

**FINAL**

**Costco Wholesale Project  
Recirculated Partial Environmental Impact Report  
SCH # 2011112025**

*Prepared for:*

**City of Ukiah**  
300 Seminary Avenue  
Ukiah, California 95482

*Prepared by:*

**DUDEK**  
1102 R Street  
Sacramento, California 95811  
*Contact: Brian Grattidge*

**APRIL 2017**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>		<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1-1
2	INTRODUCTION.....	2-1
3	COMMENTS AND RESPONSES .....	3-1
4	MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM .....	4-1

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# CHAPTER 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Costco Wholesale Project (Project) is a proposed Costco Wholesale Warehouse within the City of Ukiah (City). The City, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should be prepared. The Notice of Preparation was released on November 7, 2011. The Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse #2011112025) was released on January 30, 2013, for a public review period of 45 days. The City Council of Ukiah certified the Final EIR on December 18, 2013. Following certification of the EIR, the City approved the necessary entitlements for the Project, including rezoning of the Project Site and a Site Development Permit. The City Council then introduced the first reading of Ordinance 1146, rezoning the Project Site to Retail Commercial. On January 15, 2014, the Ordinance was approved by the City Council. The City of Ukiah Planning Commission approved the Site Development Permit on January 22, 2014. The City Council heard an appeal of the Planning Commission's action on March 5, 2014, and upheld the approval of the Site Development Permit.

On June 21, 2016, the Court of Appeals ruled that the Final EIR did not adequately address the potential energy impacts of the project (*Ukiah Citizens for Safety First v. City of Ukiah* (2016) 248 Cal.App.4th 256). The City Council of Ukiah subsequently set aside the Final EIR on November 16, 2016, and directed that the EIR be revised and recirculated to address the Court of Appeal ruling. The Recirculated Partial Draft EIR (RPDEIR) was prepared in response to this decision. The RPDEIR did not revise the EIR in any respect other than the Energy Section (section 3.15) as directed by the Court of Appeal Decision, as the Court of Appeal Decision upheld all other aspects of the EIR. As the RPDEIR document is limited to the Energy Section (section 3.15), pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, subdivision (c), the DEIR and the FEIR were not recirculated for public review and comment.

The City of Ukiah, as the lead agency under CEQA, prepared an EIR for the Project and prepared this document, entitled Final Recirculated Partial EIR (Final RPEIR).

This Executive Summary includes, for informational purposes only, a summary of environmental impacts and alternatives to the proposed project identified in the Draft EIR, as revised by the Final EIR dated December 2013, and the RPDEIR.

## 1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The approved Costco Wholesale Project includes the construction of a new Costco Wholesale warehouse, with a maximum size of 148,000 square feet (SF), and a fueling facility on approximately 15.33 acres. The fueling facility will have 16 vehicle fueling positions (with the

capacity to expand to 20 positions in the future). The plans submitted with Costco's building permit application propose a warehouse of 141,125 SF, with a bakery, pharmacy, optical center, hearing aid testing center, food court, photo center, tire center, and fueling facility along with the sale of between 3,800 and 4,000 products. The tire center would be a 5,442 SF attached building with member access through the inside of the main Costco building and would include retail tire sales and a tire installation facility. The fueling facility is separate from the main building site, and would include a 2,816 SF canopy and 16 fueling positions (expandable to 20 positions). The fueling facility occupies approximately 2.37 acres, located in the southeast corner of the site adjacent to US 101. Store hours are anticipated to be 10:00 a.m. to 8:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, 9:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday, and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sunday. Fueling facility hours would be Monday through Friday, 6:00 a.m. to 9:30 p.m., Saturday and Sunday from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Delivery hours will generally occur between 4:00 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. The Costco facility would employ approximately 175 to 200 people.

The Project Site is located in the City of Ukiah, Mendocino County, California. The Project Site consists of at least portions of twelve parcels totaling 15.33 acres (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 180-110-8 through 10, 180-080-57 through 59, and 180-080-62 through 67). The Project Site is bounded by commercial uses (north and south), US 101 (east), and Airport Park Boulevard (west) (Figure 2-2). The Project Site is within the Airport Industrial Park (AIP) Planned Development. The Airport Industrial Park is bounded by Talmage Road to the north, Ukiah Municipal Airport to the west, and US 101 to the east and south.

### **1.3 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

The purpose of the alternatives analysis in an EIR is to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly attain the objectives of the project, and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)).

Additionally, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires consideration of alternatives that could avoid or substantially lessen any significant adverse environmental effects of the proposed project, including alternatives that may be more costly or could otherwise impede the project's objectives. The range of alternatives considered must include those that offer substantial environmental advantages over the proposed project and may be feasibly accomplished in a successful manner considering economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors.

The DEIR analyzed the following alternatives:

- No Project Alternative (Existing Conditions, No Change)
- Reduced Project Size Alternative (No Gas Station)
- Off-site Alternative (West Side Airport Park Blvd.)

The Reduced Project Size Alternative (No Gas Station) was selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, as discussed in the DEIR (Section 5.5), the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the Project would not be reduced to less than significant by this alternative. In addition, the feasibility of the alternative would have to be determined by the decision making body of the lead agency.

## **1.4 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

Table 1-1 presents a summary of Project impacts and proposed mitigation measures that would further avoid or minimize potential impacts. It also indicates the level of significance of each environmental impact both before and after the application of the recommended mitigation measure(s). Table 1-1 includes any minor revisions made to mitigation measures as a result of the comments on the Draft EIR and RPDEIR.

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Aesthetics</i>		
<b>Impact 3.1.1:</b> Implementation of the Project would not change the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.1.2:</b> Implementation of the Project may create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.	<p><b>Measure 3.1.2:</b> : All outdoor light fixtures shall be located, aimed or shielded so as to minimize stray light trespassing across property boundaries. Fixtures shall be full cut-off and nighttime friendly, consistent with LEED goals and Green Globes criteria for light pollution reduction.</p> <p>The project applicant will be required to prepare a photometric plan demonstrating that lighting will not spillover onto adjacent properties. Furthermore, the Project will adhere to all City regulations relating to signage and the shielding of light in order to reduce any potential negative effects from new light sources (per Building Code Sections §3225, §3226, §3227). The revised light plan shall demonstrate an average light level no greater than 4 footcandle (fc) at grade (ground surface), and shall not exceed 10 fc in any location. Light trespass onto adjacent private property shall not exceed 0.2 fc (at the property line). Light trespass onto adjacent public rights of way or private roadway easements shall not exceed 0.2 fc measured at the centerline of the right of way. Pole-mounted parking lot lighting shall be turned off one hour after the store closes. Alternatively, 50% of pole-mounted lighting may be turned off if the City or store operator requests additional security lighting. These standards shall be included in the Project conditions of approval as well as the mitigation monitoring and reporting program.</p>	LTS
<b>Impact 3.1.3:</b> The Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative visual impact.	None required.	LTS
<i>Air Quality</i>		
<b>Impact 3.2.1:</b> Construction activities associated with development of the Project would not generate significant short-term emissions of criteria pollutants.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.2.2:</b> Operation of the Project would generate significant emissions of criteria air pollutants that could contribute to existing nonattainment conditions and degrade air quality.	<p><b>Measure 3.2.2a:</b> The Project will incorporate sustainability features in building and site design with the goal of reaching a building efficiency rating that is greater than the Title 24 requirement, in order to reduce energy consumption and associated GHG emissions. As set forth in the "Project Description," the project will incorporate the following sustainability features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking lot light standards are designed to provide even light distribution and use 20% less energy compared to a greater number of fixtures at lower heights. The use of metal</li> </ul>	SU



**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>halide lamps provide a color corrected white light and a higher level of perceived brightness with less energy than other lamps such as high pressure sodium.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locally extracted and manufactured building materials will be utilized where feasible.</li> <li>• Pre-manufactured building components, including structural framing and metal panels, are designed to minimize waste during construction.</li> <li>• Pre-manufactured metal wall panels with insulation are designed to conserve energy by increasing R-value and solar reflectivity. Building heat absorption is reduced by a decrease in the thermal mass of the metal wall when compared to a typical masonry block wall.</li> <li>• Reflective roof material will meet the requirements for the USEPA's Energy Star energy efficiency program. Reflective roofs produce lower heat absorption and thereby lower energy usage during the summer months.</li> <li>• Skylights are used on the roof to reduce the need for interior lighting. A "daylight harvesting" system monitors and adjusts the mechanical and lighting systems in order to conserve energy. The system includes the skylights, light monitors, energy efficient lighting fixtures, and associated control systems. On a typical sunny day, fewer than one third of the interior lights are needed.</li> <li>• Tree plantings to reduce summer heat gain within the parking field.</li> <li>• Planting to incorporate a substantial amount of drought tolerant species.</li> <li>• Irrigation system to incorporate the use of deep root watering bubblers for parking lot shade trees to minimize water usage and ensure that water goes directly to the intended planting areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Measure 3.2.2b:</b> The applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce motor vehicle trips and emissions associated with Project operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the use of alternative fueled vehicles (i.e., CNG, electric, etc.) for Project operations. The applicant shall implement two or more of the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Warehouse equipment, including forklifts, will be electric powered.</li> <li>○ Landscaping equipment will be electric powered.</li> <li>○ Preferred parking for zero emission vehicles.</li> <li>○ Retail fueling station will include a CNG refueling station.</li> <li>○ Customer parking will include a minimum of one (1) electric recharge station.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide commute incentives for employees to utilize alternative transportation, such as carpool/vanpool, transit, cycling, or walking. A Costco carpool and alternative transportation</li> </ul>	

