

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR DEMOLITION PERMIT FOR TWO BUILDINGS OVER 50 YEARS OLD 101 AND 105 SOUTH MAIN STREET



March 14, 2022
SCH No: XXXXXXXXX

Prepared by:

City of Ukiah
Community Development Department
Planning Division
300 Seminary Avenue, Ukiah, CA 95482

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| I. PROJECT INFORMATION | 3 |
| II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION | 4 |
| 1. <i>Project Location</i> | 4 |
| 2. <i>Environmental Setting and Background</i> | 5 |
| 3. <i>Project Components</i> | 8 |
| III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED | 10 |
| IV. DETERMINATION | 12 |
| V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS | 13 |
| 1. <i>Aesthetics</i> | 13 |
| 2. <i>Agriculture and Forestry Resources</i> | 17 |
| 3. <i>Air Quality</i> | 18 |
| 4. <i>Biological Resources</i> | 22 |
| 5. <i>Cultural Resources</i> | 23 |
| 6. <i>Energy</i> | 28 |
| 7. <i>Geology and Soils</i> | 30 |
| 8. <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> | 31 |
| 9. <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> | 33 |
| 10. <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> | 36 |
| 11. <i>Land Use and Planning</i> | 37 |
| 12. <i>Mineral Resources</i> | 39 |
| 13. <i>Noise</i> | 39 |
| 14. <i>Population and Housing</i> | 43 |
| 15. <i>Public Services</i> | 44 |
| 16. <i>Recreation</i> | 45 |
| 17. <i>Transportation</i> | 46 |
| 18. <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> | 48 |
| 19. <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> | 50 |
| 20. <i>Wildfire</i> | 52 |
| 21. <i>Mandatory Findings of Significance</i> | 53 |
| VI. REFERENCES | 55 |
| VII. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM | 58 |

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Historic Resource Evaluation for 101 South Main Street

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

| |
|--|
| Project Title: |
| Demolition Permit to Demolish Two Buildings Over the Age of 50 Years Old |
| Lead Agency Address and Phone Number: |
| City of Ukiah 300 Seminary Avenue Ukiah, California 95482 (707) 463-6200 |
| CEQA Contact Person and Phone Number: |
| Michelle Irace, Planning Manager City of Ukiah Community Development Department (707) 463-6203 mirace@cityofukiah.com |
| Applicant: |
| Todd Schapmire, Property Owner |
| Project Location: 101 and 105 South Main Street (APN 002-231-01) |
| General Plan Designation: Commercial (C) Zoning District: Urban Center (UC) within Downtown Zoning Code |

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Project Location

The ±0.48-acre Project site (APN 002-231-01) is located on the corner of Perkins Street and South Main Street in downtown Ukiah, approximately 0.5-mile west of U.S. Highway 101. Both Main Street and Perkins Street are developed with a mixture of commercial, residential and public uses. The parcel is developed with a parking lot and two buildings with separate street addresses: one ±3,328 sf building that has been occupied by the Dragon's Lair retail business (101 South Main Street); and one ±2,880 sf building that has been occupied by Tom's Glass repair service (105 South Main Street). **Figure 1** below provides a location map, **Figure 2** provides an aerial image of the Project site, and **Figures 3** and **4** depict the two existing buildings.

Figure 1, Project Location Map



Figure 2, Project Site Aerial Image



2. Environmental Setting and Background

The Project site is situated within the City of Ukiah, within the Ukiah Valley in central Mendocino County. The Ukiah Valley is located approximately 30 miles east and inland from the Pacific Ocean as the crow flies. The Ukiah Valley runs north-south for approximately nine miles, with a maximum width of three miles, and elevations varying from approximately 600-feet above mean sea level to approximately 3,000 feet in the hills surrounding the City. Vegetation communities in the Ukiah Valley include mixed oak, chaparral, and manzanita, with some sparse redwood groves. The Russian River enters the valley at the north end and runs south along the valley floor. This area is characterized by a Mediterranean climate; the winters are cool and wet, and the summers are hot and dry. Annual average temperatures for this region range from about 30 to 100 degrees Fahrenheit.

Ukiah is located along the Highway 101 corridor and near the east/west intersection of Highway 20, two hours north of the Golden Gate Bridge. Incorporated in 1876, Ukiah is the county seat and largest city in Mendocino County.

As noted above, the Project site is developed with two existing buildings and a paved parking lot. The parcel is accessed via a driveway from South Main Street, as well as a driveway located along Perkins Street. Additionally, there is a shared driveway that shares access with the adjacent parcel immediately to the east (225 East Perkins Street) that is currently occupied by Romi's Brew and BBQ (see Figures 2 through 4). For several decades, buildings on the parcel have been used for

commercial uses. Vegetation on the site is limited to the following: two California juniper shrubs, one Chinese pistache tree located against the 101101 South Main Street building (east side); blackberry bushes against the 105105 South Main Street building (east side) and four Valley oak trees approximately 14 to 60 ft away from the building. Additionally, large oak trees line the east side of the parcel but are located within the adjacent parcel (see Figure 3).

101 South Main Street (Dragon's Lair building). The Dragon's Lair building is located at the southeast corner of the parcel at the intersection of Perkins Street and South Main Street, fronting on both streets. The building consists of one story with a roughly rectangular footprint, and "chamfered" or "clipped" flat northwest corner to accommodate the primary entrance. It is comprised of red and peach colored pressed tin siding on west and north elevations and corrugated metal siding on the east and south elevations (see Figures 2-4). The existing approximately 3,328 sf building originally dates from 1921 and was included in the City of Ukiah's 1985 'Historic Resources Survey' (prepared by Historic Environment Consultants) and updated in 1999 by the "City of Ukiah Architectural Survey" (prepared by P.S. Preservation Services). According to the 1985 survey, the building was assigned a "5" status code, which includes buildings that are ineligible for the national register, but are identified as having historic importance at the local level. Specifically, the 1985 survey notes that the building is representative of a type of commercial structure common to its era that is a "rather rare survivor of the type in Ukiah, and is located prominently. Its surfacing materials and form create a rather strong image of past lifestyles." The 1999 survey was completed as an update to the 1985 survey, and reviewed each property's eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. The 1999 survey notes that the building is vernacular commercial style and originally constructed in 1921 as a hay barn and feed store. The survey notes that the pressed metal clad building is "an excellent example of its type and the only one left in Ukiah", and was therefore assigned a "3S" status code, which is defined as appearing to be eligible for the National Register as an individual property through survey information. However, the 1999 survey does not provide additional information regarding the change in status from the 1985 survey.

Although the 1999 survey identifies the building as eligible for the National Register, this does not accurately depict the building's status. In order for a building to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places, a building must first be listed on the State Register. In order to be listed on the State Register the survey form completed by the local jurisdiction must be submitted to State of California's Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) for review. SHPO then reviews the survey forms and determines if the building is eligible for listing on the State Register. Once listed on the State Register SHPO must submit a nomination form to the National Park Service for review and consideration. Upon extensive research, it was determined that Dragon's Lair building is not listed on either the State or Federal Registers. This is further supported by SHPO's most recent classification system and database of historic buildings, also known as the "Built Environment Resource Directory" (updated March, 2020), which identifies the building status code as "5S2", meaning that the local government has identified it as individually eligible for local listing. As such, the building is not listed on the State Register, nor is it identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

A Historic Resource Evaluation was prepared by APD Preservation, LLC (January, 2020; revised in January, 2022) to further research and evaluate the building's historic significance (**Attachment A**). The evaluation found that the original building was constructed in 1857 was replaced once in 1890 with a new hay barn but was destroyed during the 1917 fire that began at a restaurant (currently occupied by a law firm at 116 South State Street, just south of the Ukiah Brewing Company) two blocks west of the building. A new building was constructed in 1921 but was significantly modified between 1938 and 1963 when it was converted to retail. Modifications made to the building during this time included replacing two open bays with windows, replacing the front doors, replacing and reconfiguring the awning, and installing an additional window. The false front that most defines the building was

modified in 1938, but retains its basic early twentieth century appearance. During this time, the building was occupied by several feed stores, a cheese and wine store, and office/retail space. The existing Dragon's Lair retail business has been within the building since 1995. The evaluation (2022) notes that although it has some character-defining architectural features, the building's architecture is not historically significant. It also notes that the building is considered most significant for its association with post fire development after the 1917 fire and how the block functioned as a service hub for agricultural commerce in the region. The evaluation states, "The building appears to be significant for its association with the post-fire redevelopment of Ukiah. Its period of significance is 1921 (its inferred construction date), and the building retains enough physical integrity to convey its early twentieth century commercial origins, which render it historic. The dilapidated utilitarian building does not appear to be significant for its architectural merit." See Section V.5, *Cultural Resources*, for more information.

105 South Main Street (Tom's Glass building). According to the Mendocino County Assessor's records, the Tom's Glass building is a warehouse that dates back to 1947. The building is a rectangular approximately 2,880 sf one-story building located on the south side of the parcel and comprised of silver corrugated metal. There is a firewall between the Tom's Glass building and the building on the adjacent parcel located at 123 South Main Street (currently occupied by the Little Brown Bear business). However, the firewall was constructed as part of construction for 123 South Main Street (Little Brown Bear) and is not located within the boundaries of the Project site. As such, the firewall is not proposed for demolition. The Tom's Glass building is not included in either of the City's 1985 and 1999 historic inventories surveys, nor is it listed in the State of California's inventory of historic resources or National Register of Historic Places. Because the building is not listed in a local, state or national register, a detailed Historic Resource Evaluation was not prepared.

Per Ukiah City Code Section 3016(b), buildings over 50 years old proposed for demolition that do not meet the exemption criteria of being either an immediate safety hazard, or an accessory building that is not listed on the local historic inventory, shall be reviewed for their historic or architectural significance. Specifically, the City's Demolition Review Committee shall review the proposal and make a recommendation to the Ukiah City Council. Because the buildings do not meet the exemption criteria noted within the code, on December 28, 2021, the City's Demolition Review Committee reviewed the Project and voted to recommend demolition of both buildings to the City Council. See Section V.11, *Land Use and Planning*, for more information. This Initial Study is intended to analyze the impacts associated with demolition of the buildings, in accordance with CEQA. The Demolition Permit, together with this Initial Study, will be reviewed by City Council for final consideration.

Figure 3, Views of Existing Buildings from Perkins St. (looking southwest)



Figure 4, Views of Existing Buildings from S. Main St. (looking northeast)



3. Project Components

The property owner proposes to demolish the existing buildings on-site. Standard demolition construction techniques and equipment including a mechanical ram, dump truck, pickup truck, excavator, backhoe, front end loader, bobcat & stinger for concrete demolition would be used. The existing buildings will be disassembled via mechanical means and by hand labor where necessary. Mechanical means will include large track-driven excavators with mechanical arms. On-site concrete pads and foundations will be demolished with mechanical rams. Demolished concrete and rebar will be off-hauled and recycled at a local rock quarry. Other demolished debris will be loaded into dump trucks staged on site. Dump trucks would off-haul debris and deliver to the Ukiah Transfer Station & Recycling Center, where metal materials would be recycled and non-recyclable materials would be disposed.

Demolition would take approximately three weeks with a crew of six construction workers. All work would be performed Monday through Friday, during daylight hours (between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., depending on the season). Construction equipment would be staged on-site and all activities will be performed within the site boundaries. It is anticipated that two to three dump truck trips a day (Monday through Friday) would be necessary to transfer demolished materials for disposal and recycling. Construction equipment and trucks would utilize existing driveways and access routes on Main and Perkins Streets. No road closures are anticipated for the Project.

The existing Chinese pistache tree located on the south side of the building and the two Juniper shrubs located on the east side of the building would be removed for demolition, as they are located against the building and partially growing into the foundation. In addition, the blackberry would be removed. None of the oak trees on-site would be removed. Dust on the site will be minimized with the use of a

water truck. Although the property owner has noted that he believes another commercial building/use is the best use of the site, no development is proposed at this time.

The application was referred to departments and agencies with jurisdiction or interest in the Project, including the City of Ukiah Community Development Department- Building Official, City of Ukiah Police Department, City of Ukiah Public Works Department, City of Ukiah Electric Utility Department, Ukiah Valley Fire Authority, Mendocino County Air Quality Management District, Mendocino County Environmental Health Department, and the Mendocino County Historic Society. Comments and requirements identified by these entities have been included as Conditions of Approval for the permit and the applicant will obtain all necessary regulatory permits.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

Purpose of the Initial Environmental Study: This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the Project, as proposed, would have a significant impact upon the environment.

