ordinance that promotes the use of reusable bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee on recyclable paper bags in the City of Arcata and does not involve or include any alteration of physical sites or structures. The project would not result in substantial adverse change to a historic resource or archeological resource. The project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, nor disturb any human remains including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Consequently, there is no adverse impact.

6.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				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 risks to life or property?				X
(e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

Impact Analysis: Explanation of checklist judgments

6. (a through e)

No Impact: This project does not include any developments, and therefore the project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic related ground failure, liquefaction, landslides, or substantial erosion or loss of topsoil. The Reusable Bag Ordinance will not result in future development that would be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable, or result in an offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse as a result of the project.

7.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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	

Impact Analysis: Explanation of checklist judgments

7. (a and b)

Less than significant impact: The proposed ordinance promotes the use of reusable bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee at the point of sale for single use recyclable paper bags for certain retailers in the City of Arcata.

Life Cycle Assessment studies have shown that a switch away from both single use plastic and paper bags would decrease consumption of non-renewable energy, atmospheric acidification and ground level ozone formation, reduce water consumption, and GHG emissions. Other studies have shown that a ban on plastic bags significantly reduces litter and associated aesthetic impacts and shopping bag waste generation.

As noted in Sections 1- Aesthetics, 3- Air Quality and 4- Biological Resources, Los Angeles County found a 95 percent reduction in overall single use bag usage (eliminating all single use plastic bags and a reduction of over 30 percent in paper bag usage). Safeway stores in Washington D. C. (with a charge of \$0.05 on both paper and plastic bags) reported a 60% decline in both paper and plastic bags distributed at its D. C. stores. San Jose found their *Bring Your Own Bag Ordinance* was successful at promoting shopping with reusable bags and reducing single-use plastic bag litter in City creeks and streets. San Jose's litter surveys demonstrated a reduction in bag litter of approximately 89 percent in the storm drain system, 60 percent in the creeks and rivers, and 59 percent in City streets and neighborhoods, when comparing 2010 and/or 2011 (pre-ordinance) data to 2012 (post-ordinance) data. San Jose staff surveys of customers at retail stores before and after the ordinance showed reusable bag use increased greatly following the implementation of the ordinance, from almost 4 percent of bags observed to approximately 62 percent of bags observed. In addition, the percentage of customers that chose not to use a bag and carry items by hand more than doubled. The average number of single-use

bags used per customer decreased from 3 bags to 0.3 bags per visit following the implementation of San Jose's ordinance.

A study of single use plastic bag Greenhouse Gas impacts within the City was conducted by Humboldt State University Engineering students in 2010. Assumptions included that three million film plastic bags were distributed by retailers to their customers within the City each year. After contacting bag distributers it was found that these bags were manufactured in the Far East, transported by vessel to the US west coast, and then distributed by a film plastics importer located within the Los Angeles area. The study gave estimates of the amounts of energy expended and greenhouse gases produced to meet supply requirements for film plastic bags in Arcata. The conclusions were that 2.2 million Megajouls of energy were used in production and distribution of these bags. One kilowatt hour of electricity is equal to 3.6 Megajouls. This manufacturing and distribution of single use plastic bags would cause the release of approximately 1.1 million pounds of CO2, 10,500 pounds of other greenhouse gases, and 7,500 pounds of particulates.

The HSU study did not assess energy requirements or greenhouse gas impacts related to the production of single use or recycled content paper bags. Some opponents of Reusable Bag Ordinances have suggested that a ban on single use carry out plastic bags could cause an increase in the use of paper bags and a corresponding rise in greenhouse gas production. The passage of the Reusable Bag Ordinance in Arcata, based on the experience of other jurisdictions with similar ordinances, should result in a decrease in emissions due to reduced use of both single use plastic and single use paper bags. The fee on single use recyclable paper bags will reduce the number of single use recyclable paper bags used by customers. This fact, coupled with the capacity of 1,500 plastic bags equaling 1,000 paper shopping bags will result in reduction in the use of and thus the production and distribution of single use recyclable paper bags.

Therefore the total use of single use plastic and single use recyclable paper bags should decrease once the ordinance is implemented with a corresponding reduction in GHG emissions and no impact will occur as a result of this project.

