



INITIAL STUDY

FOR THE

BEST DEVELOPMENT GROCERY OUTLET

MAY 19, 2022

Prepared for:

City of Fort Bragg
Community Development Department
416 N. Franklin Street
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Prepared by:

De Novo Planning Group
1020 Suncast Lane, Suite 106
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
(916) 580-9818

D e N o v o P l a n n i n g G r o u p

A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm



INITIAL STUDY
FOR THE
BEST DEVELOPMENT GROCERY OUTLET

MAY 19, 2022

Prepared for:

City of Fort Bragg
Community Development Department
416 N. Franklin Street
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Prepared by:

De Novo Planning Group
1020 Suncast Lane, Suite 106
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
(916) 580-9818

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Initial Study Checklist	3
Project Title.....	3
Lead Agency Name and Address	3
Purpose of the Initial Study	3
Project Description	5
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	29
Determination.....	29
Evaluation Instructions	30
Environmental Checklist.....	32
I. <i>AESTHETICS</i>	32
II. <i>AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES</i>	36
III. <i>AIR QUALITY</i>	38
IV. <i>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</i>	40
V. <i>CULTURAL RESOURCES</i>	42
VI. <i>ENERGY</i>	46
VII. <i>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</i>	47
VIII. <i>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</i>	53
IX. <i>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</i>	55
X. <i>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</i>	59
XI. <i>LAND USE AND PLANNING</i>	64
XII. <i>MINERAL RESOURCES</i>	66
XIII. <i>NOISE</i>	67
XIV. <i>POPULATION AND HOUSING</i>	69
XV. <i>PUBLIC SERVICES</i>	70
XVI. <i>RECREATION</i>	72
XVII. <i>TRANSPORTATION</i>	73
XVIII. <i>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</i>	74
XIX. <i>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</i>	77
XX. <i>WILDFIRE</i>	79
XXI. <i>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>	81
References	83

This page left intentionally blank.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

PROJECT TITLE

Best Development Grocery Outlet Project

LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS

City of Fort Bragg
Community Development Department
416 N. Franklin Street
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER

Heather Gurewitz
City of Fort Bragg
Community Development Department
416 N. Franklin St.
Fort Bragg, CA 95437
(707) 961-2827

PROJECT SPONSOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS

Terry Johnson
Best Development Group
2580 Sierra Blvd., Suite E
Sacramento, CA 95825

PURPOSE OF THE INITIAL STUDY

An Initial Study (IS) is a preliminary analysis that is prepared to determine the relative environmental impacts associated with a proposed Project. Initial Studies are frequently used as measuring mechanisms to determine whether substantial evidence indicates that proposed projects may have one or more significant effects on the environment, thereby triggering the need to prepare Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs).

An IS may also be used, however, to “[a]ssist in the preparation of an EIR, if one is required, by: (A) Focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be significant, (B) Identifying the effects determined not to be significant, [and] (C) Explaining the reasons for determining that potentially significant effects would not be significant[.]” (California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] Guidelines Section 15063[c][3].) Where an IS serves this latter function, a lead agency may use the conclusions in the IS to satisfy the requirement in CEQA Guidelines section 15128 that “[a]n EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR.”

At a meeting held on February 28, 2022, the Fort Bragg City Council adopted Resolution 4517-2022, which directed City staff to undertake the preparation of an EIR for the proposed Best Development Grocery Outlet Project (Project). The City Council took this action at the request of the Best Development Group, the Project applicant, for reasons set forth in a letter from Best's legal counsel dated February 2, 2022. On July 26, 2021, the City Council had previously approved

the Project based on a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). On August 24, 2021, however, two petitioners – Fort Bragg Local Business Matters and Leslie Kashiwada – sued the City under CEQA, challenging the City’s reliance on the MND and arguing for the need for an EIR. Best was required by a condition of approval to defend the City’s MND in court, and asked the City, through its counsel’s letter of February 2, 2022, to prepare an EIR in order to avoid the cost in time and money associated with defending the City’s MND in that litigation. The City Council granted this request.

This Initial Study has been prepared, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063[c][3], to determine the specific issues associated with Project that merit detailed discussion in the text of the EIR for the Project. The IS will be an appendix to the EIR intended to satisfy the requirements of CEQA Guidelines section 15128.

PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

PROJECT LOCATION

The Project site is located at 825, 845, and 851 S. Franklin Street in the City of Fort Bragg, Mendocino County, California. The 1.63-acre site is located on the north side of N. Harbor Drive, the west side of S. Franklin Street, and the south side of South Street. The Project site is located approximately 230 to 450 feet east of S. Main Street/Highway 1 (a four-lane conventional highway managed by the California Department of Transportation [Caltrans]) and is located in the City’s Coastal Zone but outside the area in which appeals of coastal development approvals may be appealed to the California Coastal Commission pursuant to Public Resources Code section 30606. Properties within the Coastal Zone are regulated by the Coastal Land Use and Development Code (CLUDC), also known as Fort Bragg Municipal Code (FBMC) Chapter 17. The Project site consists of three parcels identified by Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) 018-120-47, 018-120-48 and 018-120-49.

Figures 1 and 2 show the Project’s regional location and vicinity.

EXISTING PROJECT SITE USES

The northern portion of the Project site contains existing development and the southern portion of the site is vacant with a dirt driveway. A 16,436 square-foot (sf) vacant former office building and associated 47-space parking lot are located in the northern half of the site. The building, locally referred to as the “Old Social Services Building”, has not been leased since 2010 but has been used as storage since then. Wooden fencing is currently located along the western property line and adjacent south of the building. Shrubs and trees are located in the northern portion of the site. The southern-most lot is vacant, with one-third bare soil and two-thirds covered with annual grasses and forbs with scattered shrubs.

The Project site does not contain any creeks/streams, riparian areas, or wetlands on-site. The Project site is located in Zone “X”, area of minimal flood hazard, as shown on Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette map number 06045C1016G, effective July 18, 2017.

The Project site is relatively flat with site elevations ranging from approximately 117 feet to 122 feet above mean sea level (msl).

Figure 3 shows the aerial view of the Project site.

SURROUNDING LAND USES

The Project site is located immediately adjacent to commercial developments to the north, south, and west, and approximately 500 feet north of the Noyo River. Current businesses adjacent to the western site boundary include Super 8, Mountain Mike's Pizza, and Chevron. The Seabird Lodge is across South Street to the north of the Project site, and the Harbor Lite Lodge is located across North Harbor Drive to the south of the Project site. To the east of the site across S. Franklin Street are five single-family residences, one multi-family residential building, and two vacant lots.

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

The Project site has a City of Fort Bragg General Plan land use designation of Highway Visitor Commercial (CH) and a City zoning designation of Highway Visitor Commercial (CH). No changes to the Project site's current land use or zoning designations are proposed under the Project.

The City General Plan land use designations and zoning designations for the Project site and surrounding area are shown on Figure 4.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed Project includes demolition of the existing 16,436-sf vacant former office building and parking area and subsequent development and operation of a 16,157-sf Grocery Outlet (retail grocery store) with associated improvements on the Project site. Grocery Outlet is self-described as a value grocer, meaning that it sells brand name products at bargain prices due to their opportunity buying style. Associated improvements include a parking lot, loading dock and trash enclosure, circulation and access improvements, and utility infrastructure. The proposed site plan is shown in Figure 5.

The Project would also include a merger of three existing parcels (lots) to create one 71,002 sf (1.63 acres) parcel (see Table PD-1) to accommodate the footprint of the proposed retail store within the resulting parcel.

Table PD-1: Proposed Parcel Merger

Existing Parcels	Proposed Parcel
APN 018-120-47, ±17,119 SF (±0.393 acres)	APN to be determined ±71,002 SF (±1.6299816 acres)
APN 018-120-48, ±14,723 SF (±0.338 acres)	
APN 018-120-49, ±38,986 SF (±0.895 acres)	

SOURCE: BEST DEVELOPMENT GROUP, 2021.

Retail Operations

The proposed Project would be operated by 15 to 25 full-time staff and two managers. The Project would be open from 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM, seven days per week with two different shifts covering operating hours.

Building Architecture and Signage

The proposed Project would include 51,650 sf (1.18 acres) of hardscape areas that would be covered with the proposed store, parking lot, accessways or sidewalks, and driveways. As shown in Figure 2.0-5, the retail building would be located in the northern portion of the site with parking in the south portion.

The retail grocery store would be a maximum of 32.25 feet tall at the top of the proposed canopy and a maximum of 23 feet tall at the top of the proposed parapet. The proposed building includes differentiated treatments along the base, mid-section, and top along the three facades facing public streets. Windows would remain clear glass that allows persons inside the store to see outside but does not allow people outside the store to see inside, and the roofline on the corner cut-off entrance is also unique to the other rooflines for additional visual interest. The building will be composed of elements and details representative of Fort Bragg's architectural heritage, as the Applicant's chosen design elements were influenced by Fort Bragg's downtown architecture. The window and door treatments give homage to the smaller shops along the main downtown street's detailing as well as the Hardie Board (wood composite) wood paneling, masonry, and providing a variety of the materials on the elevations to add visual interest. Rooflines of the building would align with buildings on adjacent properties to avoid clashes in building height. Architectural perspectives of the proposed building are shown in Figure 6.

The proposed Project would include the installation of a six-foot-tall illuminated monument sign on the southeast corner of the site. The monument sign would have 15 sf of branding on each side, in addition to the unbranded base. Additionally, an 83.3-sf illuminated channel sign would be located on the sign parapet along the front elevation of the building.

All exterior lighting would be limited to a maximum height of 18 feet and utilize energy-efficient fixtures and lamps. No permanently installed lighting would blink, flash, or be of unusually high intensity or brightness. Exterior lighting would be shielded or recessed and directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public right-of-way to reduce light bleed so that no on-site light fixture directly illuminates an area off-site, in compliance with regulations set by the International Dark-Sky Association.

Landscaping

Currently, four ornamental trees are located in the northwestern portion of the Project site, and additional ornamental trees are located along the South Street frontage. It is possible that the existing trees could be preserved as part of the proposed landscaping plan; however, it is likely that tree removal in some capacity would be required. Proposed landscaping includes trees and vegetation along the property boundaries within the proposed parking lot. Trees would be planted primarily along the north, south, and east boundaries, with a few along the west boundary, as well as one tree within each of the parking lot landscaping islands. Approximately 19,265 sf (0.44 acres) of the site would be landscaped and permeable to stormwater as the proposed Project would be designed to capture stormwater and pre-treat it on-site to remove dirt, oil, and heavy metals using bioretention basins located along the northwest and southwest boundaries. The proposed landscaping plan would comply with the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELo). The MWELo is also referenced by Title 24, Part 11 CalGreen Building Code. The purpose of MWELo is to not only increase water efficiency but to improve environmental conditions in the built environment. Landscaping should be valued beyond the aesthetic because landscapes replace habitat lost to development and provide many other related benefits such as improvements to public health and quality of life, climate change mitigation, energy and materials conservation and increased property values.

CIRCULATION, TRANSPORTATION, AND PARKING

Currently, the site is accessed on the north end via a paved entrance to South Street. There is an existing dirt driveway that runs across the southern parcel from S. Franklin Street to N. Harbor Drive. The proposed Project includes the construction of a new, 30-foot-wide entrance on N.

Harbor Drive and a 35-foot entrance on S. Franklin Street. The existing driveway on the north end of the site would be removed as part of the Project. Additionally, the proposed Project will include an internal system of walkways and crosswalks to provide pedestrian connectivity between the parking lot, building, and sidewalk. The pedestrian improvements would comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). A sidewalk would be constructed along the South Street, S. Franklin Street, and N. Harbor Drive frontages, as required by City standards and to provide pedestrian access around the Site. Where required, existing sidewalks would be upgraded to meet City standards.

As part of the proposed Project, a parking area with 53 parking spaces would be constructed on the south side of the Grocery Outlet building. Two electric vehicle parking stalls will be provided with the required wiring for charging facilities to be installed in the future. Additionally, six clean air vehicle priority parking spots will be provided. Further, an internal system of walkways and crosswalks would be provided, as well as two bicycle parking racks.

UTILITIES AND SERVICES

The Project site is currently served by electrical, propane, city water and wastewater, solid waste, and telecommunication services. The proposed Project would connect to existing City infrastructure to provide water, sewer, and storm drainage utilities. The Project would be served by the following existing service providers:

1. City of Fort Bragg for water;
2. City of Fort Bragg for wastewater collection and treatment;
3. City of Fort Bragg for stormwater collection;
4. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) for electricity.

Water

A six-inch fire service line water connection currently exists on South Street. As part of the proposed Project, this line would be the main water service to the building, and a new six-inch fire connection would be constructed to the east of the existing connection. A total of three fire hydrants with valve lines are proposed for fire suppression on the site.

The proposed preliminary sewer and water plan is shown in Figure 7.

Wastewater

A four-inch sewer lateral currently extends from the existing manhole on South Street. As part of the proposed Project, this lateral would be removed and replaced with a new six-inch sewer lateral per City standards. Wastewater generated on-site would be collected, treated, and disposed of by the City of Fort Bragg Municipal Improvement District No. 1. The District is larger than the City and includes much of the proposed Sphere of Influence. Currently, the District facility serves residences and businesses within the City.

The proposed preliminary sewer and water plan is shown in Figure 7.

Stormwater Drainage

Currently, stormwater typically infiltrates in the undeveloped portion of the Project site or flows to the northwest and southwest towards the neighboring property in the developed portion of the site. As part of the proposed Project, on-site drainage will be managed utilizing post-

construction Low Impact Development (LID) site design measures and Best Management Practices (BMPs). For example, bioretention facilities would be sized to capture and treat runoff from the proposed impervious surfaces produced by the 24-hour, 85th percentile rain event. Additionally, landscaped areas would be provided throughout the site to encourage natural stormwater infiltration. Perimeter improvements, such as sidewalk curbs and gutters, would be required to convey flows from the Project site to the existing Caltrans stormwater drainage system located west of the Site on State Highway 1, which does not currently exist in the vicinity of the site.

The proposed preliminary grading and drainage plan is shown in Figure 8. The proposed storm water management plan is shown in Figure 9.

Other Utilities and Services

As noted previously, electricity would be provided by PG&E. Gas service, if needed, would be provided via a propane tank located on the northern portion of the site.

