Hillmer Minor Subdivision and Residential Development

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration

MS 1-2021, CDP 7-2021, UP 3-2021

August 2, 2022

Lead Agency
City of Point Arena
451 School Street
Point Arena, California 95468

Lead Agency Contacts
Paul Andersen
City Manager
707-882-2122
cm@pointarena.ca.gov

Scott Perkins
City Planner
707-354-0145
planning@pointarena.ca.gov

Hillmer Minor Subdivision and Residential Development
CEQA Environmental Checklist and Initial Study

Project Title:	Hillmer Minor Subdivision and Residential Development
Lead Agency:	City of Point Arena 451 School Street Point Arena, California 95468
Contact Persons:	Paul Andersen City Manager 707-882-2122 cm@pointarena.ca.gov Scott Perkins City Planner 707-354-0145 planning@pointarena.ca.gov
Project Location:	The project is located at 140 School Street (APN 027-091-14), Point Arena, within Mendocino County in the incorporated city limits of Point Arena. The project is situated on the north side and along School Street/SR1. Additional project components are located on 125 Lake Street (APNs 027-091-29 and 027-091-10), Point Arena. The total project area is approximately 0.60 acres, including both parcels involved. The project has an approximate center point latitude and longitude of 38.912488°, -123.697543°.
Project Sponsor:	David Hillmer Lighthouse Investments Co, LLC 50 California Street, Suite 3550 San Francisco, California 94111 707-367-0985
General Plan Designation:	Urban Residential (UR)
Zoning Designation:	Urban Residential (UR)
Description of Project:	The applicant requests a Minor Subdivision, Coastal Development Permit, and Use Permit to a) subdivide an existing 0.48-acre parcel into two parcels of 0.21 and 0.27 acres each; and b) develop each resulting lot with

	duplexes of two 1,050 SF units. Development will connect to Point Arena Water Works through a proposed easement on adjacent parcels 027-091-27 and 027-091-10, a new encroachment onto School Street / State Route 1 (SR1) which will serve both resulting parcels, and other associated site work as demonstrated on the project plans. See Section 2 below.
Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:	The project is located on School Street / SR1 on the northern side of Point Arena, an incorporated City on the southern Mendocino County coastline. Other parcels on the north side of School Street in the vicinity are developed with residential uses, civic uses (churches and schools), or are vacant. Parcels in the surrounding area vary in size from approximately 0.25 acres to 2.4 acres. South of School Street / SR 1 is mostly undeveloped with steep properties that decline in elevation further south toward Port Road and Arena Creek.
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:	Caltrans will require an Encroachment Permit for the SR1 access. Mendocino County Building Department will review and issue a building permit for construction.
Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?	Yes—notification was sent to Manchester Band of Pomo on February 22, 2022, inviting consultation. No response was received.

1. Introduction

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared in full accordance with the procedural and substantive requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The analysis herein evaluates environmental impacts from the proposed Hillmer Minor Subdivision and Residential Development Project, which would subdivide an existing 0.48-acre parcel into two parcels of 0.21 and 0.27 acres each and develop each resulting lot with duplexes of two 1,050 SF units (hereinafter referred to as the "Project").

1.1 Purpose and Intent

CEQA requires that public agencies document and consider the potential environmental effects of the agency's actions that meet CEQA's definition of a "project." Briefly summarized, a "project" is an action that has the potential to result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment. A project includes the agency's direct activities as well as activities that involve public agency approvals or funding. Guidelines for an agency's implementation of CEQA are found in the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations).

Provided that a project is not exempt from CEQA, the first step in the agency's consideration of its potential environmental effects is the preparation of an Initial Study. The purpose of an Initial Study is to determine whether the project would involve "significant" environmental effects, as defined by CEQA, and to describe feasible mitigation measures that would avoid significant effects or reduce them to a level that is less than significant. If the Initial Study does not identify significant effects, then the agency prepares a Negative Declaration (ND). If the Initial Study notes significant effects but also identifies mitigation measures that would reduce these significant effects to a level that is less than significant, then the agency prepares a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). If a project would involve significant effects that cannot be readily mitigated, then the agency must prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The agency may also decide to proceed directly with the preparation of an EIR without an Initial Study.

The proposed project is a "project" as defined by CEQA and is not exempt from CEQA consideration. The City has determined that the project may potentially have significant environmental effects and therefore would require preparation of an Initial Study. This Initial Study describes the proposed project and its environmental setting, discusses the potential environmental effects of the project, and identifies feasible mitigation measures that would eliminate any potentially significant environmental effects of the project or reduce them to a level that would be less than significant.

This Initial Study is a public information document that describes the proposed project, existing environmental setting at the project site, and potential environmental impacts of construction and operation of the proposed project. It is intended to inform the public and decision-makers of the proposed project's potential environmental impacts and to document the lead agency's compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

This Initial Study concludes that the project would not have potentially significant environmental effects. The project applicant has accepted all the recommended mitigation measures. As a result, the District has prepared an MND and has issued a Notice of Intent to adopt the MND for the project. The time available for public comment on the Initial Study and MND is shown on the Notice of Intent.

1.2 Incorporation by Reference

In accordance with Section 15150 of the State CEQA Guidelines to reduce the size of the report, the following documents are hereby incorporated by reference into this Initial Study and are available for public review at the City of Point Arena.

- City of Point Arena General Plan
- City of Point Arena Municipal Code—Title 17: Subdivisions
- City of Point Arena Municipal Code—Title 18: Zoning
- Point Arena Community Action Plan

1.3 Public Review

In accordance with CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines, the IS/MND prepared for the Hillmer Minor Subdivision and Residential Development Project will be circulated for a 30-day public review period and distributed to interested or involved public agencies, organizations, and private individuals for review. In addition, the IS/MND has been made available for general public review by appointment at the following location:

City of Point Arena
451 School Street
Point Arena, California
Hours: Monday - Thursday
9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

During the public review period, the public will have an opportunity to provide written comments on the information contained within this IS/MND. The City will use the final IS/MND and all comments and correspondence received within the public comment period for all environmental decisions related to the proposed Project.

In reviewing the IS/MND and as articulated in Section 15204(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, affected public agencies and interested members of the public should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing potential impacts on the environment from the proposed Project, and ways in which the significant effects of the Project are proposed to be avoided or mitigated. Pursuant to Section 15204(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, such public agencies and persons should focus on the proposed finding that the Project will not have a

significant effect on the environment. If public agencies or persons believe that the proposed Project may have a significant effect, they should:

- Identify the specific effect;
- Explain why they believe the effect would occur;
- Explain why they believe the effect would be significant; and
- Per Section 105204(c), reviewers should explain the basis for their comments, and should submit data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments.

Comments on the IS/MND should be submitted in writing to:

Paul Andersen
City Manager
PO Box 67
Point Arena, California 95468
cm@pointarena.ca.gov

2. Setting and Project Description

This section provides a characterization of the Hillmer Minor Subdivision and Residential Development Project including the environmental setting and project location.

2.1 Environmental Setting

The City of Point Arena is a small City situated along the coast in southwest Mendocino County (see **Appendix A-1: Location Map**). Point Arena's history is linked to the lumber industry of the late 1800s. Arena Cove was a safe location for ships to anchor, and as a result, a wharf was built to serve ships transporting lumber from the Mendocino coast to San Francisco. The wharf quickly became a shipping location for the lumber industry and consequently the town grew. When Point Arena was incorporated in 1908, its layout and size was similar to today. The mountainous terrain of coastal northern California makes Point Arena relatively isolated from the rest of the county, accessible primarily by coastal State Route 1 (SR1). Although the town has its own post office, schools, and medical services, many services for residents are located in other communities in Mendocino County, such as Mendocino (34 miles north), Gualala (15 miles south), Fort Bragg (45 miles north), and Ukiah (50 miles northeast). Point Arena is the smallest of four incorporated areas of Mendocino County: the others being Ukiah, Willits, and Fort Bragg. Point Arena is also located immediately to the west of the Manchester/Point Arena Rancheria, a community of the Pomo Indian Tribe.

Point Arena is surrounded by coastal prairies and bluffs, riparian hillsides, and working farmlands. Downtown Point Arena lies within a narrow ravine drained by Point Arena Creek at the south end of the town. From the south to the north, Main Street/SR1 ascends a fairly steep

slope approximately 115 feet in elevation. This steep topography creates a clear view of the entire downtown from both the top and bottom of Main Street.

Arena Creek runs adjacent to Port Road from Main Street to Arena Cove, at the base of a north facing slope. The creek is bordered on both sides with riparian vegetation, and inaccessible from the road. The Point Arena General Plan and Zoning Ordinance define a riparian buffer area of a minimum of 100 feet to "protect the resources of the particular habitat area from significant degradation caused by proposed development."

Arena Creek is known habitat for the Point Arena Mountain Beaver (PAMB), which is a federally protected endangered species. The Point Arena General Plan and Zoning Ordinance establish a 500-foot buffer area along each side of the creek for the preservation of the PAMB habitat by minimizing and mitigating disturbances to the PAMB. Any noise-generating or habitat-modifying projects within the buffer area require an environmental survey, and if evidence of beavers is found within the project area, then additional project mitigation or the development of a habitat conservation plan shall be required.

The topographic change within Point Arena creates views toward the coastal bluffs, the ocean, and the inland forests from the downtown. The Point Arena General Plan identifies five viewsheds and scenic corridors that shall be protected from "inappropriate development and unavoidable alterations." These viewsheds are to the south from School Street, along Windy Hollow Road, along and from Riverside Drive, along Port Road, and at Arena Cove.

The Project site is in the geographic center of the City, with frontage on School Street/SR1. The project also utilizes two parcels to the rear of proposed residential development to place utility lines through a 10-foot-wide easement to Lake Street for connection to services. This portion of the City is characterized by moderate density residential development, schools, and open space.

The Project site consists of 0.48-acre parcel on the north side of School Street/SR1 (APN 027-091-14) and the 10-foot-wide easement on the adjacent parcels to the north (APNs 027-091-29 and -10). The Project site has not been previously developed but has been periodically disturbed over time. As is evident through historical imagery, the site appears to have been subject to periodic mowing/weed abatement and occasional vehicular access across the site. The site is at an elevation of approximately 220 feet above sea level with an approximate five percent slope from the front to the back of the property.

Most of the site is vegetated by non-native ripgut brome—mixed herbs meadow. Neighboring properties are vegetated with landscaping, such as cotoneaster, English holy, and mowed lawn. There are no trees present on the property, and sparse bushes are present are present around the periphery of the lot.

2.2 Project Description

The project consists of a minor subdivision and the development of each resulting lot with residential uses (see **Appendix A-2: Site Plan** and **Appendix A-3: Building Elevations**).

Subdivision

The proposed subdivision would divide an existing 0.48-acre parcel into two parcels of 0.21 acres (Lot 1) and 0.27 acres (Lot 2) in a front-back configuration, with the rear parcel consisting of a panhandle to provide access from School Street/SR1 (see **Appendix A-4: Tentative Map**). Lot 1 would have an access and private utility easement over a portion of the panhandle for its access and utility connections. Vehicular access to both parcels would be provided from School Street/SR1.

In order to provide the Project with water service, a 10-foot-wide waterline easement is proposed over two parcels to the rear, connecting the project to Point Arena Water Works utilities in Lake Street. Sewer hookups are proposed with a new service lateral and cleanout within the driveway.

Residential Development

The project proposes to construct a 2,100 SF structure on each of the parcels that result from the subdivision. Each structure would consist of a single-family dwelling and attached "granny unit" to form a duplex. Each of the four proposed units would be 1,050 SF, less than 24 feet in height from finished grade, and contain two bedrooms. The structures would face one another, with the front of the units opening to the center of the Project site.

The duplexes would be identical in size and design. Each structure would include two on-grade decks at the rear of the units and two patios at the front of the units. A tool shed is proposed beyond the terminus of the driveway.

Fencing is proposed around the perimeter of the Project site. Additionally, interior fencing is proposed to create individual yards for each of the four units.

Access to both parcels would be provided from School Street/SR1 via a 24-foot-wide driveway. The Project provides two off-street parking spaces for Lot 1 at the front of the property adjacent to School Street/SR1. Two off-street parking spaces are proposed at the end of the driveway for Lot 2 with a hammerhead turnaround.

As discussed above, water utilities would be provided from Lake Street to the north via a proposed 10-foot-wide easement through two parcels. Sewer service would be provided from School Street/SR1 beneath the proposed driveway.

Site development will require grading, with an anticipated total cut of 224 cubic yards (CY) and fill of 8 CY. To accommodate the grading required for site development, a 73 linear foot (LF) long two-foot-high retaining wall is proposed along the western edge of the driveway.

