



# **DRAFT Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration**

**Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department**  
 2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
 (707) 565-1900, FAX (707) 565-1103

**Publication Date:** October 20, 2023  
**Public Review Period:** October 20, 2023 – November 20, 2023  
**State Clearinghouse Number:** \*\*\*\*\* (TBD)  
**Permit Sonoma File Number:** MNS21-0001  
**Prepared by:** Adam Sharron, Project Planner  
**Phone:** (707) 565-7389

Pursuant to Section 15071 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and the attached Initial Study constitute the environmental review conducted by the County of Sonoma as lead agency for the proposed project described below:

**Project Name:** Minor Subdivision – 7135 Eastside Road, Healdsburg  
**Project Applicant:** Joe Bartolomei  
**Project Location/Address:** 7135 Eastside Rd., Healdsburg, CA 95448  
**APN:** 110-210-013, 110-210-012  
**General Plan Land Use Designation:** DA (Diverse Agriculture)  
**Zoning Designation:** DA (Diverse Agriculture) B6 17, F2 (Floodplain Combining District), F1 Floodway Combining District), MR (Mineral Resources), VOH (Valley Oak Habitat)  
**Decision-Making Body:** Project Review Advisory Committee  
**Appeal Body:** Planning Commission  
**Project Description:** See Project Description section.

## **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” or “Less than Significant with Mitigation” as indicated in the attached Initial Study and in the summary table below.

**Table 1. Summary of Topic Areas**

<b>Topic Area</b>	<b>Abbreviation*</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Aesthetics</b>	VIS	Yes	
<b>Agricultural and Forest Resources</b>	AG		No
<b>Air Quality</b>	AIR	Yes	
<b>Biological Resources</b>	BIO	Yes	
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	CUL	Yes	
<b>Energy</b>	EN		No

<b>Geology and Soils</b>	GEO	Yes	
<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>	GHG		No
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>	HAZ		No
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>	HYDRO	Yes	
<b>Land Use and Planning</b>	LU		No
<b>Mineral Resources</b>	MIN		No
<b>Noise</b>	NOISE	Yes	
<b>Population and Housing</b>	POP		No
<b>Public Services</b>	PS	Yes	
<b>Recreation</b>	REC		No
<b>Transportation and Traffic</b>	TRAF	Yes	
<b>Tribal Cultural Resources</b>	TCR	Yes	
<b>Utility and Service Systems</b>	UTL	Yes	
<b>Mandatory Findings of Significance</b>			No

## RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

The following lists other public agencies whose approval is required for the project, or who have jurisdiction over resources potentially affected by the project.

**Table 2: Responsible and Trustee Agencies**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Authorization</b>
USACE	Potential wetland fill	404 permit
RWQCB	Potential wetland fill	401 permit

## ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING

Based on the evaluation in the attached Initial Study, the project described above will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, provided that the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study are incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared. The applicant has agreed in writing to the identified mitigation measures for the project.

Prepared by: Adam Sharron, Project Planner [Month] \*\*, 20\*\*  
 Date



## **DRAFT Expanded Initial Study**

**Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department**  
2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

### **INTRODUCTION**

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Request for a Minor Subdivision of a 34.79+/- acre parcel into two parcels 15.30+/- and 19.49+/- acres in size to be served by private wells and septic systems. Parcel 1 would encompass an existing single-family residence and access is from an existing private driveway connecting to Eastside Road. Access to Parcel 2 would be from a new driveway and connection to Eastside Road. Parcel 2 includes a proposed building envelope and septic/leachfield development areas.

### **PROJECT SITE AND SURROUNDING LANDS**

The project site is located southwest of the Town of Windsor, to the south and east of Sonoma County Riverfront Regional Park along the Russian River, and fronts upon Eastside Road for approximately 2,200-linear feet with an equivalent border along Riverfront Park. The parcel to the south is an established productive vineyard zoned RRD B6 60, F1 F2 RC50/50 RC200/100 VOH. The parcels to the north and west are occupied by Riverfront Regional Park in the Sonoma County Regional Parks system and zoned PF, F1 F2 MR RC50/50 VOH. The parcel across Eastside Road is undeveloped lands of the Windsor Water District.

**Design Style.** No new structures are proposed at this time.

**Drainage.** Site drainage generally consists of sheet flow and surface infiltration. Local drainage is directed to a reservoir to the northwest and seasonal drainages to the north and east of the site. Regional drainage is provided by the Russian River approximately 0.4-mi west of the site.

**Vegetation.** Six vegetation communities occur on the project site: willow riparian forest, oak-madrone forest, redwood forest, California bay forest, non-native grassland, and wetland seep. The building envelope occurs primarily in the oak-madrone forest type. The proposed driveway traverses the redwood and California bay forests, and non-native grassland occurs in open areas that have been previously disturbed and is a minor vegetation type. A small potential wetland seep was observed where the septic leach field is proposed at the top of the ridge.

**Proposed Buildings and Uses.** Single-family residential. No new structures are proposed at this time; Parcel 2 proposes a building envelope and septic development area.

**Parking.** The project will provide adequate residential parking spaces in accordance with Sonoma County Code.

**Access.** The north parcel will continue to be accessed from Eastside Road; the south parcel will construct a new access driveway to Eastside Road.

**Sewage Disposal.** Sewage for lot 2 will be captured by a new septic system.

**Water Supply.** Water supply will be provided through an easement from a well on the north parcel.

**Landscaping.** No new landscaping is proposed; existing vegetation to be maintained except for vegetation removal associated with the new driveway and future construction of a residence and septic system on lot 2.

## **SETTING**

The property includes two prominent knolls separated by a creek which drains from the east to the west into Riverfront Regional Park. The north knoll contains an existing residence. The south knoll is undeveloped. The two knolls exhibit moderately steep topography and are primarily forested. The creek area contains riparian vegetation, but also contains approximately 12,000-yards of imported fill illegally deposited by a previous owner. The County maintains a 50-foot-wide emergency vehicle access easement adjacent to the creek between Riverfront Park and Eastside Road. The County also has a 20-foot wide by 450-foot long vehicular and pedestrian easement that contains a portion of the trail surrounding the southern pond (Lake Benoist) at Riverfront Regional Park.

## **ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC OR AGENCIES**

A referral packet was drafted and circulated to inform and solicit comments from selected relevant local, State, and federal agencies; and to special interest groups that were anticipated to take interest in the project.

Agency referral comments were received from:

1. Lytton Rancheria
2. Northwest Information Center
3. Pacific Gas & Electric
4. Permit Sonoma – Engineering – Grading/Stormwater/Drainage
5. Permit Sonoma – Natural Resources
6. Permit Sonoma – Survey
7. Sonoma County Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector
8. Sonoma County Fire District
9. Sonoma County Transportation & Public Works (currently Sonoma Public Infrastructure)
10. Stewarts Point Rancheria Kashia Band of Pomo Indians

No public comments received in response to a neighborhood notification mailed on April 1, 2021, to parcels within a 300-foot radius of the subject parcels.

## OTHER RELATED PROJECTS

Not applicable.

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section analyzes the potential environmental impacts of this project based on the criteria set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines and the County's implementing ordinances and guidelines. For each item, one of four responses is given:

**No Impact: The project would not have the impact described.** The project may have a beneficial effect, but there is no potential for the project to create or add increment to the impact described.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project would have the impact described, but the impact would not be significant. Mitigation is not required, although the project applicant may choose to modify the project to avoid the impacts.

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated:** The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. One or more mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**Potentially Significant Impact:** The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. The impact cannot be reduced to less than significant by incorporating mitigation measures. An environmental impact report must be prepared for this project.