8.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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 reasonable 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 complied 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 for people residing or working in the project area?				x

(f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		x
(g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		Х
(h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		X

8. (a through h)

No Impact: The project involves the adoption of an Ordinance in the City of Arcata designed to increase consumer use of reusable bags by banning plastic bags *and* imposing a fee on single use recyclable paper bags, thereby reducing the use of *both* single-use plastic *and* paper bags. The adoption of this ordinance would not increase use or disposal of hazardous materials, or create a public or safety hazard, or affect existing emergency response plans or routes within the city. The proposed ordinance would not affect emergency procedures or result in the exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fires.

One alternative to single use bags involves the consumer purchasing a washable durable reusable bag from a retailer. This reusable bag would be manufactured for long term use. The definitions section of the proposed Ordinance defines a reusable bag (Section 2 (b)) as one that "Shall not contain lead, cadmium, mercury or any other heavy metals in toxic amounts." This requirement is to insure that any bag manufacturer or supplier will not replace single use bags with one that would create a toxic hazard to the user. No negative impacts are anticipated.

9.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
(b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				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, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation onor off-site.				x
(d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
(e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
(f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X

(g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?		x
(h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?		X
(i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?		x
(j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?		X
(k)	Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities?		X
(1)	Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities?		X
(m)	Result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas?		X
(n)	Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters?		X
(0)	Create the potential for significant changes in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm?		Х
(p)	Create significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?		Х

9. (a through p)

No Impacts: The project as proposed will promote the use of reusable bags by prohibiting certain identified retailers from distributing single use plastic bags and requiring a fee for single use recyclable paper bags at the point of sale. The proposed project does not involve any development, and therefore would not violate water quality standards or discharge requirements. The reduction in the numbers of single use paper and plastic bags available in the City of Arcata would not generate an increased use of ground water, alter existing drainage patterns, increase surface water run-off, or degrade water quality. The project does not involve the placement of structures within a 100 year flood hazard area or impede or redirect flood flows. The project would not expose residents or structures to the significant risk of loss, injury, or death resulting from or involving flooding, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The project as proposed is anticipated to have a positive and beneficial impact on local water quality by reducing bags as sources of litter that enter storm drains and tidal and riparian areas in and adjacent to the City of Arcata.

The City of Arcata operates within the guidelines of the Federal Clean Water Act and the regulations established by the State Water Resources Control Board. No part of this project conflicts with these standards, including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The project and ordinance implementation will not impact groundwater supplies.

San Jose's surveys of trash collected from creeks and rivers, storm drain catch basins, and neighborhood sidewalks after the passage of their ordinance found that the ordinance reduced plastic bags in the environment and had a positive impact on water quality resources. Passage and implementation of Arcata's ordinance should have a similar beneficial effect on water quality. Single use shopping bags are an identifiable part of the litter material that migrates into the city's gutters,

storm sewer collection system, streams, riparian banks, and tidal zones. City employees remove litter and debris including single use bags from catchments and storm grates throughout Arcata regularly. Non-profit groups supporting City cleanup days at the Arcata Marsh, Arcata Community Forest and along City streams also encounter and collect littered plastic and paper bags. Once recovered, these bags are properly managed, but many more escape into the environment. Using USEPA estimates, if 5 percent of Arcata's film plastic bags are litter or otherwise enter the environment, then 150,000 single use plastic shopping bags per year could impact natural areas in and around Arcata.

A shopping bag constructed of virgin or post consumer recycled paper will soak up water and begin a fairly rapid process of degradation. The film plastic bag is much more durable and persistent in the environment. It's light weight and design allows it aerodynamic properties, and in the right conditions, it can be transported significant distances. If and when it enters a watercourse, research indicates that the bag remains intact for longer periods, allowing migration to a coastal or open ocean setting. Researchers have found that sun and wave action will eventually act to photodegrade the bag into smaller particles of the film plastic from which it was originally constructed.

Much discussion centers on the eventual fate of ocean debris, some centering on ocean currents drawing materials into one of the earth's seven oceanic gyres, rotating mid-oceanic collection points for all types of flotsam and jetsam. The Great North Pacific Gyre, in the Mid-Pacific north of the Hawaiian Island chain is the subject of continuing study. Ocean scientists are establishing baselines and measuring types of materials encountered in the gyres to better assess human contributions to ocean debris. Numerous materials constructed of plastic have been identified in these regions, and assessing the fate and effect of their degradation is one focal point of this research.

Ocean debris' adverse impact to marine life includes the process by which smaller fragments of anthropogenic ocean debris enters the food chain of aquatic species. Fish, marine invertebrates, and waterfowl necropsies indicate some may have perished as a result of ingestion of plastic materials.