3. 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	☐ Energy
☒ Geology and Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology and Water Quality	☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☒ Noise	☐ Population and Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☒ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities and Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

4. 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 on 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 on the effects that remain to be addressed.

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

Signature Date

5. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

This section provides an evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Hillmer Minor Subdivision and Residential Development project, as well as the CEQA Mandatory Findings of Significance. A discussion of cumulative impacts is included at the end of this chapter.

The environmental analysis in this section is patterned after the Initial Study Checklist recommended by the State CEQA Guidelines. This checklist has been updated with the revisions of the January 1, 2022, State CEQA Guidelines.

For the evaluation of potential impacts, the questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and an answer is provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. The analysis considers the long-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the development. To each question, there are four possible responses:

- No Impact. The development will not have any measurable impact on the environment.
- Less Than Significant Impact. The development will have the potential for impacting the environment, although this impact will be below established thresholds that are considered to be significant.
- Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. The development will have the potential to generate impacts which may be considered as a significant effect on the environment, although mitigation measures or changes to the development's physical or operational characteristics can reduce these impacts to levels that are less than significant.
- Potentially Significant Impact. The development will have impacts which are considered significant, and additional analysis is required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

The setting discussion under each resource section in this chapter is followed by a discussion of impacts and applicable mitigation measures.

5.1 Aesthetics

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless 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) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			✓	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		✓		

Existing Aesthetics Setting

Scenic vistas are expansive views of highly valued landscapes from publicly accessible viewpoints. Scenic vistas include views of natural features such as topography, water courses, outcrops, and natural vegetation, as well as man-made scenic structures.

There are several Point Arena General Plan policies address the protection of aesthetic resources, including the Scenic Corridors map that depicts view corridors and their orientations. View corridors are mapped from School Street facing south toward Arena Creek, along Port Road facing west toward the ocean, and along Windy Hollow Road facing east toward the ridge.

The General Plan's policies require new development be sited and designed to protect public views, viewsheds, and view corridors, with emphasis on the areas on the Scenic Corridors map.

Aesthetics Impact Discussion

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
Less than significant Impact

The project is located on the east side of School Street / State Route 1 and is backdropped by the rear of residential development on Lake Street to the north. The project is not within a mapped viewshed area, per the General Plan's Opportunities and Constraints map. There is no scenic vista in the view corridor of the project area.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
Less than Significant Impact

Although eligible for listing, SR 1 is not currently listed as a state scenic highway. The only notable scenic resources in the area are from the public right-of-way looking south across the Arena Creek drainage at the bluffs and hillsides beyond. This view is in the opposite direction of the proposed project and would not be impacted by the development.

c) In nonurbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?
Less than Significant Impact

For incorporated cities, the 2022 CEQA Statute and Guidelines defines an "urbanized area" in Section 21071 as having a population of at least 100,000 persons, or being contiguous with another incorporated city which, together, have combined populations of at least 100,000 persons. For the purposes of CEQA, the City of Point Arena is a "nonurbanized area." As such, only the thresholds applicable to nonurbanized areas are applicable for this review.

The only public views proximate to the proposed project are located along SR1 (the public right-of-way), and from Arena Union Elementary School (specifically, the main area within the school property that has views to the project parcel is the baseball/softball field).

The existing public views from SR1 look northerly at the property and are backdropped by existing residential development and vegetation along Lake Street. From the ballfield at Arena Union Middle School, the public view of the project parcel looks southwesterly. An existing fence line between the parcels partially shields the public view. Additionally, the view from the school property is characterized by existing residential development along SR1.

The development project would place four residential units within two structures in the public viewshed from both locations. However, these public views are characterized by existing comparable development, and the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

The Project site is undeveloped and adjacent to existing residential uses. Ambient lighting levels are influenced by current pattern of development and headlights from vehicles. The Project proposes new residential development that would create a new source of light or glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views. Since the proposed development is consistent with the current development patterns in the area, it is unlikely that the Project would create a new source of light or glare that would affect the current ambient lighting levels. **AES-1** will ensure impacts remain less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

AES-1: Prior to issuance of a building permit for the residential units proposed in this Project, the applicant shall submit an exterior lighting plan showing the location of all exterior lights and the manufacturer and type of lighting fixtures proposed. Lights and light fixtures shall be downcast and shielded to prevent offsite light trespass. The exterior lighting plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Manager in conjunction with building permit review.

5.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless 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?				✓

Existing Agricultural and Forestry Setting

The California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) classifies land into Important Farmland Categories, which are based on a combination of technical soil ratings and current land use. Under CEQA, the categories of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and Grazing Land constitute agricultural land.

Based on the most recent available FMMP data, the majority of Point Arena is classified as Grazing Land, with the downtown core and Hay Industrial Park classified as Urban and Built-up Land. A small area encompassing B. Bryan Preserve is classified as Rural Residential Land. The Project site and adjacent areas are classified as Urban Built-up Land.

There are no Williamson Act properties within the City; however, the parcels directly south of the City limits, and parcels north of the City and west of SR1 are under Williamson Act contract.

Under Public Resources Code (PRC) section 12220(g), “Forest land” is land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.

As stated in PRC section 4526, “Timberland” means land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of a commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees.

Under Government Code section 51104(g), "Timberland production zone" or "TPZ" means an area which has been zoned pursuant to Section 51112 or 51113 and is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses, as defined in subdivision (h). With respect to the general plans of cities and counties, "timberland preserve zone" means "timberland production zone." There are no lands within the City designated or zoned for timberland production or other forestry-related uses.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources Impact Discussion

a) Would the project 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?
No Impact

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
No Impact

The Project site is not designated under the FMMP as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance and therefore will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. The existing Urban Residential zoning and General Plan classification does not allow agricultural land uses by-right or with a conditional use permit. The proposed project would establish residential uses consistent with adjacent and nearby residential development. As a result, there are no impacts related to farmland or Williamson Act lands, as the Project would not convert Prime, Unique, or Important Farmland to non-agricultural use, nor would the Project conflict with any Williamson Act contract.

c) Would the project 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))?
No Impact

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
No Impact

The Project is not proposed on lands zoned or designated as timberland and is not forested. Surrounding properties are also not zoned timberland and are not forested. Therefore, the project would have no impact on timberland or forest lands.

e) Would the project 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?
No Impact

See discussion related to 5.2(a) and 5.2(b) above.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

5.3 Air Quality

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		✓		
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			✓	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		✓		
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			✓	

Existing Air Quality Setting

The City of Point Arena is located within the North Coast Air Basin, which includes the counties of Del Norte, Trinity, Humboldt, Mendocino and parts of Sonoma. Air quality within the North Coast Air Basin is influenced by natural geographical and meteorological conditions as well as human activities such as construction and development, operation of vehicles, industry and manufacturing, and other anthropogenic emission sources. The Federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act establish national and state ambient air quality standards. The Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (MCAQMD) is the agency responsible for

enforcing all State, Federal and Local air quality laws and regulations in Mendocino County, including the City of Point Arena.

The District is in attainment (meaning compliant with current standards) for all Federal criteria air pollutants, and most State standards with the exception of PM_{10}. Primary sources of PM_{10} include wood combustion emissions, fugitive dust from construction, automobile emissions, and industry. The MCAQMD has an adopted Particulate Matter (PM) Attainment Plan which includes recommended control measures to reduce future PM levels including alternatives to the use of wood burning stoves/fireplaces, the use of dust control practices during construction operations, and improvement of bicycle facilities to reduce vehicle trips. In addition to criteria air pollutants, the District also identifies areas likely to contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) and sets forth regulations for evaluating the presence of NOA for individual projects.

Air quality emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), ozone precursors (ROG and NOx), and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) from construction and operation are evaluated relative to the adopted air quality thresholds. The MCAQMD utilizes adopted Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) thresholds for construction-related emissions. Operational emission thresholds have been adopted to align with District rules and regulations.

The City of Point Arena's General Plan sets forth policies to maintain and improve air quality in the City. Section 4 of the Health and Safety Element includes policies to ensure development is consistent with the requirements of the MCAQMD, and to preserve Point Arena's high air quality.

Air Quality Impact Discussion

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

As previously stated, the MCAQMD is in attainment for all Federal and State criteria air pollutants with the exception of PM_{10}. The District adopted the Particulate Matter Attainment Plan in January 2005, which includes recommended control measures for PM. Particularly relevant to future residential development of the site is the restriction of woodburning stoves. District Regulation 4.1-400 prohibits the installation of wood burning fireplaces, outdoor boilers, and other wood burning appliances in new residential developments. Additionally, the Plan includes measures to control particulate matter emissions associated with vehicular activities and wind-generated particulate emissions on unpaved roads. **Mitigation Measures AQ-1** and **AQ-2**, consistent with standard conditions of approval, require that future development of the site comply with applicable MCAQMD regulations including the incorporation of dust control measures during construction and the prohibition of woodburning appliances in new residential developments. Therefore, the Project, and future development facilitated by the Project, will have less than significant impacts with mitigation due to a conflict with the regional air quality plan.

b) Would the project 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?
Less than Significant Impact

Air quality emissions associated with future development of the site would result from short-term construction activities and ongoing operation.

Construction Activities

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), which establishes the thresholds for significance for construction-related air quality impacts in Mendocino County, has adopted CEQA significance thresholds and screening protocols for criteria air pollutants. The BAAQMD developed the screening criteria to provide lead agencies and Project applicants with a conservative indication of whether the land use project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. If a project falls below the screening criteria, then the project would not result in the generation of criteria air pollutants and/or precursors that exceed the thresholds of significance, and the lead agency or applicant would not need to perform a detailed air quality assessment of their project's air pollutant emissions. A project would therefore result in a less than significant cumulative impact to air quality from criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions.

For the purpose of this analysis, use of the BAAQMD screening criteria is a conservative metric due to nature and characteristics of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB) when compared to the Mendocino County air basin. BAAQMD screening criteria includes a "single-family" land use type category, which is the most consistent category for this project that proposes two single-family residences on individual lots, with accessory dwelling units connected to each. The BAAQMD screening criteria states that the construction-related impacts associated with the development of less than 114 dwelling units to be below the threshold that requires a detailed air quality assessment of the Project's pollutant emissions. Therefore, construction related increases of any criteria pollutant are less than significant.

Operation

A future residential development on the site would result in both stationary and mobile sources of emissions at operation. Although there would be no new stationary "point sources" created (large emitters such as manufacturing plants), the Project will result in area source emissions from the use of propane gas, consumer products such as solvents, cleaners, and paints, and landscaping maintenance equipment. Most of the operational emissions would result from vehicles traveling to and from the Project site by residents, visitors, delivery vehicles, etc.

The MCAQMD has an adopted Particulate Matter (PM) Attainment Plan which includes recommended control measures to reduce future PM levels associated with residential

operation, including alternatives to the use of wood burning stoves/fireplaces, the use of dust control practices during construction operations, and improvement of bicycle facilities to reduce vehicle trips.

Operation of a future residential development is not expected to result in substantial air quality emissions. Lighting, electricity, water, and wastewater energy related demands would be expected to be minimal as new buildings are subject to Title 24 requirements under the latest building code. With these existing policies in place to limit operational pollutants, impacts related to existing air quality standards are less than significant.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
Less than Significant with Mitigation

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) defines sensitive receptors as children, elderly, individuals with asthma, and other populations who are at a heightened risk of negative health effects resulting from exposure to air pollutants. Sensitive receptor locations may include hospitals, schools, day care centers, residential areas and recreation facilities. Sensitive receptors within close proximity of the Project site which may be exposed to health risks from construction exhaust emissions and dust are Arena Union Elementary School (625 feet west of the site), Pacific Community Charter School (850 feet east of the site), Point Arena High School (950 feet northwest of the site), and existing residences adjacent to the site.

Construction

Construction associated with future development of the site would result in the emission of exhaust from vehicles and heavy-duty equipment as well as the generation of fugitive dust from grading and ground disturbing activities. To ensure that fugitive dust emissions are reduced to levels below significance, **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** shall be implemented. With implementation of **AQ-1**, impacts to sensitive receptors during construction will be reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

Operation

At operation, a residential development will not generate air quality emissions that affect sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the site. Potential impacts to sensitive receptors at operation of the Project will be less than significant, as residential projects do not generate air quality emissions that would result in health impacts.