Each question was answered by evaluating the project as proposed, that is, without considering the effect of any added mitigation measures. The Initial Study includes a discussion of the potential impacts and identifies mitigation measures to substantially reduce those impacts to a level of insignificance where feasible. All references and sources used in this Initial Study are listed in the Reference section at the end of this report and are incorporated herein by reference.

The applicant has agreed to accept all mitigation measures listed in this Initial Study as conditions of approval for the proposed project, and to obtain all necessary permits, notify all contractors, agents, and employees involved in project implementation and any new owners should the property be transferred to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures.

## 1. AESTHETICS

**Would the project:**

**a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

**Comment**

The project site is not in an area designated as visually sensitive by the Sonoma County General Plan. The project site is not located within a SR (Scenic Resource) combining district or along a scenic corridor. However, the building envelope on Proposed Lot 2 is located upon a scenic hilltop. If a large house is constructed upon the hilltop, the house will be plainly visible from people recreating within Riverfront Regional Park.

### **Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

#### **Mitigation**

##### **Mitigation Measure AES-1:**

Note on Map: "Construction of all new structures on these parcels must be within the approved building envelopes. All new structures are subject to Administrative Design Review. Building colors and materials must blend with the surrounding vegetation. Non-reflective windows are required. Building and site lighting shall be low-mounted, downward-casting, and fully shielded to prevent glare. Flood lights are not permitted. Existing trees that screen the site from Riverfront Park shall be retained to the maximum extent possible."

##### **Mitigation Measure AES-2:**

**Note on Map:** "Structures proposed upon Lot 2 are limited to a maximum height of 26-feet measured from the highest and lowers existing grades under the proposed structure to the highest point of the roof."

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

#### **Comment**

While the project would involve tree and vegetation removal within building areas, the project would not damage scenic resources because the parcel is not designated as a scenic resource, nor is the site located on a site visible from a State scenic highway.

#### **Significance Level**

No Impact

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

#### **Comment**

While the site is adjacent to a regional park, the natural topography and existing mature vegetation will screen the public views of the development areas on the subject parcels from both the adjacent land uses (Riverfront Regional Park and the Eastside Road corridor) and from public vantages in the surrounding areas.

#### **Significance Level**

No Impact

- d) **Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime view in the area?**

**Comment**

No new lighting is proposed at this time but can be expected with a future residence. All lighting is required to comply with County regulations to limit illumination, shield lighting sources, and avoid glare.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

## **2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES**

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

**Would the project:**

- 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?**

**Comment**

The parcel is considered Other Land and is not designated as Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the Important Farmland maps.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- b) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act Contract?**

**Comment**

The subject parcel is not zoned for agricultural use and does not have a Williamson Act Contract.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- c) **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?**

**Comment**

The project is not forest or timber land as defined under PRC 4526 and is not zoned Timberland Production (TP), or located near forest land or lands zoned TP, and therefore would not conflict with or have any effect on forest lands or lands zoned TP.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- d) **Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

**Comment**

The project is not forest land and is not located near any forest land and would therefore not result in the loss of or conversion of forest land.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- e) **Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

**Comment**

The project does not involve other changes in the environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

### **3. AIR QUALITY**

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

**Would the project:**

- a) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

**Comment**

The project is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), which is currently designated as a nonattainment area for State and federal ozone standards, the State PM<sub>10</sub> standard, and State and federal PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards. The District has adopted an Ozone Attainment Plan and a Clean Air Plan in compliance with federal and State Clean Air Acts. These plans include measures to achieve compliance with both ozone standards. The plans deal primarily with emissions of ozone precursors (nitrogen oxides [NO<sub>x</sub>] and volatile organic compounds, also



referred to as Reactive Organic Gases [ROG]). The project will not conflict with the District's air quality plans because the proposed project does not involve construction or development that would generate substantial emissions.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

**b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?**

**Comment**

The project is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), which is currently designated as a nonattainment area for State and federal ozone standards, the State PM<sub>10</sub> standard, and State and federal PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards.

The project will not have a cumulative effect on ozone because it will not generate substantial traffic which would result in substantial emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NOx). See discussion in Section 17, Transportation Traffic, below.

The project will have no long-term effect on PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, because all surfaces will be paved, gravel, landscaped, or otherwise treated to stabilize bare soils, and dust generation will be insignificant. However, there could be a significant short-term emission of dust (which would include PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>) during construction. These emissions could be significant at the project level and could also contribute to a cumulative impact.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

This impact would be reduced to less than significant by including dust control measures as described in the following mitigation measure:

**Mitigation Measure AIR-1:** The following dust control measures shall be included in the project:

- a. Water or alternative dust control method shall be sprayed to control dust on construction areas, soil stockpiles, and staging areas during construction as directed by the County.
- b. Trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials over public roads will cover the loads or will keep the loads at least two feet below the level of the sides of the container or will wet the load sufficiently to prevent dust emissions.
- c. Paved roads will be swept as needed to remove soil that has been carried onto them from the project site.

**Monitoring:** Permit Sonoma staff shall ensure that the measures are listed on all site alteration, grading, building, or improvement plans prior to issuance of grading or building permits.

**c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

**Comment**

Sensitive receptors are facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas are examples of sensitive receptors. Localized impacts to sensitive receptors generally occur when sources of air pollutants and sensitive receptors are located near one another. In this case, the proposed 40-unit development would be considered a sensitive receptor. The surrounding area is a mix of agricultural, residential, and public facilities (Riverfront Regional Park) uses. The proposed project would not create an incompatible situation as the residential use of the project site does not involve stationary or point sources of air pollutants which generate substantial pollutant concentrations.

Although there will be no substantial long-term increase in emissions, during construction there could be short term dust emissions that would affect nearby residents. Dust emissions can be reduced to less than significant by Mitigation Measure AIR-1.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

See AIR-1

**d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?)**

**Comment**

The project is not an odor-generating use, nor located near an odor-generating source that may affect sensitive receptors. The use would have no significant odor impacts.

Construction equipment may generate odors during project construction. The impact would be less than significant due to the distant proximity of sensitive receptors and construction would be short-term that ceases upon completion of the project.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

## **4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

### **Regulatory Framework**

The following discussion identifies federal, State, and local environmental regulations that serve to protect sensitive biological resources relevant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process. Regulations that could apply at some level include the following. See discussion for analysis.

## **Federal**

### ***Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA)***

FESA establishes a broad public and federal interest in identifying, protecting, and providing for the recovery of threatened or endangered species. The Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Commerce are designated in FESA as responsible for identifying endangered and threatened species and their critical habitat, carrying out programs for the conservation of these species, and rendering opinions regarding the impact of proposed federal actions on listed species. The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) are charged with implementing and enforcing the FESA. USFWS has authority over terrestrial and continental aquatic species, and NOAA Fisheries has authority over species that spend all or part of their life cycle at sea, such as salmonids.

Section 9 of FESA prohibits the unlawful "take" of any listed fish or wildlife species. Take, as defined by FESA, means "to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such action." USFWS's regulations define harm to mean "an act which actually kills or injures wildlife." Such an act may include "significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding or sheltering" (50 CFR § 17.3). Take can be permitted under FESA pursuant to sections 7 and 10. Section 7 provides a process for take permits for federal projects or projects subject to a federal permit, and Section 10 provides a process for incidental take permits for projects without a federal nexus. FESA does not extend the take prohibition to federally listed plants on private land, other than prohibiting the removal, damage, or destruction of such species in violation of state law.