As a coastal community working to meet federal, state and local regulations, Arcata is making efforts to insure that Arcata's contribution to ocean debris is minimized. Implementing the proposed ordinance is one such step. It is expected that the ordinance will improve local water quality concurrent with the reduction in single use plastic and paper bag debris entering nearby waterways. In turn, a modest reduction of paper and plastic bag debris entering the ocean is likely.

Consequently no adverse impacts to hydrology or water quality are anticipated.

10.	LAND USE/PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Physically divide an established community?				X
(b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
(c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				Х

10. (a through c)

No Impact: The project involves the adoption of an Ordinance in the City of Arcata that promotes use of reusable bags by prohibiting the distribution of single use plastic shopping bags and requiring a fee for single use recyclable paper bags at the point of sale by certain identified retailers. The project does not have the capability to physically divide an existing community. The ordinance would not be in conflict with any land use plan or policy or conflict with any habitat or natural community conservation plan.

11.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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?				х
(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

Impact Analysis: Explanation of checklist judgments

11. (a and b)

No Impact: The proposed ordinance promotes the use of reusable bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee on recyclable paper bags in the City of Arcata. Adoption of this ordinance does not affect any known state, regional, or local mineral resources. No impacts to any mineral resources are anticipated.

12.	NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
(b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
(c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
(d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				x
(f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

12. (a through f)

No Impact: The proposed ordinance promotes the use of reusable bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee on recyclable paper bags in the City of Arcata and would not expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established by City of Arcata ordinances. The project would not expose people to excessive ground vibration or result in a substantial permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise within the city.

13.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Induce substantial 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 housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				x
(c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				Х

Impact Analysis: Explanation of checklist judgments

13. (a through c)

No Impact: The proposed ordinance promotes the use of reusable bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee on recyclable paper bags in the City of Arcata and would not increase, decrease, or otherwise affect population or local population growth rates. Therefore, no impacts to population or housing would occur as a result of the proposed project.

14.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or 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:				
	i) Fire Protection?				X
	ii) Police Protection?				X
	iii) Schools?				X
	iv) Parks?				X
	v) Other public facilities?			X	

Impact Analysis: Explanation of checklist judgments

14. (a- i through iv)

No Impact : The proposed ordinance promotes the use of reusable bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee on recyclable paper bags in the City of Arcata and does not involve Public Safety, School, or recreational Services.

(a - v) Less than Significant Impact: The implementation of this ordinance will involve enforcement actions by the City of Arcata. As ordinance implementation progresses, city administrative staff will be involved in education and outreach to residents and affected members of the business community. Ordinance implementation is expected to require the commitment of staff resources similar to other ordinances previously adopted by the City. Any impacts to city government services and facilities are anticipated to be less than significant, and no negative impact is expected.

15.	RECREATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				х
(b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				x

Impact Analysis: Explanation of checklist judgments

15. (a and b)

No Impact: The proposed ordinance promotes the use of reusable bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee on recyclable paper bags in the City of Arcata and does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities within the city, or otherwise affect existing recreational facilities.

16.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				X
(b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				x
(c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X

(d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e. g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		x
(e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?		X
(f)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?		x

16. (a and b)

No Impact: The proposed ordinance promotes the use of reusable bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee on recyclable paper bags in the City of Arcata. The experience of other City's that have instituted similar ordinances shows a resulting reduction in use of both single use plastic and paper bags. The City's ordinance should shift consumers to reusable bags with a resulting decrease in the number of single use paper and plastic bags distributed within the City reducing delivery truck traffic. Additionally a study by the City of Palo Alto, CA (Initial Study for Ordinance Amendment to Place a Limited Prohibition on Single-Use Plastic Checkout Bags, 2009) estimated that a shift in the distribution of plastic to paper bags would result in one additional truck trip per day. The City of Palo Alto, CA has a population about four times that of the City of Arcata therefore although very unlikely; any increase in truck traffic would be very minimal and would be geographically dispersed through different areas of the City, avoiding any concentrated effect upon the level of service (LOS) at specific intersections or street segments. Therefore, the project does not conflict with applicable or adopted plans or any plans involving the city traffic circulation system, or supporting alternative modes of transportation.

(c through f)

No Impact: The project is the adoption of an ordinance that does not include any development, and therefore includes no changes in the design of traffic functions, increases in traffic hazards, impacts to emergency access, or changes in parking capability.