**Table 1-1**  
**Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>manager shall be designated to oversee the implementation of these TDM measures. Costco will provide its employees the following incentives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Four carpool parking spaces reserved for Costco employees;</li> <li>○ Bicycle parking as required by City standards;</li> <li>○ Employee locker rooms;</li> <li>○ Rideshare Program, including recognition of rideshare participants at monthly staff meetings and an annual update of rideshare benefits and incentives provided to employees;</li> <li>○ A Rideshare Bulletin Board to be located in the employee breakroom, which will contain information about the Rideshare Program, transit, bike routes, and other alternate commute information;</li> <li>○ A Rideshare Newsletter to be published and posted on the Rideshare Bulletin Board on a quarterly basis;</li> <li>○ Costco employees commuting to work in a rideshare program will be eligible for a guaranteed ride home program in the event of an emergency or unexpected situation (such as unscheduled overtime) on the days they rideshare.</li> <li>○ The applicant shall increase transit accessibility. Such measures could include the purchase of transit passes for employees. Also, implement Mitigation Measure 3.10.2a.</li> <li>● The applicant shall improve the pedestrian and bicycle network. Implement Mitigation Measure 3.10.2b a Measure 3.2.2c: Use low VOC architectural coatings and 2c.</li> </ul> <p>If the applicant demonstrates, with substantial evidence that the City finds credible and with which it agrees, that any of the above measures are infeasible, the City may allow fewer than all of the above measures to be implemented for the Project. This exception does not excuse the applicant from complying with at least two of the measures listed above to promote the use of alternative fueled vehicles and equipment.</p>	
<b>Impact 3.2.3:</b> Project traffic would not substantially increase localized carbon monoxide concentrations at sensitive receptors in the project vicinity.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.2.4:</b> Project operation would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	None required.	LTS

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact 3.2.5:</b> Construction and operation of the Project would result in cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutant emissions.	Implement Mitigation Measures 3.2.2a through 3.2.2d.	SU
<i>Urban Decay</i>		
<b>Impact 3.3.1:</b> The Project would not result in long term commercial building vacancies and therefore would not result in increased urban decay conditions.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.3.2:</b> The Project, in conjunction with other development, would not result in long term commercial building vacancies and therefore would not result in increased urban decay conditions.	None required.	LTS
<i>Geology and Soils</i>		
<b>Impact 3.4.1:</b> The Project could expose people to injury or structures to damage from potential rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides.	<p><b>Measure 3.4.1a (For Seismic Ground Shaking)</b> - Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any portion of the Project site, the Project sponsor shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Submit to the City Building Services Division a site-specific, design level geotechnical investigation prepared for each development parcel by a registered geotechnical engineer. The investigation shall comply with all applicable state and local code requirements and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Include an analysis of the expected ground motions at the site from known active faults using accepted methodologies;</li> <li>b. Determine structural design requirements as prescribed by the most current version of the California Building Code, including applicable City amendments, to ensure that structures can withstand ground accelerations expected from known active faults;</li> <li>c. Determine the final design parameters for walls, foundations, foundation slabs, utilities, roadways, parking lots, sidewalks, and other surrounding related improvements;</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Project plans for foundation design, earthwork, and site preparation shall incorporate all of the mitigations in the site specific investigations.</li> <li>3. The Project structural engineer shall review the site specific investigations, provide any additional necessary mitigation to meet Building Code requirements, and incorporate all</li> </ol>	LTS

**Table 1-1**  
**Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>applicable mitigations from the investigation in the structural design plans and shall ensure that all structural plans for the Project meet current Building Code requirements.</p> <p>4. A registered City geotechnical engineer or third-party registered engineer retained to review the geotechnical reports shall review each site-specific geotechnical investigation, approve the final report, and require compliance with all geotechnical mitigations contained in the investigation in the plans submitted for the grading, foundation, structural, infrastructure and all other relevant construction permits.</p> <p>5. The City shall review all Project plans for grading, foundations, structural, infrastructure and all other relevant construction permits to ensure compliance with the applicable geotechnical investigation and other applicable Code requirements.</p> <p><b>Measure 3.4.1b (For liquefaction and earthquake induced settlement) –</b> Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any portion of the Project site, the Project sponsor shall:</p> <p>1. Submit to the City a site-specific, design level geotechnical investigation prepared for each building site or installed facility location by a registered geotechnical engineer. The investigation shall comply with all applicable state and local code requirements and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide site specific engineering requirements for mitigation of liquefiable soils;</li> <li>b. Specify liquefaction mitigations that shall use proven methods, generally accepted by registered engineers, to reduce the risk of liquefaction to a less than significant level such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. subsurface soil improvement,</li> <li>ii. deep foundations extending below the liquefiable layers,</li> <li>iii. structural slabs designed to span across areas of non-support,</li> <li>iv. soil cover sufficiently thick over liquefaction soil to bridge liquefaction zones,</li> <li>v. dynamic compaction,</li> <li>vi. compaction grouting,</li> <li>vii. jet grouting,</li> <li>viii. mitigation for liquefaction hazards suggested in the California Geological Survey's Geology (CGS) Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards (CGS Special Publication 117, 1997) including edge containment structures (berms, dikes, sea walls, retaining structures, compacted soil zones), removal or treatment of liquefiable soils, modification of site geometry, lowering the groundwater table, in-situ ground densification, deep foundations, reinforced shallow foundations, and structural design that can withstand predicted displacements.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The geotechnical investigation shall evaluate these mitigations and identify the most effective and practicable mitigation methods for inclusion in the Project plans. These identified mitigations shall be reviewed to ensure compliance with the CGS Geology Guidelines related to protection of the public safety from liquefaction.</li> <li>3. Project plans for foundation design, earthwork, and site preparation shall incorporate all of the mitigations in the site specific investigations.</li> <li>4. The Project structural engineer shall review the site specific investigations, provide any additional necessary mitigation to meet Building Code requirements, and incorporate all applicable mitigations from the investigation in the structural design plans and shall ensure that all structural plans for the Project meet current Building Code requirements.</li> <li>5. A registered City geotechnical engineer or third-party registered engineer retained to review the geotechnical reports shall review each site-specific geotechnical investigation, approve the final report, and require compliance with all geotechnical mitigations contained in the investigation in the plans submitted for the grading, foundation, structural, infrastructure and all other relevant construction permits.</li> <li>6. The City shall review all Project plans for grading, foundations, structural, infrastructure and all other relevant construction permits to ensure compliance with the applicable geotechnical investigation and other applicable Code requirements.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Impact 3.4.2:</b> Construction of the Project would involve grading and movement of earth, which could expose soils to erosion and result in the loss of topsoil.</p>	None required.	LTS
<p><b>Impact 3.4.3:</b> The Project could be located on fill soils that are potentially unstable, or that could become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.</p>	Implement Mitigation Measures 3.4.1a and 3.4.1b.	LTS

**Table 1-1**  
**Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact 3.4.4:</b> The Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects associated with erosion, topsoil loss or increased exposure to seismic or other risks.	None required.	LTS
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>		
<b>Impact 3.5.1:</b> The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.5.2:</b> During construction, the Project could create a hazard to the public or the environment through upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or hazardous wastes to the environment.	<b>Measure 3.5.2: Hazards Remediation.</b> If contaminated soil and/or groundwater are encountered or suspected contamination is encountered during Project construction activities, work shall be halted in the area, and the type and extent of the contamination shall be identified in accordance with coordination of the overseeing agency (RWQCB, DTSC, and/or MCEHD). A qualified professional, in consultation with regulatory agencies (RWQCB, DTSC, and/or MCEHD) shall then develop an appropriate method to remediate the contamination, and determine the appropriate disposal method of any contaminated soil and/or groundwater. At this time, the available studies suggest that no contaminated soil or groundwater will be found on site. Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would require remediation procedures in the unlikely event that contamination is encountered. Additionally, if required by an overseeing agency, a remediation plan shall be implemented either before or in conjunction with continued Project construction.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.5.3:</b> The Project site is located within an airport land use plan and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.5.4:</b> The Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	None required.	LTS

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact 3.5.5:</b> The Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact related to hazards or hazardous materials.	None required.	LTS
<i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>		
<b>Impact 3.6.1:</b> Project construction activities would disturb surface soils and could cause erosion and the release of sediment and construction related water quality pollutants to receiving waters.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.6.2:</b> Subsurface excavation during Project construction could require dewatering, which may result in a discharge that could adversely affect water quality.	<b>Measure 3.6.2:</b> In the event that construction period dewatering is required, The Project Applicant will coordinate with the City concerning dewatering activities and compliance with the provisions in the permit, such as the effluent limitations in the permit, prior to discharge. The applicant will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit a Report of Waste Discharge and Application for NPDES Permit along with a feasibility study of reuse of the groundwater to the RWQCB.</li> <li>• Discharge flows only upon receipt of the Discharge Authorization Letter from the RWQCB.</li> </ul>	LTS
<b>Impact 3.6.3:</b> Project construction could require dewatering, but would not result in significant lowering of groundwater levels.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.6.4:</b> The proposed installation of new impervious surfaces associated with the proposed Costco building and parking lot would result in an increase in impervious surfaces on site. This could decrease stormwater infiltration and increase stormwater flows, causing downstream flooding, erosion, or sedimentation.	<b>Measure 3.6.4:</b> The Applicant shall prepare and submit to the City engineer and the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board for approval a Final Drainage Plan. The Final Drainage Plan shall include design/plan level depiction of the proposed stormwater drainage facilities on site, including the proposed storm drainage system, vegetated swales, and the water quality features. The following measures shall be implemented within the Final Drainage Plan, based on modeled runoff volumes and flow rates specific to with-Project conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant shall design, implement, and maintain a stormwater system such that there would be no net increase in project condition downstream peak flows; and/or, with respect to the additional impervious surface area proposed for the project, the [applicant] shall design and implement volume- and/or flow-based Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) as defined in Attachment 4 (pages 5-6) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) small municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) General Permit (Small MS4 General Permit) (SWRCB Order 2003-0005-DWQ).</li> </ul>	LTS