### ***The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA)***

The US MBTA (16 USC §§ 703 et seq., Title 50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 10) states it is "unlawful at any time, by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill; attempt to take, capture or kill; possess, offer for sale, sell, offer to barter, barter, offer to purchase, purchase, deliver for shipment, ship, export, import, cause to be shipped, exported, or imported, deliver for transportation, transport or cause to be transported, carry or cause to be carried, or receive for shipment, transportation, carriage, or export any migratory bird, any part, nest, or egg of any such bird, or any product, whether or not manufactured, which consists, or is composed in whole or in part, of any such bird or any part, nest or egg thereof..." In short, under MBTA it is illegal to disturb a nest that is in active use, since this could result in killing a bird, destroying a nest, or destroying an egg. The USFWS enforces MBTA. The MBTA does not protect some birds that are non-native or human-introduced or that belong to families that are not covered by any of the conventions implemented by MBTA. In 2017, the USFWS issued a memorandum stating that the MBTA does not prohibit incidental take; therefore, the MBTA is currently limited to purposeful actions, such as directly and knowingly removing a nest to construct a project, hunting, and poaching.

### ***The Clean Water Act (CWA)***

The CWA is the primary federal law regulating water quality. The implementation of the CWA is the responsibility of the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). However, the EPA depends on other agencies, such as the individual states and the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), to assist in implementing the CWA. The objective of the CWA is to "restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters." Section 404 and 401 of the CWA apply to activities that would impact waters of the U.S. The USACE enforces Section 404 of the CWA, and the California State Water Resources Control Board enforces Section 401.

#### ***Section 404***

As part of its mandate under Section 404 of the CWA, the EPA regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into "waters of the U.S.". "Waters of the U.S.:" include territorial seas, tidal waters, and non-tidal waters in addition to wetlands and drainages that support wetland vegetation, exhibit ponding or scouring,

show obvious signs of channeling, or have discernible banks and high-water marks. Wetlands are defined as those areas “that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions” (33 CFR 328.3(b)). The discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. is prohibited under the CWA except when it is in compliance with Section 404 of the CWA. Enforcement authority for Section 404 was given to the USACE, which it accomplishes under its regulatory branch. The EPA has veto authority over the USACE’s administration of the Section 404 program and may override a USACE decision with respect to permitting. Substantial impacts to waters of the US may require an Individual Permit’s Projects that only minimally affect waters of the U.S. may meet the conditions of one of the existing Nationwide Permits, provided that such permit’s other respective conditions are satisfied. A Water Quality Certification or waiver pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA is required for Section 404 permit actions (see below).

#### *Section 401*

Any applicant for a federal permit to impact waters of the US under Section 404 of the CWA, including Nationwide Permits where pre-construction notification is required, must also provide to the USACE a certification or waiver from the State of California. The “401 Certification” is provided by the State Water Resources Control Board through the local Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The RWQCB issues and enforces permits for discharge of treated water, landfills, storm-water runoff, filling of any surface waters or wetlands, dredging, agricultural activities and wastewater recycling. The RWQCB recommends the “401 Certification” application be made at the same time that any applications are provided to other agencies, such as the USACE, USFWS, or NOAA Fisheries. The application is not final until completion of environmental review under the CEQA. The application to the RWQCB is similar to the pre-construction notification that is required by the USACE. It must include a description of the habitat that is being impacted, a description of how the impact is proposed to be minimized and proposed mitigation measures with goals, schedules, and performance standards. Mitigation must include a replacement of functions and values, and replacement of wetland at a minimum ratio of 2:1, or twice as many acres of wetlands provided as are removed. The RWQCB looks for mitigation that is on site and in-kind, with functions and values as good as or better than the water-based habitat that is being removed.

#### **State**

##### ***California Endangered Species Act (CESA)***

Provisions of CESA protect state-listed threatened and endangered species. The CDFW is charged with establishing a list of endangered and threatened species. CDFW regulates activities that may result in “take” of individuals (i.e., “hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill”). Habitat degradation or modification is not expressly included in the definition of “take” under the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC), but CDFW has interpreted “take” to include the killing of a member of a species which is the proximate result of habitat modification.

##### ***Fish and Game Code 1600-1602***

Sections 1600-1607 of the CFGC require that a Notification of Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA) application be submitted to CDFW for “any activity that may substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake.” CDFW reviews the proposed actions in the application and, if necessary, prepares a LSAA that includes measures to protect affected fish and wildlife resources, including mitigation for impacts to bats and bat habitat.

##### ***Nesting Birds***

Nesting birds, including raptors, are protected under CFGC Section 3503, which reads, “It is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by this

code or any regulation made pursuant thereto.” In addition, under CFGC Section 3503.5, “it is unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the orders *Falconiformes* or *Strigiformes* (birds-of-prey) or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto”. Passerines and non-passerine land birds are further protected under CFGC 3513. As such, CDFW typically recommends surveys for nesting birds that could potentially be directly (e.g., actual removal of trees/vegetation) or indirectly (e.g., noise disturbance) impacted by project-related activities. Disturbance during the breeding season could result in the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings, or otherwise lead to nest abandonment. Disturbance that causes nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort is considered “take” by CDFW.

### ***California Fully Protected Species***

The classification of “fully protected” was the CDFW’s initial effort to identify and provide additional protection to those animals that were rare or faced possible extinction. Lists were created for fish, amphibians and reptiles, birds, and mammals. Most of the species on these lists have subsequently been listed under CESA and/or FESA. The Fish and Game Code sections (fish at §5515, amphibians and reptiles at §5050, birds at §3503 and §3511, and mammals at §4150 and §4700) dealing with “fully protected” species state that these species “...may not be taken or possessed at any time and no provision of this code or any other law shall be construed to authorize the issuance of permits or licenses to take any fully protected species,” although take may be authorized for necessary scientific research. This language makes the “fully protected” designation the strongest and most restrictive regarding the “take” of these species. In 2003, the code sections dealing with “fully protected” species were amended to allow the CDFW to authorize take resulting from recovery activities for state-listed species.

### ***Special-Status Species***

Special-status species include those plant and wildlife species that have been formally listed, are proposed as endangered or threatened, or are candidates for such listing under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) or California Endangered Species Act (CESA). These acts afford protection to both listed and proposed species. In addition, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Species of Special Concern, which are species that face extirpation in California if current population and habitat trends continue, US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Birds of Conservation Concern, and CDFW special-status invertebrates, are all considered special-status species. Although CDFW Species of Special Concern generally have no special legal status, they are given special consideration under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In addition to regulations for special-status species, most birds in the United States, including non-status species, are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918. Plant species on California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants with California Rare Plant Ranks (Rank) of 1 and 2 are also considered special-status plant species and must be considered under CEQA. Bat species designated as “High Priority” by the Western Bat Working Group (WBWG) qualify for legal protection under Section 15380(d) of the CEQA Guidelines. Species designated “High Priority” are defined as “imperiled or are at high risk of imperilment based on available information on distribution, status, ecology, and known threats.

### ***Species of Special Concern***

California Species of Special Concern (CSC) are broadly defined as animals not listed under the FESA or CESA, but which are nonetheless of concern to the CDFW because they are declining at a rate that could result in listing or because they historically occurred in low numbers and known threats to their persistence currently exist. This designation is intended to result in special consideration for these animals by the CDFW, land managers, consulting biologists, and others, and is intended to focus attention on the species to help avert the need for costly listing under FESA and CESA and cumbersome recovery efforts that might ultimately be required. This designation also is intended to stimulate collection of additional information on the biology, distribution, and status of poorly known at-risk species, and focus research and management attention on them. Although these species generally have no special legal status, they are given special consideration under the CEQA during project review.

### ***Critical Habitat***

Critical habitat is a term defined in the ESA as a specific geographic area that contains features essential for the conservation of a threatened or endangered species and that may require special management and protection. The ESA requires federal agencies to consult with the USFWS to conserve listed species on their lands and to ensure that any activities or projects they fund, authorize, or carry out will not jeopardize the survival of a threatened or endangered species. In consultation for those species with critical habitat, federal agencies must also ensure that their activities or projects do not adversely modify critical habitat to the point that it will no longer aid in the species' recovery. In many cases, this level of protection is similar to that already provided to species by the ESA jeopardy standard. However, areas that are currently unoccupied by the species, but which are needed for the species' recovery are protected by the prohibition against adverse modification of critical habitat.