17.	UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				х
(b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment or collection facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				x
(c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				x
(d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X

(e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?		х
(f)	Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		х
(g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes.		х

17. (a through e)

No Impact: The proposed ordinance promotes the use of reusable bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee on recyclable paper bags in the City of Arcata. The adoption of the proposed ordinance does not affect wastewater treatment requirements dictated by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board or result in the construction of new or the expansion of existing water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project does not require any additional water supply or wastewater capacity for the City of Arcata.

(f)

No Impact: The ordinance encourages residents of and shoppers in the City of Arcata to use reusable bags when purchasing goods and food from retail establishments. These customers will no longer receive single use plastic bags and will have to pay a fee for recyclable paper bags. The City works to promote recycling of single use paper bags through a curbside recycling program and recycling of single use plastic bags at store returns.

Even with recycling efforts in place, single use paper and plastic bags were a component of the municipal solid waste stream that is landfilled. The Humboldt Waste Management Authority's recent Waste Characterization Study found 0.3% or 222 tons of overall county waste, (an estimated 27 tons of the City of Arcata total waste) are made up of film plastic bags destined for landfill. Adoption of this ordinance will reduce the amount of single use plastic shopping bags being discarded within the City of Arcata, with a corresponding reduction in the number that is eventually landfilled. The fee on recyclable paper bags in other communities has demonstrated that the number of single use paper bags being used in Arcata will also decrease with a similar reduction in the amount of paper bags being landfilled.

The reusable bags that replace single use bags are capable of carrying 22 pounds over 175 feet for 125 trips (American Society of Testing Materials (ASTM) standard for reusable bags). The overall result is a reduction in the amount of single use shopping bags being landfilled, a strategy that will extend the permitted capacity of receiving landfills.

(g)

No Impact: The proposed ordinance complies with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations that pertain to the regulation and management of solid waste. No impact will result.

Less than Significant Potentially 18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Less Than With Significant Mitigation Significant No Incorporated **Impact Impact** Impact Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below selfsustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, X 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? 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 X viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or X indirectly?

Impact Analysis: Explanation of checklist judgments

18. (a through c)

No Impact: The project consists of an ordinance promoting the use of reusable bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee on recyclable paper bags in the City of Arcata. In lieu of the single use bags, consumers may chose to provide their own bag, not use a bag, or elect to purchase a recyclable paper bag for a fee that is clearly identified on the sales receipt. The retailer will retain this fee which reflects the cost of the single use recyclable paper bag. Certain low income exemptions and other provisions are included in ordinance language.

This ordinance does not include any development, nor does it have a potential to degrade the quality of the environment, or substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause s 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 a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The project would not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. There are no impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Furthermore, ordinance adoption would decrease the amount of litter in the City of Arcata and surrounding areas, assist in the protection of the City's water resources and marine environment, and decrease green house gas emissions and the amount of municipal solid waste entering a land fill. These results would serve to benefit the environment and wildlife, and place the City of Arcata in a position that advocates and participates in meaningful local and global environmental stewardship.

REFERENCES:

Agalita Marine Research Foundation. *Pelagic Plastics*, www.algalita.org/pelagic plastic.html

Arcata Municipal Code

Bousted Consulting & Associates: Life Cycle Assessment for Three Types of Grocery Bags-Recyclable Plastic; Compostable, Biodegradable Plastic; and Recycled, Single use single use recyclable paper Prepared for the progressive Bag Alliance, 2007

Californians Against Waste, Report reveals the continued failure of Plastic Bag recycling, February 2012

Californians Against Waste http://cawrecycles.org/issues/plastic campaign/plastic bags

California Coastal Commission, Public Education Program. *The Problem with Marine Debris* http://www.coastal.ca.gov/publiced/marinedebris.html

California Environmental Quality Act: CEQA Guidelines, 2004

Earth 911: Facts About Plastic Bags http://earth911.com/Plastic-Bags 6/2008

Humboldt Baykeeper - Arcata Restaurant Survey, April 2013.