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.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

Summary of Findings: The Project site is developed with a parking lot and two buildings with separate street addresses: one ±3,328 sf building that has been occupied by the Dragon's Lair retail business (101 South Main Street); and one ±2,880 sf building that has been occupied by Tom's Glass repair service (105 South Main Street). Both of the buildings are more than 50 years old and are proposed for demolition; no new development is proposed. The Tom's Glass building at 105 South Main Street is not located on a local, state or national register for historic places. However, the Dragon's Lair building at 101 South Main Street is identified in the 1985 "Ukiah Historic Resource Survey" and the 1999 "City of Ukiah Architectural Survey" as a local historic resource, and is included in the State of California's "Built Environmental Resource Database (BERD)" with a designation of "5S2," meaning that a local government has recognized the resource as "eligible for local listing or designation." However, the building is not listed on the State Register or National Register of Historic Places.

Per Ukiah City Code Section 3016(b), buildings over 50 years old proposed for demolition that do not meet the exemption criteria of being either an immediate safety hazard, or an accessory building that is not listed on the local historic inventory, shall be reviewed for their historic or architectural significance. Specifically, the City's Demolition Review Committee shall review the proposal and make a recommendation to the Ukiah City Council. Because the buildings do not meet the exemption criteria noted within the code, on December 28, 2021, the City's Demolition Review Committee reviewed the Project and voted to recommend demolition of both buildings to the City Council. See Section V.11, *Land Use and Planning*, for more information. This Initial Study is intended to analyze the impacts associated with demolition of the buildings, in accordance with CEQA. The Demolition Permit, together with this Initial Study, will be reviewed by City Council for final consideration.

As described and analyzed throughout the Initial Study, impacts to Air Quality, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources could be significant. However, with the implementation of mitigation measures, all impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Specifically, temporary activities associated with

demolition over the three-week construction period could result in direct significant impacts to Air Quality, but would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures **AQ-1** through **AQ-3**, requiring adherence to Mendocino County Air Quality Management District regulations. The Tom's Glass building is not located on a local, state, or federal historic register. Therefore, no impact to historic resources would occur as a result of its demolition. However, because the Dragon's Lair building qualifies as a local historic resource under CEQA that would be demolished, the Project would result in a significant impact to that resource if not properly mitigated. **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would require photo documentation of the building to catalogue its existence and **Mitigation Measure CUL-2** requires an educational plaque to be erected on-site to acknowledge its historic significance related to the 1917 fire. Because the Project proposes to demolish the building that is not historically significant for its architecture, and does not propose new development at this time, these mitigation measures are considered adequate for reducing impacts to less than significant levels. As such, impacts to historic resources would be **less than significant with implementation of mitigation**. The Project would result in either no impact, or less than significant impact to all other resources. See Section V, *Evaluation of Environmental Impacts*, for more information.

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of the initial evaluation that follows:

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

 X 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 mitigation measures and project revisions have been identified that would reduce all impacts to a less than significant level. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

 I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

 I find that the proposed Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

 I find that 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.



Signature

3-14-22

Date

Craig Schlatter, Director
Community Development Department
City of Ukiah
cschlatter@cityofukiah.com

V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The purpose of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) is to provide an analysis of the potential environmental consequences as a result of the proposed Project. The environmental evaluation relied on the following categories of impacts, noted as column headings in the IS checklist, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G.

“**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.

“**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.”

“**Less Than Significant Impact**” applies where the Project would not result in a significant effect (i.e., the Project impact would be less than significant without the need to incorporate mitigation).

“**No Impact**” applies where the Project would not result in any impact in the category or the category does not apply. This may be because the impact category does not apply to the proposed Project (for instance, the Project Site is not within a surface fault rupture hazard zone), or because of other project-specific factors.

1. Aesthetics

| AESTHETICS. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: Aesthetic impacts would be significant if the Project resulted in the obstruction of any scenic vista open to the public, damage to significant scenic resources within a designated

State scenic highway, substantial degradation to the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings from public views, or generate new sources of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, including that which would directly illuminate or reflect upon adjacent property or could be directly seen by motorists or persons residing, working or otherwise situated within sight of the Project.

Environmental Setting: Views of expansive hillsides, mostly within the County’s jurisdiction, surround the City. Some hillsides are densely forested with evergreen trees, while others are relatively open in comparison, dominated by mature oak trees set amid scrub and grasslands. Specific to resources within the City limits, one of the most notable scenic resources are the Western Hills, rising above the valley floor on the west side of Ukiah. Views on the Valley floor within the City of Ukiah include those typical of existing residential and commercial development and the majority of the land within the City limits is previously developed. In addition, some views of agricultural land uses within the City limits, or immediately outside of City limits, are available.

Generally speaking, scenic vistas are typically described as areas of natural beauty with features such as topography, watercourses, rock outcrops, and natural vegetation that contribute to the landscape’s quality. Noted throughout the City of Ukiah’s 1995 General Plan are views of hillsides, open space areas and agricultural areas as scenic resources within the Ukiah Valley. Water in the form of creeks, streams, and rivers is often a prominent feature in the scenic landscape as well. The General Plan generally identifies U.S. Highway 101 through the entire Ukiah Valley as a local scenic corridor, but does not identify location-specific scenic resources within the City limits. According to the California Department of Transportation’s (Caltrans) State Scenic Highway System Map, there are no designated state scenic highways within the vicinity of the Project. In addition, there are no highways identified as eligible for state designation. From the Project site, partial views Western Hills are available in the background to the west, while commercial and residential development within the downtown area development is visible in the foreground in all directions. Example views are shown in **Figures 5 and 6** below.

Figure 5, Views Facing West



Figure 6, Views Facing East



Discussion: (a and c) Less than Significant. As noted in the Project Description and shown in Figures 2-6, the Project site consists of a developed parcel with two buildings and a paved parking lot. The Tom's Glass building (105 South Main Street) is a rectangular one-story building located on the south side of the parcel and made of silver corrugated metal. The Dragon's Lair building (101 South Main Street) is located at the southeast corner of the parcel and intersection of Perkins Street and South Main Street, fronting on both streets. It is a one-story building with a roughly rectangular footprint, with "chamfered" or "clipped" flat northwest corner to accommodate the primary entrance. It is comprised of red/peach colored pressed tin siding on west and north elevations and corrugated metal siding on the east and south elevations. There is a painted mural of a dragon on the north side of the building and white columns painted on the east side. As noted in the Historic Resources Evaluation (2020; **Attachment A**), the building has some character defining features including the false front, irregular window placement, flat entrance on the northwest corner, and a gable roof. However, according to the Historic Resources Evaluation, "The dilapidated utilitarian building does not appear to be significant for its architectural merit."

Demolition of the buildings could result in temporary visual impacts from temporary construction equipment on-site and piled materials temporarily waiting for transport to the landfill. However, construction is anticipated to take approximately three weeks and occur during daylight hours, between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Demolition of the buildings would not have a substantial negative effect on available views of the nearest scenic resource, the Western Hills, as no new buildings are proposed that could potentially further restrict views of this resource. Once the buildings are demolished, the site would be cleared and remain vacant until a proposal for development is submitted by a future applicant and approved through the discretionary process. All new development would be subject to the requirements contained within the Downtown Zoning Code, a form-based code with design guidelines related to aesthetics. In addition, all new development would be reviewed by the City's Design Review Board.

For the aforementioned reasons, the Project would not result in a significant impact to scenic vistas and would not degrade the existing visual character of the site or vicinity. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

(c) Less than significant impact. Although the General Plan notes that U.S. Highway 101 provides scenic views throughout the Ukiah Valley, it does not provide specific information regarding these

views within the City limits. In addition, U.S. Highway 101 is approximately 0.5 mi east of the Project and does not offer clear views of the Project site, nor existing buildings due to the distance and other development in the downtown area. Although three trees located against the Dragon's Lair building would be removed for demolition, the trees are not listed on the City's Heritage Trees list, nor are they noted as species that should be preserved within the Downtown Zoning Code (UCC Section 9229). In addition, all of the oak trees, which are identified as species that should be preserved, would remain.

As noted above in discussion a and c, the Project would not negatively impact existing views of the Western Hills, which are also available from the highway. Lastly, there are no designated state scenic highways within the vicinity of the Project, which is what is analyzed under this criterion. Therefore, the Project would not substantially damage scenic resources within view of a state scenic highway. For the aforementioned reasons, impacts would be **less than significant**.

(d) Less than significant impact. Existing development with reflective materials such as metal and windows, as well as street signs, and parked and moving vehicles are existing sources of glare during daylight hours. Street lights, vehicle headlights, and lighting associated with business in the vicinity of the Project are existing sources of light at nighttime. Construction would take place between daylight hours and would not occur outside of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., depending on the season the work is conducted within. As such, the Project would not result in a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures: None

2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

| AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant 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 Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The Proposed Project would have a potentially significant impact on agricultural resources if it would convert prime farmland to a non-agricultural use, conflict with a Williamson Act contract, or disrupt a viable and locally important agricultural use. The Project would have a potentially significant impact on forestry resources if it would result in the loss, rezoning or conversion of forestland to a non-forest use.

Environmental Setting: Early agricultural efforts in the Ukiah Valley included the raising of livestock, and the growing of various grains, hay, alfalfa, and hops. When the Northwestern Pacific Railroad was completed in 1889; prunes, potatoes, pears, and hops could be grown and sent to San Francisco and other regional markets. Wine grapes were planted, and irrigation was practiced on a small scale. Through the 1950s, hops, pears, prunes and grapes were the most widely planted crops in the Ukiah Valley. After the railroad was completed, lumber mills sprang up in the Ukiah Valley and became the major industry in Mendocino County as trains took redwood logs and processed boards south to the San Francisco region. Today, much of the active agricultural land is located on the Valley floor and lower elevations along the Russian River system. Only a limited percentage of the Valley's agricultural lands are currently protected under Williamson Act Agricultural Preserve contracts. According to the County of Mendocino's Public GIS system, there are no Williamson Act contracts within the Project site or immediate vicinity.

There are no zoning districts within the City limits for Agriculture or Timber Preserve. While there is an overlay for agriculture in the Zoning Ordinance, it is not applied over any parcel within the City limits. There are a small number of City parcels that have current agricultural uses such as existing vineyards. However, these are ongoing non-conforming uses within non-agricultural zoning districts. According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program, California Important Farmland Finder, the majority of lands within the City of Ukiah are identified as “Urban Built-Up Land”.

Discussion: (a-e) No Impact. According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program, California Important Farmland Finder, the Project site is designated as “Urban Built-Up Land” and does not contain Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. As such, the Project would not convert Farmland, conflict with existing zoning for agriculture or forest land, and would not involve changes to the environment that would result in the conversion of agricultural resources to non-agriculture uses. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None

3. Air Quality

| AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The Proposed Project would have a significant impact to air quality if it would conflict with an air quality plan, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutant which the Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (MCAQMD) has designated as non-attainment, expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of air pollutants, or result in emissions that create objectionable odors or otherwise adversely affect a substantial number of people.

Environmental Setting: The Project is located within the North Coast Air Basin (NCAB), which includes Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino, and northern Sonoma Counties, and is under the jurisdiction of the Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (MCAQMD). The area's climate is considered Mediterranean, with warm, dry summers and cooler, wet winters. Summer high temperatures average in the 90s with high temperatures on very warm days exceeding 105 degrees. Summer low temperatures range between 50-60 degrees. Winter high temperatures generally range in the 50s and 60s. The average annual temperature is 58 degrees. Winter cold-air inversions are common in the Valley from November to February.

Prevailing winds are generally from the north. Prevailing strong summer winds come from the northwest; however, winds can come from the south and east under certain short-lived conditions. In early autumn, strong, dry offshore winds may occur for several days in a row, which may cause air pollution created in the Sacramento Valley, Santa Rosa Plain, or even San Francisco Bay Area to move into the Ukiah Valley.