### ***California tiger salamander***

The California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*) is associated with vernal pools and seasonal wetlands on the Santa Rosa Plain. The salamander is federal listed as Endangered and is State listed as Threatened.

### ***Special Status Plant Species***

The Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy defines areas potentially suitable to support any of the three federally listed plant species covered by the Conservation Strategy document: Sonoma sunshine, Burke's goldfields, and Sebastopol meadowfoam. The Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy does not designate the project site as one with a potential for presence of any of the three listed species. The mostly non-native vegetation on the property generally does not represent optimal suitable habitat for special status plants.

### ***Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act***

The intent of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne) is to protect water quality and the beneficial uses of water, and it applies to both surface and ground water. Under this law, the State Water Resources Control Board develops statewide water quality plans, and the RWQCBs develop basin plans that identify beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and implementation plans. The RWQCBs have the primary responsibility to implement the provisions of both statewide and basin plans. Waters regulated under Porter-Cologne, referred to as "waters of the State," include isolated waters that are not regulated by the USACE. Projects that require a USACE permit, or fall under other federal jurisdiction, and have the potential to impact waters of the State are required to comply with the terms of the Water Quality Certification Program. If a proposed project does not require a federal license or permit, any person discharging, or proposing to discharge, waste (e.g., dirt) to waters of the State must file a Report of Waste Discharge and receive either waste discharge requirements (WDRs) or a waiver to WDRs before beginning the discharge.

## **Local**

### ***Sonoma County General Plan***

The Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Land Use Element and Open Space & Resource Conservation Element both contain policies to protect natural resource lands including, but not limited to, watershed, fish and wildlife habitat, biotic areas, and habitat connectivity corridors.

### ***Riparian Corridor Ordinance***

The RC combining zone is established to protect biotic resource communities, including critical habitat areas within and along riparian corridors, for their habitat and environmental value, and to implement the provisions of the General Plan Open Space and Resource Conservation and Water Resources Elements. These provisions are intended to protect and enhance riparian corridors and functions along designated streams, balancing the need for agricultural production, urban development, timber and mining operations



and other land uses with the preservation of riparian vegetation, protection of water resources, floodplain management, wildlife habitat and movement, stream shade, fisheries, water quality, channel stability, groundwater recharge, opportunities for recreation, education and aesthetic appreciation and other riparian functions and values.

### **Valley Oak Habitat (VOH) Combining District**

The VOH combining district is established to protect and enhance valley oaks and valley oak woodlands and to implement the provisions of Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Resource Conservation Element Section 5.1. Design review approval may be required of projects in the VOH, which would include measures to protect and enhance valley oaks on the project site, such as requiring that valley oaks shall comprise a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the required landscape trees for the development project.

### **Sonoma County Tree Protection Ordinance**

The Sonoma County Tree Protection Ordinance (Sonoma County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 26, Article 88, Sec. 26-88-010 [m]) establishes policies for protected tree species in Sonoma County. Protected trees are defined (Chapter 26, Article 02, Sec. 26-02-140) as the following species: big leaf maple (*Acer macrophyllum*), black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*), blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*), coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), interior live oak (*Quercus wislizenii*), madrone (*Arbutus menziesii*), oracle oak (*Quercus morehus*), Oregon oak (*Quercus garryana*), redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), California bay (*Umbellularia californica*), and their hybrids.

Would the project:

- a) **Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

#### **Comment**

The project applicant submitted a biological Habitat Assessment dated December 2, 2021, which was prepared jointly by Wildlife Research Associates and Jane Valerius Environmental Consulting. Their report examined the various wildlife habitats and vegetative communities on-site and evaluated the potential for occurrence of 63 special status plant species and 52 special status wildlife species (including bats).

The majority of the special status plant species evaluated are not expected to occur within the project study area due to lack of habitat. Four plant species have the potential to occur based on the presence of potential habitats: California bottle-brush grass (*Elymus californicus*), congested-headed hayfield tarplant (*Hemizonia congesta* ssp. *congesta*), bristly leptosiphon (*Leptosiphon acicularis*), and march microseris (*Microseris paludosa*).

#### **Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

**Mitigation Measure BIO-1:**

Surveys for special status plant species shall be conducted prior to any ground disturbance to establish if any special status species are present and would be impacted by the proposed development. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) requires that surveys for special status plants should be conducted during the time of year when those species are most identifiable, which is typically when in-flower. It is recommended that surveys be conducted in April, May, and June to cover the flowering period for special status plants.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**Comment**

No work is proposed that would impact the willow riparian community at the northern portion of Parcel 2. The potential seep wetland at the south property/parcel boundary near the proposed leach field should be avoided and a 50-foot buffer maintained between the wetland and any development.

The project site is located within the boundaries of the Valley Oak Habitat Combining District which was established to protect and enhance Valley Oaks and Valley Oak woodlands. In this district, the removal of a Valley Oak is required to be mitigated through replacement, payment of fees, or preservation of other Valley Oaks on the property. There is no proposed Valley Oak removal proposed by this development. Valley Oaks are associated with the willow riparian community present in the lowland area between the two parcels, but proposed work would not impact this portion of the site.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

**Comment**

The scope, design, and construction activities associated with the proposed project would not remove, fill, hydrologically interrupt, or otherwise substantially adversely affect protected wetlands.

Drainage on the site currently is via sheet flow and surface infiltration. Local drainage is directed to a reservoir to the northwest and seasonal drainages to the north and east of the site. Regional drainage is provided by the Russian River located approximately 0.4-miles west of the site.

Future project construction may involve minor cuts, fills, and other grading. Unregulated grading during construction has the potential to increase soil erosion which could adversely impact downstream water quality. Construction grading activities shall be in compliance with performance standards in the Sonoma County Grading and Drainage Ordinance. The ordinance and adopted construction site Best Management Practices (BMPs) require installation of adequate erosion prevention and sediment control management practices. These ordinance requirements and BMPs



are specifically designed to maintain water quantity and ensure erosion and siltation impacts are less than significant level during and post construction.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2:**

1. The drainage ditch at the Parcel 2 site access shall be avoided. If avoidance is infeasible, the wetlands shall be delineated and USACE and RWQCB approvals shall be obtained to mitigate wetland impacts. All wetlands are considered sensitive and should be avoided.
2. Tree removal, tree-protection, and replanting/restoration plans shall be submitted that identifies trees potentially impacted by driveway construction.

**Monitoring:** Permit Sonoma staff will not issue permits for ground disturbing activities until the applicant has obtained wetland impact approvals and have submitted tree impact/protection plans prior to issuance.

**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?**

**Comment**

Many common bird species (including their eggs and young), are given special protection under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (Migratory Bird Act). No surveys were conducted to detect the presence of Passerines or Raptors, but habitats where they are known to occur are present on-site. A nesting bird survey shall be conducted before disturbance of any of these habitats, and seasonal restrictions put into place for occupied habitats, to ensure no take of individuals will occur. The mitigation measures recommended below are sufficient to address impacts to birds protected by the Migratory Bird Act.

Impacts to migratory birds are typically avoided by removing vegetation during non-nesting season, by having a qualified biologist verify absence immediately prior to vegetation removal. If feasible, remove vegetation and conduct ground-disturbing activities only between September 1 and February 1 to avoid bird-nesting season. If it is not feasible to remove vegetation outside of bird-nesting season, the following Mitigation Monitoring BIO-1 will reduce impacts to a level that would be less than significant.

