



CITY OF FORT BRAGG

Incorporated August 5, 1889

416 North Franklin Street

Fort Bragg, California 95437

tel. 707.961.2823

fax. 707.961.2802

www.fortbragg.com

1. PROJECT TITLE

Inland Land Use and Development Code Amendment

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS

City of Fort Bragg
416 North Franklin Street
Fort Bragg, CA 95437
707-961-2823

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NO.

Scott Perkins
Assistant Planner
Community Development Department
707-961-2827 ext. 113

4. PROJECT LOCATION

The Inland Land Use and Development Code regulates all areas of Fort Bragg located east of Highway 1 and north of Walnut Street, that are outside the California Coastal Zone. **Figure 1 (Location Map)** illustrates the jurisdiction of the ILUDC.

5. PROJECT SPONSOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS

City of Fort Bragg
416 North Franklin Street
Fort Bragg, CA 95437
707-961-2823

6. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION

All General Plan designations in the Inland area

7. ZONING

All zoning districts in the Inland area

8. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

In 2014, the City Council adopted an updated Inland Land Use and Development Code (ILUDC). The ILUDC is the City's guiding collection of land use policies and regulations that implement the General Plan's vision for Fort Bragg's future through the year 2022. The following changes are included in the ILUDC update:

Proposed ILUDC Amendments	
ARTICLE 2 – ZONING DISTRICTS AND ALLOWABLE LAND USES	
ILUDC Section	Proposed Change(s)
Chapter 18.21 <i>Residential Zoning Districts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Table 2-1: Alter the land uses and permit requirements for residential zoning districts, including:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Remove golf course use and incorporate into existing Sports and Active Recreation Facility use;▪ Combine public and private schools as one use;▪ Add residential care facility for the elderly uses;▪ Remove rooming or boarding use to comply with ADA definition of "family;"▪ Allow condominium conversions in RH and RVH;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow artisan shops in RH and RVH with Use Permit; ▪ Allow doctor offices in RM and RH with Use Permit; ▪ Allow day care, adult – 6 or fewer clients in any residential district with a Minor Use Permit; ▪ Allow day care, adult – 7 or more clients in RM, RH and RVH with a Use Permit; ▪ Revise and rename uses to match their definition or references elsewhere in the ILUDC, State law or other regulation; ▪ Remove Note (2), as it duplicates standards in Section 18.90 – Nonconforming Uses; and ▪ Add Note (2) to relocate existing policy from 18.21.060(C) for easier ILUDC use. <p>■ Table 2-2: Add reference to net acreage when calculating lot area.</p> <p>■ Table 2-4: Clarify terms and policies to remove confusion, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replace “structures and pavement” with “impervious surfaces;” and ▪ Replace “City Engineer” with “Director of Public Works.” <p>■ Table 2-5: Modify maximum site coverage standard in RVH from “N.A.” to “90%” to reflect realistic open space requirements, and clarify terms and policies as stated above.</p>
<p>Chapter 18.22 <i>Commercial Zoning Districts</i></p>	<p>■ Revise finding required for Use Permit approval within CBD by shrinking the area where uses shall be pedestrian-oriented, thereby allowing non-pedestrian-oriented uses elsewhere in CBD.</p> <p>■ Table 2-6: Alter the land uses and permit requirements for commercial zoning districts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow brewery/restaurant uses in CBD with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow research and development uses in CG with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow commercial recreation facility – outdoor uses in CN and CO with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow conference facility uses and theater uses in CO with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow library, museum, and art gallery uses in CN and CO with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow studio – art, dance, martial arts, music, etc. uses in CN with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow emergency shelters in CO with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow single-family dwellings in CN, CBD and CG with discretionary approvals; ▪ Allow building and landscape materials sale, farm supply and feed store, adult day care, and furniture, furnishing and appliance store uses in CH

