

1. Introduction and Summary

1.1 California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that discretionary decisions by public agencies be subject to environmental review. CEQA requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to be prepared when it can be determined that substantial evidence supports a fair argument that significant environmental impacts may occur as a result of a project. The purpose of an EIR is to identify the significant effects of the project on the environment, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided (Public Resources Code [PRC] 13, Section 21002.1[a]). Each public agency is required to mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment of projects it approves or carries out whenever feasible. The environmental effects of a project that must be addressed include the significant effects of the project, growth-inducing effects of the project, and significant cumulative effects.

The purpose of an EIR is not to recommend either approval or denial of a project. CEQA requires decision-makers to balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental effects in deciding whether to carry out a project. The Lead Agency will consider the analysis in the Draft EIR, comments received on the Draft EIR, and responses to those comments before making a final decision. If significant environmental effects are identified, the Lead Agency must adopt “Findings” indicating whether feasible mitigation measures or alternatives exist that can avoid or reduce those effects. If environmental impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable after proposed mitigation, the Lead Agency may still approve the project if it determines that the social, economic, or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable impacts. The Lead Agency would then be required to prepare a “Statement of Overriding Considerations” that discusses the specific reasons for approving a project, based on information in the Draft EIR, comments received on the Draft EIR, and other information in the administrative record.

This Draft EIR has been prepared by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for the proposed Ocean Ranch Restoration Project (Project) pursuant to CEQA (PRC Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15000 et seq.).

1.2 Type of Environmental Impact Report

This Draft EIR is a Project EIR, as opposed to a Program EIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161. A Project EIR is the most common type of EIR, examining the environmental impacts of a specific project. This type of EIR focuses on the changes in the environment that would result from the construction, development, and operation of a specific project.

1.3 Intended Uses of the EIR

The purpose of an EIR is to provide a clear understanding of the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of a project that is proposed by a public agency or private interest. EIRs are prepared to meet the requirements of CEQA when a proposed project may have a “significant” impact on the physical environment. An EIR is defined by the CEQA Guidelines as “... a detailed statement prepared to describe and analyze the significant environmental effects of a project and discuss ways to mitigate or avoid the effects” (Title 14 CCR Section 15362). An EIR must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of a project, as they exist at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published, from both a local and regional perspective. This environmental setting normally constitutes the baseline physical conditions by which the Lead Agency determines whether an impact is significant. The EIR is used by decision-makers, Responsible and Trustee Agencies, and the public to understand and evaluate project proposals and assist in making decisions on project approvals and required permits.

EIRs are prepared under the direction of a Lead Agency. The Lead Agency is the decision-making body that will ultimately certify the adequacy of the EIR and approve the implementation of a project. The Lead Agency for the proposed Project is CDFW.

In addition to the Lead Agency, other Responsible and Trustee Agencies may use this document in approving permits or providing recommendations for the Project. For this Project, these agencies may include:

- California Coastal Commission
- State Lands Commission
- North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
- State Water Resources Control Board

1.4 Public Scoping Process

On June 13, 2018, CDFW issued an NOP for the Project. The NOP was issued in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 CCR Section 15082) with the intent of informing agencies and interested parties that an EIR would be prepared for the Project. A copy of the NOP can be found in Appendix A. The NOP was circulated between June 13, 2018, and July 16, 2018. A public scoping meeting for the Project was held at the Fortuna River Lodge on July 9, 2018. Comments provided in response to the NOP and during the scoping meeting have been considered and are available upon request.

1.5 Effects Found Not to be Significant

To provide more meaningful public disclosure, reduce the time and cost required to prepare an EIR, and focus on potentially significant effects on the environment of a proposed project, Lead Agencies can focus the discussion in the EIR on those potential effects of a project which the Lead Agency has determined are or may be

significant. Lead agencies may limit discussion on other effects to a brief explanation as to why those effects are not potentially significant (PRC Section 21002.1 (e); CEQA Guidelines Sections 15128 and 15143). Each resource category section in Chapter 3 includes a section titled “Areas of No Project Impact” where applicable. Information used to determine which impacts would be potentially significant was derived from a review of the Project, field work, feedback from agency consultation and input, and comments received on the NOP.

1.6 Availability of the Draft EIR and Public Comment Period

This Draft EIR will be circulated for 47 days, from September 17, 2020 to November 2, 2020, to allow interested individuals and public agencies to review and comment on the document. The document will be available for review at the Humboldt County Planning and Building Department office, located at 3015 H Street, Eureka, California, as opposed to the Humboldt County Public Library which is temporarily closed to the public, and only offering curb side pickup, due to the coronavirus pandemic; and at www.wildlife.ca.gov/Notices. Comments may be submitted in writing via the United States Postal Service or via email. Written comments on the Draft EIR will be accepted by CDFW until 11:59 pm on November 2, 2020. Public agencies, interested organizations and individuals are encouraged to submit comments on the Draft EIR for consideration by CDFW. All written comments should be addressed to:

Gordon Leppig, Senior Environmental Scientist Supervisor
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
619 2nd Street
Eureka, CA 95501
Email: orurestoration@wildlife.ca.gov

To facilitate understanding of the comments, please provide a separate sentence or paragraph for each comment, and note the page and Chapter/Section of the Draft EIR to which the comment is directed. This approach to commenting will help CDFW provide a clear and meaningful response to each substantive comment.