The MCAQMD, which includes the City of Ukiah and surrounding areas, is designated as non-attainment for the State Standard for airborne particulate matter less than 10 microns in size (PM¹⁰). Particulate matter (PM) has significant documented health effects. The California Clean Air Act requires that any district that does not meet the PM¹⁰ standard make continuing progress to attain the standard at the earliest practicable date. The primary sources of PM¹⁰ are wood combustion emissions, fugitive dust from construction projects, automobile emissions and industry. Non-attainment of PM¹⁰ is most likely to occur during inversions in the winter. Regulation 1 of the MCAQMD contains regulations (known as "Rules") to regulate particulate matter; these Rules prohibit activities that would result in the injury, detriment, or annoyance of a considerable number of people, or which endanger the health and safety of the public.

The MCAQMD also provides the following significance thresholds for construction emissions:

1. 54 pounds per day of ROG (reactive organic gas)
2. 54 pounds per day of NO_x (oxides of nitrogen as nitrogen dioxide)
3. 82 pounds per day of PM¹⁰ (particulate matter less than 10 microns in size)
4. 54 pounds per day of PM^{2.5} (airborne particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less)
5. Best Management Practices for Fugitive Dust – PM¹⁰ and PM^{2.5}

Discussion: (a-d) Less than significant with mitigation. Typically, short-term construction related air quality impacts result from large projects requiring a significant amount of grading, demolition, or new construction that results in increased emission sand dust. Additionally, projects that require a large amount of vehicle trips and use of diesel equipment over an extended period (months) of time can result in air quality impacts. Long-term air quality impacts are typically from land uses that produce a significant amount of emissions, or sources of dust or other airborne irritants.

As described in the Project Description, standard demolition construction techniques and equipment including a mechanical ram, dump trucks, excavator, pickup truck, backhoe, front end loader, bobcat & stinger for concrete demolition would be used. The existing buildings will be disassembled via mechanical means and by hand labor where necessary. Mechanical means will include large track driven excavators with mechanical arms. On-site concrete pads and foundations will be demolished with mechanical rams. Demolished concrete and rebar will be off hauled and recycled at a local rock quarry. Other demolished debris will be loaded into dump trucks staged on site. Dump trucks would off-haul debris and deliver to the Ukiah Transfer Station & Recycling Center, where metal materials would be recycled and non-recyclable materials would be disposed of. Demolition would take approximately three weeks with a crew of six construction workers. All work would be performed during

daylight hours and would not occur outside of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., depending on the season the work is conducted within.

The Project is anticipated to produce up to five dump truck trips per day to haul materials off-site, in addition to six vehicle trips for construction workers, for a total of 11 trips per day. Demolition activities including the use of diesel engine equipment would be subject MCAQMD regulations intended to address air quality impacts. Specifically, MCAQMD has a set of standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) for projects involving demolition, grading, construction, and the use of diesel engine equipment that could result in emissions or fugitive dust. These regulations have been incorporated into **Mitigation Measures AQ-1** and **AQ-2**. Additionally, demolition of all commercial buildings are subject to the requirements of MCAQMD Regulation 1, Rule 492, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS) for asbestos. As required by **Mitigation Measure AQ-3**, prior to receiving a demolition permit from the City, the MCAQMD requires the applicant to complete an Asbestos Survey, submit the results to the MCAQMD, and obtain written authorization indicating that all requirements have been met.

The nearest “sensitive receptor” (includes schools, libraries, child care facilities, health care facilities, senior facilities, and residences) is the Mendocino County Library (Ukiah Branch), located at 105 North Main Street, approximately 68 ft (0.1 mi) north of the site. Additional sensitive receptors in the area include the following: residences including the Circle Trailer Park, located at 317 North Main Street, approximately 676 ft (0.13 mi) north of the site; a single-family residence located at 412 South Main Street, approximately 763 ft (0.14 mi) south of the site; and Adventist Health Ukiah Valley Hospital, located at 275 Hospital Drive, approximately 1,087 ft (0.21 mi) northeast of site. The nearest school is South Valley High School, located at 429 South Dora Street, approximately 1,880 ft (0.36 mi) southwest of the Project site.¹

Demolition activities have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to diesel particulate, fugitive emissions and dust. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-3 below, the would reduce impacts to sensitive receptors over the three-week construction period. In addition, the Project would not exceed the construction thresholds established by the MCAQMD, and air quality impacts associated with short-term construction would be **less than significant with mitigation**. Because the Project does not propose new development, no impact would occur once demolition is complete.

The nature of operational air emissions is largely a cumulative impact. As a result, no single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project’s individual emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. The MCAQMD developed the operational thresholds of significance based on the level above which a project’s individual emissions would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the North Coast Air Basin’s existing air quality conditions. Therefore, a project that exceeds the MCAQMD operational thresholds would also be a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. However, because the Project does not propose new development that would result in operational emissions, no cumulative impact would occur.

Based on the aforementioned, air quality impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation**.

¹ Instilling Goodness Elementary appears on Google Earth as being located near the Mendocino County Superior Court House, located at 100 North State Street. However, it was confirmed that the school is located in Talmage approximately 2.5 miles southeast, and there are no classes at this location.

Mitigation Measures:

AQ-1: Diesel Engines – Stationary and Portable Equipment and Mobile Vehicles:

- a. All stationary onsite diesel IC engines 50 horsepower or greater (i.e. large power generators or pumps) or any propane or natural gas engines 250 horsepower or greater require a permit from the MCAQMD.
- b. Portable diesel-powered equipment that may be used are required to be registered with the state Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or obtain permits from MCAQMD.
- c. Heavy duty truck idling and off-road diesel equipment or other diesel engine idling is limited to less than 5 minutes.

AQ-2: Grading Projects: All grading activities must comply with the following fugitive dust mitigation measures in accordance with District Regulation 1, Rule 1-430:

- a. All visibly dry disturbed soil road surfaces shall be watered to minimize fugitive dust emissions.
- b. Open bodied trucks shall be covered when used for transporting materials likely to give rise to airborne dust.
- c. All unpaved surfaces, unless otherwise treated with suitable chemicals or oils, shall have a posted speed limit of 10 mph.
- d. Earth or other material that has been transported by trucking or earth moving equipment, erosion by water, or other means onto paved streets shall be promptly removed.
- e. Asphalt, oil, water, or suitable chemicals shall be applied on materials stockpiles, and other surfaces that can give rise airborne dusts.
- f. All earthmoving activities shall cease when sustained winds exceed 15 mph.
- g. The operator shall take reasonable precautions to prevent the entry of unauthorized vehicles onto the site during non-work hours.
- h. The operator shall keep a daily log of activities to control fugitive dust.
- i. For projects greater than one acre or one mile of road not located within a Naturally Occurring Asbestos Area, prior to starting any construction the applicant is required to:
 - i. Submit a Large Area Grading permit application to the District.
 - ii. Obtain a final determination from the Air Quality Management District as to the need for an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan and/or Geologic Survey to comply with CCR sections 93106 and 93105 relating to Naturally Occurring Asbestos.
 - iii. Obtain written verification from the District stating that the project is in compliance with State and Local regulations relating to Naturally Occurring Asbestos.
 - iv. If the project is located within a Naturally Occurring Asbestos Area, additional mitigations shall be required.

AQ-3: Asbestos Survey. Demolition of all commercial buildings are subject to the requirements of MCAQMD Regulation 1, Rule 492, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS) for Asbestos. Prior to receiving a demolition permit from the City, the applicant shall:

- a. Have an Asbestos Survey completed by a licensed Asbestos contractor for the presence of asbestos containing materials;
- b. Submit a completed Asbestos Demolition/Renovation form, all test results and applicable notification fees to the District at least 10 days prior to beginning the Project;
- c. Have asbestos containing materials abated by a licensed abatement contractor prior to beginning and demolition or renovation activities, if applicable; and
- d. Obtain written authorization from MCAQMD indicating that all requirements have been met prior to receiving the demolition permit.

4. Biological Resources

| BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: Project impacts upon biological resources would be significant if any of the following resulted: substantial direct or indirect effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local/regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or any species protected under provisions of the Migratory Bird treaty Act (e.g. burrowing owls); substantial effect upon riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local/regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the agencies listed above; substantial effect (e.g., fill, removal, hydrologic interruption) upon state or federally protected wetlands; substantially interfere with movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors; conflict with any local policies/ordinances that protect biological resources or conflict with a habitat conservation plan.

Environmental Setting: As noted in the Project Description, the Project site is located within the downtown area of Ukiah and surrounded by existing development. The site is developed with two buildings and a paved parking lot. Vegetation on the site is limited to the following: two California juniper shrubs (*Juniperus californica*), one Chinese pistache tree (*Pistacia chinensis*) located against the Dragon's Lair building (east side); Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*) against the Tom's Glass building (east side) and four Valley oak trees (*Quercus lobata*) approximately 14 to 60 ft away from the building. Additionally, large oak trees line the east side of the parcel but are located on the adjacent parcel (see Figure 4).

Discussion: (a-d & f) No impact. Databases queried for the presence of biological resources included the California Department of Fish and Wildlife California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) Critical Habitat Mapper; these databases showed no biological resources including sensitive species, critical habitat, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, wildlife habitat corridors, water resources, or wetlands on the site, nor in the immediate vicinity. As such, the Project would have no impact on sensitive species, riparian habitat or wetlands. Additionally, because the site is fully developed and surrounded by development within the downtown area, there are no wildlife corridors going through the site and the Project would not impede the movement of wildlife. Lastly, there are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans for the City of Ukiah, nor the larger Ukiah Valley that are applicable to the Project. As such, **no impact** to the aforementioned biological resources would occur.

Discussion: (e) Less than significant impact. The existing Chinese pistache tree and the two Juniper shrubs located on the east side of the Dragon's Lair building would be removed for demolition, as they are located against the building and partially growing into the foundation. In addition, the blackberry against the Tom's Glass building would be removed. None of the species that are proposed for removal are listed as sensitive species at the state or federal level. Additionally, they are not identified as Heritage Trees, nor species needing preservation within the City's Downtown Zoning Code (as identified in Tables 19 and 20 in Section 9229). None of the oak trees, which are listed as species that should be preserved in the Downtown Zoning Code, would be removed. As such, the Project would not conflict with any policy or plan intended to protect trees. **No impact** would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None.

5. Cultural Resources

| CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The proposed Project would significantly impact cultural resources if the significance of a historical or archaeological resource were substantially changed, or if human remains were disturbed. Historical resources under CEQA include historic-era architectural resources within the built environment such buildings, structures, and other objects. Archaeological and unique archeological resources can also be considered historical resources, according to CEQA Section 15064.5 and Section 21083.2(g).

Section 15064.5 states the term “historical resources” includes the following:

- 1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.);
- 2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant;
- 3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:
 - a. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
 - b. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - c. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
 - d. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Section 21083.2(g) identifies a unique archeological resource as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- 1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- 2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- 3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Assembly Bill 52 (effective on July 1, 2015) requires that before a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report for a project is prepared, the lead agency for the project must seek consultation with tribes associated with the location of the project. To receive referrals, each tribe must have previously made a written request to the lead agency in order to be

consulted on projects occurring in their geographic areas of interest. The Guidiville Rancheria of California is the only tribe that has made such request. As such, an AB 52 notice was sent to them on January 18, 2022. No responses were received.

Environmental Setting: The Ukiah Township lies in a valley of the Russian River, bounded on the north by Calpella Township, on the east by Lake County, on the south by Sanel Township, and on the west by Anderson Township. The City of Ukiah was first settled in 1856 by Samuel Lowry. Initially incorporated into Sonoma County, an independent Mendocino County government was established in 1859 with Ukiah as the chosen county seat. Logging, cattle, and agricultural ventures contributed to the early settlement and growth of Ukiah throughout the remainder of the 19th century and early 20th century. 1889 is the date recorded for the first arrival of the train to Ukiah, quickly resulting in increased settlement of the City and its environs. The City of Ukiah is within the territory of the Northern Pomo. Permanent villages were often established in areas with access to staple foods, often times along eco-tones (transitions between varying environments), with access to good water, and generally flat land.