	<p>with a Use Permit;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow retail, general – less than 5,000 sf in CO as a permitted use; ▪ Allow catering service uses in the CBD as a permitted use; ▪ Allow child day care center uses in CH with a Minor Use Permit; ▪ Allow vacation rental units in the CBD with a Minor Use Permit; ▪ Remove social service organization use for consistency with ADA requirements; and ▪ Revise and rename uses to match their definition or references elsewhere in the ILUDC, State law or other regulation. <p>■ Table 2-7: Add reference to net acreage when calculating lot area.</p> <p>■ Table 2-8: Clarify terms and policies to remove confusion, as stated above.</p> <p>■ Table 2-9: Clarify terms and policies to remove confusion, as stated above.</p>
<p>Chapter 18.24 <i>Industrial Zoning Districts</i></p>	<p>■ Table 2-10: Alter the land uses and permit requirements for industrial zoning districts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow agricultural processing uses in IL with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow brewery/restaurant uses in IL and IH with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow manufacturing/processing – cannabis uses in IL and IH with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow research and development uses in IL and IH as a permitted use; ▪ Allow manufacturing/processing – medium intensity uses in IL with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow storage – personal storage facility uses in IL with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow library, museum uses in IL with a Use Permit; ▪ Prohibit school uses in IH; ▪ Allow caretaker quarters uses in IL with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow business support service uses in IH with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow parking facility uses in IL and IH with a Use Permit; ▪ Remove several out-of-date uses that are no longer applicable and remove uses from the table that are not permitted in either IL or IH; ▪ Revise and rename uses to match their definition or references elsewhere in the ILUDC, State law or other regulation; and ▪ Remove notes that no longer apply to the table. <p>■ Table 2-11: Add reference to net acreage when calculating lot area.</p> <p>■ Table 2-12: Clarify terms and policies to remove confusion, as stated above.</p>
<p>Chapter 18.26 <i>Special Purpose Zoning Districts</i></p>	<p>■ Table 2-14: Alter the land uses and permit requirements for special purpose zoning districts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow sports and active recreation facility uses in OS, PR and PF with a Use Permit;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow library, museum uses and meeting facility uses in OS with a Use Permit; ▪ Allow park, playground uses in OS as a permitted use; ▪ Allow private school uses in PR with a Use Permit; ▪ Remove several out-of-date uses that are no longer applicable and remove uses from the table that are not permitted in either IL or IH; and ▪ Revise and rename uses to match their definition or references elsewhere in the ILUDC, State law or other regulation.
ARTICLE 3 – SITE PLANNING AND PROJECT DESIGN STANDARDS	
ILUDC Section	Proposed Change(s)
Chapter 18.30 <i>Standards for All Development and Land Uses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fencing and Screening: Revise and clarify fencing and screening requirements (18.30.050), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify existing fence height requirements; ▪ Increase instances when temporary fencing may be permitted; ▪ Clarify unpermitted fence types ▪ Add flexibility to existing screening requirements; ▪ Reduce landscaping strip requirement between non-residential land uses from 10 feet to 5 feet; and ▪ Require screening of back-flow devices. ■ Clarify outdoor lighting standards (18.30.070). ■ Remove dust control requirements and reference existing Chapter 18.62, as dust and grading are address in 18.30.080. ■ Reference Chapters 17.62 and 17.64 for erosion and sediment control and stormwater runoff management requirements (18.30.080). ■ Setbacks: Revise and clarify setback requirements (18.30.100), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify fence height limits in setbacks; ▪ Allow decks and other design elements less than 30 inches above grade in setbacks; ▪ Allow averaging of front setbacks as an option, not a requirement; ▪ Clarify use of setbacks for storage of vehicles, large vehicles and non-motorized vehicles; and ▪ Allow landings and stairways to project further into setbacks.
Chapter 18.34 <i>Landscaping Standards</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Remove irrigation requirement from landscape plans. ■ Add flexibility to landscape plan revisions. ■ State that curbs are not preferable for the perimeter of a parking lot. ■ Reduce prohibitively specific landscaping requirements. ■ Relocate subdivision landscaping requirements to Article 8.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Revise irrigation system requirements to align with City's preference to move away from allowing irrigation of new landscaping areas. ■ Remove maintenance agreement policies and rely on Code Enforcement for maintenance of landscape areas. ■ Various syntax edits.
Chapter 18.36 <i>Parking and Loading</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Clarify parking requirements for vehicles for sale and large motor vehicles.
Chapter 18.38 <i>Signs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Revise policies for temporary signage and for commercial spaces with multiple tenants. ■ Allow murals with Administrative Design Review, and add to the examples of mural subjects the City encourages.
ARTICLE 4 – STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC LAND USES	
ILUDC Section	Proposed Change(s)
Chapter 18.42 <i>Standards for Specific Land Uses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Allow external evidence of accessory retail or service uses where permitted by Article 2. ■ Remove Bed and Breakfast standards for residential districts as they are not permitted in these districts. ■ Allow Director to modify or waive operating requirements for home occupations in commercial districts. ■ Remove duplexes from multifamily standards, per state law. ■ Remove news and flower stand standards, as they are replaced by Mobile Vending Unit policies in the Municipal Code. ■ Remove recycling facility requirements for uses removed from tables in Article 2. ■ Allow garages with maintenance easements to be built to side property line. ■ Revise accessory dwelling unit standards for consistency with SB 1069 and AB 2299. ■ Clarify site requirements for service stations. ■ Add standards for vacation rental units.
ARTICLE 7 – PLANNING PERMIT PROCEDURES	
ILUDC Section	Proposed Change(s)
Chapter 18.71 <i>Permit Review and Decisions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Allow greater flexibility in the permitting of special events. ■ Allow Administrative Design Review for more projects, and allow more projects to be exempt from Design Review. ■ Add noticing and hearing requirements for Planning Commission Design Review consistent with proper noticing requirements. ■ Allow Administrative Variance for modifying code requirements up to 25 percent.
ARTICLE 10 - DEFINITIONS	