Air Quality Land Use Compatibility

The proposed Project has the potential to expose new residents onsite to Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) consisting of fine particulate matter from mobile sources (i.e., vehicles) and stationary source emitters in the vicinity. New residents would potentially be exposed to emissions associated with traffic along SR1; however, the roadway presently runs adjacent to

existing residential, and school uses. SR1 has not posed any impacts to existing sensitive receptors located at comparable distances to the proposed Project, and impacts are expected to be less than significant.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?
Less than Significant Impact

Occasional localized odors during future site development associated with construction equipment, paving and the application of architectural coatings may occur during development. Any odors generated during construction would be temporary and not likely noticeable beyond the immediate construction zone. Operation of the Project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, the Project will have less than significant impacts to air quality due to objectionable odors.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-1: Future development of the site shall comply with the following mitigation measures set forth by the Mendocino County Air Quality Management District to control for fugitive dust generated during construction activities:

1. All visibly dry disturbed soil and road surfaces shall be watered to minimize fugitive dust emissions.
2. Earth or other material tracked onto neighboring paved roads shall be removed promptly.
3. Approved chemical soil stabilizers shall be applied to exposed earth surfaces in inactive construction areas and exposed stockpiles (i.e., sand, gravel, dirt).
4. Dust generating activities shall be limited during periods of high winds (over 15 mph).
5. Access of unauthorized vehicles onto the construction site during non-working hours shall be prevented.
6. A daily log shall be kept of fugitive dust control activities.

AQ-2: Future development of the site shall comply with Regulation 4, Rule 4.1-400 of the MCAQMD related to prohibitions on woodburning, including the following:

1. 4.1-400(a) No person shall install an open wood burning fireplace in any new residential, commercial, or public building or accessory building, or as part of a renovation of any residential, commercial, or public building or accessory building.
2. 4.1-400(b) No person shall install a wood-fired outdoor boiler to provide heat for any residential, commercial, or public building or accessory building.
3. 4.1-400(c) No person shall install wood burning appliances in any new, remodeled or renovated multi- family residence, commercial or public building or accessory building, except as a replacement for an existing wood burning appliance.

4. 4.1-400(d) No person shall install wood burning appliances in any new or remodeled residential dwelling of three units or less, or any accessory building, that is not an approved device as defined in Rule 4.1-140(a3).
5. 4.1-400(f) No person shall install any wood burning appliances in any residential dwelling or accessory building that is included as part of a major subdivision, which filed a tentative map after the effective date of this regulation.

5.4 Biological Resources

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			✓	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			✓	
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?				✓

Existing Biological Resources Setting

Biological resources are protected by statute including the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA), the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), and the Clean Water Act (CWA). The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) affords protection to migratory bird species including birds of prey. These regulations provide the legal protection for identified plant and animal species of concern and their habitat. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) provides an inventory of the status and location of rare plant and animal species in California.

The City's General Plan includes policies within the Open Space and Conservation Element aimed at protecting natural resources. These policies require the protection of environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHAs) and aim to enhance wildlife habitats. Open Space and Conservation Element Policy 14 establishes a 500-foot riparian setback area from the centerline of Arena Creek for the protection of Point Arena Mountain Beaver (PAMB). Within this setback area, the Zoning Ordinance requires surveys by a qualified biologist for signs of PAMB, and mitigation measures to be implemented limiting development activities and noise-generating construction activities proximate to identified habitat during the December 15 through June 15 breeding season.

In addition to PAMB, ESHAs are protected in the California Coastal Zone by implementation of City Zoning Code Section 18.25.220. Development in or adjacent to ESHA are required to meet the standards outlined in that section, notably a requirement that most development be prohibited within 100 feet of ESHA. ESHA buffers may be reduced to 50 feet after consultation with California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) that 100 feet is not necessary to protect the resource or habitat.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) identifies geographic areas that contain features essential for the conservation of threatened or endangered species. A search of the USFWS critical habitat map indicates critical habitat for California red-legged frog.

Biological Resources Impact Discussion

a) Would the project 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?
Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

Nicole Herrera of Wynn Coastal Planning and Biology drafted a Biological Scoping Survey of the property, dated December 13, 2021, and revised January 22, 2022. The report inventoried the site for special status species and includes a complete list of plant species along with habitat and plant community characteristics (see **Appendix A-5: Plant Communities**). Per the report, the majority of vegetation within the Project area is comprised of non-native ripgut brome. Other species present include California brome, California blackberry, periwinkle, subterranean clover, sweet vernal grass, velvet grass, spring vetch, naked ladies, prickly sow-thistle, purple-awned wallaby grass, English plantain, rattlesnake grass, hairy cats' ear, rough hedgenettle, and coyote brush.

Both native and non-native ornamental plantings were also observed planted around the property including wavy leaf ceanothus, Dolgo crabapple, coconut geranium, glossy abelia, and fruit trees. A large patch dominated by common sheep sorrel was present in the middle of the non-native grassland on the parcel to the north where the water easement is proposed.

The National Wetland Inventory was consulted and showed no mapped wetlands within the study area. Ground surveys confirmed that no wetland features are present in the study area.

The biological scoping survey concluded that the project as proposed would not result in a significant negative impact to any special status resources. The report did recommend a collection of mitigation measures to minimize impacts to species that may be seasonally or temporarily present within the study area, including nesting birds and special status amphibians. These are included as **Mitigation Measures BIO-1** and **BIO-2**. The biological scoping survey and its recommendations were referred to CDFW for review and comment, and no response was received.

The provided biological survey did not specifically review the property for potential PAMB habitat. On February 23, 2022, the project was referred to USFWS for comment. USFWS Fish and Wildlife Biologist Gregory Schmidt visited the Project site to determine the potential for impacts to PAMB. He concluded that the entire parcel and all adjacent parcels are unsuitable for PAMB. He stated that his conclusion is valid for five years from his March 11, 2022, assessment, and that if construction is not completed by March 11, 2027, to consult with USFWS for further PAMB technical assistance. **Mitigation Measure BIO-3** is included to require further consultation in the event that construction is not completed by that date.

The proposed mitigation measures will reduce the limited potential for impacts to special status species to a less than significant level.

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
Less than Significant Impact

c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
Less than Significant Impact

The biological survey did not identify any riparian habitats, sensitive vegetation alliances, or wetlands on the Project site. Although there's no known resources of these types in the Project area, development of the residents will be required to implement best management practices for erosion and sediment control to ensure material does not leave the site and enter any nearby waterways. Impacts will be less than significant.

d) Would the project 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?
Less than Significant Impact

There is no evidence of migratory wildlife corridors or nurseries onsite or in the Project vicinity. The total Project site consists of 0.48 undeveloped acres, and the residential development to result from the Project would consist of four units and is unlikely to create a barrier for wildlife passage at that density.

SR1 is adjacent to the Project site to the south and creates an existing barrier for wildlife passage. Open areas are present to the further to the south, allowing for the ongoing passage of wildlife around the parcel, should future development of the site somehow restrict wildlife movements. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

The City's General Plan includes policies that address the removal of trees for the protection of viewsheds. Additionally, the Zoning Ordinance includes Section 17.03.060 requires that "existing trees shall be preserved in all subdivisions where feasible." Zoning Code Section 18.25.140 includes additional landscaping and screening regulations.

The project does not propose to remove any trees and would be consistent with existing City policies related to tree preservation.

With adherence to the mitigation measures discussed in this section, the project would also be consistent with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources. With these mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?
No Impact

Mendocino County does not have any California Regional Conservation Plans, as identified in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) Map. Additionally, there are no other regional or locally adopted conservation plans applicable to the City. Therefore, no impacts resulting from a conflict with an adopted conservation plan will occur from the Project or from future development facilitated by the Project.

Mitigation Measures

BIO-1: Construction in the study area has the potential to disturb birds during the nesting season. Removal of vegetation and construction activity near trees and vegetated areas has the potential to disturb birds' nesting process.

1. Avoidance Measure: Seasonal Avoidance

No nesting bird surveys are recommended if activity occurs in the non-breeding season (September to January). If development is to occur during the breeding season (February to August), a pre-construction survey is recommended within 14 days of the onset of construction to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during development.

2. Avoidance Measure: Nest Avoidance

If active special status bird nests are observed, no ground disturbance activities shall occur within a 100-foot exclusion zone. These exclusion zones may vary depending on species, habitat, and level of disturbance. The exclusion zone shall remain in place around the active nest until all young are no longer dependent upon the nest. A biologist should monitor the nest site weekly during the breeding season to ensure the buffer is sufficient to protect the nest site from potential disturbance.

3. Avoidance Measure: Construction activities only during daylight hours

Construction should occur during daylight hours to limit disturbing construction noise and minimize artificial lights.

BIO-2: Construction activities will involve walking across areas where amphibians may be traveling. Staging of materials and removal of construction debris could also disturb special status amphibians that may be hiding underneath these materials. To minimize impacts to amphibians, the following avoidance measures should be followed.

1. Avoidance Measure: Contractor education

Within two weeks prior to construction activities, project contractors will be trained by a qualified biologist in the identification of the frogs and salamanders that occur along the Mendocino County coast. Workers will be trained to differentiate between special status and common species and instructed on actions and communications required to be conducted if special status amphibians are observed during construction.

2. Avoidance Measure: Pre-construction search

During ground disturbing activities, construction crews will begin each day with a visual search around the staging and impact area to detect the presence of amphibians.

3. Avoidance Measure: Careful debris removal

During construction and debris removal, any wood stockpiles should be moved carefully by hand in order to avoid accidental crushing or other damage to amphibians.

4. Avoidance Measure: No construction during rain event

If a rain event occurs during the ground disturbance period, all ground disturbing activities will cease for a period of 48 hours, starting after the rain stops.

Prior to resuming construction activities, trained construction crew member(s) will examine the site for the presence of special status amphibians.

If no special status amphibians are found during inspections, ground-disturbing activities may resume.

If a special status amphibian is detected, construction crews will stop all ground disturbing work and will contact the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or a qualified biologist. Clearance from CDFW will then be needed prior to reinitiating work. CDFW will need to be consulted and will need to agree with protective measures needed for any potential special status amphibians.

BIO-3: If construction is not completed prior to March 11, 2027, construction activities shall cease until such time that the City of Point Arena consults with USFWS for technical assistance regarding the protection of PAMB. Construction may resume following either

a USFWS statement that the Project site remains unsuitable for PAMB habitat, or a plan is in place, acceptable to USFWS, to mitigate impacts to PAMB if habitat is present.

For the purposes of this mitigation measure, "construction" shall include grading of the site, installation of the driveway, or construction of the residential buildings. "Completed" shall mean completion of a final inspection by the Mendocino County Building Department.

5.5 Cultural Resources

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		✓		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		✓		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?		✓		

Existing Cultural Resources Setting

The first regional inhabitants of Point Arena area were the Bokeya Pomo. Their village, Pda'hau, was near the mouth of the Garcia River. Like other California Indians, the Bokeya were primarily self-sufficient, drawing from plentiful resources of the ocean, rivers, forests, and coastal shelf.

In 1542, Spaniards arrived and named the headland Cabo de Fortunas (Cape of Fortune), in recognition of their difficult journey. The cape was renamed to Punta Delgado ("narrow point") in 1775 and later the area was called Punta Barra de Arena (i.e., "sandbar point") and finally Point Arena (literally "sand point"). Point Arena itself is a narrow peninsula jutting approximately 800 meters into the Pacific Ocean.

The Point served as a prominent navigational site. The first wharf was built in 1866 and made Point Arena the "busiest town between San Francisco and Eureka," producing 200,000 board feet of redwood lumber a day and serving as the main Mendocino coast shipping port for agricultural products. As more timber was shipped south, Point Arena became known for not just its wharf but also its dangerous coastline for ships.

Because of the increased number of shipwrecks, the U.S government issued an order in 1866 for a lighthouse to be constructed on the point at Point Arena.

Much of Point Arena, including its original lighthouse, was leveled in the 1906 San Francisco earthquake. After the earthquake, Point Arena – including its lighthouse – was rapidly rebuilt and became home to the region's ranch hands, foresters, and fishermen.

The first lumber mill was built in 1870 along the Garcia River, about 5 miles east of the city of Point Arena. A flume was constructed that used water and gravity to move the timber to port.

Point Arena incorporated on July 3, 1908, inspired by a controversy over whether Point Arena would sell alcohol or go "dry." The town had 14 liquor licenses and wanted to protect them in case Mendocino County went dry. By becoming a city, Point Arena could regulate and issue its own liquor licenses, as well as collect a larger share of the local taxes instead of relying on the county to share its revenue.

In 1927, fire destroyed most of the town's structures. The fire forced local business owners to respond to economic changes. Lumber mills and ranches were going out of business. Tourists were arriving. Buildings that served the old economy (hotels for mill workers, blacksmith shops, saloons) were replaced by buildings to serve the new economy (gas stations and a movie theater). Most of the buildings in the commercial district were constructed in 1927 and 1928.

In January 1983, storm waves battered Arena Cove, destroying the pier and fish house and severely damaging the historic boat house and cafe. In 1987, a rebuilt steel and concrete pier 322 feet long with a boat hoist opened.

Cultural Resources Impact Discussion

a) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?
Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

b) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?
Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

c) Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?
Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

Due to an absence of buildings and structures on the Project site, there is no potential for the Project to impact historic buildings or structures.