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Final Drainage Plan is not required to include retention and/or retention features if such features are not necessary to satisfy the above requirements.</li> <li>• Prior to implementation, design drawings and any related documents or specifications with respect to these required mitigation measures shall be submitted to the City of Ukiah and the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.</li> <li>• Modification of storm drain facilities within the State right-of-way (U.S. 101), may require an encroachment permit, and shall be submitted to the California Department of Transportation.</li> </ul>	
<b>Impact 3.6.5:</b> The proposed Project would include installation of a new refueling station and new impervious surfaces. During Project operation, stormwater runoff from these areas could contain elevated pollutant levels, and could result in increased pollutant loading downstream.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.6.6:</b> Increase in the impervious surfaces under the proposed Project would not significantly affect groundwater recharge in the Project area.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.6.7:</b> The Project would not subject people and structures to increased risk of floods from the potential failure of the Coyote Dam at Lake Mendocino.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.6.8:</b> Project implementation, in conjunction with other foreseeable development in the city, could result in cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts.	Implement Mitigation Measure 3.6.4.	LTS
<i>Land Use and Planning</i>		
<b>Impact 3.7.1:</b> The proposed Project would not physically divide an established community.	None required.	LTS



**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact 3.7.2:</b> The proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.7.3:</b> The proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	None required.	NI
<b>Impact 3.7.4:</b> The proposed Project, in combination with other developments in the vicinity, would not contribute to potential cumulative land use impacts.	None required.	LTS
<i>Noise</i>		
<b>Impact 3.8.1:</b> Construction and grading activities associated with the development of the Project would not increase noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive receptor locations.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.8.2:</b> Operational activities associated with the Project could increase ambient noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive land uses. This impact would be less than significant.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.8.3:</b> Traffic associated with operation of the Project would not result in a significant increase in noise exposure on area roadways.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.8.4:</b> Project operational activities would not expose people working in the Project area to excessive noise levels, for a Project located within an airport land use plan.	None required.	LTS

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact 3.8.5:</b> Noise associated with the Project in combination with other local development would not result in cumulatively considerable noise increases.	None required.	LTS
<i>Public Services and Utilities</i>		
<b>Impact 3.9.1:</b> Implementation of the Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police facilities.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.9.2:</b> Implementation of the Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire and emergency service facilities.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.9.3:</b> Implementation of the Costco Wholesale warehouse and fuel station project would indirectly increase student enrollment at UUSD schools, but not to the extent that new facilities would be required.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.9.4:</b> The Project would not result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of these facilities would occur or be accelerated, nor would the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.9.5:</b> Implementation of the Project would not significantly increase the demand for water supply.	None required.	LTS

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact 3.9.6:</b> The Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements or require construction of new wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.9.7:</b> The Project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal, and would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.9.8:</b> The Costco Wholesale warehouse Project would not exceed existing gas and electric supply or result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.9.9:</b> The Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to public services and utilities impacts associated with cumulative development in the Project vicinity.	None required.	LTS
<i>Transportation and Traffic</i>		
<b>Impact 3.10.1:</b> Implementation of the Project would increase traffic volumes on area roadways. This impact is potentially significant.	<p><b>Measure 3.10.1:</b> The City shall construct Talmage Road Interchange improvements, including the provision of two left-turn lanes on the westbound Talmage Road approach to Airport Park Blvd. The improvements include the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closure of the existing stop-controlled US 101 Southbound Off-Ramp right-turn to westbound Talmage Road</li> <li>• All US 101 Southbound Off-Ramp traffic would be redirected to access Talmage Road via a new full access intersection where the current loop ramp connects with Talmage Road so that all off-ramp traffic would utilize the off-loop ramp.</li> <li>• The existing US 101 Southbound Off-Ramp loop would be reconfigured to a more standard 90-degree angle.</li> </ul>	SU

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The intersection of the loop ramp with Talmage Road would be controlled by a new traffic signal.</li> <li>• Both the eastbound Talmage Road and northbound US 101 Southbound Off-Ramp right- turn lanes will have right-turn overlap phasing, while the westbound Talmage Road approach would include protected left-turn phasing.</li> <li>• The design would also provide for two left-turn lanes on the westbound Talmage Road approach to Airport Park Boulevard, which should extend the entire distance to the adjacent intersection.</li> <li>• Since the left-turn lanes would extend all the way to the intersection, signs and markings on the off-ramp are provided to direct drivers to the correct lane for their destination.</li> <li>• Intersection markings should be incorporated that provide guidance so as not to create a trap-lane situation for drivers in the far northbound left lane.</li> <li>• Removal of the existing northbound right-turn overlap phasing at Airport Park Boulevard/Talmage Road.</li> </ul> <p>The City shall coordinate with the California Department of Transportation regarding improvements to state facilities. The traffic mitigations shall be completed before Costco is issued a certificate of occupancy. The City shall establish a funding mechanism to pay for the cost of the improvements.</p>	
<p><b>Impact 3.10.2:</b> Implementation of the Project would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, pedestrian, or bicycle facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3.10.2a:</b> Provide a concrete pad suitable for future location of bus shelter on the northern frontage of the Project site, adjacent to the proposed sidewalk.</p> <p><b>Measure 3.10.2b:</b> The Project Applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce potential pedestrian impacts associated with the Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install sidewalks along the project frontage on Airport Park Boulevard as identified in the project site plan.</li> <li>• Install high visibility crosswalk markings across driveway entrances to the project including the existing cul-de-sac on the north side of the project to increase visibility of pedestrians.</li> <li>• Install ADA compliant curb ramps at driveway crossings and transition points along the project frontage. Also, ensure that the existing curb ramps at the existing cul-de-sac intersection with Airport Park Boulevard are compliant with current ADA standards.</li> <li>• Provide an adequate pedestrian connection from the street frontage and main parking area to the retail store entrance (per Ordinance 1098).</li> </ul> <p><b>Measure 3.10.2c:</b> The Project Applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce potential bicycle impacts associated with the Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install Class III bike lanes along the Project frontage on Airport Park Boulevard.</li> </ul>	<p>LTS</p>

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Applicant shall comply with Ordinance 1098, Airport Industrial Park Planned Development, requirements to install the required number of bicycle parking spaces (long-term spaces [bicycle lockers or covered parking spaces to reduce exposure to the elements and vandalism] for Project employees and short-term spaces for Project patrons and employees [at a convenient location adjacent to the store's primary entry points]). Bicycle racks should be an appropriate design and installed correctly to ensure proper function.</li> </ul>	
<b>Impact 3.10.3:</b> Implementation of the Project would increase traffic volumes on area roadways under Near-Term conditions. This impact is potentially significant.	Implement Mitigation Measure 3.10.1	SU
<b>Impact 3.10.4:</b> Implementation of the Project would increase traffic volumes on area roadways under Future (2030) conditions. This impact is potentially significant.	Implement Mitigation Measure 3.10.1	SU
<b>Impact 3.10.5:</b> Under Future plus Project conditions, traffic associated with the Project would contribute to inadequate queuing storage at Talmage Road/Airport Park Blvd. and Talmage Road/US 101 Southbound Off-Ramp. This impact is potentially significant.	Implement Mitigation Measure 3.10.1 <b>Measure 3.10.4:</b> In addition to the planned City-constructed left-turn lane on the westbound approach of Airport Road, the City shall construct a left-turn lane on the eastbound Hastings Avenue approach should be installed at South State Street/Hastings Avenue-Airport Road. Implementation of the recommended improvements at Talmage Road/Airport Park Boulevard would result in acceptable operating conditions during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.	SU
<i>Global Climate Change</i>		
<b>Impact 3.11.1:</b> The project could generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted to reduce GHG emissions.	The project shall implement Mitigation Measures 3.2.2a through 3.2.2d.	SU

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Biological Resources</i>		
<b>Impact 3.12.1:</b> Implementation of the proposed Project may adversely impact special-status species.	<p><b>Measure 3.12.1:</b> The following measures shall be implemented to reduce potential impacts on nesting birds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If construction-related activities are to occur during the nesting bird season (February 15 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey of all potential nesting habitats within 30 days prior to the start of activities (grubbing, dirt-moving, mobilization, or other construction-related activities) and within 500 feet of construction activities. If ground-disturbing activities are delayed or suspended for more than 30 days after the pre-construction survey, the site shall be resurveyed. The results of these surveys shall be documented in a technical memorandum that shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game (if nesting birds are documented) and the City of Ukiah.</li> <li>2. If an active nest is found during the preconstruction survey, a no-work buffer of 500 feet will be established unless otherwise approved by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG). The qualified biologist will coordinate with DFG to determine the appropriate nest avoidance, monitoring, and protective measures appropriate for the species and site conditions. In addition to establishment of a no-work buffer, these measures may include daily or spot-check monitoring of the nesting activity as deemed appropriate by DFG.</li> <li>3. If the preconstruction survey indicates that nests are inactive or potential habitat is unoccupied during the construction period, no further mitigation is required. Trees and shrubs that have been determined to be unoccupied by birds or that are located more than 500 feet from active nests may be removed (500 feet is the distance regularly recommended by DFG to prevent impacts to active avian nests).</li> </ol>	LTS
<b>Impact 3.12.2:</b> Implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances for the protection of biological resources.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.12.3:</b> Implementation of the proposed Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact to biological resources.	None required.	LTS

