|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section I** | **Description Of Project.** |
| **DATE:** January 11, 2022  **CASE#:**  R\_2021-0001 **DATE FILED:**  June 15, 2021 **OWNER/APPLICANT::**  Ghulam Murtaza Ansari  **AGENT:** Whitchurch Engineering  **REQUEST:**  Rezone of a 1.13± acre parcel from the C-1 Limited Commercial Zoning District to C-2 General Commercial District (to create a drive through automatic carwash). **ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** NEGATIVE DECLARATION  **LOCATION:**  1.75± miles south of Ukiah city center, lying west of South State Street (CR 104A) and north of Jefferson Lane (CR 267); located at 1550 S. State St, Ukiah; APN: 003-430-81. **STAFF PLANNER:**  TIA SAR | |
| **Section II** | **Environmental Checklist.** |
| *“Significant effect on the environment” means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change, may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15382).*  *Accompanying this form is a list of discussion statements for all questions, or categories of questions, on the Environmental Checklist (See Section III). This includes explanations of “no” responses.* | |

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

An explanation for all checklist responses is included, and all answers take into account the whole action involved, including off site as well as on-site; cumulative as well as project level; indirect as well as direct; and construction as well as operational impacts. The explanation of each issue identifies (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. In the checklist the following definitions are used:

"**Potentially Significant Impact**" means there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant.

"**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated**" means the incorporation of one or more mitigation measures can reduce the effect from potentially significant to a less than significant level.

“**Less Than Significant Impact”** means that the effect is less than significant and no mitigation is necessary to reduce the impact to a lesser level.

“**No Impact”** means that the effect does not apply to the Project, or clearly will not impact nor be impacted by the Project.

**INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:** This section assesses the potential environmental impacts which may result from the project. Questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and answers are provided based on analysis undertaken.

| **I. AESTHETICS.**  **­Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? |  |  |  |  |

a-c) **No Impact:** The proposed project is not located on a scenic state highway as the only such road in Mendocino County is State Route 128, in addition to visual resources of the Coastal Zone. Thus, there is no potential for the project to damage any scenic resources or have adverse effects on any scenic vistas. Additionally, the project will not require the removal of any natural elements such as trees or rocks, thus there is no impact to those resources. Furthermore, there is no visual character or site quality that would be impacted. The subject property is not located in the Coastal Zone.

| **II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |  |  |  |  |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |  |  |  |  |

a-e) **No Impact:** The Williamson Act (officially the California Land Conservation Act of 1965) is a California law that provides relief of property tax to owners of farmland and open-space land in exchange for a ten year agreement that the land will not be developed or otherwise converted to another use. The proposed project is not located within or near a zoning district intended to be used for farming.

The Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) was established in 1976 in the California Government Code as a designation for lands for which the Assessor’s records as of 1976 demonstrated that the “highest and best use” would be timber production and accessory uses. The proposed project is not located within or near a zoning district intended to be used for timber production. Furthermore, due to the proposed limitation of uses in the Contract Rezone, the harvesting and use of forest products on the subject parcel is prohibited.

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

a-e) **No Impact:** The project was referred to the Mendocino County Air Quality Management District, who did not provide any comment regarding the intended uses. The proposed project to rezone and add a new carwash building does not entail any activity that would create substantial pollution, or damage air quality in any way, thus the project would not conflict with any air quality plan, nor would it violate any air quality standards. Subsequently, there will be no considerable net increase of pollutants due to the project. As all activities will be occurring indoors (24’ x41’ new building), the proposed project would not expose any sensitive receptors to pollution, nor would any objectionable odors be created by the project.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.  Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? |  |  |  |  |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? |  |  |  |  |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? |  |  |  |  |

a-f) **No Impact:** The proposed project will not have an impact on any such resources. The project site is not located near any sensitive habitats, thus there is no potential for any substantial adverse impacts on a sensitive habitat such as a riparian zone, wetland, wildlife corridor, or any form of conservation land. Additionally, there are no conservation plans, policies, or ordinances with which the project conflicts, thus there will be no impacts to such protections. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife fee of $2,598 will be required within five (5) days of the Board of Supervisors meeting.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.**  **Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? |  |  |  |  |

a-d) **No Impact:** Per the County of Mendocino’s 2019 Archaeological Policy, projects that do not include any ground disturbance are not required to have an archaeological survey or review. There is an existing single family residence, convenience store and fueling station on the subject site. The proposed project to rezone for new car wash addition, does not permit ground disturbance beyond what may already be allowed under the current zoning classification, so there is no impact in this regard.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.**  **Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: |  |  |  |  |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |  |  |  |  |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? |  |  |  |  |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? |  |  |  |  |
| iv) Landslides? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? |  |  |  |  |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? |  |  |  |  |