Solid waste collection service is provided through City contractors (C & S Waste Solutions effective 7/1/22). Solid waste would be collected from a trash bin enclosure to be installed in the western portion of the site.

Xfinity (Comcast) provides cable TV and internet services, with various telecommunication companies providing land-line telephone service to the surrounding area. All utility lines within the Project site would be underground.

REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS AND OTHER APPROVALS

CITY OF FORT BRAGG

The City of Fort Bragg will be the Lead Agency for the proposed Project, pursuant to the State Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Section 15050. If the final City decision making body, either the Planning Commission or (on appeal) the City Council, certifies the EIR in accordance with CEQA requirements, the City may use the EIR to support the following actions:

- Adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);
- Approval of a Zoning Clearance (ZC);
- Approval of a Coastal Development Permit (CDP);
- Approval of Design Review;
- Approval of a Parcel Merger;
- Approval of a Sign Permit;
- Approval of an Encroachment Permit;
- Approval of a Grading Permit;
- Approval of a Building Permit.

OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY APPROVALS

The proposed Project is subject to a number of existing requirements of regulatory agencies other than the City of Fort Bragg, but will not require any specific discretionary approvals from such agencies. For example, although the proposed Project is subject to the policies of the Local Coastal Program governing portions of the City and requires a coastal development permit from the City, the approval by the City of such a permit for the proposed Project cannot be appealed to the

California Coastal Commission due to the character and location of the Project site. (See Public Resources Code section 30606.)

In addition, although the proposed Project is subject to water quality regulations and general permits put in place by state and federal agencies, no state or federal approvals are required in order for site construction to proceed. Construction activities for the proposed Project will be subject to the requirements of General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, also known as the CGP), issued by the State Water Resources Control Board. This General Permit requires operators of construction sites to implement stormwater controls and develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) identifying specific best management practices (BMPs) to be implemented to minimize the amount of sediment and other pollutants associated with construction sites from being discharged in stormwater runoff. SWPPPs must be submitted to the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (here, the North Coastal Regional Water Quality Control Board), but advance approval of the SWPPP by that state agency is not required.




Discharges of stormwater and non-stormwater from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) within the jurisdictional boundary of the City of Fort Bragg are subject to Water Quality Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ, NPDES General Permit No. CAS00004, Waste Discharge Requirements for Storm Water Discharges from MS4s (Phase II MS4 Permit). The Phase II MS4 Permit authorizes the City to discharge stormwater runoff and certain non-stormwater discharges from its MS4 to waters of the United States and provides a framework and requirements for the implementation of the City MS4 Program. The proposed Project can operate within the parameters of these existing authorizations without the need for any specific discretionary approvals from the North Coastal Regional Water Quality Control Board, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, or any other federal or state agency.

Finally, construction activities of the proposed Project will be subject to the Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (MCAQMD), but no individual permit is required for project construction or operation to proceed.

This page left intentionally blank.



Legend


-  Project Location
-  Incorporated Area
-  County Boundary

Sources: California State Geportal.

FORT BRAGG BEST DEVELOPMENT GROCERY OUTLET PROJECT

Figure 1. Regional Location Map

This page left intentionally blank.



**FORT BRAGG BEST DEVELOPMENT
GROCERY OUTLET PROJECT**

Figure 2. Vicinity Map

Legend

-  Project Boundary

Sources: Mendocino County; ArcGIS Online
OpenStreetMap Map Service.

This page left intentionally blank.



**FORT BRAGG BEST DEVELOPMENT
GROCERY OUTLET PROJECT**



Figure 3. Aerial View of Project Site

Legend

 Project Boundary

Sources: Mendocino County; ArcGIS Online
World Imagery Map Service, 3/13/2020.

This page left intentionally blank.



Legend

- Project Boundary
- Fort Bragg City Boundary
- Unincorporated Mendocino County

FORT BRAGG BEST DEVELOPMENT GROCERY OUTLET PROJECT

Figure 4. Existing General Plan and Zoning

Sources: City of Fort Bragg Map LU-1 Land Use Designations, July 2008;
City of Fort Bragg 7A Att4 New 2016 Zoning Map.

0 250 500
Feet

De Novo Planning Group
A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm

This page left intentionally blank.

This page left intentionally blank.



Entrance
Perspective

Parking Lot
Perspective











South St Corner
Perspective

FORT BRAGG BEST DEVELOPMENT
GROCERY OUTLET PROJECT

Figure 6. Perspectives

This page left intentionally blank.




	ASPHALT PAVEMENT		
	BUILDING AREA		
	LANDSCAPE AREA		FIRE DEPARTMENT CONNECTION (FDC)
	CONCRETE SIDEWALK		METER & BACKFLOW
	BIO RETENTION BASIN		

**FORT BRAGG BEST DEVELOPMENT
GROCERY OUTLET PROJECT**

Figure 7. Preliminary Sewer and Water Plan

Source: Best Development

This page left intentionally blank.



- 1 ACCESSIBLE PARKING/LOADING ZONE
- 2 ACCESSIBLE CURB RAMP
- 3 BIO-RETENTION BASIN (A/C4)
- 4 1-FOOT CURB OPENING INTO BASIN (A/C1)
- 5 CONCRETE VALLEY GUTTER
- 6 (2) 3" PVC SIDEWALK DRAIN PIPE
- 7 SIDEWALK



PROPOSED	EXISTING
168.0 AC	ELEVATION (165.5) FL
—	SIDEWALK DRAIN
•	DRAINAGE INLET
■	ASPHALT PAVEMENT
■	BUILDING AREA
■	LANDSCAPE AREA
■	PCC CONCRETE
■	BIORETENTION BASIN
■	CONCRETE SIDEWALK
—	DRAINAGE DIRECTION

**FORT BRAGG BEST DEVELOPMENT
GROCERY OUTLET PROJECT**

Figure 8. Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan

Source: Best Development

This page left intentionally blank.



**FORT BRAGG BEST DEVELOPMENT
GROCERY OUTLET PROJECT**

Figure 9. Preliminary Storm Water Management Plan

Source: Best Development.

This page left intentionally blank.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The City finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15063[c][3], that the environmental factors listed below will need to be discussed in detail in the text of the EIR for the Project, as described on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry Resources	X	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources	X	Energy
	Geology and Soils	X	Greenhouse Gasses		Hazards and Hazardous Materials
	Hydrology and Water Quality	X	Land Use and Planning		Mineral Resources
X	Noise		Population and Housing		Public Services
	Recreation	X	Transportation		Tribal Cultural Resources
X	Utilities and Service Systems		Wildfire	X	Mandatory Findings of Significance

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.
X	I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. Many environmental effects of the proposed Project, however, will be less than significant, and need not be addressed in the text of the EIR. Rather, the explanations and conclusions reached herein with respect to those less than significant effects are sufficient to satisfy the requirements of CEQA Guidelines section 15128. This Initial Study will be made an appendix to the Draft EIR and thus will be a part of the Draft EIR circulated for public comment.
	I find that the proposed Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

In each area of potential impact listed in this section, there are one or more questions which assess the degree of potential environmental effect. A response is provided to each question using one of the four impact evaluation criteria described below. A discussion of the response is also included.

- **Potentially Significant Impact.** This response is appropriate when there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, upon completion of the Initial Study, an EIR is required.
- **Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** This response applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact". The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
- **Less than Significant Impact.** A less than significant impact is one which is deemed to have little or no adverse effect on the environment. Mitigation measures are, therefore, not necessary, although they may be recommended to further reduce a minor impact.
- **No Impact.** These issues were either identified as having no impact on the environment, or they are not relevant to the project.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

This section of the Initial Study incorporates the most current Appendix "G" Environmental Checklist Form contained in the CEQA Guidelines. Impact questions and responses are included in both tabular and narrative formats for each of the 21 environmental topic areas.

I. AESTHETICS

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
c) In non-urbanized 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?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

Discussion

The Project site is located within the City of Fort Bragg city limits on urban and built-up land, surrounded by parcels utilized for commercial businesses, residences, and two vacant lots. The Project site contains existing development primarily within the northern half of the Project site. The northern lot is 95 percent covered by a paved parking area with shrubbery planted around the edges. The existing 16,436 sf vacant former office building is located on the middle lot. The southern-most lot is vacant with one-third bare soil and two-thirds covered with annual grasses and forbs with scattered shrubs. Currently, the Project site is accessed on the north end via a paved entrance to South Street. There is an existing dirt driveway that runs across the southern parcel from S. Franklin Street to N. Harbor Drive.

Under the proposed Project, an existing 16,436 sf vacant former office building and associated 47-space parking lot and wooden fencing along the property line would be demolished, and a Grocery Outlet (retail store) would be constructed on the Project site. Conceptual plans for the proposed Project indicate that the retail store would be a one-story structure, 16,157 sf in size. Associated improvements and infrastructure on-site would include a loading dock and trash enclosure on the west side of the store, a parking area with 53 parking spaces on the south side of the store, an internal system of walkways and crosswalks, two bicycle racks, two driveways, a

new fire connection, replacement of an existing sewer connection, connection to underground utilities, landscaping for stormwater capture and treatment, illuminated signage, and landscaping throughout the Project site. The existing planted ornamental trees along the South Street frontage would be removed and replaced with landscaping selected for the local climate. Landscaping includes trees and vegetation along the property boundaries within the proposed parking lot and bioretention basins located along the northwest and southwest boundaries. Trees would be planted along the north, south, and east boundaries, with a few along the west boundary, as well as one tree within each of the parking lot landscaping islands. The Project would include the installation of a six-foot-tall illuminated monument sign on the southeast corner of the Project site. The monument sign would have 15 sf of branding on each side, in addition to the unbranded base. Additionally, an 83.3 sf illuminated channel sign would be located on the sign parapet along the front elevation. All exterior lighting would utilize energy-efficient fixtures and lamps, shielded or recessed, and directed downward in compliance with regulations set by the International Dark-Sky Association.

The Project site is bordered to the north by South Street, to the east by S. Franklin Street, to the south by N. Harbor Drive, and to the west by a Super 8, Mountain Mike's Pizza, and Chevron. Nearby uses include commercial businesses to the north, west, and south, and residences and two vacant lots to the east. State Highway 1 is located on the other side of the existing commercial businesses, approximately 400 feet west of the Project site.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Per the City's Community Design Element of the Coastal General Plan Map CD-1., the proposed Project is not located in an area designated as having "potential scenic views toward the ocean or the Noyo River".

In the opinion of City staff, the Project site is not located "along the ocean" or within a "scenic coastal area" within the meaning of Coastal General Plan Policy CD 1.1, which provides that "[p]ermitted development shall be designed and sited to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural landforms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance scenic views in visually degraded areas." Rather, the Project site is located on the landward side of State Highway 1, and there is intervening visually obtrusive commercial development between the site and State Highway 1.

The proposed Project would replace an existing structure with one of approximately the same size. The proposed retail store would occupy a similar location to the existing structure on the northern portion of the Project site, where views looking to the west toward the Pacific Ocean are blocked by the existing Super 8 hotel, west of the Project site, which is the direction in which the Pacific Ocean and landscapes immediately adjacent to the coast are located. There are limited views of the Pacific Ocean through the Project site from S. Franklin Street along the north boundary as these views extend through numerous parcels, including an existing Chevron gas station and the undeveloped Mill Project site to the west of State Highway 1. These views are interrupted by two large trees, which substantially obscure pedestrians' and drivers' views of the ocean. The 'keyhole' view is also dependent on the future development patterns of these sites. The vacant Mill Project site could be developed under existing zoning, and a new structure could completely block the existing interrupted view of the Chevron Station and ocean.

The proposed retail store would be setback 10 feet from the north boundary and vegetation is proposed along the boundary as seen in the landscape plan (see Figure 4), which excludes new

tree planting within the 10-foot setback, preserving a limited view to the Pacific Ocean through the northern portion of the Project site. A *less than significant* impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response b): The proposed Project would be located on city streets and not along any highway. Neither of the two highways near the Project site, State Highway 1 and State Highway 20, are state scenic highways. Per Caltrans Scenic Highway System Lists, State Highway 1 and State Highway 20 are eligible state scenic highways, although they have not been designated as scenic (Caltrans, 2019). Additionally, the proposed Project would be separated from State Highway 1 by an existing hotel and gas station. Although the proposed Project would likely be visible from State Highway 1, it would only be visible behind the existing commercial development. This view is east of State Highway 1 and away from the Pacific Ocean. In addition, the existing vacant former office building slated to be demolished is not listed on any local, state, or federal historic list or registry, as it was constructed sometime between 1996 and 1998 as indicated in the Cultural Survey, prepared by Genesis Society, dated August 15, 2019.

As previously mentioned, the southern portion of the Project site is approximately one-third bare soil but is otherwise vegetated with annual grasses and forbs, with scattered shrubs. The northern portion is almost completely paved or developed with an existing structure; however, the northern property boundary has ornamental landscaping. The existing vegetation would be removed for the development of the new building, parking lot, and the Project site's landscaping. The existing vegetation was likely planted as ornamental landscaping around the existing parking lot, and is not part of a natural scenic landscape. The replacement of the existing vegetation with landscaping selected for the local climate, including the planting of 37 new trees, would not be anticipated to damage any existing scenic resources on Project site, such as existing trees or rock outcroppings. A *less than significant* impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response c): The proposed Project would replace an existing structure with one of approximately the same size. While development of the proposed Project would change and alter the existing visual character of the Project site, these changes would not degrade the visual quality of the site or the surrounding areas. The proposed building incorporates a mix of materials, architectural features, varied roof lines, building recesses and articulation which provide visual interest and maintain the City's urban character.

Various temporary visual impacts could occur as a result of construction activities as the Project develops, including grading, equipment and material storage, and staging. Though temporary, some of these impacts could last for several weeks or months during any single construction phase. The loss of existing landscaping and trees would also be a temporary impact until new landscaping matures. Because impacts would be temporary and viewer sensitivity in the majority of cases would be slight to moderate, significant impacts would not occur.