The late 19th century saw slow growth in the community, with a slight decline after the turn of the century. The town grew steadily, though it remained a relatively remote outpost in the hinterlands of Northern California for several more decades. The area around the intersection of the current Perkins and Main streets was one of the earliest settlement locations for the town. Absalom Tidwell Perkins built a house for his family near the southwest corner of the current Perkins and Main streets, and built a feed stable on the Project site around 1857. By 1860, Ukiah had approximately 25 dwellings and a budding commercial district. Ukiah's sparse population and relative remoteness delayed the arrival of the railroad. In 1886 the Cloverdale and Ukiah Railroad was formed to extend north to Ukiah; and the line was completed in 1889, 20 years after it began in Petaluma in 1869. The improved transportation network did open up Mendocino County to greater commercial and industrial growth, though the population did not expand rapidly.

A 1906 earthquake damaged a number of Ukiah buildings, particularly in the commercial core, and considerable rebuilding and remodeling activity occurred after that time. Additionally, in June 1917, a fire began at a restaurant (currently occupied by a law firm at 116 South State Street) and strong winds pushed the flames east, encompassing the two blocks between State street to the railroad tracks, including the Project site. The area was rebuilt over the next decade.

The City contains a number of Colonial Revival and Craftsman style derivations, popular during this era, that reflect the community's prosperity. The City of Ukiah's 1985 "Historic Resources Survey" (prepared by Historic Environmental Consultants) that was updated in 1999 by the "City of Ukiah Architectural Survey" (prepared by P.S. Preservation Services) identified 23 properties with local historic importance within the City limits. Per Ukiah City Code Section 3016(b), buildings over 50 years old proposed for demolition that do not meet the exemption criteria of being either an immediate safety hazard, or an accessory building that is not listed on the local historic inventory, shall be reviewed for their historic or architectural significance. Specifically, the City's Demolition Review Committee shall review the proposal and make a recommendation to the Ukiah City Council. Per UCC Section 3016(e): *In reviewing proposed permits, and formulating recommendations to the city council, the demolition review committee shall consider any information provided during the meeting, and shall use the following criteria. The structure:*

1. *Has a special or particular quality such as oldest, best example, largest, or last surviving example of its kind; or*
2. *Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, or architectural history; or*
3. *Is strongly identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history.*

Per UCC Section 3016(f), if the Demolition Review Committee finds that any of the criteria listed in subsection (e) apply to the building proposed for demolition, it shall recommend denial of the permit to the City Council. This section of the UCC also describes procedures for review by the City Council.²

As detailed in the below analysis, the buildings do not meet the exemption criteria noted within the City code; and as such, on December 28, 2021, the City's Demolition Review Committee reviewed the Project and voted to recommend demolition of both buildings to the City Council. This Initial Study is intended to analyze the impacts associated with demolition of the buildings, in accordance with CEQA. The Demolition Permit, together with this Initial Study, will be reviewed by City Council for final consideration.

Discussion: (a) Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Because the Tom's Glass building at 105 South Main Street is not located on a local, state or national register for historic places, demolition of it would not result in a significant impact to a historic resource. However, the existing Dragon's Lair building originally dates from 1921, and was included in the City of Ukiah's 1985 "Historic Resources Survey" (prepared by Historic Environmental Consultants) and updated in 1999 with the "City of Ukiah Architectural Survey" (prepared by P.S. Preservation Services). According to the 1985 survey, the building was assigned a "5" status code, which includes buildings that are identified as historic at the local level. Specifically, the 1985 survey notes that the building is representative of a type of commercial structure common to its era that is a "rather rare survivor of the type in Ukiah, and is located prominently. Its surfacing materials and form create a rather strong image of past lifestyles." The 1999 survey was completed as an update to the 1985 survey, and reviewed each property's eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. The 1999 survey notes that the building is vernacular commercial style and originally constructed in 1921 as a hay barn and feed store. The survey notes that the pressed metal clad building is "an excellent example of its type and the only one left in Ukiah", and was therefore assigned a "3S" status code, which is defined as appearing to be eligible for the National Register as an individual property through survey information. However, the 1999 survey does not provide additional information regarding the change in status from the 1985 survey.

Although the 1999 survey identifies the building as eligible for the National Register, this does not accurately depict the building's current status. In order for a building to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places, a building must first be listed on the State Register. In order to be listed on the State Register, the survey form completed by the local jurisdiction must be submitted to State of California's Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO). SHPO then reviews the survey forms and determines if the building is eligible for listing on the State Register. Once listed on the State Register SHPO must submit a nomination form to the National Park Service for review and consideration.

Upon extensive research, it was determined that Dragon's Lair building is not listed on either the State or Federal Registers. This is further supported by SHPO's most recent classification system and database of historic buildings, also known as the "Built Environment Resource Directory" (updated March, 2020), which identifies the building status code as "5S2", meaning that the local government has identified it as individually eligible for local listing. As such, the building is not listed on the State Register, nor is it identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. This is further supported by SHPO's most recent classification system and database of historic buildings, also known as the "Built Environment Resource Directory" (updated March, 2020), which identifies the building status code as "5S2", meaning that the local government has identified it as individually eligible for

²Ukiah City Code Section 3016 may be found online at:

<https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Ukiah/#!/html/Ukiah03/Ukiah0301-0300.html>

local listing. As such, the building is not listed on the State Register, nor is it identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

A Historic Resource Evaluation was prepared by APD Preservation, LLC in January, 2022 (**Attachment A**), to further research and evaluate the building's historic significance. Under CEQA (Section 5024.1(c)), historic-era buildings older than 50 years are most commonly evaluated in reference to Criteria 1 (important events), Criteria 2 (important persons) or Criteria 3 (architectural value). To be considered eligible under these criteria the property must retain sufficient integrity to convey its important qualities. Integrity is judged in relation to seven aspects including: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The Historic Resource Evaluation for the Dragon's Lair building provides an analysis of this criteria to determine if the building is historically or culturally "important" under CEQA. The evaluation (2022) found that the original building was constructed in 1857 and replaced once in 1890 with a new hay barn, but was destroyed during the 1917 fire that began two blocks west of the building. A new building was constructed in 1921 but was significantly modified between 1938 and 1963 when it was converted to retail (uses included several feed stores, a cheese and wine store, and other office/retail businesses). Modifications made to the building during this time included replacing two open bays with windows, replacing the front doors, replacing and reconfiguring the awning, and installing an additional window. The false front that most defines the building was modified in 1938, but retains its basic early twentieth century appearance. Dragon's Lair retail business has been at the location since 1995.

In conclusion, the evaluation determined that "the building appears to be significant for its association with the post-fire redevelopment of Ukiah (criterion 1). Its period of significance is 1921 (its inferred construction date), and the building retains enough physical integrity to convey its early twentieth century commercial origins, which render it historic." As such, the Dragon's Lair building qualifies as a local historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for its association with the 1917 fire. However, the analysis states that the "dilapidated utilitarian building" is not architecturally distinctive and does not possess high artistic values, and as such, does not appear to be significant for its architectural merit (criterion 3).

Because the Dragon's Lair building qualifies as a local historic resource under CEQA that would be demolished, the Project would result in a significant impact to that resource if not properly mitigated. Under CEQA, feasible Mitigation associated with alteration or demolition of historic buildings is most commonly directly related to efforts for preserving the architecture and/or the building's appearance. However, because the Project proposes to demolish the building and does not propose new development at this time, mitigation measures related to architectural preservation are not appropriate. Instead, **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would require photo documentation of the building to catalogue its existence and **Mitigation Measure CUL-2** requires an educational plaque be erected on-site to acknowledge the building's historic significance related to the 1917 fire. Because the Project proposes to demolish the building that is not historically significant for its architecture, and does not propose new development at this time, these mitigation measures are considered adequate for reducing impacts to less than significant levels. As such, impacts to historic resources would be **less than significant with implementation of mitigation**.

Discussion: (b) Less than significant impact. As noted in the City's General Plan Historic and Archeological Resources Element (1995), the Project site is not identified as an area of high cultural sensitivity- areas that are most typically culturally sensitive include those adjacent to streams, springs, and mid-slope benches above watercourses because Native Americans and settlers favored easy access to potable water. Because the Project site is fully developed with pavement and buildings, and the site does not have a high potential for cultural resources to occur, less than significant impacts would occur as a result of the Project. Additionally, construction of the Project will be required to

adhere to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (e-f) which specifically addresses actions to be taken in the event that human remains or archeological resources are accidentally discovered during ground disturbing activities.

As noted above, in accordance with AB 52, a notification providing the opportunity for consultation was sent to the Guidiville Rancheria of California but no response requesting formal consultation was received. Based on the aforementioned, impacts to cultural and archeological resources would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures:

CUL-1: Photo Documentation. Prior to issuance of the demolition permit, photo documentation of the Dragon’s Lair building shall be required in order to catalogue its existence. The photo documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director and submitted to the Mendocino County Historic Society.

CUL-2: Educational Plaque. Prior to final completion of the demolition permit, an educational plaque shall be erected on-site to acknowledge the Dragon’s Lair building’s historic significance related to rebuild efforts after the 1917 fire. The plaque design and content, as well as the proposed placement, shall be submitted to the Community Development Director for review and approval. The plaque shall remain on-site if and when the site is developed in the future. If the plaque is proposed for relocation, the property owner shall receive written approval from the Community Development Director to do so.

6. Energy

| ENERGY. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The Proposed Project would significantly impact energy if construction or operation of the Project would result in wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources or if the Project would conflict with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Environmental Setting: Recent legislature has urged the State of California to conserve energy resources and provide renewable and zero-carbon energy resources in place of fossil fuels for generating electricity in the state. Specific to construction projects, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) contain standards to regulate energy consumption through Green Building Standards to ensure construction and operation does not result in wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. In addition, current building codes require energy efficiency systems to be included in their plans for permit review. These building codes are regularly updated statewide through California Building Energy Efficiency Standards for

Residential and Nonresidential Buildings (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6), commonly referred to as “Title 24” In general, Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy, with standards to promote better windows, insulation, lighting, ventilation systems, and other features that reduce energy consumption in homes and businesses. The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods.

Discussion: (a-b) Less than significant impact. Fossil fuels for construction vehicles and other energy-consuming equipment would be used during demolition. However, fuel energy consumed during demolition would be temporary and would not represent a significant demand on energy resources. Project construction equipment would also be required to comply with the latest CARB and EPA engine emissions standards which require highly efficient combustion systems that maximize fuel efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption. Because no development is proposed, there would be no operational sources of energy consumed. All future development would be required to comply with the aforementioned regulations related to energy efficiency. With adherence to the aforementioned regulations, impacts from the Proposed Project related to energy consumption would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures: None

7. Geology and Soils

| GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The Proposed Project would result in a significant impact to geological or soil resources if it exposed people or buildings to seismic risk; ruptured a known fault; produced strong seismic ground shaking, ground failure, liquefaction, landslides or substantial soil erosion; is located on expansive soil or unstable ground or create unstable ground; or destroyed a unique paleontological resource or geologic feature.

Environmental Setting: The Ukiah Valley is part of an active seismic region that contains the Maacama Fault, which traverses the Valley in a generally northwest-southeast direction, approximately 0.8-mi east of the City limits at its closets point. The Ukiah Valley is located within the North Coast Range geologic province, comprised of a geologic feature unique to California, the Franciscan Formation. The Franciscan Formation is comprised of serpentinite, sandstone, and other sedimentary rocks. Based on California Geological Survey maps and the Background Report for the County of Mendocino General Plan Update (prepared by P.M.C., 2003), the City of Ukiah is outside of known areas of historic faults, Holocene Fault, Late Quaternary Fault and the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Because most of the lands within the City are generally flat, slope instability hazards are not a concern, with the exception of lands within the Western Hills.

Discussion: (a-d) No Impact. The Project site sits at approximately 627 feet in elevation and has a slight west to east slope. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service’s Web Soil Survey, the soils within the Project site are characterized as “210-Urban Land”, which is described as soils in highly populated areas containing largely built-out environments. In addition, according to the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), the site does not contain expansive or unstable soils and is not susceptible to landslides, nor strong seismic ground shaking. The Project includes demolition of existing buildings, but will not include trenching or significant ground disturbing activities that would result in erosion or loss of topsoil because the existing foundation and paved site would remain. Lastly, no new development is proposed that would require the use of septic tanks or other waste water treatment facilities. For the above reasons, the Project would have **no impact** to geology and soils.