ILUDC Section	Proposed Change(s)
<p>Chapter 18.100 <i>Definitions of Specialized Terms and Phrases</i></p>	<p>■ Added new definitions or revised definitions for the following terms (a minus sign (-) indicates the term is removed, a plus sign (+) indicates the term is added, no symbol indicates the term is revised):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accessory Dwelling Unit (+) ▪ Accessory Retail or Services ▪ Adult Day Care (-) ▪ Agent ▪ Agricultural Product Processing ▪ Artisan/Craft Product Manufacturing ▪ Automated Teller Machine ▪ Brewery/Restaurant (+) ▪ Business Support Services ▪ Commercial Recreation Facility – Indoor ▪ Commercial Recreation Facility – Outdoor ▪ Condition of Project Approval ▪ Condition, Special (+) ▪ Condition, Standard (+) ▪ Construction Activity ▪ Cooperative Housing ▪ Discretionary Land Use Approval ▪ Discretionary Permit ▪ Duplex ▪ Dwelling, Dwelling Unit, or Housing Unit ▪ Emergency Shelter ▪ Fence ▪ Farmers Market ▪ Formula Business ▪ Freight Terminal (-) ▪ General Retail ▪ Groceries, Specialty Foods ▪ Guest House ▪ Manufacturing/Processing – Medium Intensity ▪ Media Production ▪ Cannabis Dispensary ▪ Mixed-Use Project ▪ Mobile Home Park ▪ Multi-Family Housing ▪ Negative Declaration ▪ Net Acreage (+) ▪ Nonconforming Parcel ▪ Office ▪ Office Supporting Retail (-) ▪ Person (-) ▪ Personal Services ▪ Personal Services – Restricted ▪ Planning Permit ▪ Produce Stand (-) ▪ Public Auction, Flea Market (-) ▪ Qualifying Resident ▪ Recycling Facility ▪ Residential Accessory Use or Structure ▪ Residential Care Facility ▪ Restaurant, Café, Coffee Shop ▪ Rooming or Boarding House (-) ▪ Second Unit/Carriage House/Duplex ▪ Secondary Frontage ▪ Service Animal (+) ▪ Sign ▪ Illegal Sign ▪ Single-Family Dwelling

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Home Occupation ▪ Household Pets ▪ Industrial Research and Development (R&D) ▪ Kennel, Animal Boarding ▪ Laboratory – Analytical, Testing ▪ Laundry, Dry Cleaning Plant (-) ▪ Lodging – Vacation Rental Unit (+) ▪ Manufacturing – Cannabis (+) ▪ Manufacturing/Processing – Light 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social Service Organization (-) ▪ Sports and Entertainment Facility (-) ▪ Studio – Art, Dance, Martial Arts, Music, etc. ▪ Theater ▪ Transit Station or Terminal ▪ Urban Runoff Mitigation Plan ▪ Utility Facility ▪ Vacation Rental Unit ▪ Video Rental (-)
--	--	--

9. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:

Citywide—the ILUDC regulates all areas of Fort Bragg outside the California Coastal Zone.