As previously mentioned, the proposed Project is not located in an area designated as having "potential scenic views toward the ocean or the Noyo River". The proposed retail store would occupy a location similar to that of the existing structure on the northern portion of the Project site, where views looking to the west toward the Pacific Ocean are blocked by the existing hotel, west of the Project site. Views to the Project site are currently dominated by the existing former office building and associated parking lot, which has been vacant since 2010. The southern portion of the Project site is partially bare, with vegetation consisting of grasses and forbs, with scattered shrubs. Existing views to the Project site are not characterized as scenic; therefore, the proposed Project is not anticipated to substantially degrade the existing visual character or

quality of the public views of the Project site and its surroundings, as the height of the proposed retail store would be consistent with the Project site's existing development and would comply with all required development standards, including maximum building height. Although the Project site is located on urban and built-up land per the California Department of Conservation, the Project is not located in an "urbanized area," as defined by either Public Resources Code section 21071 or CEQA Guidelines section 15387.

The proposed Project would be consistent with the Fort Bragg Coastal General Plan, and would adhere to the requirements of the City's site plan and architectural approval process. Therefore, this is considered a ***less than significant*** impact, and no additional mitigation is required. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response d): The Project site is currently mostly developed and contains one vacant building with associated parking. Existing lighting at the Project site includes exterior building lighting, interior building lighting, and street lighting. There is a potential for the proposed Project to create new sources of light and glare, although the amount of light and glare would likely be similar to the existing conditions in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. Examples of lighting would include construction lighting, exterior building lighting, interior building lighting, and automobile lighting. Examples of glare would include reflective building materials and automobiles.

The proposed Project has the potential to increase light and glare and impact nighttime views as compared to existing conditions, as the Project site's current development consists of a former office building that has been vacant since 2010. A six-foot illuminated monument sign on the southeast corner of the Project site is proposed, in addition to an 83.3 sf illuminated channel sign located on the sign parapet along the front elevation of the retail store. To minimize potential impacts associated with light and glare on surrounding development, the proposed Project includes exterior lighting that would utilize energy-efficient fixtures and lamps, shielded or recessed, and directed downward in compliance with regulations set by the International Dark-Sky Association. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would have a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this topic. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1222(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
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?				X

Discussion

The Project site is located within the Coastal Zone in the City of Fort Bragg city limits. The approximately 1.63-acre Project site contains existing development primarily within the northern half of the Project site. The northern lot is 95 percent covered by a paved parking area with shrubbery planted around the edges. The existing 16,436 sf vacant former office building is located on the middle lot. The southern-most lot is vacant with one-third bare soil and two-thirds covered with annual grasses and forbs with scattered shrubs. The properties in the immediate vicinity of the Project site either are already developed or are vacant but ready for development if and when development applications are filed and approved. No nearby properties are actively farmed, as they are located in an urban setting.

The Project site is designated as “Urban and Built-Up Land” under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Department of Conservation (DOC), Division of Land Resource Protection, and is not under a Williamson Act Agricultural Preserve contract (Mendocino County Maps - Timber Production & Williamson Act Lands, 2014).

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The proposed Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use, conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. As noted above, the Project site is designated as “Urban and Built-Up Land” under the FMMP of the DOC and is located within the City of Fort Bragg in an urban built-up environment.

Because the proposed Project only includes redevelopment of the Project site within an urban area of the City designated for urban uses, the Project has no potential to convert any off-site agricultural land, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. Therefore, there is ***no impact***. This environmental issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response b): The Project site is not zoned for agricultural use nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. The proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. Implementation of the proposed Project would have ***no impact*** relative to this issue. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Responses c), d): The Project site is not forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1222(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526). The proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland. Implementation of the proposed Project would have ***no impact*** relative to this issue. These issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

III. AIR QUALITY

Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines states that “[w]here available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.” Consistent with this approach, the proposed Project will have a significant impact on the environment associated with air quality if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	X			
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?	X			
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	X			
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	X			

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a-d): Based on air quality concerns raised by public comments, the City has determined that the potential impacts on air quality caused by the proposed Project will require a detailed analysis in the text of the EIR. Consequently, the City will examine each of the four environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the EIR and will decide whether the proposed Project has the potential to have a significant impact on air quality. At this point, a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made. Rather, all are considered ***potentially significant*** until a detailed analysis is prepared in the text of the EIR.

The text of the EIR will include an air quality analysis that presents the methodology, thresholds of significance, an air quality plan consistency analysis, a cumulative impact analysis, and a discussion of feasible mitigation measures that should be implemented to reduce any potential impacts on air quality. The Project may result in toxic air contaminant emissions, short-term construction-related emissions, and long-term operational emissions, primarily attributable to emissions from vehicle trips and from energy consumption by the commercial uses. The proposed Project is located within North Coast Air Basin (NCAB), which is under the jurisdiction of the Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (MCAQMD). The City will consult with the MCAQMD regarding the Project’s potential to cause impacts, and the applicability of the MCAQMD’s Rules and Regulations. The City will also consult with the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The air quality analysis will include the following:

- A description of regional and local air quality as well meteorological conditions that could affect air pollutant dispersal or transport in the vicinity of the Project site. Applicable air quality regulatory framework, standards, and significance thresholds will be discussed.
- An analysis of the proposed Project’s potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plans.

- An analysis of the MCAQMD Rules and Regulations that are applicable to the proposed Project.
- Short-term (i.e., construction) increases in regional criteria air pollutants will be quantitatively assessed. The latest version of the CARB-approved California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) computer model will be used to estimate regional mobile source and particulate matter emissions associated with the construction of the proposed Project.
- Long-term (operational) increases in regional criteria air pollutants will be quantitatively assessed for area source, mobile sources, and stationary sources. The CARB-approved CalEEMod computer model will be used to estimate emissions associated with the proposed Project. Modeling will be provided for the worst-case proposed Project land use scenario.
- Exposure to odorous or toxic air contaminants during the Project's operational phase will be assessed through an air toxics health risk assessment, utilizing AERMOD and HARP-2 risk modeling software, following guidance as provided by the MCAQMD and the CARB. Incremental cancer risk for residents and workers, and chronic and acute hazards will be assessed.
- Local mobile-source (carbon monoxide) (CO) concentrations will be assessed through a CO screening method as recommended by the MCAQMD. If the screening method indicates that modeling is necessary, upon review of the traffic analysis, CO concentrations will be modeled using the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)-approved CALINE4 computer model.
- The potential for the proposed Project to generate objectionable odors on neighboring sensitive receptors will be assessed qualitatively following CARB recommendations.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

CEQA Guidelines Appendix G is a sample Initial Study checklist that includes a number of factual inquiries related to the subject of biological resources, as it does on a whole series of additional environmental topics. Notably, lead agencies are under no obligation to use these inquiries in fashioning thresholds of significance on any subject addressed in the checklist. (*Save Cuyama Valley v. County of Santa Barbara* (2013) 213 Cal.App.4th 1059, 1068.) Rather, with few exceptions, “CEQA grants agencies discretion to develop their own thresholds of significance.” (*Ibid.*) Even so, it is a common practice for lead agencies to take the language from the inquiries set forth in Appendix G and to use that language in fashioning thresholds.

Although CEQA generally gives agencies considerable discretion in fashioning significance thresholds, there are some thresholds that must, as a matter of law, be used by public agencies. Many of these relate to biological resources, and are found in CEQA Guidelines section 15065 (“Mandatory Findings of Significance”).

Finally, the City is aware that neither Appendix G nor section 15065 sets forth language directly addressing potential effects on birds of prey or nesting birds due to violation of laws (described earlier) intended to protect them. The City has therefore exercised its discretion to formulate a threshold to address this particular category of impact.

In light of the foregoing, for purposes of this EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15065, subdivision (a)(1), and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact on biological resources if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species?	X			
b) Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels?	X			
c) Threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community?	X			
d) Substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species?	X			
e) 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	X			
f) 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 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	X			
g) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not	X			

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
h) 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?	X			
i) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	X			
j) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a-i): Based on known biological resources in the region, and the potential for special-status species habitat in the region, the City has been determined that the potential impacts on biological resources caused by the proposed Project will require a detailed analysis in the text of the EIR. As such, the City will examine each of the nine environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the text of the EIR and will decide whether the proposed Project has the potential to have a significant impact on biological resources. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made, rather all are considered ***potentially significant*** until a detailed analysis is prepared in text of the EIR.

The EIR text will provide a summary of local biological resources, including descriptions and mapping of plant communities, the associated plant and wildlife species, and sensitive biological resources known to occur, or with the potential to occur in the Project vicinity. The analysis will conclude with a consistency analysis regarding local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance), cumulative impact analysis, and a discussion of feasible mitigation measures that should be implemented in order to reduce impacts on biological resources and to ensure compliance with federal and state regulations.

Responses j): The proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, as there are no such plans applicable to the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project would have ***no impact*** relative to this topic

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Consistent with Public Resources Code sections 21084.1, 21084.2, CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5[b], and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project is considered to have a significant impact on cultural resources if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			X	
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

Discussion

Consistent with Public Resources Code sections 21084.1, 21084.2, CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5[b], and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project is considered to have a significant impact on cultural resources if it will:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5;
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries; or
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
 - Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or
 - A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resources to a California Native American tribe.

CEQA guidelines use the following definitions to analyze impacts on historical or archaeological resources:

- Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired (§ 15064.5(b)(1)).
- The significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that

convey its historic significance or justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, the NRHP, CRHR, or local registers (§ 15064.5(b)(2)(A-C)).

Various City policies exist related to the protection and preservation of cultural and historical resources, including but not limited to: Policies OS-4.1 through OS-4.5 of Chapter 4 (Conservation, Open Space, Energy, and Parks) of the Coastal General Plan of the City of Fort Bragg (2008). These policies seek to protect and preserve cultural resources by requiring new development to be located and/or designed to avoid archaeological and paleontological resources, where feasible, archaeological resources reports for development in specific areas, and standard protocol in the event archaeological resources are uncovered during construction.

A Cultural Resources Inventory Survey (Cultural Survey) was prepared by Genesis Society on August 15, 2019, to evaluate the Project's potential to impact cultural resources in conformity with the City of Fort Bragg and Mendocino County rules and regulations, and in compliance with requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Due to the sensitive and confidential nature of cultural reports, a copy of the Cultural Survey is not included as an appendix to this Initial Study. This study was reviewed for adequacy as part of this Initial Study. The review determined that there is no potential for new cultural events or historical changes to have occurred on this site since the 2019 Cultural Study was performed. The 2019 Cultural Study is found to be adequate and remains valid.

According to the Cultural Resources Inventory Survey, the region in which the Project site is located was first inhabited more than 12,000 years ago. Prior to historic settlement, the lands surrounding the Noyo River were covered by a variety of coastal scrub and a mixed forest dominated by Bishop pine and including redwood, conifers, and hardwoods such as tanoak and madrone. The Project site is located within the territory claimed by the Northern Pomo at the time of initial European-American entry into the region. The Northern Pomo consisted of multiple tribelets, which consisted of three (3) to five (5) primary villages. One (1) ethnographic village, Kadiu, was located immediately north of the Noyo River and is today identified immediately west of State Highway 1, west of the Project site. Pomo cultural materials are documented in both ethnographic and archaeological records and artifacts include a wide variety of materials and expressions. Colonization of the region began in 1812 with the establishment of Fort Ross by Russia, approximately 80 miles south of the Project site, and was followed by other European-American explorers who visited, then later settled, the Mendocino Coast beginning in the 1830s. In 1855, the federal government created the 25,000-acre Mendocino Indian Reservation adjacent to the north side of the Noyo River. In 1857, Fort Bragg was established between Pudding Creek and the Noyo River, to administer the large reservation until 1864 when the interred Native Americans were forcibly moved to the Round Valley Indian Reservation near Covelo. Widespread settlement in Mendocino County was spurred by demand for both lumber and agricultural lands and led to the establishment of mills throughout the County and the 1891 formation of the Union Lumber Company in Fort Bragg; the Union Lumber Company closed in 1969 (Genesis Society, 2019).

A records search was conducted at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) located on the Sonoma State University campus on July 16, 2019 (File No. 18-2464), which included a review of all records on file for lands within a 0.25-mile radius of the Project site, including archaeological site and survey records, and numerous registries and inventories reviewed as part of the NWIC search, or evaluated separately. Topographic maps from 1943 through 1985 depict a school within the Project area; however, aerial photographs show that no structures existed on the Project site between 1943 and 1996. As such, the Cultural Survey deduced that the school icon visible on historic topographic maps represents an "artifact" from older topographic maps. A

review of the historic registers and inventories indicated that no archaeological investigation had been previously prepared for the Project site and no historic properties or cultural resources have been documented within the Project area; however, eight cultural resources have been documented within a 0.25-mile radius of the Project site.

As noted in the Cultural Survey, fieldwork was conducted on August 10, 2019, by Genesis Society and entailed an intensive pedestrian survey by means of walking systematic transects, spaced at 10-meter intervals within the portions of the Project site that did not contain existing impervious surface cover, including building, parking, roads, etc. In surfaced areas, structure and road margins were inspected for any native soils. The Cultural Survey notes that the majority of the Project site has been subjected to intensive disturbance as a result of wholesale demolition, grading, and subsequent contemporary (post-1996) commercial building construction. No evidence of prehistoric or historic use or occupation was observed within the Project site, most likely due to the degree of contemporary disturbance to which the Project site has been subjected. Based on the findings of the records search and pedestrian survey, no significant historical resources or unique archaeological resources are present within the Project area and none will be affected by the proposed Project (Genesis, 2019).

On June 20, 2019, Genesis Society contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request information concerning archaeological sites or traditional use areas for the Project area. The NAHC response letter, dated June 28, 2019, indicated that a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search was completed and returned a negative result. The NAHC provided a list of 13 Native American contacts who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the Project area and suggested that Genesis Society contact all of those indicated. The NAHC Native American Contacts List dated June 27, 2019, including the Director and Chairperson of the Cahto Tribe; the Chairpersons of the Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians, Guidiville Band of Pomo Indians, Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria, Manchester Band of Pomo Indians, Noyo River Indian Community, Pinoleville Pomo Nation, Potter Valley Tribe, Redwood Valley or Little River Band of Pomo Indians, and Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians; and the President of the Round Valley Reservation/Covelo Indian Community.

On July 22, 2019, Genesis Society sent letters to all representatives on the NAHC contact list, and those contacted were requested to supply any information they might have concerning prehistoric sites or traditional use areas within, adjacent, or near the Project area. A follow-up email and telephone call were placed with Tina Sutherland of the Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians on Saturday, August 10, 2019, prior to the pedestrian survey. No responses were received from the contacted parties. As no prehistoric cultural material was identified during the records search or pedestrian survey, no additional consultation was undertaken by Genesis Society or the City of Fort Bragg (City), and the City, as Lead Agency, has deemed the Tribal consultation process complete. Copies of the NAHC response and Native American Contacts List and an example of the letters sent to Tribal representatives are included in the Cultural Survey (Genesis Society, 2019).