Mitigation Measures: None

8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

| GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The Project would have a significant effect on greenhouse gas emissions if it would generate greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

Environmental Setting: Climate change is caused by greenhouse gases (GHGs) emitted into the atmosphere around the world from a variety of sources, including the combustion of fuel for energy and transportation, cement manufacturing, and refrigerant emissions. GHGs are those gases that have the ability to trap heat in the atmosphere, a process that is analogous to the way a greenhouse

traps heat. GHGs may be emitted a result of human activities, as well as through natural processes. Increasing GHG concentrations in the atmosphere are leading to global climate change.

The state of California has adopted various administrative initiatives and legislation relating to climate change, much of which set aggressive goals for GHG emissions reductions statewide. Although lead agencies must evaluate climate change and GHG emissions of projects subject to CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines do not require or suggest specific methodologies for performing an assessment or specific thresholds of significance and do not specify GHG reduction mitigation measures. No state agency has developed binding regulations for analyzing GHG emissions, determining their significance, or mitigating significant effects in CEQA documents. Thus, lead agencies exercise their discretion in determining how to analyze GHGs. Because there are no adopted GHG thresholds applicable to the Project, and because the Project is considered “small scale”, meaning that it does not include new large buildings or components requiring significant construction that would result in increased GHGs, the below qualitative analysis is appropriate.

Pursuant to AB 32, on December 14, 2017, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) approved the current Climate Change Scoping Plan, *California’s, 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan (2017 Scoping Plan Update)*. The 2017 Scoping Plan Update outlines the proposed framework of action for achieving the 2030 GHG target of 40 percent reduction in GHG emissions relative to 1990 levels. The Scoping Plan Update incorporates a broad array of regulations, policies, and state plans designed to reduce GHG emissions. These are largely related to operational emissions, which are not applicable to the Project. However, the Scoping Plan does include some regulations intended to reduce the amount of emissions related to construction equipment and vehicle trips applicable to the construction of the proposed Project. Most of these regulations are also incorporated into existing California Building Code regulations and other state laws applicable to operation of vehicles and equipment.

Discussion: (a-b) Less than significant impact. As described in Section V.3, *Air Quality*, demolition activities requiring the use of heavy equipment, tools (mechanical ram, dump truck, excavator, pickup truck, backhoe, front end loader, bobcat & stinger for concrete demolition) and vehicle trips (construction workers, equipment transportation, and dump truck haul trips) could result in direct GHG emissions. Demolition would take approximately three weeks with a crew of six construction workers. Demolition activities including the use of diesel engine equipment would be subject MCAQMD regulations intended to address air quality impacts and GHG emissions. Additionally, the proposed Project would not conflict with the regulations identified in the Scoping Plan Update to reduce energy use and transportation emissions, most of which are also incorporated into California Building Codes and state law. As a result, the proposed Project would not conflict with applicable Climate Change Scoping Plan strategies and regulations to reduce GHG emissions. With the temporary nature of demolition activities and adherence to the aforementioned regulations, impacts related to GHGs would be would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures: None.

9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

| HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The Project would result in significant hazards or hazardous materials impacts if it exposed people to hazardous materials or placed them into hazardous situations; if it released hazardous materials or emissions into the environment or within 0.25 miles of a school; if it is located on a listed hazardous materials site; if it would create a hazard due to its proximity to a public airport or private airstrip; if it would create excessive noise for people in the area; if it would interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan; or if it would expose people or structures to significant risks due to wildland fire.

Environmental Setting: Mendocino County has adopted numerous plans related to hazard management and mitigation including, but not limited to: Community Wildfire Protection Plan, Hazardous Waste Management Plan, Operational Area Emergency Plan, etc. The most recent plan, the Mendocino County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJHMP) was adopted by the

County in December, 2020. The MJHMP provides an explanation of prevalent hazards within the County, identifies risks to vulnerable assets, both people and property, and provides a mitigation strategy to achieve the greatest risk reduction based upon available resources. The four cities within Mendocino County, including the City of Ukiah, participated in preparation of the MJHMP to individually assess hazards, explore hazard vulnerability, develop mitigation strategies, and create their own plan for each respective city (referred to as a “jurisdictional annex” to the MJHMP). The City of Ukiah adopted its jurisdictional annex chapter of the MJHMP on November 18, 2020. Hazards identified for the City of Ukiah include earthquakes, wildfire, dam failure, flood and pandemic. Table 1-13 of the City’s jurisdictional annex lists each hazard and mitigation action for City of Ukiah.

The Ukiah Municipal Airport is located within the City of Ukiah jurisdictional limits. The Ukiah Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (UKIALUCP) was adopted by the Mendocino County Airport Land Use Commission on May 20, 2021 and adopted by the Ukiah City Council on June 16, 2021. The UKIALUCP identifies areas (known as “compatibility zones”) with potential hazards and impacts to persons using or working within the vicinity of the airport.

Under Government Code Section 65962.5, both the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) are required to maintain databases of sites known to have hazardous substances present in the environment. The site does not include any known hazardous waste sites, as mapped by the SWRCB’s GeoTracker or DTSC’s EnviroStor databases.

All lands within the City of Ukiah are within the jurisdiction of the Ukiah Valley Fire Authority. None of the lands within the City of Ukiah are located within a California Department of Forestry (CalFire) State Responsibility Area (SRA). However, some parcels within the western boundary of the City limits, are designated as “Very High” fire severity within the Local Responsibility Area (LRA). The Project site is not located within a High or Very High fire severity zone.

Discussion: (a-b) Less than significant impact. Demolition activities using heavy equipment and tools would include the routine transport, use, storage, and disposal of small quantities of common hazardous materials, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluids, and oils. However, the Project would adhere to state and federal regulations related to the transportation, use, and disposal of such materials. The use of these types and quantities of materials over the three-week construction period would not pose a significant risk to the public and/or environment. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

(c) No impact. There are no schools within 0.25 mi of the Project site; the nearest school is South Valley High School, located at 429 South Dora Street, approximately 1,880 ft (0.36 mi) southwest of the Project site. As noted above, the use of all hazardous materials will be in accordance with applicable regulations intended to reduce potential impacts to the environment and people. As such, **no impact** would occur.

(d) No impact. As previously noted, the Project site does not contain any listed hazardous sites. There is one listed cleanup site on the GeoTracker database adjacent to the Project, located at 203 South Main Street (case No. T064500019), but the site has been cleaned and the case has been closed as of 1995. As such, **no impact** would occur.

(e) Less than significant impact. The Project parcel is located approximately 1.1 mi north of the Ukiah Municipal Airport within Airport Compatibility Zone 4 (Outer Approach/Departure Zone) of the UKIALUCP, which has the potential to result in some overheard noise during approach and departure. The UKIALUCP does not contain any policies related to demolition of existing buildings. According to

Table 3A of the UKIALUCP, many uses such as a variety office, commercial and retail uses are listed as conditionally compatible, subject to density, height, and use development standards. However, no development is proposed at this time. All future development would have to comply with the UKIALUCP. The Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise related to airport operations for people working in the Project area. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

(f) Less than significant impact. There are no components of the Project that would impair or interfere with emergency response or evacuation. Access is available to the site and there are no components of the Project that would impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, the adopted MJHMP or other emergency response plan or evacuation plan. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

(g) Less than significant impact. As previously noted, the Project site is not located within a High or Very High fire severity zone. The Project does not propose new development within a High or Very High severity zone that could expose people or buildings to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The use of gasoline-powered equipment will be used in accordance with all existing Building Code and Fire Code regulations intended to reduce fire risk (such as the use of spark arresters, for example). Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures: None.

10. Hydrology and Water Quality

| HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The Project would significantly impact hydrology and water quality if it violated water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or substantially degraded surface or groundwater quality; substantially decreased groundwater supplies or impeded sustainable groundwater management; altered drainage patterns in a manner that would cause substantial on- or off-site erosion, polluted runoff or excessive runoff that caused flooding; impeded or redirected flood flows; risked a release of pollutants due to inundation if in a flood hazard, tsunami or seiche zone; or conflicted with a water quality plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

Environmental Setting: Average rainfall in Ukiah is slightly less than 35 inches. Most of the precipitation falls during the winter. Rainfall is often from brief, intense storms, which move in from the northwest. Virtually no rainfall occurs during the summer months. Surface water supplies for the Ukiah Valley include the Eel River, from which water is diverted into the Russian River watershed through the Potter Valley Project, Lake Mendocino, and the Russian River. Groundwater is drawn from the

Ukiah Valley groundwater basin. The Ukiah Valley groundwater basin is the northernmost basin in the Russian River water system and underlies an area of approximately 60 square miles. Water enters the groundwater system via percolation of surface waters and through the soil. The creeks and streams in the Ukiah Valley provide drainage channels for groundwater recharge, as well as domestic and agricultural water supply. The City of Ukiah 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) was adopted by City Council on June 2, 2021. The UWMP considers several growth scenarios including an additional 2,500 and 5,000 new hookup scenarios and determined that there is capacity through the 2045 planning horizon to serve these growth projections.

Discussion: (a-e) No impact. No groundwater would be used for demolition. Water used for dust control would be from a water truck. The Project would not require water to be discharged and groundwater would not be impacted by the Project. Additionally, there are no water resources such as creeks or streams on the Project site, nor in the immediate vicinity, that would be impacted or altered as a result of the Project. Lastly, the Project is not located within a tsunami hazard zone, nor a flood zone, as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. As such, **no impact** to hydrology and water quality would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None.

11. Land Use and Planning

| LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The Project would significantly impact land use if it physically divided an established community or conflicted with a land use plan, policy or regulation intended to avoid or mitigate an environmental impact, such as the general plan or zoning code.

Environmental Setting: The City of Ukiah includes approximately 4.72 square miles. It serves as the County Seat of Mendocino County, as well as the county’s commercial hub. Predominant land uses in the City include single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial uses ranging from local commercial to service commercial, as well manufacturing, industrial and public facilities.

Development and land use patterns within the City of Ukiah are governed by the City’s General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1995, and currently in the process of being updated. Because the 2040 General Plan has not yet been adopted, the 1995 General Plan is the applicable plan relating to land use within the City. More specifically, zoning and land use are governed by the City’s Zoning Ordinance, as outlined in Division 9, Chapter 2 of the Ukiah City Code. The purpose of the Ukiah Zoning Code is to promote the growth of the City in an orderly manner and to promote and protect the public health, safety, peace, comfort and general welfare.

Discussion: (a) No impact. Physical division of an existing community would typically be associated with construction of a new highway, railroad, park or other linear feature being constructed in a manner that would bifurcate an established neighborhood or community. Because the Project site does not contain existing residences and is immediately surrounded by existing roads and commercial and public uses (as opposed to an existing residential community), the Project would not result in the division of an established community. **No impact** would occur.

(b) Less than significant. The Project site has a General Plan (1995) designation of Commercial (C) and is zoned Urban Center (UC) within Downtown Zoning Code. The Commercial General Plan designation applies to lands appropriate for a variety of commercial uses where commerce and business may occur; uses are further specified within the corresponding zoning districts.

The Historic and Architectural Resources element (Chapter V.3) of the 1995 General Plan discusses cultural and historic resources within the City of Ukiah. Specifically, this element discusses both historical residential and commercial buildings. Regarding privately owned commercial buildings it states, "The General Plan needs to provide a balance between the preservation of historic and archeological sites for future study and analysis and the demands for current growth and development. Project design and other features of development flexibility can provide the needed protection while still preserving property rights. The purpose of this element is to establish the criteria for this balance." Section 3.04.02 provides goals and policies related to preservation of commercial buildings identified as historic on Figure V.3-EE. The buildings proposed for demolition are not identified in this figure. The General Plan also states that "Situations may occur when an historic building, or a building with historic value, may need to be demolished for any number of reasons. With many historic resources, it may be appropriate to "mitigate" removal by photographing and recording as much information as is known about the site." As noted in Section V.5, *Cultural Resources*, the Project proposes photo documentation and an educational plaque to be erected on-site to acknowledge its historic significance related to the 1917 fire, consistent with this General Plan statement.