It is likely that several trees contain potential cavity, crevice, and/or exfoliating bark roost features which are suitable for bat species. In addition, dense canopy covers most of the project site that could provide suitable potential habitat. Construction within 100 feet of trees providing potentially suitable roosting habitat may cause direct mortality of roosting bats if construction starts during seasonal periods of inactivity (maternity season or winter). No impacts will occur from the lot split. See Mitigation Measure BIO-2 below.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3:**

1. Grading or removal of nesting trees should be conducted outside the nesting season, which occurs between approximately February 1 and August 31.
2. If grading between August 31 and February 1 is infeasible and groundbreaking must occur within the nesting season, a pre-construction nesting bird (both passerine and raptor) survey of the grasslands and adjacent trees shall be performed by a qualified biologist within 7 days of groundbreaking. If no nesting birds are observed no further action is required and grading shall occur within one week of the survey to prevent “take” of individual birds that could begin nesting after the survey.
3. If active bird nests (either passerine and/or raptor) are observed during the pre-construction survey, a disturbance-free buffer zone shall be established around the nest tree(s) until the young have fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.
4. The radius of the required buffer zone can vary depending on the species, (i.e., 200 feet for passerines and 500 feet for raptors), with the dimensions of any required buffer zones to be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW.
5. To delineate the buffer zone around a nesting tree, orange construction fencing shall be placed at the specified radius from the base of the tree within which no machinery or workers shall intrude.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4:**

To prevent “take” of individual roosting bats, a bat habitat assessment of the trees to be removed and trees within 100 feet should be conducted by a qualified bat biologist. Specific recommendations based on the habitats on the site will be made to prevent direct impacts to individuals that may be roosting on the site.

**Monitoring:** Permit Sonoma staff will not issue permits for ground disturbing activities until the site has been surveyed by a qualified biologist to ensure proper fencing and buffers are in place prior to issuance.

- e) **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

**Regulatory Framework**

***Tree Protection Ordinance***

Chapter 26, Article 88. Sec. 26-08-010(m) of the Sonoma County Code contains a tree protection ordinance (Sonoma County 2013). The ordinance designates “protected” trees as well as provides mitigation standards for impacts to protected trees.

***Sonoma County General Plan***

The Sonoma County General Plan 2020 (Sonoma County 2008) Land Use Element and Open Space & Resource Conservation Element both contain policies to protect natural resource lands including,

but not limited to watershed, fish and wildlife habitat, biotic areas, and habitat connectivity corridors. Policy OSRC-8b establishes streamside conservation areas along designated riparian corridors.

**Valley Oak Habitat**

The project site is located within the boundaries of the Valley Oak Habitat Combining District (Sonoma County Code - Chapter 26, Article 88. Sec. 26-67) which was established to protect and enhance Valley Oaks and Valley Oak woodlands. In this district, the removal of a Valley Oak is required to be mitigated through replacement, payment of fees, or preservation of other Valley Oaks on the property.

**Comment**

There is no Valley Oak removal proposed by this development. There is the potential for the removal of redwood trees from the proposed driveway location. In the event of any removal of a “protected” tree species, -on-site replacement or restoration is recommended (see BIO-2 above).

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation (see BIO-2)

- 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?**

**Comment**

There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plans within the project area. The absence of federally designated Critical Habitat is discussed in 4(b), above.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

## 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- a) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?**

**Comment**

To satisfy the requirements of AB52, the project was referred to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University and to representatives of the California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project’s geographic area. Negative responses were received from the Lytton Rancheria and the Stewarts Point Rancheria Kashia Band of Pomo Indians, with no comments or requests for further information.

In January 2022, NWIC submitted the results of a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records request search, communicating the moderately high potential of identifying Native American archaeological resources and a moderately low potential of identifying historic-period archaeological resources in the project area. There are no previously recorded buildings or structures within or adjacent to the project area. NWIC recommended, in the event of construction or soil

disturbance, that further archeological assessment be submitted to provide project-specific recommendations.

As part of the previously approved subdivision project PLP07-0002, a Cultural Resources Evaluation was submitted by Archeological Resource Service in May 2007. This assessment includes a cultural resources pedestrian survey, a Sacred Lands File search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), and the results of a previous records review of the Project area. The assessment also describes the project area as part of the larger Grace Hopkirk complex (CA-Son-1405H), which extended over approximately 20 acres on both sides of Eastside Road. No surface indicators of the Grace Hopkirk complex remain, and any features associated with the complex have been covered by several feet of fill soil. If subsurface excavations are to occur within the designated historic site area (the flat portion of the project site between the two knolls), a qualified archaeologist should be consulted for further study. The project does not include subsurface excavations within the designated historic area.

### **Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

### **Mitigation**

**Mitigation Measure CUL-1:** All building and/or grading permits shall have the following note printed on grading or earthwork plan sheets:

*"If paleontological resources or prehistoric, historic, or tribal cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing work, all work in the immediate vicinity shall be halted and the operator must immediately notify the Permit and Resource Management Department (PRMD) – Project Review staff of the find. The operator shall be responsible for the cost to have a qualified paleontologist, archaeologist, or tribal cultural resource specialist under contract to evaluate the find and make recommendations to protect the resource in a report to PRMD. Paleontological resources include fossils of animals, plants or other organisms. Prehistoric resources include humanly modified stone, shell, or bones, hearths, firepits, obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, choppers), midden (culturally darkened soil containing heat-affected rock, artifacts, animal bone, or shellfish remains), stone milling equipment, such as mortars and pestles, and certain sites features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe. Historic resources include all by-products of human use greater than fifty (50) years of age including, backfilled privies, wells, and refuse pits; concrete, stone, or wood structural elements or foundations; and concentrations of metal, glass, and ceramic refuse.*

*If human remains are encountered, work in the immediate vicinity shall be halted and the operator shall notify PRMD and the Sonoma County Coroner immediately. At the same time, the operator shall be responsible for the cost to have a qualified archaeologist under contract to evaluate the discovery. If the human remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification so that a Most Likely Descendant can be designated and the appropriate measures implemented in compliance with the California Government Code and Public Resources Code."*

**Monitoring:** Building/grading permits shall not be approved for issuance by Permit Sonoma staff until the above notes are printed on the building, grading, and improvement plans.

**b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?**

**Comment**

There are no known surface archaeological resources on the site, but the project could uncover such materials during construction. The following mitigation measure CUL-1 will reduce the impact to less than significant.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

See Mitigation Measure CUL-1, above.

**c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?**

**Comment**

No burial sites are known in the vicinity of the project. However, there is a low possibility that unknown sites could be discovered during construction.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

See Mitigation Measure CUL-1, above.

## **6. ENERGY**

**Would the project:**

**a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?**

**Comment**

Short-term energy demand would result from construction activities occurring as a result of construction. Short-term demand would include energy needed to power worker and vendor vehicle trips as well as construction equipment. Long-term energy demand would result from operation of the project, which would include activities such as lighting, heating, and cooling of structures.