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): As discussed above, the Cultural Survey (Genesis Society, 2019) found that no historical resources or historic properties have been documented within the Project area. While the proposed Project includes the demolition of an existing building, the existing building is a contemporary (post-1996) commercial building. As a result, *no impact* would occur. Even so, the proposed Project, if approved, will be subject to a standard condition of approval requiring that, in the event of the discovery during construction of potential historical resources of an

archaeological nature, unique archaeological resources, or tribal cultural resources, work in the affected area will cease until a qualified archaeologist, working with City staff, determines whether, indeed, any such resources are actually present and, if so, formulates and carries out measures for either avoiding them or otherwise treating them. These issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Responses b-c): The Project is not anticipated to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or disturb any human remains. As noted above, based on the records search conducted at the NWIC, the consultation undertaken with the NAHC, and the Tribal consultation effort completed by Genesis Society (2019), no unique archaeological resources or prehistoric cultural material was identified in the Project area. The Cultural Survey recommends archaeological clearance for the proposed Project, with the inclusion of general provisions that recommend consultation and protocol in the event of inadvertent discovery. A standard condition of approval to that effect, as discussed above, will be applied to the Project. The proposed Project is found consistent with policies of the City of Fort Bragg for protection of cultural resources, including human remains. A *less than significant* impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

VI. ENERGY

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	X			
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	X			

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a), b): Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines requires consideration of the potentially significant energy implications of a project. CEQA requires mitigation measures to minimize significant effects on the environment, including measures to reduce “wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary” energy usage (Public Resources Code Section 21100, subdivision [b][3]). According to Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, the means to achieve the goal of conserving energy include decreasing overall energy consumption, decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. In particular, the proposed Project would be considered “wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary” if it were to violate state and federal energy standards and/or result in significant adverse impacts related to project energy requirements, energy inefficiencies, energy intensiveness of materials, cause significant impacts on local and regional energy supplies or generate requirements for additional capacity, fail to comply with existing energy standards, otherwise result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources, or conflict or create an inconsistency with applicable plan, policy, or regulation.

The amount of energy used at the Project site would directly correlate to the size of the future building, the energy consumption of associated technology, machinery, and appliances, and outdoor lighting. Other major sources of energy consumption associated with future buildout of the Project site include fuel used by vehicle trips generated during Project construction and operation, and fuel used by off-road construction vehicles during construction.

As a result, the potential impacts on energy caused by the proposed Project will require a detailed analysis in the text of the EIR. Consequently, the City will examine each of the environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the EIR text and will decide whether the proposed Project has the potential to have a significant impact on energy resources. The EIR text will include a discussion and analysis that provides calculated levels of energy use expected for the proposed Project, based on commonly used modelling software (i.e. CalEEMod v.2016.3.2 and the CARB’s EMFAC2014). At this point, a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made. Rather, all are considered ***potentially significant*** until a detailed analysis is prepared in the text of the EIR.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
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?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

Discussion

The City of Fort Bragg (City) is located in the Coast Ranges geologic province, an area dominated by north-west trending mountain ranges, which have been cut by major river valleys. As provided in Chapter 7 (Safety) of the City of Fort Bragg Coastal General Plan, the City is located approximately nine miles east of the San Andreas Fault Zone and 22 miles west of the Mayacama Fault Zone, which are the two major fault systems capable of generating significant earthquakes in the region.

As provided in Chapter 3, The Land Use Plan: Resources and Development Issues and Policies of the Mendocino County Coastal Element, the Coastal Zone is seismically active and vulnerable to earthquake hazards which include surface rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, and differential settlement (County, 1985). The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo special studies zone nor do any known faults traverse the Project site (California Geologic Survey [CGS], 2019). Since the Project site is located within a seismically active region and per the Earthquake Shaking Potential for California map, there is a high likelihood of experiencing large earthquakes that display strong shaking to occur during the economic lifespan (50 years) of any development on the Project site (CGS, 2016).

The specific soil type underlying the Project site is classified as Urban land, 0 to 15 percent slopes (Soil Type #219). This soil type is predominantly covered by impervious surfaces or has been altered by cutting, filling, and grading. About 25 percent consists of unaltered soils that are extremely variable and require an onsite investigation to evaluate the potential and limitations for any proposed use (USDA, 2006). No historic landslides have been mapped in the vicinity nor within the boundaries of the Project site. Additionally, the Project site is not mapped for liquefaction potential, although geologic maps indicate the Project site is underlain by Pleistocene aged marine and marine terrace deposits that are potentially susceptible to liquefaction (DMG, 1960). The Project site is relatively flat with gentle slopes of less than 5 percent to the northwest and southwest towards the neighboring property, in the developed portion of the Project site.

Paleontology is defined as a science dealing with the life of past geological periods as known from fossil remains. Paleontological resources include fossil remains, as well as fossil localities and formations that have produced fossil material. Such locations and specimens are important nonrenewable resources. According to the County of Mendocino General Plan Update Draft EIR, a search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) collections database identified 182 paleontological resources in Mendocino County. These resources primarily consist of vertebrates and invertebrates. The majority of the resources are invertebrates found in the Coastal Zone.

Response to Checklist Questions

Response a.i-ii): The CGS evaluates faults and determines if a fault should be zoned as active, potentially active, or inactive. All active faults are incorporated into a Special Studies Zone, also referred to as an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone. The Project site is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone or an area currently designated as a “Seismic Hazard Zone” by the State and the nearest active fault to the Project site is the San Andreas Fault Zone, located approximately 9 miles west of the Project site (City, 2008). However, since the Project site is located within a seismically active region proximal to multiple seismic sources (the Mayacama Fault Zone and San Andreas Fault) capable of generating moderate to large ground motions, it is expected that the Project area would likely experience large earthquakes that display strong shaking during the economic life span of any Project site development, including the proposed Project. Given the proximity of the proposed Project to active seismic sources within the region currently and based on the distance between the Project site and the closest active fault, the San Andreas Fault zone, the potential for surface rupture at the Project site is considered moderate.

The proposed Project would replace an existing structure with one of approximately the same size. The proposed retail store would occupy a similar location to the existing structure on the northern portion of the Project site. The Project does not include any off-site improvements. The Project would not cause any effects by exacerbating existing hazards, including those related to earthquake faults. There will always be a potential for groundshaking caused by seismic activity

anywhere in California, including the Project site. In order to minimize potential damage to the buildings and site improvements, all construction in California is required to be designed in accordance with the latest seismic design standards of the California Building Code (CBC). Design in accordance with these standards would reduce any potential impact to a *less than significant* level. These issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response a.iii): The Project site is not mapped for liquefaction potential, although geologic maps indicate the Project site is underlain by Pleistocene aged marine and marine terrace deposits that are potentially susceptible to liquefaction (DMG, 1960). The proposed Project would replace an existing structure with one of approximately the same size. The proposed retail store would occupy a similar location to the existing structure on the northern portion of the Project site. The Project does not include any off-site improvements. The Project would not cause any effects by exacerbating existing hazards, including those related to liquefaction. Additionally, since the proposed Project would be subject to the requirements of the latest version of the CBC to reduce any potential geological risks, a *less than significant* impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response a.iv): There are several categories of landslides including: rockfalls, deep slope failure, and shallow slope failure. Factors such as the geological conditions, drainage, slope, vegetation, and others directly affect the potential for landslides. One of the most common causes of landslides is construction activity that is associated with road building (i.e. cut and fill).

Landslides generally occur on relatively steep slopes and/or on slopes underlain by weak sediments. As previously discussed, no historic landslides have been mapped in the vicinity nor within the boundaries of the Project site. As seen from Google Earth imagery, the Project site is relatively flat with gentle slopes of less than 5 percent to the northwest and southwest towards the neighboring property, in the developed portion of the Project site and elevations ranging from approximately 117 feet and 122 feet amsl. As noted previously, the proposed Project would replace an existing structure with one of approximately the same size. The proposed retail store would occupy a similar location to the existing structure on the northern portion of the Project site. The Project does not include any off-site improvements. The Project would not cause any effects by exacerbating existing hazards, including those related to landslides. Given the relatively low slopes, both on and adjacent to the Project site, and no historic landslides mapped in the vicinity of the Project site, *no impact* would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response b): Construction activities including grading could temporarily increase soil erosion rates during and shortly after Project construction. Construction-related erosion could result in the loss of a substantial amount of nonrenewable topsoil and could adversely affect water quality in nearby surface waters. The Construction General Permit issued by the State Water Board and implemented and enforced by Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, also known as the CGP) requires a Project specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be prepared for each Project that disturbs an area one acre or larger. The SWPPP will include Project specific best management measures that are designed to control drainage and erosion.

On-site development would require demolition, excavation, and groundbreaking activities. All development activities, including the proposed retail store, would be subject to the site development regulations in Article 6, Chapter 17.60 of the City's CLUDC, which include environmental protection and Best Management Practices (BMPs) for minimizing erosion resulting from construction, avoiding runoff into sensitive habitat areas, limiting ground

disturbance to the minimum necessary, and stabilizing disturbed surfaces as soon as feasible after construction is complete. In compliance with these regulations, the Project contractor would be required to implement the BMPs provided on the approved Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) prepared for the Project, which may include, but are not limited, to straw bales, fiber rolls, and/or silt fencing structures. As a result, a *less than significant* impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response c): Liquefaction normally occurs when sites underlain by saturated, loose to medium dense, granular soils are subjected to relatively high ground shaking. During an earthquake, ground shaking may cause certain types of soil deposits to lose shear strength, resulting in ground settlement, oscillation, loss of bearing capacity, landsliding, and the buoyant rise of buried structures. The majority of liquefaction hazards are associated with sandy soils, silty soils of low plasticity, and some gravelly soils. Cohesive soils are generally not considered to be susceptible to liquefaction. In general, liquefaction hazards are most severe within the upper 50 feet of the surface, except where slope faces or deep foundations are present. Because the compaction and placement history of the fill is unknown, and the anticipated seismic and groundwater conditions, the exact liquefaction potential is unknown, although it is expected to be low during seismic events.

Lateral spreading typically results when ground shaking moves soil toward an area where the soil integrity is weak or unsupported, and it typically occurs on the surface of a slope, although it does not occur strictly on steep slopes. Oftentimes, lateral spreading is directly associated with areas of liquefaction. Areas in the region that are susceptible to this hazard are located along creeks or open water bodies, or within the foothills to the west. There are no creeks or open bodies of water within an appropriate distance from the Project site for lateral spreading to occur on the Project site. For this reason, the probability of lateral spreading occurring on the Project site is low.

As previously discussed, landslides are not known to have previously occurred on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site, as no historic landslides have been mapped in the vicinity nor within the boundaries of the Project site. Additionally, the majority of the Project site contains gentle slopes, and the potential for liquefaction at the Project site is low since the Project site is not located within a mapped liquefaction zone. As a result, the potential for lateral spreading and subsidence at the Project site is considered low.

As described above, the Project site is not located within a mapped Alquist-Priolo special studies zone; however, the Project site is located within a seismically active region and would experience large earthquakes that display strong shaking during the economic life span of any development on the Project site. As noted previously, the proposed Project would replace an existing structure with one of approximately the same size. The proposed retail store would occupy a similar location to the existing structure on the northern portion of the Project site. The Project does not include any off-site improvements. The Project would not cause any effects by exacerbating existing hazards, including those related to unstable soils. The proposed Project would be subject to the requirements of the latest version of the CBC in order to minimize potential geological risks. A *less than significant* impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response d): Expansive soils are those that undergo volume changes as moisture content fluctuates; swelling substantially when wet or shrinking when dry. Soil expansion can damage structures by cracking foundations, causing settlement and distorting structural elements. Expansion is a typical characteristic of clay-type soils. Expansive soils shrink and swell in volume

during changes in moisture content, such as a result of seasonal rain events, and can cause damage to foundations, concrete slabs, roadway improvements, and pavement sections.

Soil expansion is dependent on many factors. The more clayey, critically expansive surface soil and fill materials will be subjected to volume changes during seasonal fluctuations in moisture content. Sycamore silt loam, drained, zero percent slopes, is the only soil located on the Project site. The Sycamore series consists of soils formed under poorly drained conditions, although the Project site soils are drained. The soils formed in mixed sedimentary alluvium. The site surface soils have low expansion potential.