A records search was conducted at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) on March 10, 2022 (File No. 21-1379) to identify historical and archaeological resources within one-half mile of the Project area. The search identified a cultural resource study conducted in 2017 and noted that the Project area contains a recorded archaeological resource. It did note that the proposed Project area has a low possibility of containing additional, unrecorded archaeological sites.

The survey referenced in the NWIC records search is an Archaeological Survey of Two Parcels in Point Arena in Mendocino County, California by Thad Van Bueren, dated December 16, 2017. As noted in the NWIC search, the survey identified an archaeological resource on the Project site, and recommended options for mitigating impacts to the resource. These options include complete avoidance of the sensitive area or conducting further evaluation of the resource to determine the extent of its value.

On September 11, 2018, Sonoma State University's Anthropological Studies Center reviewed the previous archaeological survey and performed a follow-up non-invasive archaeological investigation of the Project area to provide further assessment of archaeological sensitivity and guidance on proposed construction. This investigation involved the use of ground-penetrating radar to further evaluate the site. The results of the investigation concluded that the area identified in the 2017 study as "archaeologically sensitive" be revised, and that there are no indications of the resources previously thought to be present.

The investigation did identify "at least one, and possibly two, wells on the property." As a result, Sonoma State's Anthropological Studies Center recommends the wells be avoided during construction, which would require a 15-foot radius around each well where disturbance should be limited to less than 20 inches in depth. The two wells identified are outside of the footprint of proposed development, so impacts on these resources would be less than significant.

The investigation also recommended protocols to follow if archaeological materials or features are exposed during construction activities. Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is included to ensure the project is consistent with this recommendation and to limit impacts to a less than significant level.

Additionally, the Manchester Band of Pomo were invited to consult on this project via letter dated February 22, 2022. The Manchester Band of Pomo did not respond to the request for comments.

Mitigation Measures

CUL-1: In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are encountered during Project implementation such resources shall be avoided, including altering the materials and their stratigraphic context. A qualified professional archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the find. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. Prehistoric resources include, but are not limited to, chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points, mortars, pestles, and dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-

affected rock, or human burials. Historic resources include stone or abode foundations or walls, structures and remains with square nails, and refuse deposits or bottle dumps, often located in old wells or privies.

In the event that human remains are encountered, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovered remains and the Mendocino County Medical Examiner, the Sheriff-Coroner, and a qualified archaeologist must be notified immediately to evaluate the remains. If the remains are deemed to be Native American and prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted by the Coroner so that a "Most Likely Descendant" can be designated and further recommendations regarding treatment of the remains can be provided.

5.6 Energy

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?			✓	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			✓	

Existing Energy Setting

Energy resources include electricity, natural gas, and other fuels. The production of electricity requires the consumption or conversion of energy resources, including water, wind, oil, gas, coal, solar, geothermal, and nuclear resources, into energy. Energy production and use result in the depletion of nonrenewable resources such as oil, natural gas, and coal, as well as the emission of pollutants. Energy usage is typically quantified using the British Thermal Unit (BTU). The BTU is the amount of energy required to raise the temperature of one pound of water by one-degree Fahrenheit. The approximate amount of energy contained in a gallon of gasoline, 100 cubic feet (one therm) of natural gas, and a kilowatt hour of electricity is 123,000 BTUs, 100,000 BTUs, and 3,400 BTUs, respectively.

Electricity

The production of electricity requires the consumption or conversion of energy resources, including water, wind, oil, gas, coal, solar, geothermal, and nuclear resources, into energy. The delivery of electricity involves several system components, including substations and transformers that lower transmission line power (voltage) to a level appropriate for on-site distribution and use. Electricity generated is distributed through a network of transmission and distribution lines commonly called a power grid.

Energy capacity, or electrical power, is generally measured in watts while energy use is measured in watt-hours. For example, if a light bulb has a capacity rating of 100 watts, the energy required to keep the bulb on for 1 hour would be 100 watt-hours. If ten 100-watt bulbs were on for 1 hour, the energy required would be 1,000 watt-hours or 1 kilowatt-hour (kWh). On a utility scale, a generator's capacity is typically rated in megawatts, which is one million watts, while energy usage is measured in megawatt-hours (one million-watt hours) or gigawatt-hours (GWh), which is one billion watt-hours.

California Energy Consumption

According to the California Energy Commission (CEC), total system electric generation for California in 2018 was 285,488 gigawatt-hours (GWh). California's non-CO_2 emitting electric generation categories (nuclear, large hydroelectric, and renewable generation) accounted for more than 53 percent of total in-state generation for 2018. California's in-state electric generation was 194,842 GWh and electricity imports were 90,648 GWh.

According to the CEC, nearly 45 percent of the natural gas burned in California was used for electricity generation, with the remainder consumed in the residential (21 percent), industrial (25 percent), and commercial (9 percent) sectors. In 2012, total natural gas demand in California for industrial, residential, commercial, natural gas vehicles, and electric power generation was 2,313 billion cubic feet.

According to the CEC, gasoline has remained the dominant fuel within the transportation sector, with diesel fuel and aviation fuels following. In 2016, California consumed approximately 15 billion gallons of gasoline and approximately 3.35 billion gallons of diesel fuel. An increasing amount of electricity is being used for transportation energy, which is attributed to light-duty plug-in electric vehicles. In 2016, transportation in California, consisting of light-duty vehicles, medium/heavy-duty vehicles, trolleys, and rail transit, consumed approximately 1.53 million megawatt hours (MWh).

Sonoma Clean Power

Sonoma Clean Power is a program that allows businesses and residents in Mendocino and Sonoma Counties to purchase energy created from renewable resources, including geothermal, solar, wind, water, and biomass. This service provides energy through alternative generation processes while using existing infrastructure through PG&E for delivery. By using existing delivery infrastructure, Sonoma Clean Power is billed to customers through PG&E for providing

electric generation service. In 2016, 88% of eligible customers were receiving electricity from Sonoma Clean Power. As of 2018 Sonoma Clean Power had 39% fewer greenhouse gas emissions as compared to PG&E.

Point Arena General Plan

Future development that would be facilitated by the Project is subject to goals, policies, and implementation measures set forth in the Point Arena General Plan which seek to reduce energy consumption. The following are particularly relevant to the conceptualized residential development that would be facilitated by the proposed Project.

- Encourage, through zoning, the construction of new housing within or close to the downtown core area to reduce the need for long extension of utilities and to reduce commuting time.
- Encourage, through zoning, the development of new houses in clusters or attached structures to reduce use of land and materials.
- Encourage, through code provisions and requirements, the use of solar energy systems and water-saving devices.
- Identify and help educate residents about the availability of consumer programs, such as PG&E services, to assist seniors and income-eligible customers with replacement or repair of older appliances.

Energy Impact Discussion

(a) Would the Project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?
Less Than Significant Impact

Future development of the site would involve the use of energy during construction and at operation.

Construction Activities

Future residential development of the site would involve construction activities including site preparation, grading, paving, and building construction which would consume energy in the form of gasoline and diesel fuel through the operation of heavy off-road equipment, trucks, and worker trips to and from the site. There are no unusual project characteristics that would need construction equipment or practices that would be less energy efficient than at comparable construction sites in the region or state. Construction activity would be temporary and fuel consumption associated with construction activities would cease once construction is completed. Furthermore, various equipment would be supplied by onsite generators, and would not require permanent connections to or otherwise burden local utilities. Due to the temporary nature of construction activities, the fuel and energy needed during construction

would not be considered a wasteful or inefficient use of energy. Therefore, it is expected that construction energy consumption associated with the Project would be comparable to other similar construction projects, and would therefore not be inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary

Operation

Long-term operational energy use from a residential development would include electricity consumption associated with new buildings (e.g., lighting, electronics, heating, air conditioning, refrigeration), energy consumption related to water usage and solid waste disposal, and fuel consumption (gasoline and diesel) from the generation of new vehicle trips.

While the long-term operation of future development at the site would result in an increase in energy consumption compared to existing conditions, the Project would be required to incorporate design measures related to electricity and water use in compliance with Title 24, and all applicable requirements of the City of Point Arena to minimize energy consumption. Furthermore, Sonoma Clean Power is the default provider in the City of Point Arena and would provide clean energy from renewable resources. As such, the proposed Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy and impacts would be less than significant.

(b) Would the Project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?
Less than Significant Impact

The City of Point Arena does not currently have a locally adopted plan addressing renewable energy and energy efficiency.

In December 2007, the CEC prepared the State Alternative Fuels Plan in partnership with the CARB and in consultation with the other state, federal, and local agencies. The plan presents strategies and actions California must take to increase the use of alternative non-petroleum fuels in a manner that minimizes costs to California and maximizes the economic benefits of in-state production. The plan assessed various alternative fuels and developed fuel portfolios to meet California's goals to reduce petroleum consumption, increase alternative fuels use, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and increase in-state production of biofuels without causing a significant degradation of public health and environmental quality. Future development of the site as a residential use would require installation of energy conservation features in compliance with CalGreen and California Energy codes. As such, the proposed Project, and future development facilitated by the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the State Alternative Fuels Plan and impacts would be less than significant.

5.7 Geology and Soils

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? 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, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.			✓	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				✓

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		✓		

Existing Geology and Soils Setting

Mendocino County is located within the California Coast Range geomorphic province. This province is a geologically complex and seismically active region characterized by sub-parallel northwest-trending faults, mountain ranges and valleys. The oldest bedrock units are the Jurassic-Cretaceous Franciscan Complex and Great Valley sequence sediments originally deposited in a marine environment. Subsequently, younger rocks such as the Tertiary-age Sonoma Volcanics group, the Plio-Pleistocene-age Clear Lake Volcanics and sedimentary rocks such as the Guinda, Domengine, Petaluma, Wilson Grove, Cache, Huichica and Glen Ellen formations were deposited throughout the province. Extensive folding and thrust faulting during late Cretaceous through early Tertiary geologic time created complex geologic conditions that underlie the highly varied topography of today. In valleys, the bedrock is covered by thick alluvial soil. The Project site is underlain by Miocene aged marine sedimentary rocks. These deposits are shown to consist of moderately to well consolidated sandstone, shale, siltstone, conglomerate, and breccia.

Active faults within the area that could generate strong ground shaking include the San Andreas and Maacama faults. The San Andreas fault runs approximately 2.5 miles north of the City and project site, and the Maacama fault runs approximately 32 miles to the east. Both faults are identified as an Alquist-Priolo fault zone, which is an area where an active fault has the potential to cause surface rupture during an earthquake. The smaller Hathaway Creek Fault runs north and east of the City, but is not a mapped Alquist-Priolo fault zone.

Landslides occur when forces acting down-slope exceed the strength of the earth materials that compose the slope. There are multiple causes of landslides including earthquakes and rainfall. The City of Point Arena has the potential to experience risk from landslides, primarily along the hillside locations under conditions where rock strata parallels surface slopes, high clay content absorbs excess water, displacement has fractured a fault zone, or where the bases of slopes have been removed by erosion. Liquefaction occurs when vibrations caused by earthquakes cause saturated soils to lose stability.

Geology Impact Discussion

(a.i) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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?
Less than Significant Impact

Fault rupture occurs when the ground surface fractures because of fault movement during an earthquake and almost generally follows preexisting fault traces, which are zones of weakness. The Project site does not fall within the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone and no identified active faults traverse the site. As such, there is no expectation that the site would be vulnerable to fault rupture. The nearest fault with surface rupture is the San Andreas fault. The Alquist-Priolo Zone of the San Andreas Fault is located approximately 2.5 miles north of the Project. Generally, structures intended for human occupancy are required to be placed a minimum of 50 feet from an active fault.

RGH Consultants performed a Geotechnical Study Report for the Project, and further concluded that landforms within the area do not indicate the presence of active faults and recommended that the risk of fault rupture at the site is low. However, the report also states that the Project is in an area affected by strong seismic activity and future seismic shaking should be anticipated at the site. The report recommends that the project be designed and constructed in strict adherence with current standards for earthquake-resistant construction. The future residential structures would be subject to current California Building Code requirements that address seismic risk.

The distance from future structures to the fault are such that the Project and future development of the site would have a less than significant impact related to risk of fault-related ground rupture during earthquakes within the limits of the site due to a known Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.

(a.ii) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?
Less than Significant Impact

The intensity of earthquake motion is dependent on the characteristics of the generating fault, distance to the fault and rupture zone, earthquake magnitude, earthquake duration, and site-specific geologic conditions. Future residential use of the site has the potential expose people and structures to adverse effects from strong shaking during a seismic event.

Future residential development will be required to comply with the latest California Building Standards Code seismic requirements. As such, the Project and future development of the site will result in less than significant impacts from potential impacts of ground shaking that could result in substantial adverse effects to people or structures, including the risk of loss, injury, or death.

