

OWNER/APPLICANT: NUMEROUS (See Below)

REQUEST: Adopt General Plan Amendments and associated Rezonings as listed below, constituting the 2011 Russian River Watershed General Plan Amendment Group and associated Rezones:

1. **CASE#:** GP 3-2006/R 4-2006
DATE FILED: 2/15/2006
OWNER: MARIETTA HOPLAND LLC
APPLICANT: CHRIS BILBRO
AGENT: ANDY GUSTAVSON-LANDMARK PLANNING
REQUEST: Change the General Plan land use designation of AP# 047-310-09, 047-370-11 and 047-380-05 totaling 257.20+- acres from Range Lands 160 (RL-160) to Agriculture- 40 acre minimum (AG-40). In addition a Planned Development Combining District is also requested adding a PD designation to the zoning district.
LOCATION: Approximately 3.9 +/- miles northeast of Hopland, lying on the east side of Old River Road (CR# 201) (formerly Eastside Road) approximately 3+/- miles north of its intersection with University Road (CR# 116B) also known as Mendocino Hill Event Center, located at 9801, 10275 and 10501 Old River Road; AP#'s 047-310-09, 047-370-11, 047-380-05 and 047-310-05.
PROJECT COORDINATOR: MARY LYNN HUNT
2. **CASE#:** GP 4-2010/ R 5-2010
DATE FILED: 8/26/2010
OWNER/ APPLICANT: SAVINGS BANK OF MENDOCINO COUNTY
AGENT: JOHN LAZARO
REQUEST: General Plan Amendment and Rezone of AP#'s 184-170-03, 184-170-06, 184-170-07 and 184-170-11 (approximately 15.07+/- acres) from Agriculture 40 (AG 40) to Industrial-Light (I1).
LOCATION: In Ukiah, approximately 2.2+/- miles from town center, lying east off Taylor Drive (CR# 143), approximately 1/4+/- mile south of its intersection with Plant Road (CR# 142); formerly known as the Thomas Pear Packing and Got Fruit Facility, located at 3401 and 3501 Taylor Drive; AP#'s 184-170-03, 184-170-06, 184-170-07 and 184-170-11.
PROJECT COORDINATOR: JOHN SPEKA

LOCATION: Russian River Watersheds
(See above for specific locations)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The 2011 Russian River Watershed Group of General Plan Amendments and associated Rezones is comprised of two projects (summarized in Table A). This group is one of four amendments to the General Plan allowed by State law each year. Projects determined by the Board of Supervisors to be consistent with the General Plan and that have no significant unmitigated environmental impacts, will be included in the Group. Projects inconsistent with the General Plan or with potentially significant impacts will be eliminated from the Group and denied, or remanded for preparation of an environmental impact report.

REFERRAL AGENCY COMMENTS: Agencies were requested to comment on impacts associated with these projects both individually and cumulatively as part of the Group. The referral agencies are listed within the individual staff reports of each project.

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: The individual projects identified in Table A will result in increased development potential in the Russian River Watershed as shown. Cumulative

impacts to the Russian River Watershed, most prominently including erosion, water quality, wildlife and habitat degradation, have been identified and mitigated for the cases.

#GP 3-2006/R 4-2006 (Bilbro): The proposed change in land use and zoning designation on a 257.20± acre parcel from RL to AG reflects the change in trends in managing agricultural lands and the economic viability of maintaining agriculture use. While the proposed land use and zoning change would increase density, the use of the Planned Development Use Permit process and the conditions of the Contract Rezone being proposed would monitor development potential.

No significant adverse environmental impacts will occur from the adoption of GP 3-2006/R-4-2006, although incremental increases in erosion, water, air, energy and biological impacts will occur. Prohibiting second units would reduce these impacts.

#GP 4-2010/R 5-2010 (Savings Bank of Mendocino County): The change from AG to I in land use and zoning designation on a 15± acres parcel, reflects the change in ownership and existing uses and infrastructure (previous packing shed, commercial/industrial type structures, pavement etc.). The proposed land use and zoning change has the potential to increase development potential, however, given the previous use and existing on-site development no significant adverse environmental impacts will occur from the adoption of GP 4-2010/R 5-2010.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DETERMINATION: The Initial Study prepared by staff finds no significant adverse environmental effects will result from the adoption of the 2011 Russian River Watershed General Plan Amendment Group and associated Rezones. Staff recommends adoption of a Negative Declaration for GP 3-2006/R 4-2006 (Bilbro) and GP 4-2010/R 5-2010 (Savings Bank).