CDFW will host a virtual public hearing to provide an overview of the Project and to receive public comments on the Draft EIR on October 13, 2020. The public hearing will include a brief presentation by CDFW followed by an open forum where the public may provide verbal or written comments. The public hearing will begin at 6:00 pm and the comment portion of the hearing will close at 7:30 pm. As noted above, the hearing will not have a physical location; it will be a remote-only meeting. Parties interested in participating in the hearing may join via teleconference (901-602-7766; Conference ID 542 558 411#) or virtually through a [Microsoft Teams meeting](#). Additional information on how to participate in the public hearing is available online at <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Notices>.

At the end of the public review period, written responses will be prepared for all substantive comments received on the Draft EIR during the circulation period. The comments and responses will then be included in the Final EIR and will be considered by CDFW prior to making a decision on the Project.

1.7 Organization of this Environmental Impact Report

This Draft EIR is organized into Chapters, as identified and briefly described below. Chapters are further divided into Sections (e.g., Section 3.1, Aesthetics).

- **Chapter 1, Introduction and Summary.** Chapter 1 describes the purpose and organization of the Draft EIR, context, and terminology used in the Draft EIR. This Chapter also identifies the key issues to be resolved in the Draft EIR and summarizes the environmental impacts and mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate those impacts.
- **Chapter 2, Project Description.** Chapter 2 describes the Project, including the Project objectives, location and setting, background, overall concept and proposed activities, and anticipated permits and approvals.
- **Chapter 3, Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures.** For each environmental resource area (broken out into sections), Chapter 3 describes the existing environmental and regulatory setting, discusses the environmental impacts associated with the Project, identifies feasible mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate those impacts, and provides conclusions on significance.
- **Chapter 4, Alternatives Description and Analysis.** Chapter 4 describes the alternatives to the Project that are being considered to mitigate the Project's environmental impacts while meeting the Project's objectives. This Chapter also identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative.
- **Chapter 5, Other CEQA Required Sections.** Chapter 5 describes the unavoidable significant impacts, growth-inducing, and irreversible impacts of the Project.
- **Chapter 6, List of Preparers.** Chapter 6 identifies the Draft EIR authors and consultants who provided analysis in support of the Draft EIR's conclusions.
- **Appendices A-B.** The appendices contain the Notice of Preparation and information on wildlife species used for preparation of the Draft EIR.

1.8 Areas of Controversy and Key Issues to be Resolved

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. The following provides a brief summary of the comments and issues identified during the scoping process for the EIR.

- Potential impacts on special-status species, including potential impacts during construction and changes in habitat resulting from implementation of the Project;
- Potential impacts associated with short-term and long-term invasive plant management, with particular attention given to the potential effects of herbicide application;
- Inland dune migration resulting from removal of European beachgrass (*Ammophila arenaria*), including long-term management considerations;

- Evaluation of noise and vibration impacts on species;
- Identification of potential cultural resources in the Project Area, and consideration of potential impacts to underground or submerged resources that may not be identified in a records search or cultural resources investigation;
- Analysis of sea level rise on the Project;
- Analysis of greenhouse gases through the identification of thresholds of significance;
- Information and analysis of the hydrology of the area, past and present;
- Potential conversion of habitat types resulting from the Project, such as the loss of freshwater wetlands if tidal hydrology is restored to the Project Area;
- Potential impacts to agricultural resources in the Project Area;
- Potential impacts to levees and dikes outside of the Project Area but within the Project's sphere of influence;
- Potential impacts of continued recreational use of All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) within the Project Area; and
- Impact of the Project on recreation, including waterfowl hunting, fishing and access along the Sand Road.

All of the substantive environmental issues raised during the scoping process have been addressed in this Draft EIR.

1.9 Summary of Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures

Table 1-1 identifies, by resource category, the significant Project impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and post-mitigation significance. Additional information about the impacts and mitigation measures can be found in Chapter 3 of this Draft EIR, as referenced for each resource category.

Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Aesthetics			
Impact AES-1: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Impact AES-2: In a non-urbanized area, would the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point).	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact AES-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to visual resources?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Agricultural Resources			
Impact AR-1: Would the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps for the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) by the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact AR-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to Agricultural Resources or Forestry Resources?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Air Quality			
Impact AQ-1: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure AQ-1	Less than significant after mitigation

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Impact AQ-2: Would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure AQ-1	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact AQ-3: Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure AQ-1	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact AQ-4: Would the Project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure AQ-1	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact AQ-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to air quality?	Less than significant cumulative contribution	Mitigation Measure AQ-1	Less than significant after Project mitigation
Biological Resources			
Impact BIO-1: Would the Project 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 CDFW, USFWS or NMFS?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, HHM-2, HHM-4, WQ-1, WQ-2, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, BIO-1d, BIO-1e, and BIO-1f	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-2: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other Sensitive Natural Community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures BIO-1e and BIO-1f	Less than significant after mitigation

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Impact BIO-3: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-3	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-4: Would the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, and BIO-1d	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-5: Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, HHM-2, WQ-1, WQ-2, BIO-1b, BIO-1c, BIO-1d, BIO-1e, BIO-1f, and BIO-3	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact BIO-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to biological resources?	Less than significant cumulative contribution	Mitigation Measures BIO-1a through BIO-1f, BIO-2, BIO-3, HHM-2, HHM-4, WQ-1, and WQ-2	Less than significant after Project mitigation
Cultural Resources			
Impact CR-1: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures CR-1, CR-2, CR-3, and CR-4.	Less than significant after mitigation

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Impact CR-2: Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure CR-5	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact CR-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to cultural resources?	Less than significant cumulative contribution	Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-5	Less than significant after Project mitigation
Geology and Soils			
Impact GEO-1: Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact GEO-2: Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures HWQ-1, HWQ-2, and WQ-6	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact GEO-3: Would the Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures HWQ-1, HWQ-2, and WQ-6	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact GEO-4: Would the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Impact GEO-5: Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure GEO-1	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact GEO-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to geology and soils?	Less than significant cumulative contribution	Mitigation Measures HWQ-1, HWQ-2, WQ-6, and GEO-1	Less than significant after Project mitigation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Impact GG-1: Would the Project generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact GG-2: Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?	No impact	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact GG-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact relative to GHG emissions?	No impact	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Impact HAZ-1: Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures HHM-1, HHM-3, and HHM-4	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact HAZ-2: Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures HHM-2, HHM-5 and WQ-2	Less than significant after mitigation

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Impact HAZ-3: Would the Project 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?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact HAZ-C-1: Would the Project result in a cumulatively significant impact from increased exposure of the public or environment to hazards or hazardous substances?	Less than significant cumulative contribution	Mitigation Measures HHM-1 through HHM-5 and WQ-2	Less than significant after Project mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact HWQ-1: Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures HWQ-1, HWQ-2, HWQ-3, WQ-2, WQ-6, HHM-2, and HHM-4	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact HWQ-2: Would the Project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact HWQ-3: Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Significant unavoidable	Not feasible	Not applicable

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Impact HWQ-4: Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Significant unavoidable	Not feasible	Not applicable
Impact HWQ-5: Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would 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?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures HWQ-1, HWQ-3, and WQ-6	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact HWQ-6: Would the Project impede or redirect flood flows?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact HWQ-7: Would the Project cause an increase in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to Project inundation?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact HWQ-8: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Impact HWQ-C1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to hydrology and water quality?	Less than significant cumulative contribution	Mitigation Measures HWQ-1 through HWQ-3, WQ-2, WQ-6, HHM-2, and HHM-4	Less than significant after Project mitigation
Land Use and Planning			
Impact: LU-1: Would the Project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	No impact	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact: LU-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact related to land use and planning?	No impact	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Noise			
Impact NOI-1: Would the Project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact NOI-2: Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact NOI-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact from noise?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Public Services and Utilities			
Impact PS-1: Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or 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 fire protection and police protection?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact PS-2: Would the Project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals and comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact PS-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact related to public services?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Recreation			
Impact REC-1: Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Impact REC-2: Would the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact REC-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to recreational resources?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Transportation			
Impact TR-1: Would the Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact TR-2: Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact TR-3: Would the Project substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible use?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact TR-4: Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact TR-C-1: Would the Project contribute to cumulatively significant impact related to transportation?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Tribal Cultural Resources			
Impact TCR-1: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to subdivision (c) of the Public Resources Code section 5024.1?	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures TCR-1, CR-1, and CR-2	Less than significant after mitigation
Impact TCR-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to Tribal Cultural Resources?	Less than significant cumulative contribution	Mitigation Measures TCR-1, CR-1, and CR-2	Less than significant after Project mitigation
Energy			
Impact EN-1: Would the Project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Impact EN-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to energy resources?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable
Wildfire			
Impact WF-1: Would the Project, 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?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	After-mitigation significance
Impact WF-C-1: Would the Project contribute to a cumulatively significant impact related to wildfire risk?	Less than significant	No mitigation proposed	Not applicable