(a.iii) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
No Impact

The Geotechnical Study and Report reviewed the project site for the potential for liquefaction risk and stated that subsurface conditions do not suggest the presence of materials that may be

susceptible to seismically induced densification, liquefaction, or lurching. As such, the Project and would have a less than significant impact due to risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure and liquefaction.

(a.iv) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?
No Impact

The risk of landslide is dictated by several factors including precipitation conditions, soil types, steepness of slope, vegetation, seismic conditions, and level of human disturbance. When certain conditions are present, landslides can be triggered because of seismic activity. Based on the site's relatively flat topography, the subject Project is not located in an area susceptible to landslides.

Landslide mapping made available by the California Geological Survey do not indicate large-scale slope instability at the Project site, and the Geotechnical Study and Report did not observe active landslides at the site.

(b) Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
Less Than Significant Impact

Future construction on the site would require site preparation including the removal of vegetation and grading. These ground disturbing activities have the potential to result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil if not properly controlled. As identified in the Air Quality section of this analysis, a future development proposal for the site will be required to comply with dust control measures set forth by the Mendocino County Air Quality Management District during construction. Additionally, review of a building permit application for future residential uses will ensure best management practices are in place for grading and construction activities that address erosion and sediment controls. As such, the Project and future development of the site will have a less than significant impact related to erosion and the loss of topsoil.

(c) Would the Project 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?
Less Than Significant Impact

Lateral spreading, lurching, and associated ground failure can occur during strong ground shaking on certain soil substrates typically on slopes. Lurching generally occurs along the tops of slopes where stiff soils are underlain by soft deposits or along steep channel banks whereas lateral spreading generally occurs where liquefiable deposits flow towards a "free face," such as channel banks, during an earthquake.

As previously discussed, the Project site is relatively flat and does not contain steep channel banks. Furthermore, the Project-specific geotechnical investigation did not identify potential

liquefaction or lurching risks. Therefore, potential impacts related to lateral spreading, lurching, and associated ground failure would be less than significant.

(d) Would the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?
Less than Significant Impact

Typically, soils that exhibit expansive characteristics are found within the upper five feet of the ground surface. Over long-term exposure to wetting and drying cycles, expansive soils can experience volumetric changes. The adverse effects of expansive soils include damage to foundations, utilities and infrastructure, paved roads and streets, and concrete slabs. Expansion and contraction of soils, depending on the season and the amount of surface water infiltration, could exert enough pressure on structures to result in cracking, settlement, and uplift. As discussed throughout this section, the Geotechnical Study and Report did not identify geologic concerns, such as the presence of expansive soil, at the Project site. As such, the Project and future development of the site would have a less than significant impact related to a substantial direct or indirect risk to life or property as a result of expansive soils.

(e) Would the Project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?
No Impact

Future development of the site would connect to the existing sanitary sewer system that conveys effluent to the City's wastewater treatment facility. There are no onsite septic tanks and no alternative wastewater treatment facilities are proposed. Therefore, there would be no impacts due to the disposal of wastewater where sanitary sewers are not available.

(f) Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
Less Than Significant with Mitigation

There is a low potential for paleontological resources to be present on the Project site. Nevertheless, the potential remains for the discovery of buried paleontological resources. **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** will ensure that proper procedures are followed in the event of a paleontological discovery. Therefore, the Project and future development of the site will have a less than significant impact with mitigation related to the destruction of paleontological or geological resources.

Mitigation Measures

GEO-1: If paleontological resources, including individual fossils or assemblages of fossils, are encountered during construction activities all ground disturbing activities shall halt and

a qualified paleontologist shall be procured to evaluate the discovery and make treatment recommendations.

5.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless 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?			✓	

Existing Greenhouse Gas Setting

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are generated naturally from geological and biological processes as well as human activities including the combustion of fossil fuels and industrial and agricultural processes. GHGs include carbon dioxide (CO_2), nitrous oxide (N_2O), methane (CH_3), chlorofluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, and perfluorocarbons.

While GHGs are emitted locally, they have global implications. GHGs trap heat in the atmosphere, which heats up the surface of the Earth. This concept is known as global warming and is contributing to climate change. Changing climatic conditions pose several potential adverse impacts including sea level rise, increased risk of wildfires, degraded ecological systems, deteriorated public health, and decreased water supplies.

Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 provides the California Environmental Protection Agency with the regulatory authority to coordinate the State's effort to achieve GHG reduction targets. EO S-3-05 goes beyond AB 32 and calls for an 80 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2050. Senate Bill 375 has also been adopted, which seeks to curb GHGs by reducing urban sprawl and limiting vehicle miles traveled.

The MCAQMD has adopted CEQA thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas emissions associated with the operation of land use projects. As identified in the thresholds adopted by the District in June 2010, a project is considered to have a less than significant impact due to GHG emissions if it:

- Emits less than 1,100 metric tons (MT) CO_2e per year; or
- Emits less than 4.6 MT CO_2e per service population per year (residents and employees).

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Discussion

(a) Would the Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
Less Than Significant Impact

(b) Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?
Less than Significant Impact

Construction GHG Emissions

Future construction of a residential use at the site would result in GHG emissions from heavy-duty construction equipment, worker trips, and material delivery and hauling. Construction GHG emissions are short-term and would cease upon completion of construction.

The MCAQMD has not established thresholds of significance for GHG emissions resulting from construction activities but defers to screening thresholds established by the BAAQMD. Regulation 1, Rule 1-430 requires best management practices (BMP) to reduce GHG emissions during construction. As stated under the air quality topic above, **Mitigation Measures AQ-1** and **AQ-2** shall be implemented, which will further reduce GHG emissions generated during construction activities. Therefore, impacts from GHG emissions during construction will be less than significant with mitigation.

Operational GHG Emissions

Operational GHG emissions associated with future development of the site as a residential use would be ongoing for the life of the Project as a result of onsite lighting, heating, and cooling of buildings and structures, the treatment and transport of water and wastewater, solid waste disposal, maintenance activities, and vehicle trips associated with residents, visitors, delivery vehicles, etc. Operational GHG emissions associated with future agricultural use of the site would include those listed above, as well as the use of GHG-emitting farming equipment.

The City of Point Arena is not subject to a Climate Action Plan or other plan that provides prescriptive policies to reduce GHG emissions. Future development of the site will be subject to all applicable polices related to GHG reductions as well as standard conditions of approval. Therefore, the Project, and future residential development facilitated by the Project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases, resulting in a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

See **AQ1** and **AQ2**.

5.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless 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 § 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area?				✓
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✓

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			✓	

Existing Hazards and Hazardous Materials Setting

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) defines a hazardous material as: "a substance or combination of substances that, because of its quantity, concentration or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, may either: 1) cause, or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious, irreversible, or incapacitating illness; or 2) pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, stored, transported, disposed of, or otherwise managed." Regulations governing the use, management, handling, transportation and disposal of hazardous waste and materials are administered by Federal, State, and local governmental agencies. Pursuant to the Planning and Zoning Law, DTSC maintains a hazardous waste and substances site list, also known as the "Cortese List."

The Mendocino Solid Waste Management Authority (MendoRecycle) provides administrative oversight and program implementation for solid waste and recycling in Mendocino County. MendoRecycle also directly operates the household hazardous waste facility in Ukiah. The Mendocino County Department of Environmental Health serves as the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) for the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), issuing permits and inspecting solid waste facilities to ensure compliance with state laws.

The Mendocino County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan was adopted in 2014 and serves as the local hazard mitigation plan for multiple jurisdictions within the County, including the City of Point Arena. The Plan complies with the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 by assessing natural and human-caused hazards in the County and providing mitigation strategies to reduce risks. The Plan complements recent efforts undertaken by the City of Point Arena in the 2015 General Plan Safety Element, which expands on existing hazards in the City and provides implementation measures to reduce impacts of these hazards.

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is required by law to map areas of significant fire hazards based on fuels, terrain, weather, and other relevant factors. CAL FIRE's Statewide and County maps (adopted November 2007) depict Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs) that are within the State Responsibility Area (SRA). The SRA is the area where the State of California is financially responsible for the prevention and suppression of wildfires. The SRA does not include lands within city boundaries or in federal ownership. The FHSZs in the SRA are further classified as having a Moderate, High, or Very High hazard severity.

In addition, CAL FIRE has prepared and transmitted recommendations for FHSZ's in areas where local governments have financial responsibility for wildland fire protection, referred to as Local

Responsibility Areas (LRAs). CAL FIRE has identified areas throughout the City of Point Arena as High and Moderate FHSZ's.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact Discussion

(a) Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
Less than Significant Impact

(b) Would the Project 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?
Less than Significant Impact

Future development of the site would include site preparation and construction activities that would involve the temporary presence of potentially hazardous materials including, but not limited to, fuels and lubricants, paints, solvents, insulation, electrical wiring, and other construction related materials. Although these potentially hazardous materials may be present onsite during construction, a future development project would be required to comply with all existing federal, state and local safety regulations governing the transportation, use, handling, storage and disposal of potentially hazardous materials. Upon completion of construction activities there would not be ongoing use or generation of hazardous materials onsite. Furthermore, as a proposal to amend the existing permitted and conditionally permitted uses onsite from heavy industrial uses to residential uses, the Project will reduce the likelihood for the continued use of hazardous materials typically associated with heavy industrial operations. Therefore, impacts to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

(c) Would the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
Less than Significant Impact

The Project site is located within one-quarter mile of Arena Union Elementary School to the southeast, Pacific Community Charter School to the northeast, and Point Arena High School and South Coast Continuation School to the northwest. As stated above, future development of the site would include the temporary presence of potentially hazardous materials during construction. which would be properly stored and labeled. Compliance with applicable state and local regulations will ensure that potential impacts due to the proximity of schools to the subject site would be less than significant.

(d) Would the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
No Impact

The California Environmental Protection Agency (CAL-EPA) annually updates the California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List, also known as the Cortese List. The Department of Toxic Substances Control compiles a record of sites to be included on the list, which is then submitted to the CAL-EPA. EnviroStor is the DTSC's data management system for tracking cleanup, permitting, and enforcement at hazardous waste facilities and sites with known contamination. A search of EnviroStor was performed on July 27, 2022, and showed no cleanup sites on or within close proximity to the Project site.

GeoTraker is the State Water Resources Control Board's data management system for sites that impact or have the potential to impact water quality. A search of GeoTraker was performed on July 27, 2022, and showed no cleanup sites on the Project site, but did show a LUST (Leaking underground storage tank), site number T0604500297, for Point Arena High School at 200 Lake Street. This site was closed, and cleanup status was completed as of July 11, 2002.

Due to the lack of hazardous material sites at the Project location or vicinity, there would be no impact related to these hazards to the public.

(e) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area?
No Impact

The Project site is not located within the boundaries of an Airport Land Use Plan, nor is it located in direct proximity to a private airstrip. The nearest airport is the Lofty Redwoods Airport (53CL) located approximately six miles southeast of the project site. Therefore, no impacts associated with airport-related hazards will result from the proposed Project nor future development of the site.

(f) Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
No Impact

Future development of the site is not expected to impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project proposes to develop an encroachment onto SR1, which has been designed consistent with City and Caltrans standards.

California has developed an emergency response plan to coordinate emergency services by federal, state, and local government, including responding to hazardous materials incidents. The State Office of Emergency Services (OES) employs a Hazardous Materials Division, which enforces multiple programs that address hazardous materials. Mendocino County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan serves City of Point Arena and there are no aspects of the proposed General

Project that would interfere with an adopted emergency or evacuation plan. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

(g) Would the Project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?
Less than Significant Impact

Wildland fires are of concern particularly in expansive areas of native vegetation of brush, woodland, and grassland. The Project site is surrounded by roadways and developed land uses. CALFIRE categorizes the site as a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) and does not specify a severity rating; however, it is located within close proximity of lands designated as Moderate and High Fire Hazard Severity Zones by CALFIRE. As such, the project could expose people or structures to impacts related to wildland fires.

The Project was referred to both CAL FIRE and the Redwood Coast Fire Protection District for comment. Neither entity provided comment.

The building permit for the proposed residences will require Redwood Coast Fire Protection District clearance prior to issuance, ensuring that the development will be consistent with local and State policies related to fire safety. Additionally, the building permit will be reviewed for consistency with applicable building codes addressing fire, such as requirements that new residences have fire suppression systems. Consistency with applicable fire safety codes will ensure impacts remain less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

5.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			✓	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the			✓	

Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: i. result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite? ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite? iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or iv. impede or redirect flood flows?			✓	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to Project inundation?				✓
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			✓	

Existing Hydrology and Water Quality Setting

The City of Point Arena is located near the Garcia River Estuary and is within the Point Arena-Stornetta unit of the coastal watershed between the Eel and Russian River basins. Elevations range from 0 to 250 feet. Point Arena, Moat, and Ross Creeks flow south of the site. Hathaway creek, Spanish Creek, and the Garcia river flow to the north of the site.