No known expansive soils are located at the Project site. Expansive soils generally consist of cohesive fine-grained clay soils and represent a significant structural hazard to buildings founded on them as they have a tendency to undergo volume changes (shrink or swell) with changes in moisture content, especially where seasonal fluctuations in soil moisture occur at the foundation-bearing depth. As described above, the soils at the Project site are predominantly covered by impervious surfaces or have been altered by cutting, filling, and grading. About 25 percent consists of unaltered soils that are extremely variable and require an onsite investigation to evaluate the potential and limitations for any proposed use (USDA, 2006). The Project site contains existing development primarily within the northern half, the subsurface soils are predominately covered by impervious surfaces or have been altered by cutting, filling, and grading, and would be unlikely to be affected by seasonal wetting and drying. The southern-most lot is vacant and has been heavily disturbed, with one-third bare soil and two-thirds covered with annual grasses and forbs with scattered shrubs. A *less than significant* impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response e): The Project site is currently and would continue to be served by community water and sanitary sewer systems, provided by the City of Fort Bragg's Public Works Department, which would be modified to serve the proposed retail store. Since the Project would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, *no impact* would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response f): Per Element 4 (Conservation, Open Space, Energy, and Parks) of the City's Coastal General Plan, Map OS-2 indicates that the Project site is not within a special review area, areas of known or potential archaeological or paleontological resources. As such, the probability of a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature at the Project site is low. It is a standard practice that in the event that fossils or fossil-bearing deposits are discovered during Project construction, a qualified paleontologist examines the discovery, and excavations within 50 feet of the find are temporarily halted or diverted. The area of discovery is then protected to ensure that fossils are not removed, handled, altered, or damaged until the Project site is properly evaluated, and further action is determined. The paleontologist documents a discovery as needed, in accordance with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995), evaluates the potential resource, and then assesses the significance of the finding under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and Public Resources Code section 21083.2, subdivision (g). The paleontologist notifies the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the Project proponent determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist prepares an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the Project based on the qualities that make the resource important. The plan is reviewed and approved by the City prior to implementation. While the Project site is not in a special review area for paleontological resources, the City's standard practice of halting construction in the event of a find until the resource can be evaluated is appropriate in the event a resource is encountered during Project

construction. A standard condition of approval to that effect will be applied to the Project. The proposed Project is found consistent with policies of the City of Fort Bragg for protection of paleontological resources. With implementation of standard practices in the event of a find, a ***less than significant*** impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	X			
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?	X			

Discussion

The Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, also known as Assembly Bill (AB) 32, is a State law that establishes a comprehensive program to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from all sources throughout the State. AB 32 requires the State to reduce its total GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, a reduction of approximately 15 percent below emissions expected under a “business as usual” scenario. Pursuant to the AB 32 Scoping Plan (last reviewed in 2018), the California Air Resources Board (ARB) must adopt regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emission reductions. The following major GHGs and groups of GHGs being emitted into the atmosphere are included under AB 32: carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), and nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃). The 2020 GHG emissions statewide limit set by AB 32, equal to the 1990 level, is 431 million metric tons of carbon dioxide (CO₂) equivalent (MMTCO_{2e}). In addition, in 2016, Senate Bill (SB) 32 was signed into law to codify the reduction target to reduce GHG emissions to 40 percent below the 1990 levels by 2030 (ARB, 2018). The 2019 edition of ARB’s California Greenhouse Gas Emissions for 2000 to 2017 (California GHG Emission Inventory) states that GHG emissions within the State of California have followed a declining trend since 2007. In 2017, statewide GHG emissions were 424 MMTCO_{2e}, which was 5 MMTCO_{2e} lower than 2016 levels and lower than the 2020 statewide GHG limit of 431 MMTCO_{2e}. The transportation section remains the largest source of GHG emissions in the State, accounting for 41 percent of the State’s GHG emissions in 2017 (CARB, 2019).

In 2012, the City of Fort Bragg adopted a Climate Action Plan. The plan sets GHG reduction goals, including a 30 percent reduction in GHG for the municipality by 2020, and a 7 percent reduction goal for the community by 2020. As noted in Section III (Air Quality) above, the Project site is located within the NCAB and is subject to the requirements of the MCAQMD. The MCAQMD is responsible for monitoring and enforcing federal, state, and local air quality standards in Mendocino County.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a), b): Implementation of the proposed Project could generate greenhouse gases (GHGs) from a variety of sources, including but not limited to vehicle trips, electricity consumption, water use, and solid waste generation. There could also be additional GHGs generated from stationary sources, such as industrial processes and/or diesel generators. The City has determined that the potential impacts from GHG emissions by the proposed Project will require a detailed analysis in the EIR. As such, the City will examine each of the environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the text of the EIR and will decide whether the proposed

Project has the potential to have a significant impact from GHG emissions. At this point, a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made. Rather, all are considered ***potentially significant*** until a detailed analysis is prepared in the text of the EIR.

The EIR text will include a GHG emissions analysis pursuant to the requirements of the California Governor's Executive Order S-3-05 and The Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32), Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), and Senate Bill 32 (SB 32). The analysis will follow the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) white paper methodology and recommendations presented in "Climate Change and CEQA", which was prepared in coordination with the CARB and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) as a common platform for public agencies to ensure that GHG emissions are appropriately considered and addressed under CEQA. Also, a GHG emissions analysis will be performed. These analyses will consider a regional approach toward determining whether GHG emissions are significant, and will present mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. The discussion and analysis will include quantification of GHGs generated by the Project using the CalEEMod computer model as well as a qualitative discussion of the Project's consistency with any applicable state and local plans to reduce the impacts of climate change.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
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?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
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?				X
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X	

Discussion

A material is considered hazardous if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a federal, state, or local agency, or has characteristics defined as hazardous by a federal, state, or local agency. Chemical and physical properties such as toxicity, ignitability, corrosiveness, and reactivity cause a substance to be considered hazardous. These properties are defined in the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Article 3: Characteristics of Hazardous Waste (effective July 1, 1991). A "hazardous waste" includes any hazardous material that is discarded, abandoned, or will be recycled. The criteria that render a material hazardous also cause a waste to be classified as hazardous, per California Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.5, Section 25117 (effective January 1, 1997).

The Project site does not include any known hazardous waste sites, as mapped by the State Water Resources Quality Control Board (SWRQCB) or the California Department of Toxic Substances

Control (DTSC). The Project site or immediate vicinity does not include any known hazardous waste sites as mapped by the California DTSC. As provided on the SWRQCB's GeoTracker, eight listed sites are located within one-quarter mile of the Project site, as provided in Table HAZ-1, below.

Table HAZ-1: GeoTracker-Listed Hazardous Materials Sites within Close Proximity (0.2135 miles) to Site

ID	Name & Case No.	Case Type	Location	Distance & Direction to Site	Cleanup Status
1	Chevron #9-3892 [T0604500037; RB Case #: 1TMC043]	LUST Cleanup Site	1004 Main St., South	175 feet SW of Site	Completed - Case Closed
2	Cummings Trust-Lot #2 [T0604530112; RB Case #: 1TMC558]	LUST Cleanup Site	32100 Harbor Dr., North	550 feet SE of Site	Completed - Case Closed
3	CDOT Noyo Bridge [T0604593397; RB Case #: 1NMC328]	Cleanup Program Site	Highway 1 / Noyo Bridge	715 feet SW of Site	Completed - Case Closed
4	Texaco, R&F [T0604500059; RB Case #: 1TMC068]	LUST Cleanup Site	700 Main St., South	725 feet NW of Site	Completed - Case Closed
5	Cummings Trust-Lot #3 [T0604559616; RB Case #: 1TMC553]	LUST Cleanup Site	32200 Harbor Dr., North	730 feet SE of Site	Completed - Case Closed
6	Private Residence [T0604548745; RB Case #: 1TMC544]	LUST Cleanup Site	Private Residence	825 feet N of Site	Completed - Case Closed
7	Wharf Restaurant, The [T0604593496; RB Case #: 1TMC446]	LUST Cleanup Site	32260 Harbor Dr., North	905 feet SE of Site	Completed - Case Closed
8	Mendocino Coast District Hospital [T0604500352; RB Case #: 1TMC429]	LUST Cleanup Site	700 River Dr.	995 feet NE of Site	Completed - Case Closed

NOTE: LUST = LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK.

SOURCE: SWRCB, 2020.

The Project would require the transport, use, storage, and disposal of small quantities of hazardous materials common for equipment and property maintenance and operation, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluids, oils, lubricants, and cleaning solvents and supplies. All hazardous materials would be utilized and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal and state regulations.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a-b): The Project proposes the construction and operation of a retail store that would be anticipated to require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials common to construction and operations of retail stores. During construction, common hazardous materials such as gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluids, oils, lubricants, and cleaning solvents would be anticipated to be utilized on-site. However, the types and quantities of hazardous materials to be used are not expected to pose a significant risk to the public and/or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Operation of the proposed Project may require the use of hazardous materials such as materials utilized in the routine cleaning of the building or for landscaping maintenance, and hazardous materials, including but not limited to cleaning supplies and batteries, would be anticipated to be

sold on-site. In accordance with the guidance in The Permit Place of the Mendocino County Division of Environmental Health (EH) (2008), a business that handles a hazardous material or a mixture containing a hazardous material in a quantity equal to or greater than 55 gallons liquid, 500 pounds solid material, or 200 cubic feet gaseous material at any one time during the year may be required to obtain a Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) Permit through EH, the approved CUPA for Mendocino County. As part of the CUPA Permit process, a Hazardous Materials Management Plan (HMMP) would be required to be prepared, implemented, and filed with EH. Any hazardous materials transported, used, sold, or disposed of on-site would be managed in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. A ***less than significant*** impact would occur. These issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response c): The schools closest to the Project site include Sprouts Montessori Children's located approximately 0.49 miles southwest of the Project site, Three Rivers Charter School located approximately 0.53 miles southwest of the Project site, both located across the Noyo River from the Project site, and Redwood Elementary School located approximately 0.64 miles northeast of the Project site. The Project site is not located within one-quarter mile of a school. ***No impact*** would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response d): As shown in Table HAZ-1 above, eight listed hazardous materials sites listed on the SWRCB's GeoTracker database are located within one-quarter mile of the Project site and no hazardous materials sites within the vicinity of the Project site are included on DTSC's EnviroStor database. Of the eight total sites, seven are Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites, and the case has been completed and closed for each. The Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5. ***No impact*** would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response e): The Project site is located approximately 2.8 miles southwest of the Fort Bragg airport. As the proposed Project is not located within the vicinity of an airport, the Project would not the Project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area. ***No impact*** would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response f): The City of Fort Bragg and County of Mendocino has adopted numerous plans related to hazard management and mitigation, and emergency response, including but not limited to: the City of Fort Bragg Emergency Operations Plan (2010), the Mendocino County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (2005), Hazardous Waste Management Plan, Mendocino County Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan (2016), and Mendocino County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (2014), in which the City of Fort Bragg (City) is a participant. In addition, the Safety Element of the City of Fort Bragg Coastal General Plan aims at protecting people and property from natural hazards and other locally relevant safety issues.

The County of Mendocino adopted the Mendocino County Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan (County EOP) on September 13, 2016, under Resolution Number 16-119. As noted on the Plans and Publications webpage of the Mendocino County Office of Emergency Services (MCOES), the County EOP, which complies with local ordinances, state law, and state and federal emergency planning guidance, serves as the primary guide for coordinating and responding to all emergencies and disasters within the County. The purpose of the County EOP is to "facilitate multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional coordination during emergency operations, particularly between Mendocino County, local and tribal governments, special districts as well as state and federal agencies" (MCOES - Plans and Publications, 2019). The proposed development would be compatible with existing surrounding development and would be designed to current

standards with suitable road widths and turn radii to accommodate emergency vehicles. A ***less than significant*** impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response g): The risk of wildfire is related to a variety of parameters, including fuel loading (vegetation), fire weather (winds, temperatures, humidity levels and fuel moisture contents) and topography (degree of slope). Steep slopes contribute to fire hazard by intensifying the effects of wind and making fire suppression difficult. Fuels such as grass are highly flammable because they have a high surface area to mass ratio and require less heat to reach the ignition point, while fuels such as trees have a lower surface area to mass ratio and require more heat to reach the ignition point.

The proposed Project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The Project site is located within a “Low” Fuel Rank fire hazard severity zone per Figure C-13 of the 2014 Mendocino County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, in an urban built-up environment within the City of Fort Bragg’s city limits. Additionally, the Project site is located within the Local Responsibility Area (LRA) (Mendocino County Maps – Fort Bragg – Fire Responsibility Areas, 2019) and, per the City of Fort Bragg website (Not Dated), is served by the Fort Bragg Fire Department, a Joint Powers Authority formed in 1990 by the City of Fort Bragg and the Fort Bragg Rural Fire Protection District to jointly provide fire services within the City of Fort Bragg and outlying rural areas. The nearest fire station to the Project site is the Main Street Fire Station located at 141 N. Main Street, approximately 0.9 miles north of the Project site. The proposed retail store would be constructed in accordance with state and local standards, including safety and emergency access requirements. By meeting current standards and design requirements and with sufficient fire protection services available to serve the Project site, a ***less than significant*** impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			X	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
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:			X	
(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;			X	
(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			X	
(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?				X
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	

Discussion

The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) addresses water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants to waters of the United States. Created in 1972 by the Clean Water Act, the NPDES permit program grants authority to state governments to perform many permitting, administrative, and enforcement aspects of the program. Within California, the NPDES permit program is administered by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards. Construction projects that would disturb more than one acre of land, such as the proposed Project, would be subject to the requirements of General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, also known as the CGP), which requires operators of such construction sites to implement stormwater controls and develop a SWPPP identifying specific BMPs to be implemented to minimize the

amount of sediment and other pollutants associated with construction sites from being discharged in stormwater runoff. Discharges of stormwater and non-stormwater from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) within the jurisdictional boundary of the City of Fort Bragg are subject to Water Quality Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ, NPDES General Permit No. CAS00004, Waste Discharge Requirements for Storm Water Discharges from MS4s (Phase II MS4 Permit). The Phase II MS4 Permit authorizes the City to discharge stormwater runoff and certain non-stormwater discharges from its MS4 to waters of the United States and provides a framework and requirements for the implementation of the City MS4 Program.

All development activities proposed on-site would be subject to the regulations provided in Chapter 17.64 Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control of the City of Fort Bragg CLUDC. This chapter outlines standards for managing stormwater runoff water quality and discharge during and post-construction. Compliance with Chapter 17.64 of the CLUDC would require the preparation of a SWPPP, in accordance with the CLUDC and the CGP, described above, which would evaluate and minimize potential construction-phase impacts to water quality and coastal waters by specifying temporary Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize erosion and sedimentation during construction and prevent the contamination of runoff from the Project site, and would require preliminary and final Runoff Mitigation Plans, which would describe post-construction BMPs that would be used in the Project to minimize increases in stormwater runoff volume and to prevent polluted runoff from the built Project. In addition, in accordance with Section 17.64.045 Developments of Special Water Quality Concern of the CLUDC, as the proposed Project includes the construction of greater than 10,000 sf of impervious surface area, it would be considered a "Development of Special Water Quality Concern" and would be subject to additional requirements designed to minimize potential adverse impacts to coastal water quality, including submittal of a Water Quality Management Plan, which would include BMPs to minimize post-construction water quality impacts.

As indicated in the City of Fort Bragg Public Works Department's referral dated September 2, 2020, as this development includes over one acre of disturbance, the Applicant is required to submit a SWPPP to the North Coastal Regional Water Quality Control Board pursuant to the CGP. A Runoff Mitigation Plan (RMP) is required by the City to demonstrate the Project meets the requirements established by local, state, and federal regulations. The City's RMP requirement can be fulfilled by a SWPPP instead. If using a SWPPP to fulfill the RMP, a draft version should be submitted to the City to ensure the Project is in compliance prior to filing for a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State. The draft SWPPP and/or RMP would be due prior to the issuance of a building permit. All drainage and LID features shall be constructed in accordance with the approved RMP and/or SWPPP.