a-e) **No Impact:** The proposed project is not located near any terrain that would expose any people or structures to any substantial adverse geological effect, or that would allow for soil erosion or loss of topsoil. As the proposed project is not located on a fault, the project would not trigger any issues such as a landslide or liquefaction, thus there is no impact in this regard. Furthermore, the soil on which the proposed project is not identified as expansive or incapable of supporting the rezone or the new carwash building, thus these issues are considered to have no impact. As proposed the site already operates as a single family residence, convenience store and fueling station, there are no impacts with regards to soils being incapable of supporting such a new building.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.**  **Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? |  |  |  |  |

a-b) **No Impact:** The proposed project does not entail any activities that would generate any greenhouse gases, thus there is no impact in this regard. There are no identified plans, policies, or regulations that would be violated through any of the project activities, thus there is considered to be no impact.

| **VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? |  |  |  |  |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |  |  |  |  |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |  |  |  |  |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? |  |  |  |  |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? |  |  |  |  |

a-b)**No Impact:** The proposed project does not allow transport, use, storage or disposal of hazardous materials beyond what may already be allowable in the respective zoning district, and therefore there is no impact to potential hazardous materials releases.

c) **No Impact:** The project does not propose or permit any activities that would emit any hazardous emissions or expose people to any hazardous materials thus, there is considered to be no impact in this regard.

d) **No Impact:** The project site has not been identified as a hazardous materials site, thus there will be no significant hazard to the public or the environment in terms of exposure to on-site hazardous materials.

e-f) **No Impact:** The project site is located within Zone 6 of the Airport Influence area. The rezone will not be affected by the airport influenced area designation, but future allowed uses (carwash) will.

g) **No Impact:** There is currently no adopted emergency response plan for the Ukiah Valley. There is an existing gas station onsite, the proposed rezone to allow a new automatic carwash would not foreseeably increase the amount of traffic or road obstruction in the area. The proposed project will not cause interference in the event of a local emergency requiring evacuation.

h) **No Impact:** The project is within a Local Responsibility Area and therefore has not been assigned a fire hazard classification by Cal Fire. The Ukiah Valley Fire District has responsibility for structure and wildland protection, and the firehouse is within five miles of the project area. The proposed rezone project does not allow for construction of structures beyond what is already allowed under the current zoning classifications, so there is no impact in this regard. The proposed future carwash building, will require a fire department clearance, prior to building permit issuance.

| **IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? |  |  |  |  |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? |  |  |  |  |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? |  |  |  |  |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? |  |  |  |  |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? |  |  |  |  |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? |  |  |  |  |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? |  |  |  |  |
| k) Result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters considering water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g. heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash)? |  |  |  |  |
| l) Have a potentially significant impact on groundwater quality? |  |  |  |  |
| m) Impact aquatic, wetland or riparian habitat? |  |  |  |  |

a, f)**No Impact:** The project will not violate any water quality standards or degrade water quality itself as there are no aspects of the proposed project that would affect water quality.

b) **No Impact:** The proposed rezone and future carwash project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Therefore, no negative impact to groundwater supplies is expected. County Staff referred the project to Willow County Water District, on August 5, 2021 and our office received no comments.

c-e) **No Impact:** The proposed project does not entail alterations to any drainage pattern that would result in erosion or siltation of the site or neighboring properties, thus this concern is considered to have no impact.

g-h) **No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within a flood plain, thus there is considered to be no impact in terms of these issues. Additionally, the subject parcel is far enough away from the coastline that no ocean related flooding would occur.

i-j) **No Impact:** The project is not located within a dam inundation zone, tsunami area, or area subject to potential mudflow, thus there are no impacts with regards to these issues.

k-l)**No Impact:** The proposed project does not entail any large water discharging that would result in pollutant discharges or any activities that would significantly impact groundwater quality, thus there is considered no impact in terms of these issues.

m) **No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within or near any aquatic, wetland, or riparian habitats, thus there is no potential for the project to have an impact on these types of environments.

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

a)**No Impact:** The proposed project would not physically divide any established community.

b) **No Impact:** The Ukiah Valley Area Plan (UVAP) was adopted in August of 2011 as a policy document to help guide future development with the Ukiah Valley. The project site is within the UVAP and subject to its guidance, but no conflicts with the UVAP polices were identified.