The Mendocino County Water Agency is a special district encompassing the entirety of the County and governed by the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors. The Water Agency is responsible for the management of water resources in the County including stormwater and groundwater management.

Surface water quality is regulated by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) via the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast (Basin Plan). The RWQCB is responsible for implementing Section 401 of the Clean Water Act through the issuance of a Clean Water Certification when development includes potential impacts to jurisdictional areas such as creeks, wetlands, or other Waters of the State.

Future development at the site would be subject to the RWQCB Municipal Regional Stormwater National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, Order No. R1- 2010-0017, NPDES No. CA0023060, which requires permitees (i.e., City of Point Arena) to use their planning authorities to include appropriate source control, site design, and stormwater treatment measures in new development and redevelopment projects to address both soluble and insoluble stormwater runoff pollutant discharges and prevent increases in runoff flows from new development and redevelopment projects. This goal is to be accomplished primarily through the implementation of low impact development (LID) techniques.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) flood hazard mapping program provides important guidance for the City in planning for flooding events and regulating development within identified flood hazard areas. FEMA's National Flood Insurance Program is intended to encourage State and local governments to adopt responsible floodplain management programs and flood measures. As part of the program, FEMA defines floodplain and floodway boundaries that are shown on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). As indicated in FEMA mapping, the Project site is not located within a flood hazard zone.

Hydrology and Water Quality Impact Discussion

(a) Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?
Less Than Significant Impact

(e) Would to Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?
Less Than Significant Impact

Construction activities have the potential to result in runoff that contains sediment and other pollutants that could degrade water quality if not properly controlled. Sources of potential pollution associated with future construction of a residential development include fuel, grease, oil and other fluids, concrete material, sediment, and litter. These pollutants have the potential to result in impacts due to chemical contamination from the release of construction equipment and materials that could pose a hazard to the environment or degrade water quality if not properly managed.

Review of a building permit application for future residential uses will ensure best management practices and LID measures are in place for grading and construction activities that address

erosion and sediment controls. As such, the Project will have a less than significant impact with regard to degradation of surface or ground water quality.

(b) Would the Project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?
Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed residential uses would access the Point Arena Water Works' existing potable water supply for all onsite water needs. Future development on the site would increase water demand relative to existing water use as it would change from vacant land to a residential development. However, in compliance with building code standards, a future development would include the use of high efficiency appliances and fixtures for interior water use.

Additionally, the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan designation of the site, where this level of density was considered as part of General Plan adoption. Future development at the site would not substantially increase water use or deplete groundwater supplies nor would it interfere with groundwater recharge. Therefore, the Project, and future development facilitated by the Project would have a less than significant impact to groundwater supplies and recharge.

(c(i)-c(iv)) Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows?
Less Than Significant Impact

Per the National Wetlands Inventory and the site-specific Biological Scoping Survey, there are no wetlands or drainage courses on the project site. Future development of the site would increase impervious surfaces compared to existing conditions including building footprints and driveways. Existing protections of wetland and riparian areas prohibits the placement of structures or driveways within these areas, and none are presumed to be on site. As such, potential impacts to the existing drainage patterns and storm drain system would be less than significant.

(d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the Project risk release of pollutants due to Project inundation?
No Impact

The Project site is located in an area of minimal flood hazard, as shown on FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer. As such, future development of the site would have no impacts due to placing housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. As no habitable structure would be placed within a flood hazard area there would be no impact due to significant risk of loss, injury or death associated with the Project. Similarly, the site is not located within an inundation area of a levee or dam, nor is the site expected to be impacted by inundation. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with risks due to flooding or inundation from a levee or dam failure, or from a seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

5.11 Land Use and Planning

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				✓
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			✓	

Existing Land Use and Planning Setting

Point Arena's total land area is 829 net acres (excluding public streets). This total is divided into approximately 280 assessor's parcels of various sizes accommodating a variety of rural and urban uses, including open spaces and unbuildable lands. The overall impression is of abundant open space, including properties that have not been developed to their full potential, low residential densities, the presence in town of many urban development opportunities, and an attractive and unique rural and small-town character.

According to the 2020 U.S. Census, Point Arena's population is approximately 460 residents living in approximately 200 dwelling units. (The State Department of Finance's January 1, 1994, estimate of population was 409). The in-city growth rate is judged to be extremely modest throughout the near term, although the general market-area population (persons living within the city limits plus those living in the surrounding county territory) is likely to increase

somewhat. The date by which build-out might occur is unknown and it is an event that will occur very far into the future.

The General Plan's Land Use Map depicts graphically the City's intentions and policies for growth, development, and land usage, and for the preservation and safety of public and private properties, within the city limits.

The permitted land-use designations shown on the Map generally echo existing patterns of land usage. The main changes from the 1994 General Plan to the current Plan and Map are increases in the amount and extent of land available for multi-family residential uses.

Additionally, the "Opportunities and Constraints Maps" serves as "overlays" that depict the City's intentions and policies regarding open spaces, creeks and stream beds, riparian areas, view sheds and view corridors, conservation areas, safety and seismic safety considerations, natural habitat areas, and trails. The Maps are an "early-warning" depiction of matters that shall be attended to as part of project planning and review.

The City's Zoning Ordinance is the implementation component of the Local Coastal Program, which sets forth the purposes and intents of zoning districts, land uses permissible within districts, and limitations on development to make densities and patterns consistent with the underlying districts. The Zoning Ordinance includes the Zoning Map, which depicts zoning districts largely consistent with the land use classifications specified in the General Plan.

The project site is currently designated Urban Residential (UR) in both the General Plan and Zoning Map. The General Plan states that the UR lands are suitable for single-family residential uses, including manufactured homes, individual mobile homes, and co-housing projects, in protected residential settings where both city-approved water and sewer services are provided or will be provided. Single-family residential units are permissible uses by right, and one granny unit or a second dwelling unit where there is an existing single-family home are permissible by use permit. These land use permissions are echoed in the Zoning Ordinance's UR district regulations.

Land Use and Planning Impact Discussion

(a) Would the Project physically divide an established community?
No Impact

The Project would place four residential units on two lots within the Urban Residential zoning district, where residential uses of this density are allowable. The Project is surrounding on all sides by residential development and would connect an existing gap in residential development along School Street. There would be no impacts with respect to the division of an established community.

b) Would the Project 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?

Less than Significant Impact

Approval of the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone, as well as future development of the site with a residential use, would be generally consistent with the General Plan and other applicable land use plans and policies. As previously discussed, the project is consistent with the intents and allowable land uses within the Urban Residential zoning district and General Plan land use Designation.

Additionally, the Project is consistent with goals, and programs set forth in the 2019-2027 Housing Element, including:

- Goal 1: Promote and facilitate housing unit construction at all income levels, with specific emphasis on increased housing opportunities for Point Arena's low-income households.

- Program 1-1.2: Work with large vacant or underutilized parcel owners to facilitate residential development, particularly on those vacant lands near downtown core area. Make market and funding information available.

- Program 1-1.3: Work with vacant or underutilized lot owners in the urban core to develop low to moderate income rental units at higher densities (i.e., greater than 7.5 units per acre with applicable density bonuses).

The project would facilitate the development of four residential units of approximately 1,050 SF each. While the project does not propose to restrict housing to a particular income category, the relatively modest size of the units would be priced below housing stock nearer the ocean or on larger parcels, consistent with these General Plan policies.

The project is consistent with the various applicable development standards of the UR zoning district, such as lot coverage, setbacks, yard requirements, height, and landscaping. Additionally, the Project requires City approval of three discretionary permits—a Coastal Development Permit (since the project meets the Coastal Act definition of "development" within the California Coastal Zone), a Use Permit (to permit the accessory dwelling unit on each parcel, as required by UR zoning policies), and a Minor Subdivision (to split the existing parcel into two lots). For approval of these permits, the City Council must make required findings that the Project is consistent with applicable land use plans and policies. The Council may impose conditions of approval on the Project in order to ensure consistency with these policies. The project would not be inconsistent with policies or plans to have a significant impact on the environment.

Land Use Conflicts

The Project site is adjacent to existing and principally permitted residential land uses. The Project would allow for new residential uses, which would introduce new sensitive receptors, potentially exposing future residents to potential noise, odor, and air quality impacts associated with the ongoing agricultural uses.

The Project site is also adjacent to the SR1, which could place sensitive receptors nearby the existing infrastructure. However, the residential units meet the City's front setback and yard requirements, and Caltrans did not have concerns about the proximity of the units from the right-of-way.

As described previously, the area is surrounded by low-density residential development. Given the existing surrounding development, the development of new residential units would represent a compatible use of the property with surrounding uses. As such, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact related to inconsistencies with Point Arena's land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

5.12 Mineral Resources

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a 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?				✓

Existing Mineral Resources Setting

The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) identifies mineral resources within California and requires classification of mineral resources based on their relative value for extraction. A variety of mineral resources, including aggregate resource minerals and hard rock quarries are known to exist in Mendocino County. According to the Division of Mine Reclamation, California Department of Conservation and the United States Geological Survey, Mineral Resources Data System, there are no mineral resources within the City of Point Arena nor in or around the Project site.

Mineral Resources Impact Discussion

(a) Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state,

(b) Would the Project 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?
No Impact

There are no known mineral resources within the City of Point Arena nor does the City identify locally important mineral resources in the General Plan. Therefore, the proposed Project would have no impact regarding the loss of availability of mineral resources.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

5.13 Noise

Would the Project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		✓		
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			✓	

c) For a Project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?			✓	

Existing Noise Setting

The Point Arena General Plan Noise Element provides a framework for evaluating sound in the community, both qualitatively and quantitatively, and sets forth noise reduction or noise suppression policies and programs. This is done by describing the current local environment of sounds, identifying and measuring local noise sources, identifying and mapping noise-sensitive land uses, projecting future noise levels, and prescribing policies and programs for achieving the city's noise-control goals.

Sources that contribute to the ambient noise levels within Point Arena include vehicular traffic, aircraft, industrial activities, and mechanical equipment including refrigeration units, heating and cooling, and ventilation. Commercial and general industrial land uses are typically considered the least noise-sensitive, whereas residences, schools, and hospitals are the most noise- sensitive. Other features of the soundscape include storm surf, and the toll of the offshore bell buoy. The Noise Element includes goals, policies, and programs aimed at maintaining low ambient noise levels.

The Project site is bounded by established low-density residential land uses. Primary noise sources that contribute to the ambient noise environment at the Project site include vehicles driving on local roadways and noise associated with school or church uses.

Noise Impact Discussion

(a) Would the Project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation

The proposed Project would permit future residential development of the site that would generate noise on a temporary basis during construction activities and on an ongoing basis upon occupancy.

Construction Noise

Construction of a future residential project would result in temporary and intermittent noise onsite and in the Project vicinity from the use of construction equipment. Construction noise

would be perceptible to established uses in the immediate vicinity, specifically nearby existing residences.

Noise impacts resulting from construction at the site will depend upon the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise- generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise-sensitive areas. Construction noise impacts primarily result when construction activities occur during noise-sensitive times of the day (e.g., early morning, evening, or nighttime hours), the construction occurs in areas immediately adjoining noise-sensitive land uses, or when construction occurs over extended periods of time. During each stage of construction, there would be a different mix of equipment operating, and noise levels would vary based on the amount of equipment in operation and the location at which the equipment is operating.

Section 9.35.040 of the Point Arena Municipal Code outlines provisions associated with noise, and states that "Noise levels shall not be permitted to exceed 60 Leq anywhere within the City of Point Arena." Leq is an equivalent continuous noise level, which is calculated by determining the sound level in decibels for specific sounds during the day and applying those frequencies over the time period in which these sounds occur. According to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), common noisy equipment used at a construction site can vary in noise level. A backhoe is measured at approx. 85 decibels, a nail gun at 97 decibels, and a bulldozer at around 100 decibels.

The type of equipment to be used at the site during construction is unknown at this time. **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** is added to require that equipment generating noise above 60 decibels (the sound of a normal conversation) must occur between the hours of 7 a.m. and 8 p.m., and that any equipment used that exceeds 85 decibels, such as a nail gun or bulldozer, be limited to weekdays between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. As a result of mitigation, impacts related to construction noise will be less than significant.

Operational Noise

At operation, a residential use would contribute to the ambient noise environment from the introduction of mechanical equipment, parking, outdoor areas, and vehicles traveling to and from the site. The Project site is in an area that contains established residential uses proximate to SR1. The proposed residential uses are expected to be compatible with ambient noise levels. As such, the Project, and future development of the site will have less than significant impacts.