Humboldt State University Schatz Energy Research Center. City of Arcata Plastic Bag Usage- Energy Consumption and GHG Emissions Study March, 2010

Humboldt Waste Management Authority, Waste Characterization Study, March 2012

Humboldt Waste Management Authority, *Draft CEQA Initial Study examining an Ordinance that would amend the City of Arcata Municipal Code by prohibiting the distribution of single-use paper and plastic shopping bags by certain identified retailers at the point of sale.*

Hyder Consulting. Comparison of existing life cycle analysis of shopping bag alternatives. 2007

Green Cities California. Master Environmental Assessment on Single Use and Reusable Bags. March, 2010

Los Angeles County website - http://ladpw.org/epd/aboutthebag/

Moore, C.J., Lattin, G.L., Zellers, A.F., *Density of Plastic Particles Found in Zooplankton Trawls from Coastal Waters of California to the North Pacific Grye* – 2006

NOAA - http://marinedebris.noaa.gov/info/faqs.htm

NOAA - http://marinedebris.noaa.gov De-Mystifying the "Great Pacific Garbage Patch,"

North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board- NPDES and SWQCB Guidelines

Palo Alto, City of, CA. *Initial Study for Ordinance Amendment to Place a Limited Prohibition on Single-Use Plastic Check Out Bags* 2009

San Jose, City of, Memo- Bring Your Own Bag Ordinance Implementation Results

And Actions To Reduce Eps Foam Food Ware, November 2012

San Francisco, City and County of - Office of the Controller, *Checkout Bag Charge: Economic Impact Report, November* 2011.

Save The Plastic Bag: An American success story under threat. www.savetheplasticbag.com

USA Today. Lead in reusable grocery bags prompts call for federal inquiry, November, 2010

US EPA 2005 Characterization of Municipal Solid Waste http://epa.gov/msw/facts.htm

Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute. *Plastics in Our Oceans*, http://www.whoi.edu/science National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, *Marine Debris FAQ 2010*

CITY OF ARCATA NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROPOSED PROJECT: Arcata Reusable Bag Ordinance

File #: State Clearinghouse # XXXXXX Project: Arcata Reusable Bag Ordinance

PROJECT SUMMARY: The project consists of an ordinance promoting the use of reusable shopping bags by prohibiting distribution of single use plastic bags and imposing a fee (\$0.10) on recyclable paper bags in the City of Arcata. In lieu of the single use bags, consumers may chose to provide their own bag or elect to purchase a single use recyclable paper bag for a fee that is clearly identified on the sales receipt. The retailer will retain this fee which is a true reflection of the cost of the single use recyclable paper bag. Certain low income exemptions and other provisions are included within the model ordinance language.

Application Type: Approval of Negative Declaration

Location: City limits.

Assessor Parcel Number: Various

Application Submitted: To State Clearinghouse July 29, 2013

Property Owner: Various **Applicant:** City of Arcata

File Number: State Clearinghouse #

Zoning: The project occurs throughout the City and potentially includes areas zoned residential, commercial, industrial, light industrial, agricultural, natural resource areas, and state and federal lands

General Plan: The project occurs throughout the City and potentially includes areas zoned residential, commercial, industrial, light industrial, agricultural, natural resource areas, and state and federal lands.

Coastal Zone: Portions are in the Coastal Zone

Environmental: An Initial Study and draft Negative Declaration has been prepared for the project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

FINDINGS:

The project proposes a Negative Declaration per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Pursuant to an Initial Study Report, the proposed project, is found to not have a significant effect on the environment and a Negative Declaration is adopted in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The project is subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Staff recommends a Negative Declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines for this project. A Negative Declaration can be adopted for this project if it can be demonstrated that a significant impact would not result from this project. Prior to making a decision on the project application, the Environmental Services Department received, analyzed, and updated the Initial Study and proposed Negative Declaration, together with all written and oral comments thereon received on or before the established deadline of August 25, 2013. The Negative Declaration adopted herein reflects the City of Arcata staff's independent judgment and analysis, such that:

- The administrative record for the Negative Declaration includes the Initial Study Report, the
 written and oral comments received, and the September 4, 2013 staff report which includes
 the City's responses to comments received. The Arcata Environmental Services Department
 located at 736 "F" Street, Arcata, is the custodian of the documents and other materials that
 constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Arcata City Council decision is based.
- 2. The Initial Study shows that the project could not potentially cause significant effects on the environment, in light of the whole record before the Agency.
- 3. There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the Agency, that the project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. To illustrate this Finding, see the Initial Study & draft Negative Declaration. In light of the whole record before the Agency, there is no substantial evidence to require further environmental reviews or to deny this project based upon perceived non-compliance with specific development standards or policies embodied within the Arcata General Plan: 2020.
- 4. The Initial Study Report is a complete and adequate informational document and the Negative Declaration is hereby adopted.

COMMENT PERIOD: August 2, 2013 to September 11, 2013