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Population and Housing</i>		
<b>Impact 3.13.1:</b> The Project would not induce substantial population growth or concentration of population in the area, either directly or indirectly.	None required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.13.2:</b> The Project, in conjunction with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable effect related to population, or housing.	None required.	LTS
<i>Cultural Resources</i>		
<b>Impact 3.14.1:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could result in a substantial adverse change to historic resources as defined by CEQA Section 15064.5.	None required.	NI
<b>Impact 3.14.2:</b> Ground-disturbing activities associated with implementation of the proposed project could result in the substantial adverse change of previously unknown archaeological or paleontological resources as defined by CEQA Section 15064.5.	<p><b>Measure 3.14.2:</b> If cultural resources are encountered, all activity in the vicinity of the find shall cease until it can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American representative. Prehistoric archaeological materials might include obsidian and chert flaked- stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (“midden”) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If the archaeologist and Native American representative determine that the resources may be significant, they will notify the City of Ukiah. An appropriate treatment plan for the resources should be developed. The archaeologist shall consult with Native American representatives in determining appropriate treatment for prehistoric or Native American cultural resources.</p> <p>In considering any suggested mitigation proposed by the archaeologist and Native American representative, the City will determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) will be instituted. Work may proceed in other parts of the project area while mitigation for cultural resources is being carried out.</p>	LTS

**Table 1-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact 3.14.3:</b> Ground-disturbing construction associated with implementation of the proposed project could result in damage to previously unidentified human remains.	<b>Measure 3.14.3:</b> If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC. The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent, who will help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.14.4:</b> The Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects to cultural resources.	None required.	LTS
<i>Energy</i>		
<b>Impact 3.15.1:</b> The Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy; conflict with existing energy standards and regulations; or adversely affect local and regional energy resources or require additional supply, the provision of which could have a substantial impact on the environment.	No additional mitigation measures are required to avoid a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.2.2 a and b, and Measures 3.10.2 a, b, and c, would further reduce energy consumption.	LTS



## CHAPTER 2 INTRODUCTION

---

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15089 and 15132, a lead agency must prepare a Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) before approving a project. The purpose of a Final EIR is to provide an opportunity for the lead agency to respond to comments made by the general public and public agencies regarding the project. The City of Ukiah (City) acting as lead agency has prepared this Final EIR, which is based on the Costco Wholesale Project Recirculated Partial Draft EIR (RPDEIR) and referred to herein as the Final Recirculated Partial Environmental Impact Report (Final RPEIR), regarding the Costco Wholesale Project in compliance with CEQA. The Final RPEIR is an informational document intended to disclose to the City and the public the environmental consequences of approving and implementing the Costco Wholesale Project.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15132, this Final RPEIR includes the public and agency comments received on the RPDEIR, responses thereto, and revisions to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). All written comments received during the public review period (February 13 to March 30, 2017) on the RPDEIR are addressed in this Final RPEIR.

The responses in the Final RPEIR clarify, correct, and/or amplify text in the RPDEIR, as appropriate. No text changes to the Draft were made as a result of the public review process. This document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; California Public Resources Code (PRC), Sections 21000–21177).

This Final RPEIR is intended to be a companion to the February 2017 RPDEIR, which is incorporated by reference and bound separately. Given the narrow scope of the RPDEIR, which was prepared in response to the Court of Appeals ruling in *Ukiah Citizens for Safety First v. City of Ukiah* (2016) 248 Cal.App.4th 256, this Final RPEIR focuses on the responses to those comments directly related to the contents of the RPDEIR, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5

### 2.2 BACKGROUND

In accordance with CEQA, the City released a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on November 7, 2011. The purpose of the NOP was to provide notification that an EIR for the project was being prepared and to solicit guidance on the scope and content of the document. The Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse #2011112025) was released on January 30, 2013, for a public review period of 45 days. The City Council of Ukiah certified the Final EIR on December 18, 2013. Following certification of the EIR, the City approved the necessary entitlements for the Project, including

rezoning of the Project Site and a Site Development Permit. The City Council then introduced the first reading of Ordinance 1146, rezoning the Project Site to Retail Commercial. On January 15, 2014, the Ordinance was approved by the City Council. The City of Ukiah Planning Commission approved the Site Development Permit on January 22, 2014. The City Council heard an appeal of the Planning Commission’s action on March 5, 2014, and upheld the approval of the Site Development Permit.

On June 21, 2016, the Court of Appeals ruled that the Final EIR did not adequately address the potential energy impacts of the project (*Ukiah Citizens for Safety First v. City of Ukiah* (2016) 248 Cal.App.4th 256). The City Council of Ukiah subsequently set aside the Final EIR and associated Project approvals on November 16, 2016, and directed that the EIR be revised and recirculated to address the Court of Appeal ruling. As the Court of Appeal Decision upheld all other aspects of the EIR, the RPDEIR document is limited to the Energy Section (section 3.15). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, subdivision (c), the non-energy related sections of the Draft EIR were not recirculated for public review and comment.

## **2.3 CEQA REQUIREMENTS**

Under CEQA, the Lead Agency must prepare and certify a Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prior to approving a proposed project. The contents of a Final EIR are specified in Section 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines, which states that the Final EIR shall consist of:

- a. The Draft EIR or a revision of the Draft.
- b. Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.
- c. A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.
- d. The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.
- e. Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

The Lead Agency must provide each public agency that commented on the Draft EIR with a copy of the Lead Agency’s response to such comments a minimum of 10-days before certifying the Final EIR.

The Final EIR that will be considered for certification by the decision makers of the City of Ukiah will include the following:

- The Draft EIR, dated January 2013
- The Final EIR, dated November 2013
- The RPDEIR, dated February 2017
- The Final RPEIR, dated April 2017

## 2.4 USE OF THE FINAL EIR

The Final EIR allows the public and the City an opportunity to review revisions to the Draft EIR and the Responses to Comments. The Final EIR serves as the environmental document to support approval of the proposed project, either in whole or in part, or one of the alternatives to the project discussed in the Draft EIR.

As required by Section 15090 (a) (1)-(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, a Lead Agency, in certifying a Final EIR, must make the following three determinations:

1. The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA.
2. The Final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the Lead Agency, and the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the Final EIR prior to approving the project.
3. The Final EIR reflects the Lead Agency's independent judgment and analysis.

As required by Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified that identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings (Findings of Fact) for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding supported by substantial evidence in the record. The possible findings are:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Additionally, pursuant to Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, when a Lead Agency approves a project that would result in significant unavoidable impacts that are disclosed in the Final EIR, the agency must state in writing the reasons supporting the action. The Statement of Overriding Considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the Lead Agency's administrative record. The Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations are included in a separate document that will be considered for adoption by the City's decision makers at the time of project approval.

## **2.5 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**

A list of public agencies and individuals commenting on the RPDEIR is included in Chapter 3 in this Final EIR. A total of two comment letters were received from public agencies. Two comments were received from the public.

Responses to comments received appear in Chapter 3 of this Final Recirculated Partial EIR. Each comment letter on the RPDEIR is designated with a letter and presented with brackets indicating how the letter has been divided into individual comments. Each comment is given a binomial with the letter of the comment letter appearing first, followed by the comment number. For example, comments in Letter C are numbered C-1, C-2, C-3, and so on. Immediately following the letter are responses, each with binomials that correspond to the bracketed comments.

## **2.6 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project, presented in Chapter 4 of this Final RPEIR, includes all of the mitigation measures required of the proposed project by the Draft EIR and RPDEIR.

If the City Council chooses to approve the proposed project or one of the alternatives described in the RPDEIR, the Council will be required to adopt the MMRP at the same time it adopts its CEQA Findings, as required by Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code.

## **2.7 OVERVIEW OF THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND REVIEW PROCESS**

The City notified all responsible and trustee agencies and all known interested groups, organizations, and individuals that the RPDEIR was available for review. The following list of actions took place during the preparation, distribution, and review of the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR:

- The Notice of Completion was filed with the State Clearinghouse on February 13, 2017, to start the required 45-day public review period. The City distributed a Notice of Availability (NOA) to interested groups, organizations, and individuals and published a notice in the Ukiah Daily Journal, a newspaper of general circulation.
- Copies of the RPDEIR were available for review on the City's website and at the Planning & Community Development Department, 300 Seminary Avenue, Ukiah, California.

## **CHAPTER 3 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**

---

This chapter contains the comment letters received in response to the Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR (RPDEIR). Each comment letter is designated with a letter, each comment is bracketed, and responses are provided to each comment. CEQA Guidelines section 15088(a) states that “[t]he lead agency shall evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR and shall prepare a written response. The lead agency shall respond to comments that were received during the noticed comment period and any extensions and may respond to late comments.” Additionally, as discussed in Chapter 2 of this Final RPEIR, CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(f)(2) authorizes a lead agency to respond only to comments on the portions of a Draft EIR that were recirculated for additional public review and comment. Consistent with this guidance, the City stated in the RPDEIR that commenters should limit comments to the issues discussed in the RPDEIR.

In this Final RPEIR, the City provides responses to comments made on the RPDEIR. The responses amplify or clarify information provided in the RPDEIR and/or refer the reader to the appropriate place in the document where the requested information can be found. Comments that are not directly related to environmental issues (e.g., opinions on the merits of the project unrelated to its environmental impacts) may either be discussed or noted for the record.

No changes were made to the RPDEIR and minor clarifications/ amplifications do not constitute significant new information under CEQA.

Below is a list of agencies and persons commenting on the RPDEIR.

### **Federal Agencies**

- There were no comments received from federal agencies by the close of the comment review period.