Although implementation of the project would result in an increase in energy usage compared to current conditions due to the new structures on the project site, the increase in energy use would not be wasteful nor inefficient because of measures incorporated into project design, including energy-efficient building design meeting CALGreen requirements.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

**b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?**

**Comment**

The project would be required to comply with Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations, Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Additionally, the project is not located in an identified area designated for renewable energy productions nor would the project interfere with the installation of any renewable energy systems. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct with applicable State and local plans for promoting use of renewable energy and energy efficiency.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

## **7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

**Would the project:**

**a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

**Comment**

The project site is not within a fault hazard zone as defined by the Alquist-Priolo fault maps.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?**

**Comment**

All of Sonoma County is subject to seismic shaking that would result from earthquakes along the San Andreas, Healdsburg-Rodgers Creek, and other faults. By applying geotechnical evaluation techniques and appropriate engineering practices, potential injury and damage from seismic activity can be diminished, thereby exposing fewer people and less property to the effects of a major damaging earthquake. The design and construction of new structures are subject to engineering standards of the California Building Code (CBC), which account for soil properties, seismic shaking, and foundation type. Project conditions of approval require that building permits be obtained for all construction and that the project meet all standard seismic and soil test/compaction requirements. The project would therefore not expose people to substantial risk of injury from seismic shaking. The following mitigation measures will ensure that potential impacts are reduced to less than significant levels.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

***Mitigation***

**Mitigation GEO-1:** All earthwork, grading, trenching, backfilling, and compaction operations shall be conducted in accordance with the County Subdivision Ordinance (Chapter 25, Sonoma County Code). All construction activities shall meet the California Building Code regulations for seismic safety. Construction plans shall be subject to review and approval of Permit Sonoma prior to the issuance of a building permit. All work shall be subject to inspection by Permit Sonoma and must conform to all applicable code requirements and approved improvement plans prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

**Monitoring:** Building/grading permits for ground disturbing activities shall not be approved for issuance by Project Review staff until the above notes are printed on applicable building, grading and improvement plans. The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about code requirement.

**iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**Comment**

Strong ground shaking can result in liquefaction and the sudden loss of shear strength in saturated sandy material, resulting in ground failure. The project site is located in a Liquefaction Hazard Area of high, moderate, and very low liquefaction susceptibility. The Geologic Investigation submitted by PJC & Associates, Inc., on June 8, 2022, determined the risk of liquefaction to be very low. All structures would be required to meet building permit requirements, including seismic safety standards and soil test/compaction requirements. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 above would reduce any impacts to less than significant.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

***Mitigation***

See Mitigation Measure GEO-1, above.

**iv. Landslides?**

**Comment**

No active landslide scarps, debris flows, or areas of instability were observed as part of the Geologic Investigation. However, surface soils and near-surface soils at the project site could be prone to downhill creep on slopes of 15% and greater. Soil creep should be considered during design and construction of the project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce any impacts to less than significant.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

***Mitigation***

See Mitigation Measure GEO-1, above



**b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

**Comment**

The project includes grading and cut-and-fill which will require the issuance of a grading permit. Improper grading, both during and post construction, has the potential to increase the volume of runoff from a site which could have adverse downstream flooding and further erosional impacts, and increase soil erosion on and off site which could adversely impact downstream water quality.

Erosion and sediment control provisions of the Drainage and Storm Water Management Ordinance (Chapter 11, Sonoma County Code) and Building Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sonoma County Code) requires implementation of flow control best management practices to reduce runoff. The Ordinance requires treatment of runoff from the two-year storm event. Required inspection by Permit Sonoma staff ensures that all grading and erosion control measures are constructed according to the approved plans. These ordinance requirements and adopted best management practices are specifically designed to maintain potential water quantity impacts at a less than significant level during and post construction.

In regard to water quality impacts, County grading ordinance design requirements, adopted County grading standards and best management practices (such as silt fencing, straw wattles, construction entrances to control soil discharges, primary and secondary containment areas for petroleum products, paints, lime and other materials of concern, etc.), mandated limitations on work in wet weather, and standard grading inspection requirements, are specifically designed to maintain potential water quality impacts at a less than significant level during project construction.

Issuance of a grading permit requires the applicant to prepare and conform to an erosion prevention/sediment control plan which clearly shows best management practices to be implemented, limits of disturbed areas, vegetated areas to be preserved, pertinent details, notes, and specifications to prevent damages and minimize adverse impacts to the environment. Tracking of soil or construction debris into the public right-of-way shall be prohibited. Runoff containing concrete waste or by-products shall not be allowed to drain to the storm drain system, waterway(s), or adjacent lands.

For post-construction water quality impacts, adopted grading permit standards and best management practices require that storm water to be detained, infiltrated, or retained for later use. Other adopted water quality best management practices include storm water treatment devices based on filtering, settling, or removing pollutants. These construction standards are specifically designed to maintain potential water quality grading impacts at a less than significant level post construction.

The County adopted grading ordinances and standards and related conditions of approval which enforce them, are specific, and require compliance with all standards and regulations adopted by the State and Regional Water Quality Control Board, such as the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements, Low Impact Development and any other adopted best management practices. Therefore, no significant adverse soil erosion or related soil erosion water quality impacts are expected given the mandated conditions and standards that need to be met.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant



- 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?**

**Comment**

The Geologic Investigation determined the primary geotechnical considerations to be 1. The presence of weak and compressible surface soils; 2. The potential of soil creep on and near the slope faces; 3. The presence of potentially expansive near-surface soils along the driveway alignment; 4. Control of surface and subsurface drainage. Based on this investigation, PJC determined that the project is feasible provided that the recommendations contained in the Geographic Investigation are followed and implemented, reducing the risk of on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation

**Mitigation**

See Mitigation Measure GEO-1, above

- d) **Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?**

**Comment**

Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code is an index of the relative expansive characteristics of soil as determined through laboratory testing. The Geologic Investigation submitted by PJC determined that soils at the middle and upper driveway alignment are medium in plasticity – however, the expansion index test result indicates a low-to-medium expansion potential. The soils at the building envelope have a low plasticity index and can be considered to have a low expansion potential. The sandstone bedrock does not appear to be prone to significant shrink-and-swell cycles. A building-level geotechnical report will be required to be submitted with building permit applications.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant

- 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?**

**Comment**

The project site is comprised of soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

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

**Comment**

As discussed in Section 5, Cultural Resources, above, a Historic Property Survey was prepared for the project and found no paleontological resources or unique geologic features were identified within the project site.

**Significance Level**

No impact

## **8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

**Would the project:**

- a) **Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

**Comment**

The County concurs with and utilizes as County thresholds the GHG emissions significance recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The County concurs that these thresholds are supported by substantial evidence for the reasons stated by BAAQMD staff. For projects other than stationary sources, the greenhouse gas significance thresholds address efficient use of electricity, no use of natural gas and minimization of Vehicle Miles traveled. The project would rely on extension of existing electrical transmission lines, would not result in wasteful use of energy, comply with green building standards and have a negligible impact on VMT.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

- b) **Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

**Comment**

The project, by implementing current County codes, would be consistent with local or State plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases, including the Climate Change Action Resolution adopted by the County in 2018.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

## **9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

**Would the project:**

- a) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

**Comment**

Small amounts of potentially hazardous materials will be used on this project during construction such as fuel, lubricants, and cleaning materials. Proper use of materials in accordance with local, State, and federal requirements, and as required in the construction documents, will minimize the potential for accidental releases or emissions from hazardous materials. This will assure that the risk of the project uses impacting the human or biological environment will be reduced to a less than significant level. Building Code requires the proper disposal of construction materials and treated wood waste.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

- 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?**

**Comment**

During construction there could be spills of hazardous materials. See discussion in 9(a), above.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

- c) **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**Comment**

The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- 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?**

**Comment**

The project site was not identified on, or in the vicinity of, any parcels on lists compiled by the California Environmental Protection Agency, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the CalRecycle Waste Management Board Solid Development Waste Information System (SWIS). The project area is not included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?**

**Comment**

The site is not within the Airport Referral Area as designated by the Sonoma County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- f) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**Comment**

The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with the County's adopted emergency operations plan. There is no separate emergency evacuation plan for the County. In any case, the project would not change existing circulation patterns significantly, and would have no effect on emergency response routes. In addition, any future development will be reviewed for compliance with fire safe standards through the building permit process.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

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

**Comment**

The project site is deemed a Moderate hazard per the Wildland Fire Hazard Areas maps found in the Sonoma County General Plan 2020. The project site is located in a State Responsibility Area (SRA) for fire safety and would be served by Sonoma County Fire District station in Windsor, approximately 2.8-miles to the northeast. Beginning in 2017, buildings undergoing a remodel and/or addition for which an application for a building permit is required, located in any Fire Hazard Severity Zone or Wildland Interface Fire Area, shall comply with the Wildland-Urban Interface area requirements of the 2016 California Building Code and the 2016 California Residential Code.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

## 10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- a) **Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?**

**Comment**

Conditions of approval require compliance with Sonoma County Low Impact Development (LID) regulations and preparation of a Storm Water Control Plan prior to issuance of grading permits. Application of these standards as required by Mitigation Measure HYD-1, below, will reduce water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

**Mitigation HYD-1:** Prior to grading permit issuance applicant shall submit a storm water control plan and meet the requirements of the Sonoma County Storm Water Quality Ordinance by incorporating Low Impact Development standards and Best Management Practices in the final stormwater design.