One of the main purposes of the Downtown Zoning Code (contained within Article 18 of the City's Zoning Code) is to create an urban environment that implements and fulfills the objectives and strategies of the General Plan to facilitate the coexistence of a wide range of mixed uses in close proximity within a downtown urban environment. The UC zoning designation allows for higher density residential and mixed-use buildings that may accommodate retail, office, services, local and regional civic uses, and residential uses. The Downtown Zoning Code does not contain regulations pertaining to demolition, with the exception of requiring City Council approval to demolish buildings older than 50 years old, in accordance with Ukiah City Code Section 3016. As noted in Section V.5, *Cultural Resources*, per Ukiah City Code Section 3016(b), buildings over 50 years old proposed for demolition that do not meet the exemption criteria of being either an immediate safety hazard, or an accessory building that is not listed on the local historic inventory, shall be reviewed for their historic or architectural significance. Because the buildings do not meet the exemption criteria noted within the code, on December 28, 2021, the City's Demolition Review Committee reviewed the Project and voted to recommend demolition of both buildings to the City Council. This Initial Study is intended to analyze the impacts associated with demolition of the buildings, in accordance with CEQA. The Demolition Permit, together with this Initial Study, will be reviewed by City Council for final consideration.

As discussed in Section V.4, *Biological Resources*, the Downtown Zoning Code contains policies pertaining to the protection of trees. However, none of the species proposed for removal are species identified as needing protection. Lastly, no development is proposed at this time. Once the buildings are demolished, the site would be cleared and remain vacant until a proposal for development is submitted and approved through the discretionary process; all new development would be subject to the development requirements contained within the Downtown Zoning Code.

For the reasons stated above, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning, the General Plan, or other land use policies intended for reducing environmental impacts. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures: None

12. Mineral Resources

| MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: Impacts to mineral resources would be considered significant if the proposed Project were to result in the loss of a known mineral resource that has value to the region and state or is otherwise locally important as designated on a local land use plan.

Environmental Setting: The most predominant of the minerals found in Mendocino County are aggregate resource minerals, primarily sand and gravel, found along many rivers and streams. The Ford Gravel Bars are located in Ukiah, along the Russian River.

Discussion: (a-b) No impact. There are no identified mineral resources within the Project area. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None

13. Noise

| NOISE. Would the project result in: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The Project would have a significant impact if it temporarily or permanently exceeded local noise standards in the vicinity of the Project, generated excessive ground borne noise or vibration; or would expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels from public airports or private airstrips.

Environmental Setting: The Ukiah City Code does not contain thresholds for analyzing noise impacts from construction-related noise, but guidance documents from the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Highway Administration provide information on maximum noise and vibration levels associated with construction equipment and thresholds of significance for analyzing such impacts.

Although the Ukiah City Code does not contain thresholds of significance for analyzing construction-related noise, UCC §6054, *Construction of Buildings and Projects*, states that it shall be unlawful for any person within a residential zone, or within a radius of five hundred feet (500') therefrom, to operate equipment or perform any outside construction or repair work on buildings, buildings or projects or to operate any pile driver, power shovel, pneumatic hammer, derrick, power hoist or any other construction type device (between the hours of 7:00 p.m. of one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day) in such a manner that a reasonable person of normal sensitiveness residing in the area is caused discomfort or annoyance unless beforehand a permit therefor has been duly obtained from the Director of Public works.

The UCC's Noise Ordinance (Division 7, Chapter 1, Article 6) that establishes ambient base noise level standards that apply to specific zoning districts within the City of Ukiah. These are specific to operation (not construction). "Ambient noise" is the all-encompassing noise associated with a given environment, being usually a composite of sounds from many sources near and far. For the purpose of the Noise Ordinance, ambient noise level is the level obtained when the noise level is averaged over a period of fifteen (15) minutes without inclusion of noise from isolated identifiable sources, at the location and time of day near that at which a comparison is to be made. Land uses exceeding these standards for long periods of time are considered to be significant.

Discussion: (a) Less than significant impact. Construction activities such as the proposed demolition could result in periodic increases in the ambient noise environment and generally occur when construction activities occur in areas immediately adjoining noise-sensitive land uses, during noise-sensitive times of the day (typically early morning or nighttime), or when construction activity occurs at the same precise location over an extended period of time (e.g., pile driving in one location for 8-10 hours in a day, or over a duration of several successive days). Certain land uses are particularly sensitive to noise, including schools, hospitals, rest homes, long-term medical and mental care facilities. Residential areas are also considered noise sensitive, particularly during the nighttime hours.

The nearest “sensitive receptor” (includes schools, libraries, child care facilities, health care facilities, senior facilities, and residences) is the Mendocino County Library (Ukiah Branch), located at 105 North Main Street, approximately 68 ft (0.1 mi) north of the site. Additional sensitive receptors in the area include the following: residences including the Circle Trailer Park, located at 317 North Main Street, approximately 676 ft (0.13 mi) north of the site; a single-family residence located at 412 South Main Street, approximately 763 ft (0.14 mi) south of the site; and Adventist Health Ukiah Valley Hospital, located at 275 Hospital Drive, approximately 1,087 ft (0.21 mi) northeast of site. The nearest school is South Valley High School, located at 429 South Dora Street, approximately 1,880 ft (0.36 mi) southwest of the Project site.³

Equipment for demolition would include a mechanical ram, dump truck, pickup truck, excavator, backhoe, front end loader, bobcat & stinger for concrete demolition. According to the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) *Default Noise Emission Reference Levels and Usage Factors (2017)*, maximum noise levels (at a 50-foot distance) for equipment that would be used for the Project are listed below in **Table 1**.

Table 1, Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels

| Type of Equipment | L_{max} at 50 feet, dBA⁴ |
|--------------------------|--|
| Backhoe | 78 |
| Mechanical Ram | 90 |
| Dump Truck | 76 |
| Excavator | 81 |
| Front End Loader | 79 |
| Pickup Truck | 75 |
| Bobcat | 80 |
| Stinger (jack hammer) | 88 |

The main source of existing noise at the Project site is from vehicles driving by, as the Project is located at a fairly busy intersection (Perkins Street and Main Street within downtown Ukiah. For reference, normal conversation is approximately 60 dBA, vehicles passing by are approximately 70-80 dBA, and a gasoline-powered lawn mower is 90 dBA. There are no quantitative standards for construction noise levels specified by either the Ukiah General Plan or the UCC. However, UCC Section 6054 restricts construction activities within a residential zone, or within a radius of 500 feet therefrom, to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Although the Project would not be located within a residential zone, it would adhere to these regulations intended to lessen noise impacts to sensitive receptors.

³ Instilling Goodness Elementary appears on Google Earth as being located near the Mendocino County Superior Court House, located at 100 North State Street. However, it was confirmed that the school is located in Talmage approximately 2.5 miles southeast, and there are no classes at this location.

⁴ L_{max} is the maximum sound level measured during a single noise event (at 50 ft in this case). dBA is the measurement of noise in decibels on a weighted scale for judging loudness that corresponds to the hearing threshold specific to the human ear.

The Federal Transit Administration's *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual* (2018) identifies a daytime noise levels of over 90 dBA for extended periods of time as a noise level where adverse community reaction could occur at residential land uses within 500 ft of the noise. As shown in Table 1, the range of noise associated with equipment used for the Project would be 75 to 90 decibels (dBA) at 50 feet away from the noise source. Maximum noise levels generated by the Project would reach up to 90 dBA at times with the use of a mechanical ram and stinger (jack hammer) for concrete demolition. However, the nearest residence is approximately 676 ft away from the Project, which is beyond the distance identified as resulting in an adverse impact to adjacent residential uses. While the library is approximately 68 ft away from the Project, existing noise levels in the Project area associated with passing vehicles is 70-80 dBA. The Project could result in an increase of up to 10 dBA with the use of the mechanical ram and stinger, but would likely be lower, as it is more than 50 ft away and library users would be located inside the building. Additionally, operation of each piece of equipment over the temporary three-week period would not be constant throughout the day, as equipment would be turned off when not in use. Lastly, Project construction will occur Monday through Friday, during daylight hours, between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., in accordance with the City's Noise Ordinance. As such, noise impacts associated with the Project would be **less than significant**.

(b) Less than significant impact. Project construction can generate varying degrees of ground borne vibration, depending on the construction procedure and the construction equipment used. Operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in amplitude with distance from the source. The results from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibration at moderate levels, to slight damage at the highest levels. Similar to the discussion in the noise analysis in criteria (a) above, the City does not contain specific standards or thresholds related to groundborne vibration. However, the Federal Transit Administration's *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual* identifies 0.2 inches per second peak particle velocity (in/sec PPV) as the level at which potential damage could result to non-engineered timber and masonry buildings.⁵ Additionally, Caltrans identifies 0.24 in/sec PPV as the level at which vibration is distinctly perceivable to humans. Based on ground-borne vibration levels for standard types of construction equipment provided by the FTA, of the equipment proposed to be used for Project construction, the use of the stinger jack hammer would be expected to generate the highest vibration levels (typically 0.035 in/sec PPV at a distance of 25 feet). Due to the Project's proximity to the nearest sensitive receptor (library, approximately 68 ft away) and the fact that the operation of equipment would produce vibration levels below the aforementioned thresholds, the Project would not result in significant groundborne vibration, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

(c) Less than significant impact. The Project parcel is located approximately 1.1 miles north of the Ukiah Municipal Airport within Airport Compatibility Zone 4 (Outer Approach/Departure Zone) of the UKIALUCP, which has the potential to result in some overheard noise during approach and departure. The UKIALUCP does not contain any policies related to demolition of existing buildings. According to Table 3A of the UKIALUCP, many uses such as a variety office, commercial and retail uses are listed as conditionally compatible, subject to density, height, and use development standards. However, no development is proposed at this time. All future development would have to comply with the

⁵ Peak Particle Velocity is the peak signal value of an oscillating vibration velocity waveform. Usually expressed in inches/second in the United States.

UKIALUCP. The Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise related to airport operations for people working in the Project area. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures: None

14. Population and Housing

| POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The proposed Project would result in significant impacts to the local population or housing stock if it directly or indirectly induced substantial unplanned population growth or displaced a substantial number of people or housing such that the construction of replacement housing would be required.

Environmental Setting: The City of Ukiah is approximately 4.72 square miles in size and located within Mendocino County. Overall, the City of Ukiah’s population has increased moderately over the past nearly 30 years, with a more accelerated increase in the last four years. Projections from the California State University Chico Center for Economic Development- Mendocino County Economic/Demographic Profile show this trend continuing. As described in the City’s Housing Element (2019) of the General Plan, the City’s annual growth rate between 1990 and 2018 averaged approximately 0.3%. Between 2000 and 2010, the City added 545 residents, or 3.7%, to its population. According to the California Department of Finance, the population in the County of Mendocino was 59,985 in 2018 and 16,226 in the City of Ukiah. The 2020 Census data identifies the City of Ukiah population as 16,607.

Discussion: (a-b) No Impact. The Project would not involve the construction of new homes or businesses, or the extension of roads that would induce population growth, nor would the Project displace any people or housing, as no residences are located on-site. **No impact.**

Mitigation Measures: None

15. Public Services

| PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | | | | |
| Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: The Project would result in a significant impact to public services if it resulted in a requirement for increased or expanded public service facilities or staffing, including fire or police protection, schools and parks.

Environmental Setting: Police protection services for the entire City limits is provided by the Ukiah Police Department, while the Mendocino County Sherriff’s Department provides police services for areas outside of the City limits. Fire protection services in the City are provided by the Ukiah Valley Fire Authority. Educational facilities in the City are provided by the Ukiah Unified School District (UUSD) and County Office of Education. Additionally, there are several private and charter schools serving residents within the City of Ukiah. As mentioned below in Section 16, Recreation, of this Initial Study, there are 13 City parks, a municipal golf course, and a skate park managed by the City of Ukiah, as well as other recreational facilities in the area.

Discussion: (a) Less than significant impact. The City of Ukiah Police Department and Ukiah Valley Fire Authority are responsible for emergency response at the Project site, including during demolition activities. Because the Project does not propose development, the Project will not have a substantial effect on their ability to serve the area, nor would it result in the need for additional resources. Similarly, the Project would not result in an increase in population that would impact schools or parks in the area. As such, the Project would not result in result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any public services. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures: None

6. Recreation

| RECREATION. | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: Impacts to recreation would be significant if the Project resulted in increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities to the extent that substantial deterioration was accelerated or if the Project involved the development or expansion of recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the physical environment.