### **State Agencies**

- Katy Sanchez, Associate Environmental Planner, Native American Heritage Commission

### **Local Agencies**

- Adele Phillips, Planner II, County of Mendocino Planning & Building Services

### **Public Comment**

- James F. Houle, Redwood City
- Robert Taylor, Ukiah

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Comment Letter A

**From:** Adele Phillips [<mailto:phillipsa@co.mendocino.ca.us>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 07, 2017 3:36 PM  
**To:** Kevin Thompson  
**Subject:** Referral Response: Costco DEIR

Hello Mr. Thompson,

Mendocino County Department of Planning and Building Services Planning Division has reviewed the Costco Wholesale Project Recirculated Partial Draft EIR, and has no comment.

A-1

Best Regards,

ADELE PHILLIPS, PLANNER II  
County of Mendocino Planning & Building Services  
860 North Bush St.  
Ukiah, CA 95482  
tel. (707) 234-6650

[phillipsa@co.mendocino.ca.us](mailto:phillipsa@co.mendocino.ca.us)  
[www.co.mendocino.ca.us/planning](http://www.co.mendocino.ca.us/planning)

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



## **Response to Comment Letter A**

**Adele Phillips, Planner II  
County of Mendocino Planning & Building Services**

- A-1** The comment letter states that the Mendocino County Department of Planning and Building Services Planning Division has reviewed the RPDEIR and has no comment. This comment is noted, and no response is required.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION  
1550 Harbor Blvd., Suite 100  
West Sacramento, CA 95691  
Phone (916) 373-3710  
Fax (916) 373-5471  
Email: [nahc@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:nahc@nahc.ca.gov)  
Website: <http://www.nahc.ca.gov>  
Twitter: @CA\_NAHC

Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor



Comment Letter B

March 13, 2017

Kevin Thompson  
City of Ukiah  
300 Seminary Ave.  
Ukiah, CA 95482

Re: SCH# 2011112025 Costco Wholesale Project, Mendocino County, California

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)<sup>1</sup>, specifically Public Resources Code section 21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.<sup>2</sup> If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report (EIR) shall be prepared.<sup>3</sup> In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources with the area of project effect (APE).

CEQA was amended in 2014 by Assembly Bill 52. (AB 52).<sup>4</sup> **AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation or a notice of negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015.** AB 52 created a separate category for "tribal cultural resources", that now includes "a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment."<sup>5</sup> Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. Your project may also be subject to **Senate Bill 18 (SB 18)** (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004), Government Code 65352.3, if it also involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space. **Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements.** Additionally, if your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966<sup>6</sup> may also apply.

**Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.**

B-1

Agencies should be aware that AB 52 does not preclude agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Consultation Lists and Sacred Lands File searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: <http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/>. Additional information regarding AB 52 can be found online at [http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation\\_CalEPA.pdf](http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPA.pdf), entitled "Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices".

The NAHC recommends lead agencies consult with all California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources.

A brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC's recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments is also attached.

Please contact me at Email address, [Katy.Sanchez@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:Katy.Sanchez@nahc.ca.gov) or call phone number, (916) 373-3712, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Katy Sanchez  
Associate Environmental Planner

Attachment

<sup>1</sup> Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.  
<sup>2</sup> Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064.5 (b); CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (b)  
<sup>3</sup> Pub. Resources Code § 21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064 subd.(a)(1); CEQA Guidelines § 15064 (a)(1)  
<sup>4</sup> Government Code 65352.3  
<sup>5</sup> Pub. Resources Code § 21074  
<sup>6</sup> Pub. Resources Code § 21084.2  
<sup>7</sup> Pub. Resources Code § 21084.3 (a)  
<sup>8</sup> 154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. § 800 et seq.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## Response to Comment Letter B

### Katy Sanchez, Associate Environmental Planner, Native American Heritage Commission

**B-1** The commenter states that the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report and provides notice regarding the requirements of AB 52 and SB 18. Any project with a notice of preparation or a notice of negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration that is filed on or after July 1, 2015 is required to comply with the requirements of AB 52. SB 18 applies to any project that involves the adoption of a general plan or specific plan amendment, or the designation or proposed designation of open space. The commenter recommends that lead agencies consult with all California Native American tribes that are affiliated with the geographic area of the Project as early as possible to protect tribal cultural resources and urges consultation with NAHC for Native American Tribal Consultation Lists and Sacred Lands File searches.

As the Notice of Preparation for the Project's EIR was filed on November 7, 2011, this predates the requirements of AB 52, and therefore the mandates specified by AB 52 do not apply to the Project. The Project would not involve a general plan or specific plan amendment, nor would it involve the designation or proposed designation of open space. Therefore, requirements set forth by SB 18 would not apply to the Project. Applicable California Native American tribes have been consulted and cultural resources impacts were evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Project. The RPDEIR did not involve any changes to the EIR or Project related to cultural or historic resources. The comment is noted, and no response is required.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

City of Ukiah  
Community Development Dept.  
300 Seminary Avenue  
Ukiah, CA 95482

RECEIVED

MAR 27 2017

CITY OF UKIAH  
BUILDING/PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Subject: COSTCO Wholesale Project: Recirculated Partial Draft EIR

Comment Letter C

March 27, 2017

The following comments are offered to the Recirculated Partial Draft EIR prepared by your consultants DUDEK in February 2017: These comments only pertain to the potential energy impacts of the COSTCO facility proposed for Ukiah. It is this section that has been revised by DUDEK as Section 3.15 to the DEIR.

C-1

The Need for a Refueling Station at the COSTCO Site: 16 vehicle fueling positions are proposed with capacity to expand to 20 positions in the future. There is no need for more vehicle fueling stations in Ukiah:

1. Currently, Ukiah has 14 operating gasoline and diesel fueling stations with 100 fueling positions located between Talmage Road on the south side of town and the north Ukiah on-ramp to the Freeway. Seldom, if ever, is there a waiting line for fuel at any of these 14 stations.
2. Locating another 16 fueling positions at a remote site almost one-half mile from the nearest freeway off-ramp will have two outcomes for our community: (1) force more conveniently located gasoline stations to go out of business, and (2) increase COSTCO profits. There is no requirement that COSTCO stores must have a gasoline station – their stores in San Francisco and in Novato seem to do quite well without selling fuel. Furthermore, the fuel consumed in making this one mile round trip to the gasoline pumps more than equals the saving in fuel costs at COSTCO discount fuel pricing.
3. At the COSTCO stores in Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park, roughly half of all traffic into COSTCO is for gasoline only. If this pattern of use is similar in Ukiah, then we can expect a major increase in traffic on Airport Boulevard. No provision for expansion of the road's handling capacity is being considered. At the very least, a traffic analysis is warranted.

C-2

C-3

C-4

Energy Savings With New High - Efficient Solar Panels has not been investigated: It is over 6 years since the first draft EIR was prepared. The efficiency of solar panels to convert the sun's energy to electric power has increased 50% over those years. The impacts upon energy use in this 148,000 square foot wholesale store would be considerable and should be examined rather than dismissed out of hand as was done in this DEIR.

C-5

Beyond these two comments, many other concerns with the COSTCO proposed warehouse are still unanswered: These must be addressed by the City Council.

Firstly: CALTRANS has not approved the design for the Highway 101 off-ramp. Without their approval, work cannot go forward,

C-6

Secondly: Expansion of the WALMART operation to Superstore status, which was defeated over four years ago for lack of a plan to handle the additional traffic from Highway 101, will most likely be revived once the COSTCO project is approved. No allowance for such an eventuality has been addressed. Therefore another traffic study will be required and additional provisions for the greatly increased traffic demands must be considered.

C-7

Thirdly: No source of finance for the \$6.0 billion needed for the costs of the highway off-ramp expansion and Airport Boulevard has been identified. The City is not able to fund this from their general funds, given current indebtedness and impending payments on bonds taken out more than five years ago for the now-abandoned Redevelopment Program.

C-8

The COSTCO Project remains a poorly planned and carelessly considered attempt by the City Council to increase tax revenues that will only result in the further forcing out of business smaller commercial enterprises along Ukiah's main thoroughfares. Had these implications been seriously considered years ago, much time and money foolishly spent on planning for COSTCO could have been saved.

Sincerely,  
James F. Houle  
7130 Black Bart Trail  
Redwood Valley, CA 95470





## Response to Comment Letter C

James F. Houle

- C-1** The commenter notes that his comments pertain only to the potential energy impacts of the Project as listed in Section 3.15 of the RPDEIR and presents his opinion that Ukiah does not have the need for additional vehicle fueling stations. The comment is noted.
- C-2** The commenter states that Ukiah currently includes 14 gasoline and diesel fueling stations with 100 fueling positions located between Talmage Road in southern Ukiah and the north Ukiah on-ramp to the freeway. The commenter notes that there is rarely a line for use of these stations. The comment is unrelated to the energy evaluation described in the RPDEIR, the comment is noted, and no response is required.
- C-3** The commenter expresses his expectation that the fueling station associated with the Project would drive conveniently located gasoline stations to go out of business, and increase Costco profits. The commenter further notes that Costco stores do not have a requirement to include a gasoline station, and that the fuel consumed to access the Project's fueling station would be close to savings obtained by using the Project's discounted fueling stations. The energy consumption for project-related vehicle trips has been described and analyzed in the RPDEIR (see REDEIR Table 3.15-6, Transportation Fuels, Project Operations). The cost of the fuel sold at the proposed project is not an environmental issue, and no additional response is required.
- C-4** The commenter states his observation that traffic issues around Costco stores in Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park occur due to Costco gasoline stations. The commenter expects that a similar increase in traffic on Airport Boulevard would occur due to the Project's fueling station. The commenter notes that there are no plans for expansion of Airport Boulevard's handling capacity and requests that a traffic analysis be conducted. An analysis of traffic impacts was provided in the Project's Draft EIR, not in the RPDEIR. The comment is unrelated to the energy evaluation and analysis described in the RPDEIR or the adequacy of the RPDEIR. As such, this comment is outside the scope of the RPDEIR and, as noted above, the City does not have an obligation to respond to comments outside the scope of the RPDEIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(f)(2)). No additional response is required.
- C-5** The commenter notes that over the 6 years since the preparation of the DEIR, the efficiency of solar panels has increased by 50%, and states that Project energy savings with these higher-efficiency solar panels was not evaluated. The commenter expresses his opinion that energy use impacts resulting from the Project's warehouse would be considerable and states that these impacts should be examined. The

commenter states that other concerns regarding the Project are left unanswered and requests that these be addressed by the City Council.