10. OTHER AGENCIES REQUIRING APPROVAL

The ILUDC Amendment does not require other agencies' approval.

PROJECT LOCATION

The project is located in the portion of Fort Bragg east of Main Street and North of Walnut Street, as shown in **Figure 1 (Location Map)**. The Inland Land Use and Development Code regulates land use, subdivisions and development for the eastern half of the City.




Figure 1: Location Map

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions |

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

I. Aesthetics

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

Impacts a-d: Impacts are less than significant

The ILUDC boundaries do not include areas that are part of a scenic vista, per the City's General Plan. Impacts this ILUDC amendment could cause to scenic vistas are less than significant

There are no Caltrans-designated state scenic highways in Mendocino County; therefore, this ILUDC update will not impact these thoroughfares.

Although some scenic resources—such as open space, trees, waterways and historic buildings—are present within the ILUDC plan area, the proposed ILUDC amendment does not include changes that would substantially affect scenic resources. In fact, the ILUDC amendment includes new and revised regulations that will improve aesthetic and scenic quality, such as:

Section 18.30.050 strengthens provisions on cyclone fencing and fences of similar materials, and requires screening of backflow devices.

Section 18.30.070 expands the City's prohibition on blinking lights to include temporary signs.

Section 18.30.100 clarifies the City's standards for the storage of large motor vehicles and non-motorized vehicles.

Chapter 18.34 includes modifications to landscaping requirements to enhance the appearance of development projects.

Chapter 18.38.080 reduces the review requirements for murals.

The ILUDC amendment does not propose to alter policy in a way that would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the ILUDC plan area. The ILUDC revisions that affect visual character and quality (which are enumerated above) are intended to improve aesthetic resources.

The current ILUDC contains Section 18.30.070, which states the City's outdoor lighting requirements. The existing requirements are intended to prevent substantial light or glare in the City. This ILUDC amendment proposes to modify policy language in this Section to expand the City's prohibition on blinking

or flashing signs, as well as clarification to the City's policy relating to upward-directed lighting. The ILUDC amendments will further protect day and nighttime views in the area, and any impacts are less than significant.

II. Agricultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</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?				✓
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				✓
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?				✓
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				✓
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				✓

Impacts a-e: *No impacts*

The plan area does not include agricultural lands or forest land, nor are there agriculturally-zoned parcels in the ILUDC plan area. The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program designates the majority of the plan area as "Urban and Built-Up Land." Other designations include "Vacant or Disturbed Land" and "Nonagricultural or Natural Vegetation." The ILUDC amendment would not convert farmland to non-agricultural use, would not conflict with the existing zoning for forest land and would not affect any property subject to a Williamson Act contract.

III. Air Quality

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			✓	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			✓	
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			✓	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✓	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓	

Impacts a-e: Impacts are less than significant

The ILUDC plan area is within the Mendocino County Air Quality Management District Air Basin, which relies on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's CEQA Guidelines. All of Mendocino County is non-attainment for the State PM10 standard; however, the ILUDC amendment proposes to allow the establishment of new cannabis manufacturing uses in the industrial zoning districts with an approved Use Permit. Future cannabis manufacturing uses would be individually subject to environmental review, and any project impacts would require mitigation at that time.

The Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990, is the federal law governing air quality. Its counterpart in California is the California Clean Air Act of 1988. These laws set standards for the quantity of pollutants permitted in the air. At the federal level, these are National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Standards have been established for six criteria pollutants linked to potential health concerns; the criteria pollutants are: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone (O₃), particulate matter (PM), lead (Pb), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂).