The 1.63-acre Project site consists of three lots located on the west side of S. Franklin Street. The Project site contains existing development primarily within the northern half of the Project site. The northern lot is 95 percent covered by a paved parking area with shrubbery planted around the edges of the lot. The existing 16,436 sf vacant former office building, locally referred to as the "Old Social Services Building," is located on the middle lot. The southern-most lot is vacant with one-third bare soil and two-thirds covered with annual grasses and forbs with scattered shrubs. The Project site is not known to contain any creeks/streams, riparian areas, or wetlands on-site (USFWS, 2020; Wildland Resources Managers, Revised March 2022). The Project site is located in Zone "X" - area of minimal flood hazard - as shown on Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette map number 06045C1016G, effective July 18, 2017. As the topography of the Project site is relatively flat, stormwater typically infiltrates in the undeveloped portion of the Project site or flows to the northwest and southwest

towards the neighboring property, in the developed portion of the Project site. The nearest bodies of water are the Noyo River, which is located approximately 600 feet south of the Project site, and the Pacific Ocean, which is located approximately 1,200 feet west of the Project site. Regional drainage is controlled by the Noyo River. The Noyo River is on the SWRCB's 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies for sediment. The listing was the result of water quality problems related to sedimentation throughout the watershed, which impacts the cold-water fishery utilized by cold-water fish such as coho salmon and steelhead trout (USEPA, 1999).

The proposed Project includes the demolition of an existing 16,436 sf vacant former office building and associated 47-space parking lot and wooden fencing along the property line, and the construction and operation of a 16,157 sf, one-story, retail store with a 53-space parking lot and associated improvements and infrastructure. The Project would include 51,650 sf (1.18 acres) of hardscape area, which includes the proposed store, parking lot, accessways, or sidewalks, and approximately 19,265 sf (0.44 acres) of landscaped areas throughout the Project site that would encourage natural stormwater infiltration. The existing planted ornamental trees along the South Street frontage would be removed and replaced with landscaping selected for the local climate and would include trees and vegetation along the north, south, and east boundaries, with a few along the west boundary, as well as one tree within each of the parking lot landscaping islands. Drainage improvements on-site would include post-construction BMPs, including bioretention basins located along the northwest and southwest boundaries, designed to capture stormwater and pre-treat it on-site to remove dirt, oil, and heavy metals. Off-site improvements, such as sidewalk curbs and gutters, would be required to convey flows from the post-construction BMPs at the Project site to the existing Caltrans stormwater drainage system located west of the Project site on State Highway 1.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. As discussed above, the Project site is located within the City of Fort Bragg and is located in the Coastal Zone. As such, the proposed Project would be required to obtain a Coastal Development Permit (CDP), which requires conformance with all relevant regulations of the City of Fort Bragg, including Chapter 17.64 Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control and Chapter 12.14 Drainage Facility Improvements of the CLUDC. As described above, compliance with Chapter 17.64 and 12.14 of the CLUDC and the Statewide CGP, for projects disturbing over one acre, would ensure that the proposed Project would minimize pollutant loading and erosive stormwater runoff flows both during and post-construction. Additionally, the proposed development would be provided water and wastewater collection service by the City of Fort Bragg. These service providers are required to operate in compliance with all water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. Through proper implementation of appropriate BMPs, and compliance with the aforementioned regulations required as part of the CDP process, the proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. A ***less than significant*** impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response b): The proposed Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. As noted above, the proposed development would be provided water and wastewater collection service by the City of Fort Bragg and would therefore not require the use of groundwater to serve the proposed development. As the Project site is partially undeveloped, the proposed Project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces on-site. However, the Project proposal includes landscaping and post-construction BMPs, including bioretention facilities, designed to capture and treat runoff from the proposed

impervious surfaces, and substantial landscaping that would allow for stormwater infiltration and groundwater recharge throughout the Project site. With the incorporation of landscaping and post- construction BMPs, development of the 1.63-acre Project site would not significantly impact groundwater recharge, and a ***less than significant*** impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Responses c.i-ii): The proposed Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the Project site in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site since any potential runoff from the Project site would be controlled within the guidance of existing regulations. During construction, erosion would be minimized, and runoff would be managed through the implementation of Project-specific BMPs detailed in the SWPPP prepared for the proposed Project, which may include physical barriers such as straw bales, fiber rolls, and/or silt fencing structures, and preventative actions such as scheduling construction for the non-rainy season, if possible, soil compaction, and seeding/mulching disturbed areas. In addition, post-construction runoff and stormwater flows would be managed through stormwater facilities designed in accordance with Chapter 17.64 of the CLUDC. Off-site improvements, such as sidewalk curbs and gutters, would be required to convey flows from the post-construction BMPs at the Project site to the existing Caltrans stormwater drainage system located west of the Project site on State Highway 1, which does not currently exist in the vicinity of the Project site. With the implementation of off-site improvements, a ***less than significant*** impact would occur. These issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response c.iii): The proposed Project would not be anticipated to 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. As previously discussed, drainage improvements on-site would include post- construction BMPs, including bioretention basins located along the northwest and southwest boundaries, designed to capture stormwater and pre-treat it on-site to remove dirt, oil, and heavy metals, in accordance with Chapter 17.64 of the CLUDC, and landscaped areas throughout the Project site to encourage natural stormwater infiltration. Stormwater from the proposed impervious surfaces would be directed to landscaped areas and bioretention basins to maximize infiltration first and then any runoff exceeding the design storm would flow towards the Caltrans storm drain collection system. The Caltrans storm drain collection system is located west of the Project site on State Highway 1, as no infrastructure related to the City of Fort Bragg stormwater drainage system exists in this area. Off-site improvements such as sidewalk curbs and gutters, are required to be installed to adequately convey any surface water in excess of the design storm from the development to the nearest receiving inlet. Off-site improvements to the stormwater drainage system would be designed in accordance with the applicable sections of the CLUDC and would be reviewed and approved by Caltrans and the City of Fort Bragg Public Works Department, which would ensure runoff from the Project site would not exceed the capacity of the stormwater drainage system. A ***less than significant*** impact would occur.

Response c.iv): As discussed above, the Project site is located in Zone “X” – area of minimal flood hazard – as shown on FEMA’s National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMetMap number 06045C1016G, effective July 18, 2017. Based on the FEMA designation, the risk of flooding to occur at the Project site is low. ***No impact*** would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response d): The Project site is located approximately 600 feet north of the Noyo River and 1,200 feet east of the Pacific Ocean. As shown on the Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning for the Fort Bragg Quadrangle, the Project site is not located in a tsunami inundation

area (DOC, 2009). As noted above, the Project site is located in an area of minimal flood hazard (FEMA, 2017). **No impact** would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response e): The proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. As discussed above, the proposed Project would be subject to the Statewide CGP and the standards outlined in Chapter 17.64 of the CLUDC, which would ensure that the proposed Project would minimize pollutant loading and erosive stormwater runoff flows both during and post-construction. Compliance with these regulations would facilitate the implementation of water quality control efforts at the local and state levels. In addition, there is currently no sustainable groundwater management plan for the Fort Bragg Terrace Area in which the proposed Project would be located. A **less than significant** impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
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?	X			

Discussion

The Applicant proposed to construct a Grocery Outlet (retail store) on a 1.63-acre site located at 825, 845, and 851 S. Franklin Street, Fort Bragg, and identified by APNs 018-120-47, 018-120-48, and 018-120-49 (Project site). The Project site is located in the Coastal Zone within the City of Fort Bragg city limits but outside the area in which appeals of coastal development approvals may be appealed to the California Coastal Commission pursuant to Public Resources Code section 30606. The Project site has a City of Fort Bragg land use designation of CH (2008) and a zoning designation of CH per the City of Fort Bragg Zoning Map (2016). No changes to the Project site's current land use or zoning designations are proposed under the Project.

The Project includes the demolition of an existing 16,436 sf vacant former office building and associated 47-space parking lot and wooden fencing along the property line, and the construction and operation of a 16,157 sf, one-story, retail store with a 53-space parking lot and associated improvements and infrastructure. The Project would include 51,650 sf (1.18 acres) of hardscape areas that would be covered with the proposed store, parking lot, accessways, or sidewalks. Associated improvements and infrastructure on-site would include a loading dock and trash enclosure on the west side of the store, a parking area with 53 parking spaces on the south side of the store, an internal system of walkways and crosswalks, two bicycle racks, two driveways, a new fire connection, replacement of an existing sewer connection, connection to underground utilities, landscaping for stormwater capture and treatment, illuminated signage, and landscaping throughout the Project site. The Project would be operated by 15 to 25 full-time staff and two managers and would be open from 9:00 AM to 10:00 PM, 7 days per week with two different shifts covering operating hours.

Per the CLUDC Article 2, Policy No. 17.22.020 D, the CH zoning district's allowable land uses include lodging, restaurants, and retail stores. The City of Fort Bragg CLUDC (2018) defines a "Groceries, specialty foods" as "a retail business where the majority of the floor area open to the public is occupied by food products packaged for preparation and consumption away from the store. Includes retail bakeries, where any on-site baking is only for on-site sales" and defines "General retail - 5,000 sf or larger" as "stores and shops selling many lines of merchandise." These are both permitted land uses in the CH district and have no "special use regulations"; therefore, the proposed retail store would be a permitted use on-site, subject to the approval of a ZC and CDP. The Project site is located in an urban built-up environment and is surrounded by commercial businesses to the north, west, and south, and residences and two vacant lots to the east, of similar scale to the proposed Project.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The Project site is located within the Fort Bragg city limits and is adjacent to developed land on all sides. The Project would result in redevelopment of the site with a retail grocery store. Development of the Project would not result in any physical barriers, such as a wall, or other division, that would divide an existing community, but would serve as an orderly extension of existing utilities. The Project would have ***no impact*** in regards to the physical division of an established community. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response b): The proposed Project may 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. This land use and planning impact will require a detailed analysis in the text of the EIR. As such, the City will examine this environmental issue in the EIR text and will decide whether the proposed Project has the potential to have a significant impact. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for this environmental topic will not be made; rather, this is considered ***potentially significant*** until a detailed analysis is prepared in the text of the EIR.

The EIR text will include a detailed discussion of the Project entitlements as they relate to the existing General Plan, Zoning Code, and other local regulations. The local, regional, state, and federal jurisdictions potentially affected by the Project will be identified, as well as their respective plans, policies, laws, and regulations, and potentially sensitive land uses. The proposed Project will be evaluated for consistency with the Fort Bragg Coastal General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, and other local planning documents. Planned development and land use trends in the region will be identified based on currently available plans. Reasonably foreseeable future development projects within the region will be noted, and the potential land use impacts associated with the Project will be presented.

This section will provide an analysis including the thresholds of significance, a consistency analysis, cumulative impact analysis, and a discussion of feasible mitigation measures that should be implemented to ensure consistency with the existing and planned land uses.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
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?				X

Discussion

The proposed Project is not located in an area of known rock, aggregate, sand, or other mineral resource deposits of local, regional, or state residents. There are no known mineral resources of significance on the Project site that would be made unavailable by the proposed Project. Furthermore, the Project site is not utilized for Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) activities.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a-b): The proposed Project area does not contain mineral resources that are of value locally, to the region, or to residents of the City, County, or state. According to the Mineral Land Classification Studies Index of the California Department of Conservation (DOC, 2015), the proposed Project is not located in an area with known mineral resources. The proposed Project area is not identified as a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed Project would not interfere with materials extraction or otherwise cause a short-term or long-term decrease in the availability of mineral resources. Overall, there would be **no impact** regarding the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

XIII. NOISE

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and CEQA case law, the Project will have a significant impact related to noise if it will result in:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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?	X			
b) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of ambient conditions?	X			
c) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	X			
d) 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?				X

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a-c): Based on concerns raised from the public regarding noise impacts, the City has determined that the potential impacts from noise caused by the proposed Project will require a detailed analysis in the text of the EIR. As such, the City will examine each of the three environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the EIR text and will decide whether the proposed Project has the potential to have a significant impact from noise. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made. Rather, all are considered ***potentially significant*** until a detailed analysis is prepared in the text of the EIR.

The EIR text will identify sensitive receptors, land use compatibility, noise impacts, and attenuation of noise related impacts. The noise study will also include an assessment of construction noise and vibration impacts. The noise analysis will identify the noise level standards contained in the General Plan Noise Element and Municipal Code, as well as any germane state, and federal standards. Continuous (24-hour) and short-term noise measurements will be performed in the Project site and in the Project vicinity in order to quantify existing ambient noise levels from existing community noise sources.

The EIR will provide an estimate of existing traffic noise levels adjacent to the Project site roadways through application of accepted traffic noise prediction methodologies. Noise sources from the Project will be quantified through noise level measurements. Proposed on-site mobile and stationary noise sources will be evaluated. This will include noise generating equipment, such as HVAC systems, generators, etc., as well as mobile noise sources such as truck loading/docking/idling. The EIR text will include thresholds of significance, a consistency

analysis, cumulative impact analysis, and a discussion of feasible mitigation measures that should be implemented to reduce any potential impacts associated with noise.

Response d) The Project has been determined to not be 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. The Project site is located approximately 2.8 miles southwest of the Fort Bragg airport. As such, there is *no impact* related to this topic and it will not be addressed further in the EIR.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion

Based on the U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts, Fort Bragg city, a census-designated place had a population of approximately 7,291 persons as of July 1, 2019, a decrease of approximately 0.2 percent since April 1, 2018. There were an estimated 2,775 households between 2014 and 2018, with 2.56 persons per household. Approximately 8 percent of the persons living in Mendocino County reside in the City of Fort Bragg, based on estimates provided by the U.S. Census Bureau.