(b) Would the Project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
Less Than Significant Impact

Vibration from operation of heavy equipment can result in effects ranging from annoyance of people to damage of structures. Varying geology and distance results in different vibration levels containing different frequencies and displacements. In all cases, vibration amplitudes

decrease with increasing distance from the source. Perceptible ground-borne vibration is generally limited to areas within a few hundred feet of construction activities. As seismic waves travel outward from a vibration source, they excite the particles of rock and soil through which they pass and cause them to oscillate. The rate or velocity (in inches per second) at which these particles move is the commonly accepted descriptor of the vibration amplitude, referred to as the peak particle velocity (PPV).

Caltrans establishes significance criteria for potential damage to structures as well as human perception. Groundborne vibration of 0.3 in/sec PPV is established for older residential structures and 0.5 in/sec PPV for newer residential structures. Groundborne vibration is considered barely perceptible to humans at 0.01 in/sec PPV and severe at 0.4 in/sec PPV. Development of the site would include construction activities that may generate perceptible vibration during use of heavy equipment or impact tools. Construction equipment including vibratory rollers, bulldozers, caisson drills, loaded trucks, and jackhammers generate vibration levels ranging from 0.003 in/sec PPV to 0.2 in/sec PPV at a distance of 25 feet.

Based on the significance criteria established by Caltrans and the typical groundborne vibration generated by construction equipment, future development of the Project site would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or noise in excess of 0.3 in/sec PPV at existing off-site uses. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to excessive groundborne vibration and impacts from groundborne vibration and noise would be less than significant.

(c) For a Project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?
Less than Significant Impact

The Project site is not located within the boundaries of an Airport Land Use Plan, nor is it located in direct proximity to a private airstrip. The nearest airport is Lofty Redwoods Airport (53CL), located approximately 6 miles southeast of the Project site. Though noise from aircrafts flying overhead would be perceptible at the Project site, people residing or working in the Project area would not be exposed to excessive noise levels associated with such noise and therefore impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

NOI-1: During construction of the project, noise above 60 decibels must occur only between the hours of 7 a.m. and 8 p.m. Any equipment used that exceeds a noise level of 86 decibels, such as a nail gun or bulldozer, shall be limited to weekdays between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.

5.14 Population and Housing

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				✓
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

Existing Population and Housing Setting

The City of Point Arena is a small jurisdiction, encompassing approximately 1.4 square miles, located along the coast in southern Mendocino County. According to the U.S. Census, in 2020 the population of Point Arena was approximately 160 residents. The City's population has remained relatively stable, with 449 residents in 2010, and 472 residents in 2017.. Compared with other cities, Point Arena has seen a larger growth rate within the county and Mendocino County as a whole. With the exception of Fort Bragg, Point Arena is well above the overall growth trend of Mendocino County and surrounding cities—most of which have seen an increase of less than 10% since 1990.

The Housing Element includes numerous goals, policies, and programs aimed at promoting housing unit construction (with emphasis on low-income households) and preserving the existing housing stock (particularly rental units).

Population and Housing Impact Discussion

(a) Would the Project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
No Impact

The proposed residential development on the site that is consistent with the property's General Plan land use designation (UR) and Zoning District (UR). Both adopted documents anticipated and permit the proposed pattern and density of development. While the Project would create an additional parcel, the resulting lots meet the UR district's minimum parcel size requirements.

The project would gain access from SR1 and would not require the development of future roadways. Utilities are available either in front of or behind the parcel, negating any need for infrastructure extensions. The relatively modest growth that would result from this Project is planned for in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, and there would be no resulting impacts related to population growth.

(b) Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
No Impact

A project would be considered to have a significant environmental effect if it displaces a large number of people or induces substantial growth or concentration of population. The site could accommodate a maximum of four residential units.

The Project site is currently vacant, undeveloped land. The proposed Project would not displace existing housing units or people, nor necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, the Project, and subsequent development of the site would have no impacts to population and housing regarding displacing people or existing housing.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

5.15 Public Services

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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?			✓	
b) Police protection?			✓	

c) Schools?			✓	
d) Parks?			✓	
e) Other public facilities?			✓	

Existing Public Services Setting

The City of Point Arena receives police protection services from the Mendocino County Sheriff's Department. Fire protection and emergency medical services are provided by the Redwood Coast Fire Protection District. The fire station is located at 19601 CA-1 in Manchester.

The Point Arena Schools District is one of ten Common Districts in the State, with a separate elementary school district (Arena Union Elementary School District) and high school district (Point Arena Joint Union High School District), with a common district office, superintendent, board of trustees and budget. Point Arena High School serves students from northern Sonoma County and southern Mendocino County, and as far inland as the Kashia Rancheria. Arena Union Elementary School serves students from Gualala to Manchester. The district also includes the Pacific Community Charter School, South Coast Continuation High School, the independent study program, K-8 After School Program and State Preschool.

The Point Arena Public Works Department is responsible for the management and maintenance of the City's recreation facilities. The General Plan identifies Downtown Park and Harper Park as the City's park facilities, with plans to develop a park at Arena Cove and east of downtown. Bureau of Land Management maintains the Point Arena-Stornetta Unit along and beyond the north end of the City, providing eight miles of marked paths and substantial open space opportunities for Point Arena residents and guests. Though the City does not control this land, it is anticipated to remain.

Public Services Impact Discussion

(a-e) 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 listed public services?
Less Than Significant Impact

The Project site is well served by existing public services. The project would result in four units or approximately ten residents that would increase the need for services from Fire and Police Departments, schools, and parks. However, the increase would represent a minimal change

that would not trigger the need for an expansion of services, an increase in staffing, or otherwise adversely affect public services. Increasing demands on public services have been anticipated as part of General Plan, which anticipated this level of residential use of the Project site.

The Project is anticipated to facilitate future residential development of the site, which is expected to introduce new residents, including school- aged children. Though the Project would increase enrollment of nearby public schools, it is not anticipated to exceed existing capacity of these facilities. Furthermore, new residential developments are subject to school fees, which fund necessary improvements and offset any potential impacts of introducing new students to the area. Therefore, the Project is expected to have a less than significant impact on public schools.

Future development of the site would not be expected to generate a substantial increase in demand that would warrant the expansion or construction of new public facilities, including parks within the vicinity of the Project site. Impacts to parks will likewise have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

5.16 Recreation

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			✓	

Existing Recreation Setting

Point Arena and the surrounding area offers several active and passive outdoor recreational amenities including parks, trails, and ocean recreation options at Arena Cove. The Bureau of Land Management operates the Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands north of the City.

Recreation Impact Discussion

(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?
Less Than Significant Impact

(b) Would the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
Less Than Significant Impact

The Project will allow residential uses where there is presently a vacant, residentially zoned parcel. A future residential development on the site would introduce residents who would utilize existing parks and recreation facilities within the City. Existing facilities would be adequate to meet recreational demands of future residents at the site. Because a future residential development at the site would not induce substantial population growth and is within the population growth anticipated in the General Plan, there is little expectation that further pressure would be put on recreational amenities thereby requiring construction or expansion of such facilities. Therefore, impacts related to the increased use, deterioration, construction or expansion of recreational facilities are expected to be less than significant as a result of the proposed Project and a future residential development at the site.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

5.17 Transportation

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?		✓		

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			✓	
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			✓	
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?			✓	

Existing Transportation and Impact Setting

The Point Arena General Plan establishes goals, policies, and implementation measures that seek to maintain an integrated transportation network that provides for safe and convenient multi-modal travel. The transportation network within the City includes roadways, buses, bikeways, and sidewalks. Roadways consist of the following street types.

Local Streets: Low-speed, low-volume facilities which are used primarily to access property. Lake Street, Scott Place, Mill Street, Starboard Way, Center Street, Port Street (east of Iversen), and Gillmore Alley, serve these local functions.

Collector Streets: Moderate-speed, low- to medium-volume facilities which serve to collect traffic from local streets and distribute to the arterial system. Riverside Drive, Windy Hollow Drive, Iversen Avenue, and Port Road west of Iversen are streets that serve as collectors.

Arterial Streets: Designed to move traffic efficiently. Property access is deemphasized, whereas traffic movement is emphasized. In Point Arena, only SR1 functions as an arterial. In the downtown, SR1 functions equally as a collector as it assumes the role of Main Street.

On-street parking is provided along SR1. On-street parking is also permitted along Mill Street, parts of Lake Street (near the elementary school), and sections of School Street and Riverside Avenue/Eureka Hill Road. Several businesses along SR1 have off-street parking areas for their patrons.

The General Plan identifies alternative modes of transportation as an important aspect of the circulation network, providing multiple benefits including a reduction in traffic, improved air quality, and reduced noise levels. SR1 is designated as part of the Pacific Coast Bike State Route, a Class III facility running most of the length of SR1 in California. The City also maintains bike lanes on Port Road between Iversen Avenue and the coast.

The Community Action Plan was adopted in 2010 and makes recommendations for a wide range of transportation and circulation improvements. The Plan includes a proposed “School

Trail" between Lake Street and School Street to provide additional access for students through property across from Harper's Cut-Off Trail. This would be a mid-block crosswalk and pedestrian island, with an easement on the private properties between School Street and Lake Street for pedestrian access.

Public transportation in the City is provided by Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA). Route 95 makes one daily round trip from Santa Rosa to Point Arena, and Route 75 makes one daily round trip from Ukiah to Gualala.

Vehicle Miles Traveled Discussion

Level of service (LOS), which is used to describe vehicle delay, has historically been used to measure traffic service within the City of Point Arena. The General Plan establishes that new development shall not cause collector streets to degrade to a lower level of service than their existing capacity, beyond which would be considered to have a significant impact to the circulation network. Pursuant to SB 743, the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) was charged with identifying an alternative metric to LOS for evaluating environmental impacts from transportation. In December 2018 the OPR released the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, which provides technical recommendation regarding assessment of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), as an alternate to LOS, thresholds of significance for VMTs, and mitigation measures.

CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b) describes specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impact using a VMT metric. This metric refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project.

In June 2019 the Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG), which serves as the Regional Transportation Planning Authority (RTPA) adopted the Transportation Planning Work Program for fiscal year 2019/2020. The Program included a grant request to conduct a Regional Baseline Study to analyze existing traffic conditions in the region, establish a baseline standard from which to determine significance thresholds for future land use projects, and develop technical tools and procedures for evaluating VMT impacts of development projects. In June 2020, the MCOG Board of Directors received the final Regional Baseline Study report from the traffic consultant, Fehr & Peers. The study summarizes available VMT data for Mendocino County, discusses alternative measurement methods and thresholds, recommends VMT methods and thresholds for lead agencies, and provides Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies for reducing VMT generated by the project. At the June 2020 meeting, the MCOG Board of Directors accepted the final Report prepared by Fehr & Peers.

Transportation Impact Discussion

(a) Would the Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?
Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation

Construction

Construction would result in vehicle trips by construction workers and haul-truck trips for material off-haul and deliveries via SR1. Construction-related traffic would be temporary, would vary daily, and would be distributed over the course of a workday and work week. The number of construction-related vehicles traveling to and from the Project Area would vary on a daily basis. As required by **Mitigation Measure NOI-1**, construction hours would generally be limited. Due to the infrequency of truck traffic and the temporary nature of construction, Project construction is not anticipated to conflict with plans, policies or programs related to the effectiveness of the circulation system.

Operation

Once complete, the proposed Project of four residential units would marginally increase vehicle traffic on local streets, as it negligibly increases the area's population and would not redirect on-road traffic patterns. The Project is proposed on lands designated for this scale of residential development, consistent with nearby development patterns. The operational effects of the residences on the transportation network are consistent with the planned uses for the area.

Community Action Plan

The Point Arena Community Action Plan Trail Map shows a proposed pedestrian trail through the east side of the property. This "School Trail" is intended to provide additional access for students through property across from Harper's Cutoff Trail.

Zoning Code Section 18.25.100(4) and 4(a) state that permits for "new development" shall include a condition of approval that a "25-foot-wide easement" be included in the project approval to provide trailways "designated in the Point Arena General Plan, or any area or adopted specific plan…on the subject property." The proposed Project, including the utility connection through the parcel north of the parcel proposed for residential development, would trigger this requirement.

Exemptions to this requirement may be made by the City Council if certain conditions exist (Zoning Code Section 18.25.100(5)). The Project proponent is requesting a waiver to the requirement to provide this trail access on the basis that "adequate access exists nearby," which is one condition by which the Council may waive the trail requirement.

To support the assertion that adequate access exists nearby, and the trail is not necessary, the applicant offers the following for Council consideration:

- The proposed trail does not provide a significant decrease in the total distance for High Schoolers to walk to school along the same road.

- There are existing alternative paths that are a shorter total distance than the proposed path would provide.
- Requiring the proposed trail would prevent workforce housing from being built in Point Arena.

