

# Executive Summary

---

This document is a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to the City of Ukiah 2040 General Plan EIR (“2040 General Plan EIR”) (SCH #2022050556), analyzing the environmental effects of the City of Ukiah 2026 Reorganization Project (proposed project). This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed project, alternatives to the proposed project, and the environmental impacts and mitigation measures associated with the proposed project.

## Project Synopsis

### Lead Agency and Contact Person

Craig Schlatter, AICP, Director  
 City of Ukiah, Community Development Department  
 300 Seminary Avenue  
 Ukiah, California 95482  
 707-463-6219

### Project Description

This SEIR has been prepared to examine the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. The following is a summary of the full project description, which can be found in Chapter 2, *Project Description*.

The proposed project is located within and adjacent to the City of Ukiah in Mendocino County, California, and includes unincorporated areas within the City’s Sphere of Influence (SOI). The project area consists of multiple geographically distinct areas generally located south, north-northeast, north, and east of the existing city limits. These areas are currently served by the Ukiah Valley Sanitation District, Millview County Water District, and Willow County Water District. Surrounding land uses include a mix of residential, commercial, industrial, public facilities, agricultural uses, and open space.

### *Project Characteristics*

The proposed project consists of two primary components: a Reorganization Component and a Pre-Zone Component.

#### **Reorganization Component**

The Reorganization Component would reorganize jurisdictional and service boundaries within the City’s SOI to improve efficiency and governance of water and wastewater services. Specifically, the project would:

- Annex unincorporated areas currently within the Millview County Water District and detach those same areas from Millview
- Annex areas within the Willow County Water District and detach those areas from Willow
- Annex areas within the Ukiah Valley Sanitation District; once at least 70 percent of the district’s area is within city limits, the City would establish the district as a subsidiary district in accordance with applicable law
- Coordinate with the Pinoleville Rancheria regarding continued service provision without annexation

These actions would be processed in accordance with State law governing jurisdictional boundary changes and would require approval by the Mendocino County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo).

### **Pre-Zone Component**

The Pre-Zone Component would apply City land use designations and zoning to annexed areas at the time of annexation. This component would:

- Maintain consistency with existing County land use designations and zoning
- Not change allowable uses, development intensity, or site development standards
- Include a General Plan amendment to incorporate City land use designations that align with the County General Plan and Ukiah Valley Area Plan

The proposed project would not induce population growth, expand infrastructure capacity, or increase development beyond what is currently allowed under existing County zoning and land use regulations.

## **Project Objectives**

- Promote logical and orderly municipal boundaries consistent with the City's existing SOI
- Improve efficiency and clarity in the provision and governance of water and wastewater services
- Align service areas and jurisdictional boundaries to reduce fragmented governance and unincorporated islands
- Maintain consistency with existing County and City land use policies through pre-zoning
- Implement reorganization actions without inducing growth, expanding infrastructure capacity, or changing development potential

## **Alternatives**

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this SEIR examines alternatives to the proposed project. Studied alternatives include seven alternatives. Based on the alternatives analysis, Alternative 2 is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

- No Project Alternative
- Alternative 1: Valley Oak (Original 2025 Proposed Reorganization)
- Alternative 2: Proposed Project plus Western Parcels and Brush Street Triangle
- Alternative 3: Proposed Project plus Brush Street Triangle
- Alternative 4: Proposed Project plus Western Parcels
- Alternative 5: Proposed Project minus Territory above Lake Mendocino Drive
- Alternative 6: Acorn (Proposed Project minus Territory Above Orr Springs Road)

**No Project Alternative** assumes that the proposed reorganization, annexations, and pre-zoning are not approved. Under this alternative, the City would not modify its SOI, annex lands within the Millview County Water District, Willow County Water District, or Ukiah Valley Sanitation District, or apply City pre-zoning. Existing jurisdictional boundaries, service providers, and County land use and zoning designations would remain unchanged, and no physical development would occur. This alternative would not achieve the project objectives, including improving efficiency and clarity in water and wastewater service provision, reducing fragmented governance, or promoting orderly municipal boundaries.

**Alternative 1 (Valley Oak - Original 2025 Proposed Reorganization)** would include a broader reorganization than the proposed project, including expansion of the City's SOI and more extensive annexation of lands within Millview, Willow, and the Ukiah Valley Sanitation District. Under this alternative, the City would consolidate a larger portion of these service areas and establish subsidiary districts, while maintaining existing land use designations through pre-zoning. No physical development or infrastructure expansion would occur. However, this alternative would extend the City's SOI into areas not identified for

annexation in the General Plan, resulting in reduced consistency with adopted land use policies and increased long-term planning uncertainty.

**Alternative 2 (Proposed Project plus Western Parcels and Brush Street Triangle)** would include the proposed project with the addition of western and eastern areas, including lands outside the City's existing SOI and areas not currently served by public water or wastewater systems. These areas include rural residential and agricultural lands, as well as an unincorporated island and portions of the Brush Street Triangle. No changes to land use designations, development potential, or infrastructure would occur. However, this alternative would expand the City's consideration of service provision into areas with uncertain long-term service conditions and would introduce greater uncertainty related to water supply, wastewater service, and land use planning consistency compared to the proposed project.

**Alternative 3 (Proposed Project plus Brush Street Triangle)** would include the proposed project with the addition of the Brush Street Triangle area located entirely within the City's existing SOI. This alternative would not expand the SOI or modify land use designations, zoning standards, or development potential. No construction or infrastructure expansion would occur. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would create a more contiguous and cohesive planning area, reduce unincorporated islands, and improve service coordination within the existing SOI. Because it meets project objectives while maintaining similar environmental conditions, this alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

**Alternative 4 (Proposed Project plus Western Parcels)** would include the proposed project with the addition of westside areas outside the City's existing SOI, including the Oak Knoll and Doolan Canyon areas and an unincorporated island. These areas consist primarily of rural residential and agricultural uses and are not fully served by public water or wastewater systems. No changes to land use designations, development potential, or infrastructure would occur. However, this alternative would extend the City's SOI into areas not identified for annexation in the General Plan, resulting in reduced consistency with adopted land use policies and increased long-term planning uncertainty.