The ILUDC boundaries are located in Mendocino County within the North Coast Air Basin (NCAB) and the plan area is under the jurisdiction of the Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (MCAQMD). The MCAQMD reviews CEQA documents and has established quantitative thresholds of significance for environmental documentation. These thresholds are consistent with those developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

Mendocino County is non-attainment for the State PM-10 standard (particulate matter less than 10 microns in size). The primary manmade sources of PM-10 pollution in the area are wood combustion (woodstoves, fireplaces, and outdoor burning), fugitive dust, automobile traffic, and industry. The MCAQMD maintains full-time monitoring equipment in the City of Fort Bragg. Development within

Mendocino County must comply with all applicable provisions of the Particulate Matter Attainment Plan adopted by the Mendocino County Air Quality Management District on March 15, 2005.

This ILUDC amendment will not lead to significant impacts to air quality. The existing ILUDC contains numerous policies that address automotive use, bicycling and walking, reducing dust emissions from construction projects, and encouraging renewable energy generation. The majority of these existing standards remain unchanged. The only amendment affecting the existing air quality policies in the ILUDC is as follows:

Section 18.30.080(D), which currently contains dust management methods required for new construction projects, has been replaced with a reference to Chapter 18.62.

Chapter 18.62 more thoroughly addresses grading, erosion and sediment control standards, including Section 18.62.020 *Dust Prevention and Control*. Replacement of Section 18.30.080(D) with a reference to Chapter 18.62 will not lead to increased or significant impacts on air quality.

The ILUDC and the Municipal Code include regulations to address issues of smell and the proposed changes to the ILUDC will not change these requirements.

IV. Biological Resources

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

Impacts a-e: *Impacts are less than significant*

The majority of the ILUDC plan area is comprised of urban development; however, small patches of open space, wetlands, and bishop cone forest remain in the Inland area.

The existing ILUDC contains numerous policies aimed at the preservation and protection of biological resources (specifically, Article 5 *Resource Protection*), and this ILUDC amendment will not modify or eliminate these regulations. These existing policies will continue to apply to future projects.

Impact f: *No impacts*

No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan applies to the ILUDC area.

V. Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			✓	
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			✓	
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			✓	
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			✓	

Impacts a-d: *Impacts are less than significant*

The proposed ILUDC amendment retains all of the 2014 ILUDC update regulations protecting cultural resources (specifically, Section 18.50.030 *Archaeological Resource Preservation*). The existing policies will continue to apply to new development, and as a result, there will be no new significant impacts to cultural resources.

VI. Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Rupture of known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv. Landslides? 			✓	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			✓	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			✓	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property?			✓	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.			✓	

Impacts a-e: *Impacts are less than significant*

Chapter 18.60 provides existing policy to ensure new development will not be located on unstable, expansive, or otherwise inadequate soils, and would not be amended by this ILUDC amendment. The California Building Code also regulates construction to protect building occupants from exposure to hazards from structures. This ILUDC amendment proposes no modifications to the existing policies designed to keep geologic impacts at less than significant levels for individual projects.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			✓	
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			✓	

Impacts a-b: *Impacts are less than significant*

The City of Fort Bragg has adopted a greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction target of 7% by 2020, and has prepared a Climate Action Plan and Greenhouse Gas inventory. The proposed Green Building and Energy Conservation measures in the *Sustainability Element* of the General Plan are intended to help achieve the City's GHG reduction goal. The proposed ILUDC amendment does not conflict with the Climate Action Plan or the Sustainability Element of the General Plan nor does it propose any changes to the existing policies.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

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

Impacts a-c: *Impacts are less than significant*

Hazardous materials could be used during construction activities in the ILUDC plan area. Additionally, commercial or industrial development may include businesses that utilize chemicals and hazardous materials, and their routine business operations may involve chemicals that are manufactured, warehouse, or transported. However, the hazards presently exist within the ILUDC plan area, and approval of the ILUDC amendment will not increase these hazards to a significant level.

Hazardous materials could be used during construction activities in the Inland Area. Additionally, future development may include uses that employ chemicals and hazardous materials, and their routine business operations may involve chemicals that are manufactured, warehoused, or transported. The secondary activities that would occur with non-residential and residential uses (e.g., building and landscape maintenance) would also involve the use of hazardous materials. However, the Inland area already includes these policies that address hazards (specifically, Chapter 6.24 *Hazardous Materials*), which will apply to all future development. This ILUDC amendment will not affect these regulations or produce hazards at a significant level.