Energy consumption at the proposed warehouse is analyzed in the RPDEIR. As no significant impacts were identified, the lead agency cannot mandate the inclusion of solar panels as part of the project to avoid or reduce an impact. The project is wired to accommodate solar panels at such time as they would be a financially beneficial energy source. See RPDEIR page 3.15-20.

- C-6** The commenter states that CALTRANS has not approved the design for the Highway 101 off-ramp and states that work cannot proceed without this approval. The comment is unrelated to the energy evaluation and analysis described in the RPDEIR or the adequacy of the RPDEIR. As such, this comment is outside the scope of the RPDEIR and, as noted above, the City does not have an obligation to respond to comments outside the scope of the RPDEIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(f)(2)). The comment is noted, and no response is required.
- C-7** The commenter states that expansion of the WALMART operation would occur once the Project is approved. The commenter states that the potentiality of this event has not been addressed and requests that another traffic study be prepared and future increased traffic demands be considered. The comment is unrelated to the energy evaluation and analysis described in the RPDEIR or the adequacy of the RPDEIR. As such, this comment is outside the scope of the RPDEIR and, as noted above, the City does not have an obligation to respond to comments outside the scope of the RPDEIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(f)(2)). The comment is noted, and no response is required.
- C-8** The commenter notes that no source of finance for the highway off-ramp expansion and Airport Boulevard has been identified. The commenter expresses their impression that the City would not be able to fund this from its general funds. The comment is unrelated to the energy evaluation and analysis described in the RPDEIR or the adequacy of the RPDEIR. As such, this comment is outside the scope of the RPDEIR and, as noted above, the City does not have an obligation to respond to comments outside the scope of the RPDEIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(f)(2)). The comment is noted, and no response is required.

Comment Letter D

From: Robert Taylor [mailto:boontay@gmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2017 1:13 PM  
To: Kevin Thompson  
Subject: Comments re: Recirculated Partial Draft EIR

To Whom It May Concern,

A good number of the EIR subjects pressed to the fore by a small group of egocentric Costco opponents would almost be comedic were it not for the tragedy implied in the potential loss of a very good business and the many assets it would bring to our community. To be sure, some of the subjects addressed such as fighting, energy use, traffic congestion, and habitat and archeological sensitivities are very worthy of thoughtful attention, and I think they are extremely well addressed in the draft mitigations. If Costco accepts a final version of this plan along with the many extra costs and delays involved in its implementation, I think they will have attained a level of beneficence seldom seen in the corporate world. At the same time, in the area of archeological, cultural and habitat considerations, I see unfortunate openings for future obstructionist tactics. Will every animal bone have to be analyzed? Will a team of the opponents scour every nook and cranny in search of an overlooked bird nest? Will every chip of chert or obsidian, many of which lie unheralded in known locations all over the valley, become the cause célèbre of further lawsuits and delays?

As a lifelong resident of Ukiah, I have witnessed many culturally and environmentally impactful projects, such as the inundation of Coyote Valley, the construction of the freeway, the rise and fall of Masonite, the emergence of the marijuana industry and the Willits bypass, to name a few. For the most part I am thankful that we now live in a time when more public scrutiny is allowed for projects that impact us all in multiple ways. However, this scrutiny needs to be reasonable and carefully considerate of the wishes of the majority. There is no doubt that a Ukiah Costco is desired by a large majority of our citizens, many of whom now regularly drive one-way 60 miles or more to the Santa Rosa Costco, in an energy and pollution inefficient way, not to mention the fact that they spend money, pay taxes and benefit Sonoma County businesses while our local businesses and the community tax base suffer.

At age 70 I've come to wonder, perhaps jokingly, perhaps not, whether I will ever shop at a Ukiah Costco in my lifetime. However, the Willits bypass--also much contested and by many of the same obstructionist minority--finally and thankfully came to fruition; thus I have cause to hope that reason may prevail in this case too, and that our local officials may finally give this deserving project the final green light.

Robert Taylor  
1401 Boonville Road  
Ukiah



D-1

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## Response to Comment Letter D

**Robert Taylor**

**D-1** The commenter discusses general concerns with the long approval process for the proposed project. Commenter further notes the public scrutiny on other projects in the region.

There are no comments specific to the energy analysis or the adequacy of the RPDEIR. As such, this comment is outside the scope of the RPDEIR and, as noted above, the City does not have an obligation to respond to comments outside the scope of the RPDEIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(f)(2)). The comment is noted, and no response is required. The Planning Commission and City Council will consider all public comments when considering action on the proposed project.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## **CHAPTER 4 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

---

### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

Section 15097 of the Guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that, whenever a public agency approves a project based on a Mitigated Negative Declaration or an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the public agency shall establish a mitigation monitoring or reporting program to ensure that all adopted mitigation measures are implemented.

The mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) contained herein is intended to satisfy this requirement of the CEQA Guidelines as it relates to the Costco Wholesale Project (Project). This MMRP is intended to be used by City staff and mitigation monitoring personnel to ensure compliance with mitigation measures during project implementation. Mitigation measures identified in this MMRP were developed in the Draft EIR prepared for the Project. No new mitigation measures were proposed in the RPDEIR, as mitigation measures outlined previously in the Draft EIR would adequately reduce energy impacts.

The Draft EIR for the Project presents a detailed set of mitigation measures required for implementation.

As noted above, the intent of the MMRP is to ensure the effective implementation and enforcement of all adopted mitigation measures. The MMRP will provide for monitoring of construction activities, as necessary, and in the field identification and resolution of environmental concerns.

### **4.2 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

#### **Compliance**

The City of Ukiah will coordinate monitoring activities and document the implementation of mitigation measures. The table below identifies the mitigation measures, the monitoring actions, the implementing entities, the responsible parties for monitoring actions, and the timing of mitigation actions. The entity identified as having implementing responsibility has the primary duty to execute the mitigation measures. The “applicant” shall refer to the entity seeking entitlements for development of the project in the project area. In some instances this may require contracting for specialized consultant services. In instances where the implementing responsibility is shared between the City and construction contractors, the City would be responsible for ensuring that the mitigation requirements are implemented.

### **Field Monitoring of Mitigation Measures**

Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, City staff will be responsible for ensuring compliance with mitigation monitoring applicable to the project design phase.

During construction and following the project, the City's Public Works Department will assign inspectors who will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the mitigation measures. The inspectors will report to the City's Public Works Department and will be thoroughly familiar with the mitigation measures in the MMRP. In addition, the inspectors will be familiar with construction contract requirements, schedules, standard construction practices, and mitigation techniques. The City will be responsible for on-site, day-to-day monitoring of construction activities, reviewing construction plans and equipment staging/access plans to ensure conformance with adopted mitigation measures. The City will also have the authority to enforce mitigation measures by suspending particular construction activities.

Once construction has been completed, the City will monitor the project as necessary.

If any mitigation measures are not being implemented, the City may pursue corrective action. Penalties that may be applied include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) a written notification and request for compliance; (2) withholding of permits; (3) administrative fines; (4) a stop-work order; (5) criminal prosecution and/or administrative fines; (6) forfeiture of security bonds or other guarantees; (7) revocation of permits or other entitlements.

### **Changes to Mitigation Measures**

Any substantive change in the monitoring plan made by City Staff shall be reported in writing to the Planning Division. Modifications to the mitigation may be made by City staff subject to one of the following findings, documented by evidence included in the record:

- a. The mitigation measure included in the Final EIR and MMRP is no longer required because the significant environmental impact identified in the Final EIR has been found not to exist or to occur at a level which makes the impact less than significant as a result of changes in the project, changes in conditions of the environment or other factors.

Or

- b. The modified or substitute mitigation measure to be included in the MMRP provides a quantified level of environmental protection equal to or greater than that afforded by the mitigation included in the Final EIR and the MMRP; and the modified or substitute mitigation measures do not have significant adverse effects on the environment in addition to or greater than those which were considered by the responsible hearing bodies in their decisions on the Final EIR and the proposed project; and the modified or substitute mitigation measures are feasible, and the City through measures included in the MMRP or other City procedures can ensure their implementation.



Findings and related documentation supporting the findings involving modifications to mitigation measures shall be maintained in the project file with the MMRP and shall be made available to the public upon request.

### **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

The table presented on the following pages provides the MMRP for the proposed project. The MMRP identifies the following:

1. an explanation of each impact by issue area, summarized as an impact statement;
2. the full text of the mitigation measure(s) applicable to each impact statement;
3. the method and/or process by which the mitigation measure will be implemented;
4. the timing of implementation of each mitigation measure; and
5. the party responsible for ensuring implementation of each mitigation measure.

Following completion of the monitoring and reporting process, the final monitoring results will be filed with the Project's Environmental Record.