c) **No Impact:** Habitat and Natural Community Conservation Plans are state and federal programs intended to protect extremely endangered species from anthropogenic impacts.There are no identified Habitat or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the project location, thus there is no possibility for the project to conflict with any such plans.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XI. MINERAL RESOURCES.**  **Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than**  **Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? |  |  |  |  |

a-b)**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located on or within any identified mineral resource lands, thus it will not result in the loss of any available mineral resource.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XII. NOISE.**  **Would the project result in:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? |  |  |  |  |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? |  |  |  |  |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? |  |  |  |  |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |  |  |  |  |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |  |  |  |  |

a-b) **No Impact:** Appendix C of the Mendocino County Zoning Code, Division I lists adopted allowable noise limit standards. These standards and the associated levels, which are not to be exceeded for a sustained period of time, can also be found in the County General Plan through Tables 3-J, 3-K, and 3-L. The proposed project will not exceed these standard noise levels as the proposed uses are not major sources of noise. Additionally, the proposed project will not expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration as there are no nearby businesses or activities to create such a disturbance, nor would the project itself cause any ground vibrations.

c-d) **No Impact:** The proposed project is a rezone, which will have no effect on noise levels. The rezone will allow subsequent construction of an automatic car wash on the site. A single-family residence, convenience store and fueling station already exist on the site and generate traffic and minimal ambient noise associated with these uses. Staff expects the addition of a car wash to work harmoniously with these existing uses and no significant increase to ambient notice is anticipated.

e-f)  **No Impact:** The proposed project is less than 1,000 feet from the Ukiah Municipal Airport and is located within the airport land use plan area. An updated Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan was adopted in May of 2021 for the Ukiah Airport. As part of the plan, noise impacts on the surrounding areas were analyzed using the *Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)* metric. The project site is located within Zone 6 of the revised ACLUP, designated as a *Low Impact* area with regard to noise, with typical exposures below CNEL 55 dB (decibels). The addition of a car wash to the site may expose employees to occasional individual loud events, but not to a level that would constitute a significant impact.

| **XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.**  **Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? |  |  |  |  |

a-c) **No Impact**: As the proposed project does not entail any new homes or housing infrastructure, it is unlikely that direct substantial population growth would occur. The proposed project is located in a developed Commercial zone. No impacts to population and housing will occur due to this project.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: |  |  |  |  |
| Fire protection? |  |  |  |  |
| Police protection? |  |  |  |  |
| Medical Services? |  |  |  |  |
| Schools? |  |  |  |  |
| Parks? |  |  |  |  |
| Other public facilities? |  |  |  |  |

a)**No Impact:** The proposed project does not create any barrier for the delivery of public services.

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

a-b)**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located near state or regional parks and the proposed project does not entail the creation of any recreational spaces and thus it would be unnecessary to expand recreational facilities.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.**  **Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |  |  |  |  |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? |  |  |  |  |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? |  |  |  |  |

a-f)**No Impact:** The Ukiah Valley Area Plan (UVAP) was adopted in August of 2011 as a policy document to help guide future development with the Ukiah Valley. The project site is within the UVAP and subject to its guidance, but no conflicts with the UVAP polices were identified.. The project does not entail any obstructions to emergency access and would not alter any movement patterns, nor increase traffic hazards to others within the surrounding area.

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

a-d) **No Impact:** Per the County of Mendocino’s 2019 Archaeological Policy, projects that do not include any ground disturbance are not required to have an archaeological survey or review. The proposed project to rezone to add a future automatic car wash does not permit ground disturbance beyond what may already be allowed under the current zoning classification, so there is no impact in this regard.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.**  **Would the project:** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |  |  |  |  |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? |  |  |  |  |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? |  |  |  |  |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? |  |  |  |  |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? |  |  |  |  |

a-b) **No Impact:** The proposed project to rezone for an automatic carwash does not exceed wastewater treatment requirements. The project does not entail new water or wastewater treatment facilities that can cause significant environmental effects. The proposed project was referred to Ukiah Valley Sanitation District, on August 10, 2021 our office received no comments.

c) **No Impact:** The project will not have significant environmental impact to storm water runoff or mitigation. County Staff referred the project to Ukiah Valley Sanitation District on August 10, 2021 and our office has received no comments.

d-e) **Less Than Significant Impact:** The project have sufficient water supplies and adequate wastewater capacity to serve the proposed automatic carwash. County Staff referred the proposed project to Willow County Water District on August 5, 2021, and our office has received no comments.

f-g) **No Impact:** The proposed project is located within Ukiah Valley Sanitation District, thus there are no impacts with regard to these issues. The proposed project was referred to Ukiah Valley Sanitation District on August 10, 2021, and our office has received no comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XVIV. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.** | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |  |  |  |  |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? |  |  |  |  |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? |  |  |  |  |

a)**No Impact:**  As noted in previous sections, the proposed project has no impact on the quality of the environment and it would not reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, nor would the project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) **No Impact:**  The site exist of a single family residence, convenience store and fueling station. The proposed project will not create any individual or cumulative impacts on the surrounding area.

c) **No Impact:** Due to the insignificant impacts on the environment, as indicated through this Initial Study, the proposed project would not have an effect on the environment that would have adverse impacts on human beings.

**DETERMINATION:** On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

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

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.
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