Impacts d-h: *No impacts*

There are no known locations in the ILUDC plan area listed as potentially hazardous material sites pursuant to Government Code 65962.5.

A private airstrip exists north of the City boundary, and a helipad operates at the Mendocino Coast District Hospital. Both facilities are outside of the ILUDC plan area, and no impacts will result from the proposed amendment.

The ILUDC plan area is not located within a wildland fire hazard area. It is located in an urbanized portion of the City of Fort Bragg.

The City's Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) has been developed to provide a comprehensive emergency management program for the City. It mitigates the effects of hazards and includes measures to be taken to preserve life and minimize damage, enhance response during emergencies, provide necessary assistance, and establish a recovery system, in order to return the City to its normal state of affairs in case of an emergency. The plan defines preparations and mitigations to respond to the effects of natural disasters including wildfire, technological accidents, nuclear incidents, and other major incidents/hazards. The proposed ILUDC amendment has no impact on this plan.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project</i>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			✓	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (e.g. the production rate of a pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			✓	
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			✓	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			✓	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			✓	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			✓	
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				✓
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				✓

i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				✓
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓

Impacts a-f: *Impacts are less than significant*

Development entitled through compliance with the ILUDC would increase stormwater flows in the plan area; however, the existing ILUDC includes numerous regulations requiring stormwater infiltration, treatment and improved conveyance. The proposed amendments to the ILUDC revise some of the existing policies as follows:

Tables 2-4, 2-8 and 2-12 replace “structures and pavement” with “impervious surfaces” to encompass all development impacting stormwater.

Section 18.30.080(L) adds stating that all projects shall comply with Chapter 17.62 and 17.64 with regard to erosion and sediment control and stormwater management.

Chapter 18.34 revises landscape plan requirements for consistency with the City’s move toward discouraging irrigation and encouraging stormwater infiltration.

With the proposed revisions, the ILUDC amendment will have a beneficial impact on hydrology over current regulations, and will not result in significant impacts.

Impacts g-j: *No impacts*

The proposed amendment will not alter any existing standards designed to reduce or eliminate impacts relating to flooding, seiche, tsunami or mudflow. All new development will be subject to the existing standards and will produce no new impacts.

X. Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project</i>				
a. Physically divide an established community?				✓
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				✓
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓

Impacts a-c: No impacts

This ILUDC amendment does not itself propose any physical development, and will not divide or have any other impact on an established community.

The revisions to the Land Use Tables of Article 2 were closely reviewed to verify consistency with the City's Inland General Plan. The following discussion considers the changes to the residential, commercial and industrial land use tables and their consistency with the General Plan.

Table 2-1 Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements for Residential Zoning Districts

The ILUDC amendment proposes to allow the following uses in residential zoning districts where they are currently unpermitted:

- | | |
|---|--|
| ▪ Private residential recreation facility | ▪ Doctor office |
| ▪ Condominium conversion | ▪ Day care, adult – 6 or fewer clients |
| ▪ Artisan shop | ▪ Day care, adult – 7 or more clients |

The City's Inland General Plan defines the purpose and intent of each residential land use designation, and includes the allowance of limited neighborhood-serving commercial uses with the approval of a conditional use permit. The ILUDC amendment will now allow the uses listed above in certain residential zoning districts, as depicted in Table 2-1, but only with either an approved Minor Use Permit or Use Permit. The requirement that these limited neighborhood-serving commercial uses obtain conditional use permits is consistent with the Inland General Plan.

The ILUDC amendment proposes other revisions to the residential district land use tables, but simply revises terms for consistency with other code sections, the General Plan, or State policy.