The Project proponent supplied maps supporting the statement that the trail does not provide a significant decrease in the total distance for high school students to walk. These materials will be considered by City Council for a possible waiver of this requirement.

However, the project is not consistent as proposed with the Community Action Plan's proposed trail placements without the benefit of a Council waiver. As a result, **Mitigation Measure TRAN-1** is included requiring the applicant to dedicate a 25-foot-wide easement through the subject parcels consistent with the Community Action Plan.

Alternative Modes of Transportation

Public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities in the Project vicinity will not be substantially impacted by a future residential development. The introduction of four additional residential units would contribute ridership to the public transit system. Existing bus stops are located at on Lake Street near the elementary school (approximately 750 feet from the Project site), and on Main Street near the library (approximately one half-mile from the Project site). The Mendocino County Transit system currently has sufficient capacity and facilities to support increased ridership generated by the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts to public transit would be less than significant.

Summary

With **Mitigation Measure TRAN-1**, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy and would have less than significant impacts to the circulation system.

(b) Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines 15064.3, subdivision (b)?
Less Than Significant Impact

As previously discussed, lead agencies are required to evaluate a Project's potential impacts using a VMT metric as of July 1, 2020. This Project proposes the development of four residential units, which would represent a slight increase in vehicular use in the City.

California's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) issued a Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA. The advisory establishes screening thresholds for projects and includes an assumption that projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day may be assumes to cause a less than significant impact, absent substantial evidence otherwise.

At maximum build-out of four residential units and with an increase in population estimated at approximately ten individuals, it can be reasonably assumed that the Project would generate fewer than 110 trips per day, which would represent greater than ten trips per person per day. With the guidance provided by OPR's advisory report, the Project would have a less than significant impact related to VMT.

(c) Would the Project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
Less Than Significant Impact

Project would add four residential units with one shared driveway off of an encroachment from SR1. SR1 is existing and adequate across the parcel frontage, and future development would not be anticipated to require the construction of additional public roadways.

The Project was referred to Caltrans for comment and review for consistency with their requirements. Caltrans requested that the Project be conditioned to require a 30-foot setback from the SR1 centerline. The UR district requires a 20-foot setback from the front property line, which fully encompasses the area within 30 feet of the SR1 centerline to accommodate a future SR1 improvement project. Therefore, the Project will be consistent with the Caltrans request.

Access to the site would be from SR1, and installation of a driveway would require approval of an encroachment permit, which would ensure consistency with City policies regulating driveway approaches in the right-of-way. As a result, impacts related to geometric design would be less than significant.

(d) Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?
Less Than Significant Impact

Future development of the Project site will not result in insufficient emergency access during construction or at operation. Road closures would not be anticipated, although temporary encroachment would occur during frontage improvements along SR1, which will require an approved Encroachment Permit from Caltrans. All roads would be expected to remain accessible during temporary construction activities and would not substantially impair emergency access.

Internal circulation was reviewed for adequacy by the Redwood Coast Fire Protection District, which did not respond with requested modifications. The site design includes driveway access through to the rear of the site, providing access for emergency vehicles to all residences. Therefore, impacts to emergency vehicle access would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

TRAN-1: Unless waived by City Council per Zoning Code Section 18.25.100(5), a 25-foot-wide public access easement shall be recorded from School Street to Lake Street, consistent

with the Community Action Plan and Zoning Code Section 18.25.100(4). The recorded grant of easement shall be conveyed to the city or to a designated private nonprofit association acceptable to the city who is willing to accept the easement and willing to operate and maintain the public accessway or trail. Where grants of easement are not feasible because neither the city nor private nonprofit association is willing to accept, maintain, and operate the accessway, the required access shall be implemented through a recorded offer to dedicate an easement to a public agency or a designated private nonprofit association acceptable to the city.

5.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. 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				✓
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a		✓		

California Native American tribe.				

Existing Tribal Cultural Resources Setting

Tribal Cultural Resources are defined as sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, or objects that have cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resource (CRHR) or are included in a local register of historical resources. Additionally, a lead agency may identify a significant resource at its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Thad Van Beuren, archaeologist, prepared an Archaeological Report for the Project, superseded by Sonoma State University's Anthropological Studies Center Investigation. (see Cultural Resources discussion). The reports include copies of letters sent to tribes inviting consultation on the proposed Project. Pursuant to the AB 52 consultation process, the City of Point Arena sent letters to the Manchester-Point Arena Rancheria on February 22, 2022, informing them of the proposed Project and providing an opportunity to request consultation. No responses requesting consultation were received by the City.

Tribal Cultural Resources Impact Discussion

6.18(a.i) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is 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)?
No Impact

As stated above, surveys of the Project site did not find evidence of suggesting the site is eligible for listing as a Historical Resource. Therefore, the Project would have no impact on a tribal cultural resource 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).

6.18(a.i) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

As previously stated, the City of Point Arena sent formal notification to Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the area. Though no consultation was requested, an Archaeological Report and follow-up investigation has been prepared with mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to significant cultural and tribal cultural resources. Implementation of the previously described **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** requires compliance with procedures set forth in the Archaeological Report and follow-up investigation. As such, the proposed Project, and future physical development facilitated by the proposed Project will have a less than significant impact with mitigation to tribal cultural resources.

Mitigation Measures

See **Mitigation Measure CUL-1.**

5.19 Utilities and Service Systems

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			✓	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?			✓	
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			✓	

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			✓	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			✓	

Existing Utilities and Service Systems Setting

Water

The Point Arena Water Works (PAWW), a privately-owned utility under California Public Utility Commission oversight, supplies water to most of Point Arena. The exceptions are users who have individual wells. The major source of water is a well adjacent to the Garcia River. The main storage tank is just east of downtown. It was estimated in2006 that the system produces 33,000 gallons per day and delivers water to approximately 179 homes and businesses.

Existing water permits allow the PAWW to pump 0.22 cubic feet per second (142,000 gallons per day) or a maximum of 100-acre feet per year (90,000 gallons per day). Existing water storage can hold 575,000 gallons. Under the current water permits, a maximum of 1,385 people may be served (90,000 gallons per day maximum at 65 gallons per person). An emergency contingency plan is lacking in the advent of loss of water at its source or within the system due to a natural disaster, particularly seismic activity at the river or seismic activity in the vicinity of any water lines or storage tanks. Water quality is regulated by the State Department of Health Services, which conducts regular inspections to ensure continuing water quality.

Wastewater

The City's sewage collection and disposal system is owned and operated by the City of Point Arena. Sewer lines serve most of the existing developed area. The treatment includes aerated pond treatment, and chlorination, and percolation and evaporation for disposal. Areas not served are accommodated by individual septic tank systems.

A wastewater system capacity analysis was completed in January of 1996 by Bonneau Dickson, P.E. This study used buildout figures from density and zoning allowed by this General Plan, and it determined that the City of Point Arena wastewater system has adequate capacity to handle and treat the highest foreseeable flows and biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) loads that will be generated under the current General Plan.

The average flows to the system, which in 2006 were just under 30,000 gallons per day (GPD) in dry weather, but the capacity of the system is limited not by the average flows but by the peak flows, which are occasionally 20 to 30 times higher than the average dry weather flows. The

capacity of the sewer system is determined by the peak instantaneous flow that it will pass and will become inadequate only when there is an overflow from the system. The sewer system has never been known to overflow due to a lack of hydraulic capacity. It may increase very little as new connections are made to the sewer system because the system may already be leaking at the maximum rate possible.

Solid Waste

Recology hauls residential of solid waste and recyclable materials in the City of Point Arena to a permitted collection site, and would be available for the Project

Utilities and Service Systems Impact Discussion

(a) Would the Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?
Less Than Significant Impact

(c) *Would the Project 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?*
Less Than Significant Impact

The Project would allow four residential units onsite. This increase in residents in the City has been anticipated by the General Plan and would not be expected to necessitate the expansion or construction of water or wastewater treatment facilities. As previously stated, the City's existing water supply and wastewater treatment capacity is adequate to supply future residential uses. Therefore, impacts related to the relocation, construction, or expansion of water and wastewater facilities would be less than significant.

Future development of the site would be required to install new storm drain infrastructure onsite to accommodate the increase in impervious surfaces. Furthermore, future development would be required to comply with stormwater control strategies and LID standards, which minimize runoff from new impervious surfaces. Therefore, impacts related to the relocation, construction, or expansion of existing storm drain facilities would be less than significant.

6.19(b) Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?
Less Than Significant Impact

Future development of the site would utilize water obtained from the existing PAWW system to meet onsite water demands. Potable water would be accommodated via the installation of new water laterals. The introduction of new residents to the site would increase water demands

relative to existing conditions. However, the increase in onsite water demand resulting from the future development of the site has been anticipated in the General Plan. Therefore, impacts due to insufficient water supplies or inadequate entitlements would be less than significant.

(d) Would the Project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?
Less Than Significant Impact

(e) Would the Project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?
Less Than Significant Impact

Future development of the site as a residential use would be expected to contribute to the generation of solid waste within the City. As a Project condition of approval, future development will be required to provide written verification that the plan for solid waste and recyclables has been accepted by the City's waste hauler. As such, disposal of solid waste resulting from the Project, and future development of the site that would be facilitated by the Project would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

5.20 Wildfire

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			✓	
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			✓	
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources,			✓	

power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			✓	

Existing Wildfire Setting

Mendocino County is highly susceptible to fire hazards due to natural and man-made causes. Dry conditions and high winds along with human encroachment into the wildland-urban interface (WUI) presents increasing risk to human life and structures.

In July 2018, the Mendocino Complex Fire, which was comprised of the Ranch and River fires, burned approximately 458,900 acres near Lakeport, Ukiah, and areas within the Mendocino National Forest. Residents of Point Arena were exposed to the secondary effects of the wildfire, such as smoke and air pollution. Smoke generated by wildfire consists of visible and invisible emissions that contain particulate matter (soot, tar, water vapor, and minerals) and gases (carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxides). Public health impacts associated with wildfire include difficulty in breathing, odor, and reduction in visibility.

Wildfire Impact Discussion

(a) Would the Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
Less Than Significant Impact

The Project site is categorized as a Local Responsibility Area by CAL FIRE. Though the site is located within close proximity to land designated as Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone, there are no lands designated as Very High Fire Hazard Severity within five miles of the Project site. New development would be required to comply with all fire safety standards identified in building code and would be reviewed by the Redwood Coast Fire Protection District. The project is not expected to substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. As such, impacts of the Project, and future development of the site would be less than significant.

6.20(b-d) ***Would the Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***
Less Than Significant Impact

The Project site is relatively flat and is adjacent to existing residential development. Future development onsite would be built in accordance with the building code, which contains fire prevention standards for building materials, systems, and assemblies used in the exterior design and construction of new buildings. There are no factors, such as steep slopes, prevailing winds, or the installation/maintenance of new infrastructure, that would exacerbate fire risk or expose future occupants of the site to the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire, post-fire slope instability, or post-fire flooding. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

5.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the Project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			✓	
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?			✓	

Findings Discussion

(a) Does the Project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self- sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
Less Than Significant Impact

The Project is located within the City limits and potential impacts associated with development have been anticipated by the City's General Plan and analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The proposed Project is generally consistent with the goals of the General Plan and other applicable policy documents. The proposed Project would not result in a reasonably foreseeable development that would adversely impact sensitive habitat, riparian areas, nor would the Project result in significant impacts to special-status plant or wildlife species. With implementation of mitigation measures contained herein, as well as adherence to the City's uniformly applied development standards, the impacts of a future development facilitated by the Project to the quality of the environment would be reduced to levels below significance. As such, the Project will not degrade the quality of the environment, reduce habitat, or adversely affect cultural resources.

(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)?
Less Than Significant Impact

The CEQA Guidelines defines cumulative impacts as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or increase in environmental impacts. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the proposed Project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time" (Guidelines, Section 15355(a)(b)).

This Initial Study evaluates cumulative impacts using the General Plan EIR. Development of the proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and future development in the City could

result in long-term impacts to air quality, traffic, and noise. Cumulative long-term impacts from development within the City were identified and analyzed in the City's General Plan EIR.

The proposed Project and future development that would be permitted by approval of the Project is within the City's long-range plan for future development. The Project will contribute to cumulative impacts identified in the City's General Plan EIR but not to a level that is cumulatively considerable. As described in **Sections 7.1 – 7.20** of this document, the Project and could potentially result in significant impacts; however, those impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures. The implementation of mitigation measures would ensure that development of the proposed Project would not be cumulatively considerable.

(c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
Less Than Significant Impact

The Project has the potential to result in adverse impacts to humans due to air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, geology and soils, noise, and transportation. However, implementation of mitigation measures contained herein will ensure that the Project and future development facilitated by the Project will have less than significant environmental effect that would directly or indirectly impact human beings onsite or in the Project vicinity.

6. Appendix A