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY RECOMMENDATION: Staff finds that GP 3-2006/R 4-2006 (Bilbro) and GP 4-2010/R 5-2010 (Savings Bank) are consistent with the General Plan as stated in the Staff Reports and should be included in the 2011 Russian River Watershed General Plan Amendment Group and associated Rezones.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Until the Board of Supervisors takes preliminary action on each individual project, the proposed composition of the 2011 Russian River Watershed General Plan Amendment Group and associated Rezones is not known. Once the composition of the Group has been determined, the Board must then evaluate the cumulative effect of all projects selected for inclusion in the Group.

Motion: That the Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Supervisors approval of the 2011 Russian River Watershed General Plan Amendment Group and associated Rezones GP 3-2006/R 4-2006 (Bilbro) and GP 4-2010/R 5-2010 (Savings Bank) as shown in Table A, based on the evidence and findings in the Staff Reports, the project record as a whole, and the following:

1. An Initial Study has been prepared concluding that GP 3-2006/R 4-2006 (Bilbro) and GP 4-2010/R 5-2010 (Savings Bank) will not result in potential adverse impacts and an environmental Negative Declaration is recommended for adoption.
2. The recommended projects are consistent with goals and policies of the Mendocino County General Plan and the draft Ukiah Valley Area Plan as applicable, and are in the public's interest.

DATE

JOHN SPEKA and MARY LYNN HUNT
PLANNER II

TABLE A
 2011 RUSSIAN RIVER GENERAL PLAN
 AMENDMENT GROUP AND ASSOCIATED REZONES

CASE NUMBER	AP#	REQUEST - GP & ZONING	LOCATION	NET DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL*	STAFF RECOM.
Russian River Watershed					
GP 3-2006/ R 4-2006 (Bilbro)	047-310-09, 047-370-11 047-380-05	RL to AG 40 RL160 to A-G:L- 40:PD:CR	Northeast of Hopland	Two dwellings (40 acres- dwellings subject to PD/CR)	Approve
GP 4-2010/ R 5-2010 (Savings Bank of Mendocino Co)	184-170-03 184-170-06 184-170-07 184-170-11	AG40 to I AG40 to I(1):AZ:FP	South Ukiah	None	Approve

**MENDOCINO COUNTY
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW GUIDELINES
INITIAL STUDY**

Section I	Description of Project. DATE: 2011 Russian River General Plan Amendment Group and associated Rezones consisting of the following projects: A. # GP 3-2006/R 4-2006 Bilbro B. # GP 4-2010/R 5-2010 Savings Bank of Mendocino County
Section II	Environmental Checklist. "Significant effect on the environment" means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change, may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15382). Accompanying this form is a list of discussion statements for <u>all</u> questions, or categories of questions, on the Environmental Checklist (See Section III). This includes explanations of "no" responses.

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. GP 3-2006/R 4-2006 Bilbro

B. GP 4-2010/R 5-2010 Savings Bank

Will the project result in the following environmental effects:	No	Yes			Cumulative
		Not Significant	Significant Unless It is Mitigated	Significant - No Apparent Mitigation	
1. EARTH:					
A. Unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures.	B	A			
B. Disruptions, displacements, compaction, or overcovering of the soil.	AB				
C. Change in topography or ground surface relief features.	AB				
D. The destruction, covering, or modification of any unique geologic or physical features.	AB				
E. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site.	AB				
F. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river, stream, inlet, or bay?	AB				
G. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, ground failure, or other hazards.	AB				
2. AIR:					
A. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality.	B	A			
B. The creation of objectionable odors.	AB				
C. Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?	AB				
3. WATER:					
A. Changes in currents, or the course of water movements, in either fresh or marine waters.	AB				
B. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff.	AB				
C. Alterations to the course of flow of flood waters.	AB				
D. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body.	AB				
E. Discharge into surface waters, or in	B	A			