Table 2-6 Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements for Commercial Zoning Districts

The ILUDC amendment proposes to allow the following uses in commercial zoning districts where they are currently unpermitted:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brewery/Restaurant ▪ Research and Development ▪ Commercial recreation facility – outdoor ▪ Conference facility ▪ Library, museum, art gallery ▪ School ▪ Sports and active recreation facility ▪ Studio – art, dance, martial arts, music, etc. ▪ Theater ▪ Emergency shelter ▪ Single-family residential dwelling ▪ Building and landscape materials sales ▪ Convenience store | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Farm supply and feed store ▪ Furniture, furnishings and appliance store ▪ Retail, general – less than 5,000 sf ▪ Adult day care ▪ Catering service ▪ Child day care center ▪ Lodging – Vacation rental units ▪ Personal Services ▪ Personal Services – Restricted ▪ Repair service – equipment, large appliances, etc. |
|---|---|

The City's Inland General Plan defines the purpose and intent of each commercial land use designation. The ILUDC amendment will now allow the uses listed above in certain commercial zoning districts, as depicted in Table 2-6. The vast majority of the uses also require a Use Permit to be allowed. Through the Use Permit review and approval process, future projects seeking to establish these uses will be individually subject to discretionary review which may include further CEQA analysis. The City has reviewed the uses above for consistency with the intent and purpose of the various commercial zoning districts, and found the proposed revisions consistent with the General Plan

The ILUDC amendment proposes other revisions to the commercial district land use tables, but simply revises terms for consistency with other code sections, the General Plan, or State policy.

Table 2-10 Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements for Industrial Zoning Districts

The ILUDC amendment proposes to allow the following uses in industrial zoning districts where they are currently unpermitted:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agricultural product processing ▪ Artisan/craft product manufacturing ▪ Brewery/Restaurant ▪ Boat and ship construction, repair, maintenance ▪ Manufacturing/processing – Cannabis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Manufacturing/processing – Medium intensity ▪ Research and Development ▪ Storage – warehouse, indoor storage ▪ Library, museum ▪ Caretaker quarters |
|--|---|

The City's Inland General Plan defines the purpose and intent of each industrial land use designation. The ILUDC amendment will now allow the uses listed above in certain industrial zoning districts, as depicted in Table 2-10. With the exception of the research and development use, each of the uses listed above require a Use Permit to be allowed. Through the Use Permit review and approval process, future projects seeking to establish these uses will be individually subject to discretionary review which may include further CEQA analysis. The City has reviewed the uses above for consistency with the intent and purpose of the various industrial zoning districts, and found the proposed revisions consistent with the General Plan

The ILUDC amendment proposes other revisions to the industrial district land use tables, but simply revises terms for consistency with other code sections, the General Plan, or State policy.

The myriad other revisions to existing policy throughout the code are intended to either clarify regulations or better implement the General Plan or other internal or external policy. The proposed ILUDC amendment does not conflict with the General Plan or any other adopted land use plan.

There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the ILUDC boundaries, and no impact will result.

XI. Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project</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?				✓
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?				✓

Impacts a-b: *No impacts*

The ILUDC plan area does not have locally important mineral resources. Therefore, development in compliance with the ILUDC would not result in the loss of known mineral resources, nor conflict with mineral resource recovery or processing facilities.

XII. Noise

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

Impacts a-d: *Impacts are less than significant*

Chapter 9.44 of the Fort Bragg Municipal code regulates noise in the City of Fort Bragg. The ILUDC amendment would have no impact on this chapter. However, future uses in compliance with the proposed ILUDC have the potential to create noise. Future uses would continue to be subject to the existing regulations, and should impacts be significant, project-specific mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to an insignificant level.

Impacts e-f: *No impacts*

A private airstrip exists north of the City boundary, and a helipad operates at the Mendocino Coast District Hospital. Both facilities are outside of the ILUDC plan area, and no impacts will result from the proposed amendment.

XIII. Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project</i>				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				✓
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

Impact a: *Impacts are less than significant.*

This ILUDC amendment will not directly induce substantial population growth, as it does not propose new homes, businesses or any other physical development such as roads or other infrastructure. While the amendment does allow some new uses where they are presently unpermitted, including residential uses, the project does not “upzone” any parcels creating the potential for substantial population growth beyond the existing ILUDC. As stated below, the newly allowable residential uses in zoning districts where they are presently not permitted each require discretionary permitting for approval. Any future development projects reliant on the proposed changes to where residential uses are allowed would be individually subject to discretionary approval, including environmental review. Impacts to population growth will be less than significant.