**Table 4-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Sign Off
<i>Aesthetics</i>			
<p><b>Measure 3.1.2:</b> All outdoor light fixtures shall be located, aimed or shielded so as to minimize stray light trespassing across property boundaries. Fixtures shall be full cut-off and nighttime friendly, consistent with LEED goals and Green Globes criteria for light pollution reduction. The project applicant will be required to prepare a photometric plan demonstrating that lighting will not spillover onto adjacent properties. Furthermore, the Project will adhere to all City regulations relating to signage and the shielding of light in order to reduce any potential negative effects from new light sources (per Building Code Sections §3225, §3226, §3227). The revised light plan shall demonstrate an average light level no greater than 4 footcandle (fc) at grade (ground surface), and shall not exceed 10 fc in any location. Light trespass onto adjacent private property shall not exceed 0.2 fc (at the property line). Light trespass onto adjacent public rights of way or private roadway easements shall not exceed 0.2 fc measured at the centerline of the right of way. Pole-mounted parking lot lighting shall be turned off one hour after the store closes. Alternatively, 50% of pole-mounted lighting may be turned off if the City or store operator requests additional security lighting. These standards shall be included in the Project conditions of approval as well as the mitigation monitoring and reporting program.</p>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department</p>	<p>Plan prepared and approved prior to issuance of building permit. Monitoring ongoing during construction.</p>	
<i>Air Quality</i>			
<p><b>Measure 3.2.2a:</b> The Project will incorporate sustainability features in building and site design with the goal of reaching a building efficiency rating that is greater than the Title 24 requirement, in order to reduce energy consumption and associated GHG emissions. As set forth in the "Project Description," the project will incorporate the following sustainability features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking lot light standards are designed to provide even light distribution and use 20% less energy compared to a greater number of fixtures at lower heights. The use of metal halide lamps provide a color corrected white light and a higher level of perceived brightness with less energy than other lamps such as high pressure sodium.</li> <li>• Locally extracted and manufactured building materials will be utilized where feasible.</li> <li>• Pre-manufactured building components, including structural framing and metal panels, are designed to minimize waste during construction.</li> </ul>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department</p>	<p>Plan prepared and approved prior to issuance of building permit. Monitoring ongoing during construction.</p>	

**Table 4-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Sign Off
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-manufactured metal wall panels with insulation are designed to conserve energy by increasing R-value and solar reflectivity. Building heat absorption is reduced by a decrease in the thermal mass of the metal wall when compared to a typical masonry block wall.</li> <li>• Reflective roof material will meet the requirements for the USEPA's Energy Star energy efficiency program. Reflective roofs produce lower heat absorption and thereby lower energy usage during the summer months.</li> <li>• Skylights are used on the roof to reduce the need for interior lighting. A "daylight harvesting" system monitors and adjusts the mechanical and lighting systems in order to conserve energy. The system includes the skylights, light monitors, energy efficient lighting fixtures, and associated control systems. On a typical sunny day, fewer than one third of the interior lights are needed.</li> <li>• Tree plantings to reduce summer heat gain within the parking field.</li> <li>• Planting to incorporate a substantial amount of drought tolerant species.</li> <li>• Irrigation system to incorporate the use of deep root watering bubblers for parking lot shade trees to minimize water usage and ensure that water goes directly to the intended planting areas.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Measure 3.2.2b:</b> The applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce motor vehicle trips and emissions associated with Project operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the use of alternative fueled vehicles (i.e., CNG, electric, etc) for Project operations. The applicant shall implement two or more of the following measures:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Warehouse equipment, including forklifts, will be electric powered.</li> <li>○ Landscaping equipment will be electric powered.</li> <li>○ Applicant/operator owned service or delivery vehicles shall be low or zero emission vehicles.</li> <li>○ Preferred parking for zero emission vehicles.</li> <li>○ Retail fueling station will include a CNG refueling station.</li> <li>○ Customer parking will include a minimum of one (1) electric recharge station.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide commute incentives for employees to utilize alternative transportation, such as carpool/vanpool, transit, cycling, or walking. A Costco carpool and alternative</li> </ul>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department</p>	<p>Plan prepared and approved prior to issuance of building permit. Monitoring ongoing during construction.</p>	

**Table 4-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Sign Off
<p>transportation manager shall be designated to oversee the implementation of these TDM measures. Costco will provide its employees the following incentives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Four carpool parking spaces reserved for Costco employees;</li> <li>○ Bicycle parking as required by City standards;</li> <li>○ Employee locker rooms;</li> <li>○ Rideshare Program, including recognition of rideshare participants at monthly staff meetings and an annual update of rideshare benefits and incentives provided to employees;</li> <li>○ A Rideshare Bulletin Board to be located in the employee breakroom, which will contain information about the Rideshare Program, transit, bike routes, and other alternate commute information;</li> <li>○ A Rideshare Newsletter to be published and posted on the Rideshare Bulletin Board on a quarterly basis;</li> <li>○ Costco employees commuting to work in a rideshare will be eligible for a guaranteed ride home program in the event of an emergency or unexpected situation (such as unscheduled overtime) on the days they rideshare.</li> <li>○ The applicant shall increase transit accessibility. Such measures could include the purchase of transit passes for employees. Also, implement Mitigation Measure 3.10.2a.</li> <li>● The applicant shall improve the pedestrian and bicycle network. Implement Mitigation Measure 3.10.2b and 2c.</li> </ul> <p>If the applicant demonstrates, with substantial evidence that the City finds credible and with which it agrees, that any of the above measures are infeasible, the City may allow fewer than all of the above measures to be implemented for the Project. This exception does not excuse the applicant from complying with at least two of the measures listed above to promote the use of alternative fueled vehicles and equipment.</p>			
<p><b>Measure 3.2.2c:</b> Use low VOC architectural coatings.</p>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department</p>	<p>Plan prepared and approved prior to issuance of building permit. Monitoring ongoing during construction.</p>	

**Table 4-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Sign Off
<i>Geology and Soils</i>			
<p><b>Measure 3.4.1a</b> (For Seismic Ground Shaking) - Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any portion of the Project site, the Project sponsor shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Submit to the City Building Services Division a site-specific, design level geotechnical investigation prepared for each development parcel by a registered geotechnical engineer. The investigation shall comply with all applicable state and local code requirements and:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Include an analysis of the expected ground motions at the site from known active faults using accepted methodologies;</li> <li>b. Determine structural design requirements as prescribed by the most current version of the California Building Code, including applicable City amendments, to ensure that structures can withstand ground accelerations expected from known active faults;</li> <li>c. Determine the final design parameters for walls, foundations, foundation slabs, utilities, roadways, parking lots, sidewalks, and other surrounding related improvements;</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Project plans for foundation design, earthwork, and site preparation shall incorporate all of the mitigations in the site specific investigations.</li> <li>3. The Project structural engineer shall review the site specific investigations, provide any additional necessary mitigation to meet Building Code requirements, and incorporate all applicable mitigations from the investigation in the structural design plans and shall ensure that all structural plans for the Project meet current Building Code requirements.</li> <li>4. A registered City geotechnical engineer or third-party registered engineer retained to review the geotechnical reports shall review each site-specific geotechnical investigation, approve the final report, and require compliance with all geotechnical mitigations contained in the investigation in the plans submitted for the grading, foundation, structural, infrastructure and all other relevant construction permits.</li> <li>5. The City shall review all Project plans for grading, foundations, structural, infrastructure and all other relevant construction permits to ensure compliance with the applicable geotechnical investigation and other applicable Code requirements.</li> </ol>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department, City Building Services Division</p>	<p>Plan prepared and approved prior to issuance of building permit.</p>	

**Table 4-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Sign Off
<p><b>Measure 3.4.1b</b> (For liquefaction and earthquake induced settlement) – Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any portion of the Project site, the Project sponsor shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Submit to the City a site-specific, design level geotechnical investigation prepared for each building site or installed facility location by a registered geotechnical engineer. The investigation shall comply with all applicable state and local code requirements and:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide site specific engineering requirements for mitigation of liquefiable soils;</li> <li>b. Specify liquefaction mitigations that shall use proven methods, generally accepted by registered engineers, to reduce the risk of liquefaction to a less than significant level such as:                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. subsurface soil improvement,</li> <li>ii. deep foundations extending below the liquefiable layers,</li> <li>iii. structural slabs designed to span across areas of non-support,</li> <li>iv. soil cover sufficiently thick over liquefaction soil to bridge liquefaction zones,</li> <li>v. dynamic compaction,</li> <li>vi. compaction grouting,</li> <li>vii. jet grouting,</li> <li>viii. mitigation for liquefaction hazards suggested in the California Geological Survey's Geology (CGS) Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards (CGS Special Publication 117, 1997) including edge containment structures (berms, dikes, sea walls, retaining structures, compacted soil zones), removal or treatment of liquefiable soils, modification of site geometry, lowering the groundwater table, in-situ ground densification, deep foundations, reinforced shallow foundations, and structural design that can withstand predicted displacements.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li>2. The geotechnical investigation shall evaluate these mitigations and identify the most effective and practicable mitigation methods for inclusion in the Project plans. These identified mitigations shall be reviewed to ensure compliance with the CGS Geology Guidelines related to protection of the public safety from liquefaction.</li> <li>3. Project plans for foundation design, earthwork, and site preparation shall incorporate all of the mitigations in the site specific investigations.</li> </ol>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department, City Building Services Division</p>	<p>Plan prepared and approved prior to issuance of building permit.</p>	