The Project includes the construction and operation of a 16,157 sf, one-story, Grocery Outlet (retail store). The proposed retail store would serve as a grocery and retail store for the City of Fort Bragg and surrounding area. The retail store would be equipped with 11,189 sf of merchandising space and 2,231 sf of stock space and be operated by 15 to 25 full-time staff and two managers and would be open from 9:00 AM to 10:00 PM, 7 days per week with two different shifts covering operating hours.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The proposed Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area, as the Project entails the construction and operation of a comparatively small retail store and only up to a total of 15 to 25 employees are anticipated under operation of the Project. While some employees may relocate to the Fort Bragg area to work at the proposed retail store, most, if not all, of the employees would be anticipated to commute from their current residences within the City of Fort Bragg and surrounding communities. In addition, customers who would shop at the proposed retail store would largely be those who reside in Fort Bragg and surrounding communities. The proposed Project would be constructed over an approximately 6-month period until the entire Project is completed. Because construction of the Project would be temporary in nature, it is anticipated that most, if not all, of the construction workers, would be local, although some workers may temporarily relocate to the area for the duration of the construction period. Although there may be a minimal increase in employees and population in the area as a result of the Project, changes would be limited, and no significant infrastructure improvements would be required to serve the Project. As such, a *less than significant* impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response b): No housing is located on-site. Implementation of the proposed Project would have *no impact* relative to this topic. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact if it:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?			X	
Police protection?			X	
Schools?			X	
Parks?			X	
Other public facilities?			X	

Discussion

There are no elements of the proposed Project that would impact the ability of the City of Fort Bragg or other local service providers to provide public services to the Project site or local community. The Project includes the demolition of an existing 16,436 sf vacant former office building and associated 47-space parking lot and wooden fencing along the property line, and the construction and operation of a 16,157 square-foot, one-story, retail store with a 53-space parking lot and associated improvements and infrastructure. Associated improvements and infrastructure on-site would include a loading dock and trash enclosure on the west side of the store, a parking area with 53 parking spaces on the south side of the store, an internal system of walkways and crosswalks, two bicycle racks, two driveways, a new fire connection, replacement of an existing sewer connection, connection to underground utilities, landscaping for stormwater capture and treatment, illuminated signage, and landscaping throughout the Project site. The Project site would be landscaped and permeable to stormwater as the Project would be designed to capture stormwater and pre-treat it on-site to remove dirt, oil, and heavy metals using bioretention basins located along the northwest and southwest boundaries. The proposed driveways and parking area would be designed to current standards with suitable road widths and turn radii to accommodate emergency vehicles.

While it is expected that most, if not all, of the Project site's employees (25 maximum) would already live locally, it is possible that some workers may relocate from another location or may commute from their current residences in the surrounding communities. In addition, customers who would shop at the proposed retail store would largely be those who reside in the City of Fort Bragg and surrounding communities. Since a significant population is not expected as a result of the Project, significant impacts on public services are also not anticipated.

Response to Checklist Questions

Response a): As previously discussed, the Project site is located within the LRA (Mendocino County Maps – Fort Bragg – Fire Responsibility Areas, 2019) and is mapped as located within an area with “Moderate” Fuel Rank fire hazard severity zone per Figure C-13 of the 2014 Mendocino

County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. Per the City of Fort Bragg website (Not Dated), the Project site is served by the Fort Bragg Fire Department. The City of Fort Bragg (City) and the Fort Bragg Rural Fire Protection District formed a Joint Powers Authority in 1990 to jointly provide fire services within the City and outlying rural areas. As detailed on the City's website, the Fort Bragg Fire Department is a volunteer fire department with 36 firefighters and four auxiliary members. Currently, there are four (4) paid positions in the department: a full-time Fire Chief, an Office Manager, a Maintenance Engineer, and a Fire Prevention Officer. The nearest fire station to the Project site is the Main Street Fire Station located at 141 N. Main Street, approximately 0.9 miles north of the Project site.

A significant population increase is not anticipated as a result of the Project and the Project would be located within the service boundaries of the Fort Bragg Fire Department. No new or expanded Fire Department facilities would be required. A **less than significant** impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Since the Project site is located within the City of Fort Bragg, the Project site and surrounding area are currently and would continue to be served by the Fort Bragg Police Department (Fort Bragg PD). The Fort Bragg PD is located at 250 Cypress Street, in Fort Bragg, California, approximately 0.30 miles north of the Project site. As the Project would entail developing a currently developed but vacant Project site, a significant population increase is not anticipated as a result of the Project and the Project would be located within the service boundaries of the Fort Bragg PD. No new or expanded Fort Bragg PD facilities would be required. A **less than significant** impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

The Project site is located within the Fort Bragg Unified School District (FBUSD), which is comprised of two elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, and one alternative school. Mendocino College, which is not affiliated with the FBUSD, is located approximately 0.9 miles southwest of the Project site, and Redwood Elementary School, which is affiliated with the FBUSD, is located approximately 1.11 miles northeast of the Project site. The proposed Project does not involve the development of any residential units and does not directly generate a student population. No new or expanded school facilities would be required. Implementation of the proposed Project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

As detailed in Section XVI (Recreation), below, 14 parks and recreational facilities are located within 4.5 miles of the Project site, including C.V. Starr Community and Aquatic Center, and Fort Bragg Dog Park, which is located approximately 1.2 miles northeast of the Project site, and Harold O. Bainbridge Park, located approximately 1.3 miles northeast of the Project site. No residential units are proposed nor is a significant population increase anticipated as a result of the Project. As a result, the use of the existing park and recreational facilities in the City and the surrounding unincorporated area of Mendocino County would not substantially increase as a result of the Project, and there would not be a need for a new or physically altered park facility. A **less than significant** would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

There are no elements of the proposed Project that would impact other public facilities, such as libraries or governmental facilities. The Project involves the demolition of an existing vacant building and the construction and operation of a Grocery Outlet (retail store) that would serve customers who reside in the City of Fort Bragg and surrounding community. No new or expanded library facilities or other government facilities would be required. A **less than significant** impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

XVI. RECREATION

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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?				X
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Discussion

The Project site is located within the vicinity of the following neighborhood parks and recreational facilities:

- C.V. Starr Community and Aquatic Center, located approximately 1.2 miles northeast of the Project site;
- Fort Bragg Dog Park, located approximately 1.2 miles northeast of the Project site;
- Harold O. Bainbridge Park, located approximately 1.3 miles northeast of the Project site;
- Fort Bragg Skatepark, located approximately 1.4 miles northeast of the Project site;
- Otis R. Johnson Wilderness Park, located approximately 1.6 miles northeast of the Project site;
- Noyo Beach Off-Leash Dog Area, located approximately 1 mile southwest of the Project site;
- Noyo Headlands Park, located approximately 2 miles west of the Project site;
- Todds Point, located approximately 1.2 miles southwest of the Project site;
- Pomo Bluffs Park, located approximately 1.3 miles southwest of the Project site;
- Glass Beach, located approximately 2 miles northwest of the Project site;
- Ka Kahleh Coastal Trail, located approximately 0.5 miles west of the Project site;
- Coastal Trail, located approximately 2 miles northwest of the Project site;
- Pudding Creek Beach, located approximately 2.3 miles northwest of the Project site; and
- Mac Kerricher State Park extends approximately nine miles along the coast beginning at Glass Beach. There is a campground located approximately 2.75 miles north of Glass Beach.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a-b): No residential units would be constructed, nor is the population expected to substantially increase, as a result of the proposed Project. Demand for the existing park and recreational facilities would not be expected to substantially increase and there would not be a need for a new or physically-altered park or recreational facility. **No impact** would occur. These issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	X			
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	X			
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	X			
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	X			

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a-d): Based on concerns raised by the public regarding traffic/transportation, the City has determined that traffic impacts will require a detailed analysis in the text of the EIR. As such, the City of Fort Bragg will examine each of the four environmental issues listed in the checklist above in the EIR text and will determine whether the proposed Project has the potential to have a significant impact from traffic. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made, rather all are considered ***potentially significant*** until a detailed analysis is conducted in the text of the EIR.

The EIR will include a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) to address the impacts of the proposed Project on the surrounding transportation system including the roadways, transit service, pedestrian facilities, and bicycle facilities. The TIA will be conducted to address compliance with the City's General Plan and other requirements under CEQA. It will be prepared following applicable guidelines and standards of the City of Fort Bragg, Mendocino County, and Caltrans, as applicable. The EIR will describe existing and future traffic conditions and will identify the trips that will be generated by the Project and the projected distribution of those trips on the roadway system. Potential impacts associated with site access, on-site circulation, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and consistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) will also be addressed in the EIR.

The TIA will include an evaluation of existing conditions, cumulative conditions, cumulative plus Project conditions, access and circulation, and Project alternatives. Future conditions will be evaluated with the use of the applicable travel model. Significant impacts will be identified in accordance with the established criteria, and mitigation measures will be identified to lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

The EIR text will provide an analysis including the thresholds of significance, a consistency analysis, cumulative impact analysis, and a discussion of feasible mitigation measures that should be implemented to reduce impacts associated with transportation.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
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)?			X	
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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resources to a California Native American tribe.			X	

Discussion

Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), enacted in 2014, modified CEQA to require lead agencies, in some circumstances, to consider whether projects will adversely affect tribal cultural resources. Public Resources Code Section 21074 defines “Tribal cultural resources” as “either of the following: 1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following: A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources. B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.”

Under AB 52, a lead agency, prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report for a project, to begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project if: (1) the California Native American tribe requested to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed by the lead agency through formal notification of proposed projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribe, and (2) the California Native American tribe responds, in writing, within 30 days of receipt of the formal notification, and requests the consultation. Where the lead agency receives no timely response from a notified tribe, the AB 52 consultation process is complete. As explained below, the City and its consultants complied with AB 52 in connection with the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed Project in 2021.

A Cultural Resources Inventory Survey was prepared by Genesis Society on August 15, 2019, to evaluate the Project’s potential to impact cultural resources in conformity with City of Fort Bragg and Mendocino County rules and regulations, and in compliance with CEQA (including changes made by AB 52) and the CEQA Guidelines. Due to the sensitive and confidential nature of the report, a copy of the Cultural Survey is not included in this Initial Study.

According to the Cultural Resources Inventory Survey, the region in which the Project site is located was first inhabited more than 12,000 years ago. Prior to historic settlement, the lands surrounding the Noyo River were covered by a variety of coastal scrub and a mixed forest dominated by Bishop pine and including redwood, conifers, and hardwoods such as tanoak and madrone. The Project site is located within the territory claimed by the Northern Pomo at the time of initial European-American entry into the region. The Northern Pomo consisted of multiple tribelets, which consisted of three to five primary villages, one ethnographic village, Kadiu, was located immediately north of the Noyo River and is today identified immediately west of State Highway 1, west of the Project site. Pomo cultural materials are documented in both ethnographic and archaeological records and artifacts include a wide variety of materials and expressions. Colonization of the region began in 1812 with the establishment of Fort Ross by Russia, approximately 80 miles south of the Project site, and was followed by other European-American explorers who visited, then later settled, the Mendocino Coast beginning in the 1830s. In 1855, the federal government created the 25,000-acre Mendocino Indian Reservation adjacent to the north side of the Noyo River. In 1857, Fort Bragg was established between Pudding Creek and the Noyo River, to administer the large reservation until 1864 when the interred Native Americans were forcibly moved to the Round Valley Indian Reservation near Covelo. Widespread settlement in Mendocino County was spurred by demand for both lumber and agricultural lands and led to the establishment of mills throughout the County and the 1891 formation of the Union Lumber Company in Fort Bragg, which closed in 1969 (Genesis Society, 2019).

A records search was conducted at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) located on the Sonoma State University campus on July 16, 2019 (File No. 18-2464), which included a review of all records on file for lands within a 0.25-mile radius of the Project site, including archaeological site and survey records, and numerous registries and inventories reviewed as part of the NWIC search, or evaluated separately. Topographic maps from 1943 through 1985 depict a school within the Project area; however, aerial photographs show that no structures existed on the Project site between 1943 and 1996. As such, the Cultural Survey deduced that the school icon visible on historic topographic maps represents an “artifact” from older topographic maps. A review of the historic registers and inventories indicated that no archaeological investigation had been previously prepared for the Project site and no historic properties or cultural resources have been documented within the Project area; however, eight cultural resources have been documented within a 0.25-mile radius of the Project site.

As noted in the Cultural Survey, fieldwork was conducted on August 10, 2019, by Genesis Society and entailed an intensive pedestrian survey by means of walking systematic transects, spaced at 10-meter intervals within the portions of the Project site that did not contain existing impervious surface cover, including building, parking, roads, etc. In surfaced areas, structure and road margins were inspected for any native soils. The Cultural Survey notes that the majority of the Project site has been subjected to intensive disturbance as a result of wholesale demolition, grading, and subsequent contemporary (post-1996) commercial building construction. No evidence of prehistoric or historic use or occupation was observed within the Project site, most likely due to the degree of contemporary disturbance to which the Project site has been subjected. Based on the findings of the records search and pedestrian survey, no significant historic resources or unique archaeological resources are present within the Project area and none will be affected by the proposed Project (Genesis, 2019).

On June 20, 2019, Genesis Society contacted the NAHC to request information concerning archaeological sites or traditional use areas for the Project area. The NAHC response letter, dated June 28, 2019, indicated that a SLF search was completed and returned a negative result. The

NAHC provided a list of 13 Native American contacts who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the Project area and suggested that Genesis Society contact all of those indicated. The NAHC Native American Contacts List dated June 27, 2019, including the EPA Director and Chairperson of the Cahto Tribe; the Chairpersons of the Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians, Guidiville Band of Pomo Indians, Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria, Manchester Band of Pomo Indians, Noyo River Indian Community, Pinoleville Pomo Nation, Potter Valley Tribe, Redwood Valley or Little River Band of Pomo Indians, and Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians; and the President of the Round Valley Reservation/ Covelo Indian Community.

On July 22, 2019, Genesis Society sent letters to all representatives on the NAHC contact list, and those contacted were requested to supply any information they might have concerning prehistoric sites or traditional use areas within, adjacent, or near the Project area. A follow-up email and telephone call were placed with Tina Sutherland of the Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians on Saturday, August 10, 2019, prior to the pedestrian survey. No responses were received from the contacted parties. As no prehistoric cultural material was identified during the records search or pedestrian survey, no additional consultation was undertaken by Genesis Society or the City of Fort Bragg (City), and the City, as Lead Agency, has deemed the AB 52 Tribal consultation process complete. Copies of the NAHC response and Native American Contacts List and an example of the letters sent to Tribal representatives are included in the Cultural Study.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a.i), a.ii): As discussed above, no Tribal Cultural Resources were identified at or near the Project site during the records review and pedestrian survey. While the proposed Project includes the demolition of an existing building, the existing building is a contemporary (post-1996) commercial building. In addition, no responses were received from the Tribal consultation effort and there are no known tribal cultural resources in the Project area. Even so, the proposed Project, if approved, will be subject to a standard condition of approval requiring that, in the event of the discovery during construction of potential historical resources of an archaeological nature, unique archaeological resources, or tribal cultural resources, work in the affected area will cease until a qualified archaeologist, working with City staff, determines whether, indeed, any such resources are actually present and, if so, formulates and carries out measures for either avoiding them or otherwise treating them. A *less than significant* impact would occur. These issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	X			
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	X			
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 projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?	X			
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?	X			
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	X			

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a-e): Implementation of the proposed Project would result in increased demands for utilities to serve the Project. As such, the EIR text will examine each of the environmental issues listed in the checklist above and will decide whether the proposed Project has the potential to have a significant impact to utilities and service systems. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made, rather all are considered ***potentially significant*** until a detailed analysis is prepared in the EIR text.