**Monitoring:** Permit Sonoma shall not issue the Grading Permit until the Drainage Review Section has reviewed the final stormwater control plan and grading plan for compliance with Low Impact Development standards and Best Management Practices.

- b) **Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?**

**Comment**

The project is located within a Class 1 – Major Groundwater Basin Area with ample supply and will not interfere with groundwater recharge. Proof of adequate water is a standard condition of subdivision approval to be addressed prior to issuance of a building permit for a new residence on Lot 2.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- c) **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:**

- i. **Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site**

**Comment**

There are no blue line streams on the site. Drainage on the site currently is via sheet flow and surface infiltration. Local drainage is directed to a reservoir to the northwest and seasonal drainages to the north and east of the site. Regional drainage is provided by the Russian River located approximately 0.4-miles west of the site.

Future project construction may involve minor cuts, fills, and other grading. Unregulated grading during construction has the potential to increase soil erosion which could adversely impact downstream water quality. Construction grading activities shall be in compliance with performance standards in the Sonoma County Grading and Drainage Ordinance. The ordinance and adopted construction site Best Management Practices (BMPs) require installation of adequate erosion prevention and sediment control management practices. These ordinance requirements and BMPs are specifically designed to maintain water quantity and ensure erosion and siltation impacts are less than significant level during and post construction.

Construction activities associated with the proposed project will not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a way that would result in downstream erosion and/or sedimentation.

### **Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

### ***Mitigation***

See Mitigation Measure HYD-1, above.

### **ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

The project would result in an increase in the amount of impervious surface area on the project site. Post-construction storm water best management practices would be utilized to maintain current storm water run-off. Conditions of approval and Mitigation Measure HYD-1, above, require compliance with Sonoma County Low Impact Development (LID) regulations and preparation of a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan prior to issuance of grading permits. Application of these standards will reduce impacts from increased surface runoff to a less than significant level. In addition, standard conditions require that the drainage system be designed to comply with the Sonoma County Water Agency flood control requirements.

### **iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

#### **Comment**

As discussed in 10(ii), above, the proposed project has been designed and/or conditioned to maintain the current rate of storm water run-off from the site (see Mitigation Measure HYD-1, above). Also noted is the requirement that the stormwater system shall be designed to meet flood control design criteria.

Permit Sonoma requires that any construction be designed and conducted to prevent or minimize the discharge of pollutants or waste from the project site. Best management practices (BMPs) to be used to accomplish this goal include measures such as silt fencing, straw wattles, and soils discharge controls at construction site entrances. Storm water BMPs may also include primary and secondary containment for petroleum products, paints, lime, and other hazardous materials of concern.

Low Impact Development BMPs, as required by the Grading & Storm Water Section of Permit Sonoma, will prevent or minimize post-construction pollutants and waste. Prior to grading or building permit issuance, construction details for all post-construction storm water BMPs shall be submitted for review and approval by the Grading & Storm Water staff, pursuant to the adopted Sonoma County Best Management Practice Guide. The construction plans shall be in substantial conformance with the conceptual plan reviewed at the planning permit stage.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

See Mitigation Measure HYD-1, above.

**iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?**

At the time of submitting a grading, drainage, or building permit application, a final drainage report must be submitted for review. A typical drainage report would include a project narrative, on- and off-site hydrology maps, hydrologic calculations, hydraulic calculations, pre- and post-development analysis for all existing and proposed drainage facilities. The drainage report shall abide by and contain all applicable items in the Drainage Report Required Contents (DRN-006) handout.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

**d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?**

No structures or facilities that could contain pollutants or hazardous materials are located in portions of the project site subject to flooding.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

**e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?**

Storm water treatment Best Management Practices (BMPs), as required in Mitigation Measure HYD-1, would address potential water quality impacts and also address storm water run-off. Storm water treatment BMPs would be required to be designed to treat storm events and associated runoff to the 85-percentile storm event in accordance with County Standards. Therefore, it would not obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

## **11. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

**Would the project:**

**a) Physically divide an established community?**

**Comment**

The project would not physically divide a community. It does not involve construction of a physical structure (such as a major transportation facility) or removal of a primary access route (such as a

road or bridge) that would impair mobility within an established community or between a community and outlying areas.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- b) **Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

**Comment**

The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including in the Sonoma County General Plan and zoning ordinance.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

## **12. MINERAL RESOURCES**

**Would the project:**

- 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?**

**Comment**

The majority of the project site is not located within a known mineral resource deposit area (Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan, as amended 2010), with a small portion of the northwest corner of the project site zoned MR (Mineral Resources) in relation to the historic gravel mining that historically took place on the Riverfront Regional Park parcels. The project would not result in a loss of mineral resource availability as the MR zoning is a small portion of the overall project site and there are no current or future plans for the resumption of mining operations in the vicinity.

Sonoma County has adopted the Aggregate Resources Management Plan that identifies aggregate resources of statewide or regional significance (areas classified as MRZ-2 by the State Geologist). Consult California Geologic Survey Special Report 205, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the North San Francisco Bay Production-consumption region, Sonoma, Napa, Marin, and Southwestern Solano Counties, California (California Geological Survey, 2013).

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact



**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?**

**Comment**

The majority of the project site is not located within a known mineral resource deposit area (Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan, as amended 2010), with a small portion of the northwest corner of the project site zoned MR (Mineral Resources) in relation to the historic gravel mining that historically took place on the Riverfront Regional Park parcels. The project would not result in a loss of mineral resource availability as the MR zoning is a small portion of the overall project site and there are no current or future plans for the resumption of mining operations in the vicinity.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

## **13. NOISE**

**Would the project:**

**a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

**Comment**

Residential projects are considered to be noise sensitive rather than noise producing. While the residential uses will be surrounded by mature forest and therefore not expected to result in adverse noise impacts, construction noise could be significant if not properly regulated as noted in Mitigation Measure NOISE-1 below.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

**Mitigation Measure NOISE-1:** Construction activities for this project shall be restricted as follows:

All plans and specifications or construction plans shall include the following notes:

1. All internal combustion engines used during construction of this project will be operated with mufflers that meet the requirements of the State Resources Code, and, where applicable, the Vehicle Code. Equipment shall be properly maintained and turned off when not in use.
2. Except for actions taken to prevent an emergency, or to deal with an existing emergency, all construction activities shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 am and 5:00 pm on weekdays and 9:00 am and 5:00 pm on weekends and holidays. If work outside the times specified above becomes necessary, the applicant shall notify the PRMD Project Review Division as soon as practical.
3. There will be no startup of machines nor equipment prior to 7:00 am, Monday through Friday or 9:00 am on weekends and holidays; no delivery of materials or equipment prior to 7:00 am nor past 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday or prior to 9:00 am nor past 5:00 pm on weekends and holidays and no servicing of equipment past 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday, or

weekends and holidays. Signs shall be posted on the site regarding the allowable hours of construction and including the developer's and contractor's mobile phone number for public contact, 24 hours a day, or during the hours outside of the restricted hours.