Environmental Setting: The City of Ukiah manages several recreation facilities, including more than 13 City parks. In addition, there are approximately 30 miles of trails located throughout the Ukiah Valley, under County and federal jurisdiction.

Discussion: (a-b) No impact. The Project does not include the alteration or addition of recreational facilities. The Project does also does not propose new development that could potentially increase the use of recreational facilities in the area. As such, **no Impact** would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None

17. Transportation

| TRANSPORTATION. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b), Criteria for Analyzing Traffic Impacts? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: Impacts to transportation and traffic would be significant if the Project conflicted with a local plan, ordinance or policy addressing transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; conflicted with CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15064.3(b), which contains criteria for analyzing transportation impacts; substantially increased hazards due to geometric design features; or resulted in inadequate emergency access.

Traditionally, transportation impacts had been evaluated by using Level of Service (LOS) analysis to measure the level of congestion on local roadways. However, on September 27, 2013, Governor Jerry Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 743 into law, initiating an update to the CEQA Guidelines to change how lead agencies evaluate transportation impacts under CEQA, with the goal to better measure the actual transportation-related environmental impacts of a given project. Starting July 1, 2020, lead agencies are required to analyze the transportation impacts of new projects using vehicle miles traveled (VMT), instead of LOS. VMT measures the amount of additional miles produced by the project. If the project increases car travel onto the roads excessively, the project may cause a significant transportation impact.

In 2018, the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) published a Technical Advisory on *Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (2018) which is intended to provide advice and recommendations for evaluating VMT, which agencies and other entities may use at their discretion. As discussed further below, the Technical Advisory offers that screening thresholds may be used to identify when land use projects, such as small-scale residential projects, should be expected to cause a less-than-significant impact without conducting a detailed traffic study.

On behalf of the Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG), Fehr & Peers, prepared a Senate Bill 743 Vehicle Miles Traveled Regional Baseline Study (Baseline Study; May, 2020) to provide an overview of SB 743, summarize VMT data available for Mendocino County, discuss alternatives for and recommend VMT measurement methods and thresholds for lead agencies in Mendocino County, and recommend transportation demand management (TDM) strategies for reducing VMT on projects in Mendocino County.

The following local plans have historically addressed transportation within the City of Ukiah: 2017

Ukiah Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, City of Ukiah Safe Routes to School Plan (2014), Mendocino County Rail Trail Plan (2012), Ukiah Downtown Streetscape Improvement Plan (2009), and the City of Ukiah General Plan (Circulation and Transportation Element amended in 2004). MCOG's Regional Transportation Plan (2017) and Section 5, Circulation and Transportation, of the Ukiah Valley Area Plan (2011) addresses transportation within the larger Ukiah Valley. The Baseline Study incorporated applicable goals and policies from each of these documents into the methodology and analysis when formulating its screening tools.

A lead agency has discretion to choose the most appropriate methodology to evaluate a project's vehicle miles traveled. If existing models or methods are not available to estimate the vehicle miles traveled for the particular project being considered, a lead agency may analyze the project's vehicle miles traveled qualitatively.

Environmental Setting: The City of Ukiah generally lies west of U.S. 101 between the U.S. 101/North State Street interchange, and the U.S. 101 / South State Street interchange. Three major interchanges along U.S. 101, Talmage Road, Gobbi Street, and Perkins Street (from south to north), provide access to southern and central Ukiah. The City of Ukiah is developed in a typical grid pattern with streets generally oriented north to south and east to west. Bicycle lanes are located throughout the City and public transit is provided by the Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA).

The Project site is currently accessed via both Perkins Street and Main Street, both City-maintained two-lane roads that are developed with sidewalks but no bike lanes in the Project area. The nearest MTA bus stop is located in front of the library, approximately 130 ft north of the Project site at the intersection of North Main and East Stanley Street.

Discussion: (a-d) Less than significant impact. No change to the City's circulation system, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities would be required or is proposed to occur with implementation of the Project. Access, including emergency access, is currently provided through existing driveways and City streets. The Project does not propose any modifications to access or other transit-related facilities on-site or in the immediate vicinity. As such, impacts to this criterion (c and d) would be **less than significant**.

Because the Project does not propose new development, this analysis focuses on temporary impacts to the circulation system that may occur during the construction (demolition) phase. The Project has been reviewed by Staff, as well as the Public Works Department to analyze the Project's impacts to traffic and circulation. Staff relied upon the Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) Technical Advisory on *Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (Technical Advisory; 2018) and the Mendocino Council of Governments' (MCOG) *Senate Bill 743 Vehicle Miles Traveled Regional Baseline Study* (Baseline Study; 2020) which are intended to provide recommendations and screening thresholds for evaluating traffic impacts by the way of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). One useful tool within these documents for small scale commercial Projects, are the thresholds identified to determine when such projects should be expected to cause a less-than-significant impact without conducting a detailed traffic study. Specifically, as noted in OPR's Technical Advisory, absent substantial evidence indicating that a project would generate a potentially significant level of VMT, or inconsistency with a general plan or other transportation related document, projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less-than- significant transportation impact. This is further supported in MCOG's Baseline Study that identifies construction of up to 50,000 sf of commercial buildings in urban areas as less than significant. VMT analyses are most appropriate for analyzing operational impacts or large-scale construction projects that produce significant traffic trips and/or vehicle miles traveled. However, these screening thresholds have been conservatively used for analyzing impacts associated with the Project.

Demolition would include a temporary increase in traffic associated with ingress and egress of vehicles and equipment to and from the Project site via South Main and Perkins Streets. As noted in the Project Description, demolition would take approximately three weeks with a crew of six construction workers. All work would be performed Monday through Friday, during daylight hours (between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and p.m., depending on the season). Construction equipment would be staged on-site and all activities will be performed within the site boundaries. It is anticipated that two to three dump truck trips a day would be necessary to transfer demolished materials for disposal and recycling. Construction equipment and trucks would utilize existing driveways and access routes on Main and Perkins Streets and travel to the quarry, transfer Station and recycling center via U.S. Highway 101. No road closures are required or anticipated for the Project.

The Project is anticipated to produce up to five dump truck trips per day, in addition to six vehicle trips for construction workers, for a total of 11 trips per day. Because the Project's daily trips would be less than the 110 trips screening threshold identified by OPR, the Project does not involve new construction, and does not conflict with the City's General Plan or other local plans intended to address circulation, the Project can be presumed to not result in a significant impact to traffic. As such, a subsequent detailed traffic study is not required and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures: None

18. Tribal Cultural Resources

| TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: An impact to tribal cultural resources would be significant if the Project were to substantially reduce the significance of a tribal cultural resource, a listed or eligible historic resource, or a resource considered significant by a California Native American tribe. Tribal cultural resources include "sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to

a California Native American Tribe” that are eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) or included in a local register of historical resources. Lead agencies are required to “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the Proposed Project.” The consultation process must be completed before a CEQA document can be certified.

Environmental Setting: As discussed in Section V.5, *Cultural Resources*, areas that are most typically culturally sensitive include those adjacent to streams, springs, and mid-slope benches above watercourses because Native Americans and settlers favored easy access to potable water.

Tribes known to be present within the Ukiah area include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians
- Guidiville Indian Rancheria of Pomo Indians
- Hopland Band of Pomo Indians
- Pinoleville Pomo Nation
- Potter Valley Rancheria
- Redwood Valley Little River Band of Pomo Indians
- Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians
- Yokayo Tribe, not federally recognized

Discussion: (a) Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. As described in Section V.5, *Cultural Resources*, because the Dragon’s Lair building qualifies as a local historic resource under CEQA that would be demolished, the Project would result in a significant impact to that resource if not properly mitigated. Under CEQA, feasible Mitigation associated with alteration or demolition of historic buildings is most commonly directly related to efforts for preserving the architecture and/or the building’s appearance. However, because the Project proposes to demolish the buildings and does not propose new development at this time, mitigation measures related to architectural preservation are not appropriate. **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would require photo documentation of the building to catalogue its existence and **Mitigation Measure CUL-2** requires an educational plaque to be erected on-site to acknowledge its historic significance related to the 1917 fire. Because the Project proposes to demolish the building that is not historically significant for its architecture, and does not propose new development at this time, these mitigation measures are considered adequate for reducing impacts to less than significant levels. As such, impacts to historic resources would be **less than significant with implementation of mitigation.**

Discussion: (b) Less than significant. As described in Section V.5, *Cultural Resources*, of this Initial Study, the site is considered to have a “low potential” for cultural and archeological resources. In accordance with AB 52, a notification proving the opportunity for consultation was sent to the Guidiville Rancheria of California but no response requesting formal consultation was received. Regardless, construction of the Project will be required to adhere to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (e-f) which specifically addresses what to do in the event that human remains or archeological resources are accidentally discovered.

Mitigation Measures:

Implementation of CUL-1 and CUL-2

19. Utilities and Service Systems

| UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: Impacts to utility and service systems would be significant if the Project resulted in the construction or expansion of utilities that could cause significant environmental effects; have insufficient water supplies available to the Project during normal to extremely dry years; resulted in inadequate capacity of the wastewater treatment plant; generated solid waste exceeding the capacity of local infrastructure or impairing the achievement of solid waste reduction goals; or failed to comply with any management and reduction statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

Environmental Setting: The majority of City properties are served by City water, sewer, electricity and trash collection as summarized below.

Electric. The City of Ukiah's Electric Utility Department provides electric services to properties within the City limits, while Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) provides services to properties outside of the City.

Water. There are five major providers of community water services in the Ukiah Valley. The City of Ukiah serves customers within the City, while Rogina Water Company and Millview, Calpella, and Willow County Water Districts serve the unincorporated areas. The City of Ukiah 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) was adopted by City Council on June 2, 2021. The UWMP considers several growth scenarios including an additional 2,500 and 5,000 hookup scenarios and determined that there is capacity through the 2045 planning horizon to serve these growth projections.

Sewer and Wastewater. The Ukiah Valley Sanitation District (UVSD) and the City of Ukiah provide public sewer services to customers within their boundaries under the purview of the State Water Quality Control Board. The City's sewage treatment plant and Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP), operational since 1958, serves the City of Ukiah and the Ukiah Valley Sanitation District.

Solid Waste. The Ukiah landfill, outside City limits on Vichy Springs Road, stopped receiving municipal solid waste in 2001 and the City is working on capping the landfill. Solid waste generated in the Ukiah Valley is exported for disposal to the Potrero Hills Landfill in Solano County. The Valley's solid waste disposal system consists of a large volume transfer station, Ukiah Transfer Station, which receives waste for export.

Discussion: (a-c) No Impact. The Project does not propose new development or alteration of the following: water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. The Project would not use water, with the exception of a water truck to mitigate dust, as needed. As such, there would be **no impact** to these utilities and services systems.

Discussion: (d & e) Less than significant impact. As noted in the Project Description, demolished concrete and rebar will be off hauled and recycled at a local rock quarry. Dump trucks would off-haul debris and deliver to the Ukiah Transfer Station & Recycling Center, where metal materials would be recycled and non-recyclable materials would be disposed of. All waste produced from Project activities would be disposed of at the Ukiah Transfer Station in accordance with all applicable local, state and federal regulations. Impacts related to solid waste would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures: None

20. Wildfire

| WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria: Impacts to wildfire would be significant if the Project were located in or near a State Responsibility Area (SRA) or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones and substantially impaired an emergency response plan; exposed Project occupants to wildfire pollutants or uncontrolled spread of wildfire due to site conditions such as slope and prevailing winds; require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure that could exacerbate fire risk; or expose people or structures to significant risks as a result of post-fire runoff, slope instability or drainage changes.

Environmental Setting: All lands within the City of Ukiah are within the jurisdiction of the Ukiah Valley Fire Authority. None of the lands within the City of Ukiah are located within a California Department of Forestry (CalFire) State Responsibility Area (SRA). However, some parcels within the western boundary of the City limits are designated as “Very High” fire severity within the Local Responsibility Area (LRA). The Project site is not located in an area identified as having a High or Very High fire severity risk.

As discussed in Section 9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the County’s EOP plan and MJHMP address emergency operations, natural disasters (including wildfire), as well as mitigation strategies to reduce potential risks. The City of Ukiah adopted its “jurisdictional annex” chapter of the MJHMP on November 18, 2020. Hazards identified for the City of Ukiah include earthquakes, wildfire, dam failure, flood and pandemic. Table 1-13 of the City’s jurisdictional annex lists each hazard and mitigation action for City of Ukiah.