**Table 4-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Sign Off
<p>4. The Project structural engineer shall review the site specific investigations, provide any additional necessary mitigation to meet Building Code requirements, and incorporate all applicable mitigations from the investigation in the structural design plans and shall ensure that all structural plans for the Project meet current Building Code requirements.</p> <p>5. A registered City geotechnical engineer or third-party registered engineer retained to review the geotechnical reports shall review each site-specific geotechnical investigation, approve the final report, and require compliance with all geotechnical mitigations contained in the investigation in the plans submitted for the grading, foundation, structural, infrastructure and all other relevant construction permits.</p> <p>6. The City shall review all Project plans for grading, foundations, structural, infrastructure and all other relevant construction permits to ensure compliance with the applicable geotechnical investigation and other applicable Code requirements.</p>			
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>			
<p><b>Measure 3.5.2: Hazards Remediation.</b> If contaminated soil and/or groundwater are encountered or suspected contamination is encountered during Project construction activities, work shall be halted in the area, and the type and extent of the contamination shall be identified in accordance with coordination of the overseeing agency (RWQCB, DTSC, and/or MCEHD). A qualified professional, in consultation with regulatory agencies (RWQCB, DTSC, and/or MCEHD) shall then develop an appropriate method to remediate the contamination, and determine the appropriate disposal method of any contaminated soil and/or groundwater. At this time, the available studies suggest that no contaminated soil or groundwater will be found on site. Nevertheless, this mitigation measure would require remediation procedures in the unlikely event that contamination is encountered. Additionally, if required by an overseeing agency, a remediation plan shall be implemented either before or in conjunction with continued Project construction.</p>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department</p>	<p>During project construction.</p>	

**Table 4-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Sign Off
<i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>			
<p><b>Measure 3.6.2:</b> In the event that construction period dewatering is required, The Project Applicant will coordinate with the City concerning dewatering activities and compliance with the provisions in the permit, such as the effluent limitations in the permit, prior to discharge. The applicant will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit a Report of Waste Discharge and Application for NPDES Permit along with a feasibility study of reuse of the groundwater to the RWQCB.</li> <li>• Discharge flows only upon receipt of the Discharge Authorization Letter from the RWQCB.</li> </ul>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department</p>	<p>Prior to project construction.</p>	
<p><b>Measure 3.6.4:</b> The Applicant shall prepare and submit to the City engineer and the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board for approval a Final Drainage Plan. The Final Drainage Plan shall include design/plan level depiction of the proposed stormwater drainage facilities on site, including the proposed storm drainage system, vegetated swales, and the detention basin. The following measures shall be implemented within the Final Drainage Plan, based on modeled runoff volumes and flow rates specific to with-Project conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant shall design, implement, and maintain a stormwater retention and/or detention feature(s) such that there would be no net increase in project condition peak flows; and/or, with respect to the additional impervious surface area proposed for the project, the [applicant] shall design and implement volume- and/or flow-based Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) as defined in Attachment 4 (pages 5-6) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) small municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) General Permit (Small MS4 General Permit) (SWRCB Order 2003-0005-DWQ).</li> <li>• Prior to implementation, design drawings and any related documents or specifications with respect to these required mitigation measures shall be submitted to the City of Ukiah and the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.</li> </ul>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department</p>	<p>Plan prepared and approved prior to issuance of building permit. Monitoring ongoing during construction.</p>	



**Table 4-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Sign Off
<i>Transportation and Traffic</i>			
<p><b>Measure 3.10.1:</b> Construct Talmage Road Interchange improvements, including the provision of two left-turn lanes on the westbound Talmage Road approach to Airport Park Blvd. The improvements include the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closure of the existing stop-controlled US 101 Southbound Off-Ramp right-turn to westbound Talmage Road</li> <li>• All US 101 Southbound Off-Ramp traffic would be redirected to access Talmage Road via a new full access intersection where the current loop ramp connects with Talmage Road so that all off-ramp traffic would utilize the off-loop ramp.</li> <li>• The existing US 101 Southbound Off-Ramp loop would be reconfigured to a more standard 90-degree angle.</li> <li>• The intersection of the loop ramp with Talmage Road would be controlled by a new traffic signal.</li> <li>• Both the eastbound Talmage Road and northbound US 101 Southbound Off-Ramp right-turn lanes will have right-turn overlap phasing, while the westbound Talmage Road approach would include protected left-turn phasing.</li> <li>• The design would also provide for two left-turn lanes on the westbound Talmage Road approach to Airport Park Boulevard, which should extend the entire distance to the adjacent intersection.</li> <li>• Since the left-turn lanes would extend all the way to the intersection, signs and markings on the off-ramp are provided to direct drivers to the correct lane for their destination.</li> <li>• Intersection markings should be incorporated that provide guidance so as not to create a trap-lane situation for drivers in the far northbound left lane.</li> <li>• Removal of the existing northbound right-turn overlap phasing at Airport Park Boulevard/Talmage Road.</li> </ul> <p>The City shall coordinate with the California Department of Transportation regarding improvements to state facilities. The traffic mitigations shall be completed before Costco is issued a certificate of occupancy. The City shall establish a funding mechanism to pay for the cost of the improvements.</p>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department (in coordination with the City of Ukiah Public Works Department and California Department of Transportation)</p>	<p>The project funding shall be obligated prior to the issuance of a building permit. The interchange improvements shall be substantially completed prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the Project.</p>	

**Table 4-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Sign Off
<p><b>Measure 3.10.2a:</b> Provide a concrete pad suitable for future location of bus shelter on the northern frontage of the Project site, adjacent to the proposed sidewalk.</p>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department and Mendocino Transit Authority</p>	<p>The concrete pad location will be identified on the approved building plan, as determined through coordination between the City and the Mendocino Transit Authority.</p>	
<p><b>Measure 3.10.2b:</b> The Project Applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce potential pedestrian impacts associated with the Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install sidewalks along the project frontage on Airport Park Boulevard as identified in the project site plan.</li> <li>• Install high visibility crosswalk markings across driveway entrances to the project including the existing cul-de-sac on the north side of the project to increase visibility of pedestrians.</li> <li>• Install ADA compliant curb ramps at driveway crossings and transition points along the project frontage. Also, ensure that the existing curb ramps at the existing cul-de-sac intersection with Airport Park Boulevard are compliant with current ADA standards.</li> <li>• Provide an adequate pedestrian connection from the street frontage and main parking area to the retail store entrance (per Ordinance 1098).</li> </ul>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department</p>	<p>Complete prior to certificate of occupancy.</p>	
<p><b>Measure 3.10.2c:</b> The Project Applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce potential bicycle impacts associated with the Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install Class III bike lanes along the Project frontage on Airport Park Boulevard.</li> <li>• The Project Applicant shall comply with Ordinance 1098, Airport Industrial Park Planned Development, requirements to install the required number of bicycle parking spaces (long-term spaces [bicycle lockers or covered parking spaces to reduce exposure to the elements and vandalism] for Project employees and short-term spaces for Project patrons and employees [at a convenient location adjacent to the store's primary entry points]). Bicycle racks should be an appropriate design and installed correctly to ensure proper function.</li> </ul>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department</p>	<p>Complete prior to certificate of occupancy.</p>	

**Table 4-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Sign Off
<p><b>Measure 3.10.4:</b> In addition to the planned left-turn lane on the westbound approach of Airport Road, a left-turn lane on the eastbound Hastings Avenue approach should be installed at South State Street/Hastings Avenue-Airport Road. Implementation of the recommended improvements at Talmage Road/Airport Park Boulevard would result in acceptable operating conditions during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.</p>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department</p>	<p>City shall incorporate improvements into planned improvements at South Street/Hastings. To be completed within five years of Project operation (as measured from certificate of occupancy).</p>	
<i>Biological Resources</i>			
<p><b>Measure 3.12.1:</b> The following measures shall be implemented to reduce potential impacts on nesting birds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If construction-related activities are to occur during the nesting bird season (February 15 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey of all potential nesting habitats within 30 days prior to the start of activities (grubbing, dirt-moving, mobilization, or other construction-related activities) and within 500 feet of construction activities. If ground-disturbing activities are delayed or suspended for more than 30 days after the pre-construction survey, the site shall be resurveyed. The results of these surveys shall be documented in a technical memorandum that shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game (if nesting birds are documented) and the City of Ukiah.</li> <li>2. If an active nest is found during the preconstruction survey, a no-work buffer of 500 feet will be established unless otherwise approved by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG). The qualified biologist will coordinate with DFG to determine the appropriate nest avoidance, monitoring, and protective measures appropriate for the species and site conditions. In addition to establishment of a no-work buffer, these measures may include daily or spot-check monitoring of the nesting activity as deemed appropriate by DFG.</li> <li>3. If the preconstruction survey indicates that nests are inactive or potential habitat is unoccupied during the construction period, no further mitigation is required. Trees and shrubs that have been determined to be unoccupied by birds or that are located more than 500 feet from active nests may be removed (500 feet is the distance regularly recommended by DFG to prevent impacts to active avian nests).</li> </ol>	<p>City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department</p>	<p>30 days prior to construction IF construction begins February 15 through August 31. If active nest is found, monitoring schedule to be determined by the qualified biologist and the California Department of Fish and Game</p>	

**Table 4-1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Timing	Sign Off
<i>Cultural Resources</i>			
<p><b>Measure 3.14.2:</b> If cultural resources are encountered, all activity in the vicinity of the find shall cease until it can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American representative. Prehistoric archaeological materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (“midden”) containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If the archaeologist and Native American representative determine that the resources may be significant, they will notify the City of Ukiah. An appropriate treatment plan for the resources should be developed. The archaeologist shall consult with Native American representatives in determining appropriate treatment for prehistoric or Native American cultural resources.</p> <p>In considering any suggested mitigation proposed by the archaeologist and Native American representative, the City will determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) will be instituted. Work may proceed in other parts of the project area while mitigation for cultural resources is being carried out.</p>			
<p><b>Measure 3.14.3:</b> If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC. The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent, who will help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains.</p>			