The text of the EIR will analyze wastewater, water, and storm drainage infrastructure, as well as other utilities (i.e. solid waste, gas, electric, etc.), that are needed to serve the proposed Project. The wastewater assessment will include a discussion of the proposed collection and conveyance system, treatment methods and capacity at the treatment plants, disposal location(s) and methods, and water use for irrigation in the future. The EIR text will analyze the impacts associated with future on-site construction of the conveyance system, including temporary impacts associated with the construction phase. The proposed infrastructure will be presented. The EIR text will provide a discussion of the wastewater treatment plants that are within proximity to the Project site, including current demand and capacity at these plants. The analysis will discuss the disposal methods and location, including environmental impacts and permit requirements associated with disposal of treated wastewater.

The storm drainage assessment will include a discussion of the proposed drainage collection system, including impacts associated with on-site construction of the storm drainage system. The EIR text will identify permit requirements and mitigation needed to minimize and/or avoid impacts. The proposed infrastructure will be presented.

The EIR text will include an assessment for consistency with City and outside agency Master Plans and Management Plans that are directly related to these utilities.

The EIR text will analyze the impacts associated with water supply and on-site and off-site construction of the water system, including temporary impacts associated with the construction phase. The EIR text will also identify permit requirements and mitigation needed to minimize and/or avoid impacts, and will present the proposed infrastructure as provided by the Project engineering reports.

The EIR text will also address solid waste collection and disposal services for the proposed Project. This will include an assessment of the existing capacity and Project demands. The assessment will identify whether there is sufficient capacity to meet the Project demands.

The EIR text will provide thresholds of significance, a consistency analysis, cumulative impact analysis, and a discussion of feasible mitigation measures that should be implemented to reduce impacts associated with utilities and service systems).

XX. WILDFIRE

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
d) 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?				X
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?				X
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?			X	

Discussion

The Project site is located within the LRA (Mendocino County Maps – Fort Bragg – Fire Responsibility Areas, 2019) and, per the City of Fort Bragg website (Not Dated), is served by the Fort Bragg Fire Department. The Fire Department is a Joint Powers Authority formed in 1990 by the City of Fort Bragg and the Fort Bragg Rural Fire Protection District to jointly provide fire services within the City of Fort Bragg and outlying rural areas. The Project site is mapped as located within an area with “Moderate” Fuel Rank fire hazard severity zone per Figure C- 13 of the 2014 Mendocino County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. The nearest fire station to the Project site is the Fort Bragg Fire Department, located approximately 1-mile northwest of the Project site.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The City of Fort Bragg approved an Emergency Plan on January 11, 2016, under Resolution Number 3881-2016. The purpose of the City’s Emergency Plan is to “bring a renewed focus on what emergencies can happen here (Fort Bragg) and how we (community) can respond to them – together.”

The County of Mendocino County also adopted a County EOP on September 13, 2016, under Resolution Number 16-119. As noted on the Plans and Publications webpage of the MCOES, the County EOP, which complies with local ordinances, state law, and state and federal emergency planning guidance, serves as the primary guide for coordinating and responding to all emergencies and disasters within the County. The purpose of the County EOP is to “facilitate multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional coordination during emergency operations, particularly between Mendocino County, local and tribal governments, special districts as well as state and Federal agencies” (MCOES – Plans and Publications, 2019).

As discussed under Section IX (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), above, there are no components of the Project that would impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, including the adopted County EOP. The Project site is located within the LRA and within a “Moderate” Fuel Rank fire hazard severity zone per Figure C-13 of the 2014 Mendocino County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. The facility would be constructed in accordance with state and local standards, including safety and emergency access requirements. As such, there are no components of the Project that would impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. A *less than significant* impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response b): Under the proposed Project, it is not anticipated that wildfire risks would be exacerbated due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors. The Project site is relatively flat, with elevations at the Project site ranging between approximately 117 feet and 122 feet above mean sea level. In addition, the Project site is located in an urban built- up environment where there is a low threat of wildfire. *No impact* would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response c): The Project site would be served with electricity from PG&E, propane by an existing tank on-site, and water and wastewater service by the City of Fort Bragg, and solid waste services by a local waste hauler. There are existing utility connections located on Project site that served the vacant former office building. These existing water and wastewater utility connections would require new connections to the proposed retail store as part of the Project. Under the proposed Project, all utility lines would be underground. As such, the Project would not require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. *No impact* would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

Response d): The proposed Project would not 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 challenges, as the Project site is relatively flat, with elevations at the Project site ranging between approximately 117 and 122 feet above mean sea level, and is surrounded by an urban built-up environment. In addition, bioretention basins would be constructed on-site to capture and treat increased stormwater flows due to the proposed increase in impervious surfaces. As such, a *less than significant* impact would occur. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact related to this topic if it will:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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?	X			
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)?	X			
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	X			

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a-c): Certain mandatory findings of significance must be made to comply with CEQA Guidelines §15065. The EIR text will examine each of the environmental topics identified in this Initial Study as **potentially significant** to determine if there would be an impact related to these mandatory findings. At this point a definitive impact conclusion for each of these environmental topics will not be made; rather, the impacts considered **potentially significant** until a detailed analysis is prepared in the text of the EIR. Many of the issues raised by the mandatory findings of significance will be addressed along the way. Thus, for example, the analysis of biological resources in the EIR text will address whether the proposed Project would 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; or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. For all other topics similarly addressed in detail in the text of the EIR, the City will address whether the proposed Project will have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable impacts. The analysis of air quality in the EIR text will address whether air pollution associated with the proposed Project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

All other topics addressed in this Initial Study were deemed to be **less than significant**, or **no impact**, and do not warrant further environmental review. As to these other topics, this Initial Study has found that the proposed Project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment.

As discussed in Sections V, Cultural Resources, and XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources, the proposed Project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As discussed previously, the Cultural Survey (Genesis Society, 2019) found that no historical resources or historic properties have been documented within the Project area. While the proposed Project includes the demolition of an existing building, the existing building is a contemporary (post-1996) commercial building. Additionally, the Project is not anticipated to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or disturb any human remains. As noted previously, based on the records search conducted at the NWIC, the consultation undertaken with the NAHC, and the Tribal consultation effort completed by Genesis Society (2019), no unique archaeological resources or prehistoric cultural material was identified in the Project area. The Cultural Survey recommends archaeological clearance for the proposed Project, with the inclusion of general provisions that recommend consultation and protocol in the event of inadvertent discovery. A standard condition of approval to that effect will have been applied to the proposed Project if it is approved. The proposed Project is found consistent with policies of the City of Fort Bragg for protection of cultural resources, including human remains.

The analyses in Sections IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and X, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Initial Study have determined that substantial adverse effects on human beings will not result from the use of, or exposure to, hazardous materials or from the proposed Project's effects on water quality. Those topics therefore will not be addressed in the text of the EIR.

REFERENCES

- Branum, D., Chen, R., Petersen, M., and Wills, C., California Geological Survey. 2016. Earthquake Shaking Potential for California Map. Map Sheet 48 (Revised 2016).
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2018. AB 32 Scoping Plan. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scopingplan.htm>.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2022. GHG Current California Emission Inventory Data. California Greenhouse Gas Emissions for 2000 to 2017. Accessed March 2022. Available at: https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/pubs/reports/2000_2017/ghg_inventory_trends_00-17.pdf.
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2016. Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2019. California Geological Survey. EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>.
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2015. California Geological Survey. Mineral Land Classification Studies Index. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc>.
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2021. California Tsunami Maps and Data. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps>.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2022. Scenic Highways. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2022. EnviroStor. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>.
- California Energy Commission (CEC). 2022. 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/programs-and-topics/programs/building-energy-efficiency-standards/2019-building-energy-efficiency>.
- California Energy Commission (CEC). October 2017. California Energy Commission Final Commission Report - Senate Bill 350: Doubling Energy Efficiency Savings by 2020. Accessed March 2022. Available at: http://docketpublic.energy.ca.gov/PublicDocuments/17-IEPR-06/TN221631_20171026T102305_Senate_Bill_350_Doubling_Energy_Efficiency_Savings_by_2030.pdf.
- California Legislative Information. July 12, 2019. Assembly Bill No. 998. Accessed March 2022. Available at: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB998.
- California Legislative Information. January 1, 2015. Public Resources Code – PRC Chapter 21071. Accessed March 2022. Available at:

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=PRC&division=13.&title=&part=&chapter=2.5.&article=.

California Legislative Information. September 27, 2006. Assembly Bill No. 32. Accessed March 2022. Available at: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=200520060AB32.

California Legislative Information. Effective January 1, 1997. Health and Safety Code (HSC). Division 20, Chapter 6.5 Hazardous Waste Control, Article 2. Section 25117. Accessed March 2022. Available at: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=HSC§ionNum=25117.

California Legislative Information. October 7, 2015. Senate Bill No. 350. Accessed March 2022. Available at: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160SB350.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS), Rare Plant Program. 2022. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v8-03 0.39). Fort Bragg Quad. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <http://www.rareplants.cnps.org>.

CalRecycle. 2022. SWIS Facility/Project site Activity Details – Fort Bragg Disposal (23-AA-0036). Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/Site/Summary/1814>.

City of Fort Bragg. 2022. Fort Bragg Fire Department. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://fortbraggfire.specialdistrict.org/>.

City of Fort Bragg. 2020. Initial Study and Environmental Checklist for Best Development Grocery Outlet. December 2020.

City of Fort Bragg. 2014. City of Fort Bragg Design Guidelines – Chapter 2 Commercial District Design Guidelines. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.city.fortbragg.com/home/showpublisheddocument/2544/637726447452770000>.

City of Fort Bragg. Last updated November 13, 2018. Fort Bragg Coastal Land Use and Development Code. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/FortBragg/#!/LUC17/FortBraggNT.html>.

City of Fort Bragg. July 23, 2014. Grading Permit 2013-08 (GP 2013-08) Agenda Item Summary Report. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://cityfortbragg.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=3176938&GUID=B53382A3-BF87-4927-92E7-8BBD8040362D>.

City of Fort Bragg. Not Dated. Local Parks & Aquatic Center. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.city.fortbragg.com/services/local-parks-aquatic-center>.

City of Fort Bragg. Not Dated. Fort Bragg Coastal General Plan (July 2008). Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.city.fortbragg.com/departments/community-development/general-plan-zoning-information/local-coastal-program>.

- City of Fort Bragg. Not Dated. Police Department. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.city.fortbragg.com/departments/police-department>.
- County of Mendocino. 2022. Office of Emergency Services. Plans and Publications. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.mendocinocounty.org/government/executive-office/office-of-emergency-services>.
- County of Mendocino. 1987. Code of Ordinances: Chapter 22.12 – Archaeological Resources.
- County of Mendocino. 2022. Department of Planning & Building Services. Mendocino County Maps (Various). Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.mendocinocounty.org/government/planning-building-services/county-maps>.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). No Date. FEMA Flood Map Service Center: Search by Address. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search>.
- Genesis Society. August 15, 2019. Grocery Outlet Development Project, Mendocino County, Cultural Resources Inventory Survey. Circa 1.6 acres, Fort Bragg, Mendocino County, California.
- Google Earth. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://earth.google.com/web/>.
- Google Maps. 2022. California Geomorphic Province Areas. Accessed March 2022. Available at: https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=1gv8_j62Eex_PVCFTgkfUiGPrHf0&hl=en&ll=37.41380016608167%2C-119.23461750000001&z=6.
- Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, State of California. April 2018. Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA. Accessed March 2022. Available at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf.
- Jennings, C.W., and Strand, R.G., Division of Mines and Geology. 1960. Geologic Map of California Ukiah Sheet. State of California Department of Natural Resources.
- KD Anderson & Associates, Inc. October 22, 2019. Traffic Impact Analysis for Grocery Outlet Store. Fort Bragg, California.
- Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG). May 20, 2020. Senate Bill 743 Vehicle Miles Traveled Regional Baseline Study. Prepared by Fehr & Peers. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.mendocinocog.org/files/60111f0bd/SB743+VMT+Regional+Baseline+Study-accepted%28w-links%29.pdf>.
- Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (MCAQMD). June 2, 2010. Adopted Air Quality CEQA thresholds of Significance. Accessed March 2022. Available at: http://www.co.mendocino.ca.us/aqmd/pdf_files/MCAQMDCEQARecomendations.pdf.
- Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (MCQAMD). January 2005. Particulate Matter Attainment Plan. Accessed March 2022. Available at: http://www.co.mendocino.ca.us/aqmd/pdf_files/Attainment%20Plan_DRAFT.pdf.

Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (MCAQMD). February 2011. Rules and Regulations. Regulation 1 – Air Pollution Control Rules. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <http://www.co.mendocino.ca.us/aqmd/district-regulation-4.html>.

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2020. GeoTracker. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>.

United States Census Bureau. Not Dated. Quick Facts. Fort Bragg city, California. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/fortbraggcitycalifornia>.

United States Census Bureau. Not Dated. Quick Facts. Mendocino County, California. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/mendocinocountycalifornia>.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). 2006. Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Soil Survey of Mendocino County, California, Western Part. Accessed March 2022. Available at: https://www.blogs.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_MANUSCRIPTS/california/CA694/0/MendocinoWP_CA.pdf.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). 2019. Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Web Soil Survey. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Region IX. December 16, 1999. Noyo River Total Maximum Daily Load for Sediment. Accessed March 2022. Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water_issues/programs/tmdls/noyo_river/pdf/noyo.pdf.

USS United Sign Systems. March 6, 2019. Grocery Outlet Fort Bragg – Signage Package.

Waste Management (WM). 2020. Commercial Services. Accessed March 2022. Available at: <https://www.wm.com/location/california/cabay/fort-bragg/commercial.jsp>.

Wildland Resource Managers. Revised March 2022. Grocery Outlet Fort Bragg, California Property Biological Review.