Discussion: (a-b) Less than significant impact. The Project site is accessed via existing driveways and roads, and there are no components of the Project that would conflict with, or impair the adopted MJHMP, EOP, or other adopted emergency response plan or emergency evaluation plan. As described in Section 9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the Project site is not located within a High or Very High fire severity zone. Because the Project site is developed with pavement, and the Project

does not propose new development within a High or Very High severity zone, it would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The use of gasoline-powered equipment will be used in accordance with all existing Building Code and Fire Code regulations intended to reduce fire risk (such as the use of spark arresters, for example).

Discussion: (c-d) No impact. The Project would not require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities that would exacerbate fire risk. In addition, the Project would not include earthwork in a sloped, undeveloped area or other components that could result in downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. **No impact** would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None.

21. Mandatory Findings of Significance

| MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. | Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) 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 self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: (a) Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. As described and analyzed throughout the Initial Study, impacts to Air Quality, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources could be significant. However, with the implementation of mitigation measures, all impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Specifically, temporary activities associated with demolition over the three-week construction period could result in direct significant impacts to Air Quality, but would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures **AQ-1** through **AQ-3**, requiring adherence to Mendocino County Air Quality Management District regulations. The Tom's Glass building is not located on a local, state, or federal historic register. Therefore, no impact to historic resources would occur as a result of its demolition. However, because the Dragon's Lair building qualifies as a local historic resource under CEQA that would be demolished, the Project would

result in a significant impact to that resource if not properly mitigated. **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would require photo documentation of the building to catalogue its existence and **Mitigation Measure CUL-2** requires an educational plaque to be erected on-site to acknowledge its historic significance related to the 1917 fire. Because the Project proposes to demolish the building that is not historically significant for its architecture, and does not propose new development at this time, these mitigation measures are considered adequate for reducing impacts to less than significant levels. As such, impacts to historic resources would be **less than significant with implementation of mitigation**. The Project would result in either no impact, or less than significant impact to all other resources. See Section V, *Evaluation of Environmental Impacts*, for more information.

(b) Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. Cumulative impacts are generally considered in analyses of Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Noise, and Traffic. As discussed throughout the Initial Study, the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts on these resources or less than significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures described herein. Short-term construction impacts associated with the Project would not significantly contribute to cumulative impacts in the area as there are no known past projects nor current projects within the vicinity of the site. Based on the findings and conclusions contained in the Initial Study, cumulative impacts related to the Proposed Project would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

(c) Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. Based on the findings and conclusions contained in the Initial Study, the Proposed Project would not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

VI. REFERENCES

1. APD Preservation. LLC. Historic Resource Evaluation for 101 South Main Street. Revised January, 2022.
2. CalFire State Responsibility Area Viewer
http://www.fire.ca.gov/firepreventionfee/srviewer_launch
3. CalFire, California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Web Viewer.
<http://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>
4. California Air Resources Board (CARB). *California Releases Report Charting Path to 100 Percent Clean Electricity*. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/news/california-releases-report-charting-path-100-percent-clean-electricity>
5. California Department of Conservation. California Geological Survey. Earthquake Fault Map, Ukiah. Zones of Required Investigation.
<http://gmw.conservation.ca.gov/SHP/EZRIM/Maps/UKIAH.PDF> .
6. California Department of Conservation. California Geological Survey. U.S. Landslide Inventory Web Application.
<https://usgs.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=ae120962f459434b8c904b456c82669d>
7. California Department of Conservation. Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program, California Important Farmland Finder. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>
8. California Department of Finance. American Community Survey.
http://www.dof.ca.gov/Reports/Demographic_Reports/American_Community_Survey
9. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Bios Vegetation Mapping.
<https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/>
10. California Department of Toxic Substance Control. EnviroStor database
<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/>
11. California Department of Transportation California State Scenic Highway System map.
<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2e921695c43643b1aaf7000dfcc19983>
12. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research. Discussion Draft Technical Advisory: AB 52 and Tribal Cultural Resources in CEQA, May 2015.
13. City of Ukiah General Plan. Last amended 2019. <http://www.cityofukiah.com/documents-and-maps/>

14. City of Ukiah Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Prepared by Alta Planning + Design, W-Trans and Walk Bike Mendocino. August 2015.
15. City of Ukiah Code. Last amended 2021. <https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Ukiah>
16. City of Ukiah, 1985. City of Ukiah Historic Resources Survey, prepared by Historic Environmental Consultants.
17. City of Ukiah, 1999. City of Ukiah Architectural Survey Update, prepared by P.S. Preservation Services.
18. City of Ukiah. Housing Element Update 2019-2027. Adopted October 23, 2019 and Certified by HCD December 5, 2019. <http://www.cityofukiah.com/projects/housing-element-update/>
19. Federal Highway Administration. 2006. Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA-HEP-05-054). https://www.gsweventcenter.com/Draft_SEIR_References/2006_01_Roadway_Construction_Noise_Model_User_Guide_FHWA.pdf
20. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), 2017. Default Noise Emission Reference Levels and Usage Factors, last updated August 24, 2017. Available: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm.
21. Federal Transit Administration (FTA), 2018. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual, September 2018. Available: https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdf
22. Fehr & Peers, on behalf of the Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG), Senate Bill 743 Vehicle Miles Traveled Regional Baseline Study. May 20, 2020. <https://www.mendocinocog.org/vehicle-miles-traveled-vmt-regional-baseline-study-completed>
23. Landslide Inventory (Beta). California Department of Conservation. California Geological Survey. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/lasi/>
24. Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG). 2017 Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by Davey Bates Consulting. Adopted February 5, 2018. <https://www.mendocinocog.org/files/742330750/2017+RTP+As+Adopted%28web+format%29.pdf>
25. Mendocino County Air Quality Management District of the California North Coast Air Basin. Particulate Matter Attainment Plan. January 2005. <https://www.co.mendocino.ca.us/aqmd/pm-attainment.html>
26. Mendocino County Air Quality Management District website. <http://www.co.mendocino.ca.us/aqmd/diesel-engine-information.html>.
27. Mendocino County Airport Land Use Commission. Ukiah Municipal Land Use Compatibility Plan. Adopted by the Mendocino County Airport Land Use Commission on May 20, 2021 and adopted by the Ukiah City Council on June 16, 2021.

<http://www.cityofukiah.com/NewWeb/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Ukiah-Municipal-Airport-Land-Use-Compatibility-Plan-2021.pdf>

28. Mendocino County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJHMP). Adopted December, 2020. Vol 2, Chapter 1, City of Ukiah Jurisdictional Annex, adopted by the City of Ukiah November 18, 2020.
29. Mendocino County Office of Education. Schools & Districts.
<https://www.mcoe.us/schools-districts/>
30. Mendocino County Public GIS Portal <https://gis.mendocinocounty.org/portal/home/>
31. State Water Resources Control Board. GeoTracker.
<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov>.
32. Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts In CEQA. December 2018. https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf
33. U.S. Department of Agriculture - Soil Conservation Service. Web Soil Survey.
<https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>
34. U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife. Environmental Conservation Online System.
<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp0/reports/species-listed-by-state-report?state=CA&status=listed>
35. U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). Interactive Fault Map. https://www.usgs.gov/natural-hazards/earthquake-hazards/faults?qt-science_support_page_related_con=4#qt-science_support_page_related_con
36. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Wetland Habitat Mapper.
<https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>
37. Ukiah Valley Area Plan, adopted August 2, 2011.
<https://www.mendocinocounty.org/government/planning-building-services/plans/ukiah-valley-area-plan>

VII. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

| Potential Impact | Mitigation Measure | Implementation Responsibility | Monitoring & Reporting Responsibility | Timing | Date Implemented |
|--|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|------------------|
| <i>Air Quality</i> | | | | | |
| Construction and ground disturbing activities could result in short-term impacts to air quality. | AQ-1: Diesel Engines – Stationary and Portable Equipment and Mobile Vehicles: a. All stationary onsite diesel IC engines 50 horsepower or greater (i.e. large power generators or pumps) or any propane or natural gas engines 250 horsepower or greater require a permit from the MCAQMD. b. Portable diesel-powered equipment that may be used are required to be registered with the state Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or obtain permits from MCAQMD. c. Heavy duty truck idling and off-road diesel equipment or other diesel engine idling is limited to less than 5 minutes. | Applicant or contractor | Applicant or contractor; Mendocino County Air Quality Management District | Throughout construction | |
| | AQ-2: Grading Projects: All grading activities must comply with the following fugitive dust mitigation measures in | Applicant or contractor | Applicant or contractor; Mendocino | Throughout construction | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>accordance with District Regulation 1, Rule 1-430:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All visibly dry disturbed soil road surfaces shall be watered to minimize fugitive dust emissions. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Open bodied trucks shall be covered when used for transporting materials likely to give rise to airborne dust. b. All unpaved surfaces, unless otherwise treated with suitable chemicals or oils, shall have a posted speed limit of 10 mph. c. Earth or other material that has been transported by trucking or earth moving equipment, erosion by water, or other means onto paved streets shall be promptly removed. d. Asphalt, oil, water, or suitable chemicals shall be applied on materials stockpiles, and other surfaces that can give rise airborne dusts. e. All earthmoving activities shall cease when sustained winds exceed 15 mph. f. The operator shall take reasonable precautions to prevent the entry of unauthorized vehicles onto the site during non-work hours. g. The operator shall keep a daily log of activities to control fugitive dust. h. For projects greater than one acre or one mile of road not located within a Naturally Occurring | | <p>County Air Quality Management District</p> | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| <p>Asbestos Area, prior to starting any construction the applicant is required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Submit a Large Area Grading permit application to the District. ii. Obtain a final determination from the Air Quality Management District as to the need for an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan and/or Geologic Survey to comply with CCR sections 93106 and 93105 relating to Naturally Occurring Asbestos. iii. Obtain written verification from the District stating that the project is in compliance with State and Local regulations relating to Naturally Occurring Asbestos. iv. If the project is located within a Naturally Occurring Asbestos Area, additional mitigations shall be required. | | | | |
| <p>AQ-3: Asbestos Survey. Demolition of all commercial buildings are subject to the requirements of MCAQMD Regulation 1, Rule 492, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPS) for Asbestos. Prior to receiving a demolition permit from the City, the applicant shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Have an Asbestos Survey completed by a licensed Asbestos contractor for | Applicant or contractor | Applicant or contractor; Mendocino County Air Quality Management District | Prior to issuance of Demolition Permit | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | <p>the presence of asbestos containing materials;</p> <p>b. Submit a completed Asbestos Demolition/Renovation form, all test results and applicable notification fees to the District at least 10 days prior to beginning the Project;</p> <p>c. Have asbestos containing materials abated by a licensed abatement contractor prior to beginning and demolition or renovation activities, if applicable; and</p> <p>d. Obtain written authorization from MCAQMD indicating that all requirements have been met prior to receiving the demolition permit.</p> | | | | |
| <i>Cultural/Tribal Cultural Resources</i> | | | | | |
| <p>Demolition of the Dragon's Lair building could result in significant impacts to a historic resource</p> | <p>CUL-1: Photo Documentation. Prior to issuance of the demolition permit, photo documentation of the Dragon's Lair building shall be required in order to catalogue its existence. The photo documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director and submitted to the Mendocino County Historic Society.</p> | <p>Applicant or contractor</p> | <p>Applicant or contractor; City of Ukiah Community Development Department</p> | <p>Prior to issuance of demolition permit</p> | |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <p>CUL-2: Educational Plaque. Prior to final completion of the demolition permit, an educational plaque shall be erected on-site to acknowledge the Dragon's Lair building's historic significance related to rebuild efforts after the 1917 fire. The plaque design and content, as well as the proposed placement, shall be submitted to the Community Development Director for review and approval. The plaque shall remain on-site if and when the site is developed in the future. If the plaque is proposed for relocation, the property owner shall receive written approval from the Community Development Director to do so.</p> | <p>Applicant or contractor</p> | <p>Applicant or contractor; City of Ukiah Community Development Department</p> | <p>Prior to receiving final completion of the demolition permit</p> | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|--|