Will the project result in the following environmental effects:	No	Yes			
		Not Significant	Significant Unless It is Mitigated	Significant - No Apparent Mitigation	Cumulative
any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity.					
F. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water.	AB				
G. Change in the quantity of ground water, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations.	AB				
H. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies.	AB				
I. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding or tsunamis.	AB				
4. PLANT LIFE:					
A. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants.	B	A			
B. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, or endangered species of plants.	AB				
C. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species.	AB				
D. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop.	B	A			
5. ANIMAL LIFE:					
A. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of animals including birds, land animals, reptiles, fish, shellfish, insects, and benthic organisms.	AB				
B. Reduction in the number of any unique, rare, or endangered species of animals.	AB				
C. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals.	AB				
D. Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat.	B	A			
6. NOISE:					
A. Increases in existing noise levels.	AB				

Will the project result in the following environmental effects:	No	Yes			
		Not Significant	Significant Unless It is Mitigated	Significant - No Apparent Mitigation	Cumulative
B. Exposure of people to severe noise levels.	AB				
7. LIGHT AND GLARE:					
A. Production of new light and glare.	AB				
8. LAND USE:					
A. Substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of a given area.	B		A		
9. NATURAL RESOURCES:					
A. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources.	AB				
10. POPULATION:					
A. Alterations in the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of human populations.	AB				
11. HOUSING:					
A. Will the proposal affect existing housing or create a demand for new housing?	AB				
12. TRANSPORTATION/ CIRCULATION:					
A. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?	AB				
B. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?	AB				
C. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?	AB				
D. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	AB				
E. Alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic?	AB				
F. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians.	AB				
13. PUBLIC SERVICES:					
A. Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:					
Fire protection?	B	A			
Police protection?	AB				
Schools?	AB				
Parks and other recreational facilities?	AB				
Maintenance of public facilities, and roads?	AB				
Other governmental services?	AB				
14. ENERGY:					

Will the project result in the following environmental effects:	No	Yes			
		Not Significant	Significant Unless It is Mitigated	Significant - No Apparent Mitigation	Cumulative
A. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?	AB				
B. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new energy sources?	AB				
15. UTILITIES:					
A. Will the project result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to the following:					
Potable water?	AB				
Sewerage?	AB				
Energy or information transmission lines?	AB				
16. HUMAN HEALTH:					
A. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	AB				
B. Exposure of people to any existing health hazards?	AB				
C. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions.	AB				
D. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or evacuation plan.	AB				
17. AESTHETICS:					
A. Obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or create an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	AB				
18. RECREATION:					
A. Impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?	AB				
19. CULTURAL RESOURCES:					
A. Alteration or destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site?	A	B			
B. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building or structure?	B	A			
C. Cause a physical change that would affect the unique ethnic cultural values?	AB				
D. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact	AB				

Will the project result in the following environmental effects: area?	No	Yes			
		Not Significant	Significant Unless It is Mitigated	Significant - No Apparent Mitigation	Cumulative

Section III	Responses to Environmental Checklist.
	For a discussion of each of the environmental effects listed in the Environmental Checklist along with related goals and policies of the General Plan, see the Environmental Review section of the attached staff report.

Section IV	Mandatory Findings of Significance.
	<p>A. As discussed in the preceding sections, as designated in the Initial Study do not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, including effects on animals or plants, or to eliminate historic or prehistoric sites.</p> <p>B. As discussed in the preceding sections, both short-term and long-term environmental effects associated with cases as designated in the Initial Study will be less than significant.</p> <p>C. When impacts associated with the project are considered alone or in combination with other impacts, as designated in the Initial Study-related impacts are insignificant.</p> <p>D. The above discussions do not identify any substantial adverse impacts to people as a result as designated in the Initial Study.</p>

Section V	Determination.
	<p>On the basis of this initial evaluation, it has been determined that:</p> <p>The proposed cases as designated in the Initial Study will not have a significant effect on the environment, and it is recommended that a NEGATIVE DECLARATION be adopted.</p>

II. DETERMINATION.

In accordance with Mendocino County's procedures for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the proposed project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. On the basis of that study, it has been determined that:

The following projects will not have a significant effect on the environment, and it is recommended that a NEGATIVE DECLARATION be adopted as designated in the Initial Study.

The attached Initial Study and staff report incorporates all relevant information regarding the potential environmental effects of the project and confirms the determination that an EIR is not required for cases A (Bilbro), and B (Savings Bank).