**Alternative 5 (Proposed project minus territory above Lake Mendocino Drive)** would include a reduced version of the proposed project by excluding parcels located north of the intersection of North State Street and Lake Mendocino Drive. This alternative would reduce the geographic extent of the reorganization area while maintaining the same approach to annexation and pre-zoning. No changes to land use designations, development potential, or infrastructure would occur. While this alternative would achieve many of the project objectives, it would not fully improve boundary continuity or reduce fragmented service areas to the same extent as the proposed project.

**Alternative 6 (Acorn – Proposed project minus territory Above Orr Springs Road)** would further reduce the project area by excluding parcels north of Orr Springs Road. This alternative represents the smallest reorganization area among the action alternatives and would minimize the inclusion of rural and agricultural lands. No changes to land use designations, development potential, or infrastructure would occur. However, this alternative would meet project objectives to a lesser degree by limiting the City's ability to create cohesive boundaries, reduce fragmentation, and improve service coordination.

## Areas of Known Controversy

CEQA requires that an EIR discuss areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency including issues raised by agencies and the public (CEQA Guidelines Section 15123 (b)(2)). Controversial issues related to the proposed project are primarily those related to potential future development, conversion of agricultural resources, and utility provider capabilities. Responses to the Notice of Preparation of a Draft SEIR and input received at the SEIR scoping meeting held by the City are summarized in Chapter 1, *Introduction*.

## Issues to be Resolved

The proposed project would require approval by the City of Ukiah Planning Commission/City Council to adopt a General Plan Amendment and establish pre-zoning for the parcels included within the project area. The City Council would also consider certification of this SEIR, along with the previously certified Ukiah 2040 General Plan EIR and the Mendocino County General Plan EIR, prior to taking action on the proposed reorganization.

## Issues Not Studied in Detail in the SEIR

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163, this SEIR focuses on environmental topics that were not adequately addressed in the previously certified Ukiah 2040 General Plan EIR and that could result in potential impacts associated with the proposed project. Based on the nature of the project, which consists of administrative boundary changes, annexations, and pre-zoning without authorizing development or physical improvements, there is no substantial evidence that significant impacts would occur in the following resource areas beyond those already evaluated in the Ukiah 2040 General Plan EIR: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Wildfire.

## Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table ES-1 summarizes the environmental impacts of the proposed project, proposed mitigation measures, and residual impacts (the impact after application of mitigation, if required). Impacts are categorized as follows:

- **Significant and Unavoidable.** An impact that cannot be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be issued if the project is approved pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** An impact that can be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires findings under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091.
- **Less than Significant.** An impact that may be adverse but does not exceed the identified impact threshold levels and does not require mitigation measures.
- **No Impact.** The proposed project would have no effect on environmental conditions or would reduce existing environmental problems or hazards.

**Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

Environmental Impact	Project Impact Conclusion	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
<b>Agricultural and Forestry Resources</b>			
<b>Impact AG-1 (Threshold 1, 2 and 5).</b> The project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use. The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. The project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.	No Impact	None Required	No Impact
<b>Impact AG-2 (Threshold 3 and 4).</b> The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land; timberland; or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
<b>Impact HYD-1 (Threshold 1 and 5).</b> The project would not include development and would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or conflict with regulatory compliance. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. No impact would occur.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
<b>Impact HYD-2 (Threshold 2).</b> The proposed project would not create an incremental increase in demand for groundwater supplies, nor would it directly interfere with the groundwater table or its recharge. No impact would occur.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
<b>Impact HYD-3 (Threshold 3).</b> The proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the project alignment, alter the course of a stream or river, or add new impervious surfaces. No impact would occur.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
<b>Impact HYD-4 (Threshold 4).</b> The proposed project is not subject to flooding from a tsunami or seiche, and regulations for development within a Federal Emergency Management Agency-designated flood zone would reduce the risk of pollutant release. No impact would occur.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
<b>Land Use and Planning</b>			
<b>Impact LU-1 (Threshold 1).</b> The project would not physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
<b>Impact LU-2 (Threshold 2).</b> The project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No impact would occur.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
<b>Utilities and Service Systems</b>			
<b>Impact UTIL-1 (Threshold 1).</b> The proposed project would not facilitate or authorize development or infrastructure expansion. The project would not increase demand for water, wastewater, electric power, natural gas, telecommunications, or stormwater drainage facilities. No impact would occur.	No Impact	None required	No Impact

Environmental Impact	Project Impact Conclusion	Mitigation Measure(s)	Residual Impact
<b>Impact UTIL-2 (Threshold 2).</b> The proposed project would not facilitate or authorize development or infrastructure expansion. Water demand would remain consistent with existing conditions, and no expansion of water supply infrastructure would be required. No impact would occur.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
<b>Impact UTIL-3 (Threshold 3).</b> The project is administrative in nature and would not authorize development. The proposed project would not increase demand for wastewater treatment or require expansion of wastewater facilities. No impact would occur.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
<b>Impact UTIL-4 (Threshold 4 and 5).</b> The proposed project would not increase the volume of solid waste generated in Ukiah or annexed areas because it would not facilitate or authorize development. The proposed project is administrative in nature and would not result in the generation of construction or operational waste. Therefore, no impact would occur.	No Impact	None required	No Impact