The ILUDC plan area is largely built-out with development, with few opportunities for in-fill development. As the ILUDC amendment would not convert any existing housing, nor would it displace citizens, there are no impacts to population and housing associated with this project.

Impact b-c: *No impacts.*

This project does not displace existing housing or people; in fact, the proposed changes to the land use tables of Article 2 increase the number of zoning districts where residential uses are allowable. For example:

Table 2-1 now allows condominium conversions in RH and RVH with a Use Permit.

Table 2-6 now allows single-family residential dwellings in CN with a Minor Use Permit and in CG and CH with a Use Permit.

Table 2-10 now allows caretaker quarters in IL with a Use Permit.

The ILUDC amendment creates some new opportunities for housing, and will have no potential to displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people.

XIV. Public Services

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection?			✓	
b. Police protection?			✓	
c. Schools?			✓	
d. Parks?			✓	
e. Other public facilities?			✓	

Impacts a-e: *Impacts are less than significant*

The ILUDC amendment retains all regulations addressing public services in the 2014 ILUDC, which was found to have a less than significant impact on public services. The amount of development that could potentially be accommodated in the ILUDC plan area can be served by the existing unused service capacity for fire, police, schools, parks, libraries and other public service facilities. The adoption of the ILUDC amendment will have a less than significant impact on public services.

XV. Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project</i>				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			✓	
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			✓	

Impacts a-b: *Impacts are less than significant*

The ILUDC plan area has adequate parks to serve the existing and future population. The proposed ILUDC amendment does not convert any existing park or open space area to a new use, and affects no policies requiring the development of future parks or open space areas.

The proposed ILUDC amendment contains some revisions to policy that more easily allow for the development of recreation facilities in the future, including:

Table 2-6 now allows outdoor commercial recreation facilities, conference facilities and theaters in CN and CO with a Use Permit.

Table 2-14 now allows sports and active recreation facilities in OS, PR and PF with a Use Permit.

Table 2-14 now allows parks and playgrounds in OS as a permitted use.

Impacts to recreation resulting from the ILUDC amendment will be less than significant.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic

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

Impacts a: *Impacts are less than significant*

The ILUDC amendment is consistent with the Inland General Plan policies pertaining, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle access, and transit. Future transportation projects in compliance with the ILUDC will be subject to additional permitting and environmental review, and would require mitigation for any impacts associated with specific projects.

Impacts b-c: *No impacts*

The ILUDC amendment does not conflict with the *Mendocino Council of Government Regional Transportation Plan* because the ILUDC plan area does not have regional serving roads. Additionally, development pursuant to the ILUDC would not change air traffic patterns, increase air traffic levels or result in a change in location that would produce substantial safety risks.

Impacts d-e: *Impacts are less than significant*

Most of the street infrastructure in the ILUDC area is already installed. Existing streets are generally wide and interconnect in a grid pattern to facilitate emergency vehicle access. This ILUDC amendment does not alter or affect existing circulation.

Impacts f: *No impacts*

The ILUDC amendment does not conflict with the Bicycle Master Plan, Inland General Plan, or any other plans.

XVII. Utilities and Service Systems

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

Impacts a-g: Impacts are less than significant

Development consistent with this ILUDC amendment would increase sewer flows only marginally, due to the limited infill development opportunities. The City's sewer treatment plant can accommodate all additional flows from the ILUDC plan area. Additionally, adoption of the ILUDC amendment will have less than significant impacts on the need for additional stormwater conveyance facilities.

Development pursuant to the Inland LUDC would increase water use and solid waste generation slightly, and would place few additional demands on existing water service capacities or storage. The Inland General Plan includes additional policies and programs to reduce water use, reduce solid waste generation, and this amendment would not affect the existing policies.

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

Impacts: *Impacts are less than significant*

Several plant and animal species listed as threatened by the state or federal government are known to exist in the area. Protection of sensitive communities and species are important for long-term ecological diversity and sustainability. The ILUDC includes regulations to protect and preserve valuable resource areas, and these existing policies are not affected by the proposed ILUDC amendment.