4. Construction maintenance, storage and staging areas for construction equipment shall avoid proximity to residential areas to the maximum extent practicable. Stationary construction equipment, such as compressors, mixers, etc., shall be placed away from residential areas and/or provided with acoustical shielding. Quiet construction equipment shall be used when possible.
5. The developer shall designate a Project Manager with authority to implement the mitigation prior to issuance of a building/grading permit. The Project Managers 24-hour mobile phone number shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site. The Project Manager shall determine the cause of noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, faulty muffler, etc.) and shall take prompt action to correct the problem.

**Monitoring:** Permit Sonoma staff shall ensure that the measures are listed on all site alteration, grading, building, or improvement plans, prior to issuance of grading or building permits. Permit Sonoma staff shall inspect the site prior to construction to assure that the signs are in place and the applicable phone numbers are correct. Any noise complaints will be investigated by Permit Sonoma staff. If violations are found, Permit Sonoma shall seek voluntary compliance from the permit holder or may require a noise consultant to evaluate the problem and recommend corrective actions, and thereafter may initiate an enforcement action and/or revocation or modification proceedings, as appropriate.

**b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Comment**

Construction would be located 50 feet or further from structures and pile driving is not anticipated as a method of construction, based on knowledge of similar project's construction methods. At a distance of 50 feet, groundborne vibration from construction activities is anticipated to generate vibration levels in the range of 0.001 to 0.098 in/sec PPV. These vibration levels would be well below the conservative 0.3 in/sec PPV vibration limit recommended by the California Department of Transportation for buildings that are found to be structurally sound but where structural damage is a major concern.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant

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

**Comment**

The project site is not located in the vicinity of an existing airport or airport land use zone and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive aircraft noise levels.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

## **14. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

**Would the project:**

- a) **Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

**Comment**

The project parcels contain one existing single-family residence and a proposed building envelope. There will be no unplanned population growth as part of this project.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**Comment**

No housing will be displaced by the project and no replacement housing is proposed to be constructed.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

## **15. PUBLIC SERVICES**

**Would the project:**

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

- i. **Fire protection?**

**Comment**

Construction of the project would not involve substantial adverse physical impacts associated with provision of public facilities or services and the impact would be less than significant. The project is within the projected population growth of the County's General Plan and would not require or facilitate construction of new public facilities.

The Sonoma County Fire District will continue to serve this area. There will be no significantly increased need for fire protection services resulting from the project.

Sonoma County Code requires that all new development meet Fire Safe Standards (Chapter 13). The County Fire Marshal reviewed the project and required that any development comply with Fire Safe Standards, including fire protection methods such as sprinklers in buildings, alarm systems, extinguishers, vegetation management, hazardous materials management, and management of flammable or combustible liquids and gases. This is a standard condition of approval and required by County code and impacts would be less than significant.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

**ii. Police?**

**Comment**

The Sonoma County Sheriff will continue to serve this area. There will be no significantly increased need for public safety services resulting from the project. As discussed in 15(a)(i) above, the project is within the projected population growth of the County's General Plan and would not require or facilitate construction of new public facilities.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

**iii. Schools, parks, or other public facilities?**

**Comment**

As discussed in 15(a)(i) above, the project is within the projected population growth of the County's General Plan and would not require or facilitate construction of new public facilities. Development impact fees to offset potential impacts to public services, including schools and parks, are required by Sonoma County code and State law for new residential developments. No new schools are reasonably foreseeable because of this development. Existing public access easements for Riverfront Regional Park will be continued as part of this proposal.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

**iv. Parks?**

**Comment**

Sonoma County Code, Chapter 23 requires payment of parkland mitigation fees for all new residential development for acquisition and development of added parklands to meeting General Plan Objective OSRC-17.1 to "provide for adequate parkland and trails primarily in locations that are convenient to urban areas to meet the outdoor recreation needs of the population..." Development fees collected by Sonoma County are used to offset potential impacts to public services, including park mitigation fees. As discussed in 15(a)(i) above, the project is within the projected population growth of the County's General Plan and would not require or facilitate construction of new public facilities. The project will not result in the need for any new park facilities, and demand for parks in general is addressed through fees. Existing public access easements for Riverfront Regional Park will be continued as part of this proposal.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

**v. Other public facilities?**

**Comment**

As discussed in 15(a)(i) above, the project is within the projected population growth of the County's General Plan and would not require or facilitate construction of new public facilities.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

## **16. RECREATION**

- 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?**

**Comment**

The proposed project would not involve activities that would cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of parks or recreational facilities. Existing public access easements for Riverfront Regional Park will be continued as part of this proposal.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- 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?**

**Comment**

The project will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Existing public access easements for Riverfront Regional Park will be continued as part of this proposal.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

## 17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

- a) **Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?**

**Comment**

The project would maintain current transportation and traffic facilities and would not have adverse impacts on any existing transportation- or traffic-related program, ordinance, or policy. The proposed uses of the subject parcels are in compliance with the scope and scale of the residential components of the Diverse Agriculture land-use designation.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

- b) **Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

**Comment**

Vehicle miles traveled associated with two new single-family residences in conformance with General Plan and zoning densities would not be substantial or conflict with CEQA Section 15064.3.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

- c) **Substantially increase hazards due to geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

**Comment**

The project would not increase hazards since it maintains the existing alignment of the roadway and would not create hazards from incompatible uses. The new driveway would be designed to meet Sonoma Public Infrastructure standards.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- d) **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

**Comment**

Development on the site must comply with all emergency access requirements of the Sonoma County Fire Safety Code (Sonoma County Code Chapter 13), including emergency vehicle access requirements. Project development plans are required to be reviewed by a Fire and Emergency Services Fire Inspector during the building permit process to ensure compliance with emergency access issues. Refer to discussion in item 16(d), above.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

## 18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California native American tribe, and that is:**

- i. **Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5030.1(k), or**

**Comment**

As discussed in Section 5, Cultural Resources, above, Permit Sonoma staff referred the project application to the Northwest Information Center and Native American Tribes within Sonoma County. A Historic Property Survey identified no cultural resources within the project site.

No archaeological resources were discovered on the site, but the project could uncover such materials during construction. Standard construction monitoring mitigation measures (Mitigation Measure CUL-1, above) are included as a Condition of Approval of the project.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

See Mitigation Measure CUL-1, above

- ii. **A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

**Comment**

As discussed in Section 5, Cultural Resources, above, Permit Sonoma staff referred the project application to the Northwest Information Center and Native American Tribes within Sonoma County. A Historic Property Survey identified no cultural resources within the project site.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

**Mitigation**

See Mitigation Measure CUL-1, above

## 19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- a) **Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Comment**

The project will not result in the relocation or new construction of water, wastewater, or stormwater drainage facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Grading, drainage improvements, and erosion/prevention sediment control measures shall abide by all applicable standards and provisions of the Sonoma County Code and all other relevant laws and regulations.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

- b) **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?**

**Comment**

The project is located within a Class 1 – Major Groundwater Basin Area with ample supply and will not interfere with groundwater recharge. Proof of adequate water is a standard condition of subdivision approval.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

- c) **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

**Comment**

The parcels will utilize septic systems with demonstrated adequate capacity for wastewater treatment.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

- d) **Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

**Comment**

Sonoma County has a solid waste management program in place that provides solid waste collection and disposal services for the entire County. The program can accommodate the permitted collection and disposal of the waste that would result from the proposed residential project.



**Significance Level**

No Impact

- e) **Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**Comment**

Sonoma County has a solid waste management program in place that provides solid waste collection and disposal services for the entire County. The program can accommodate the permitted collection and disposal of the waste that would result from the proposed residential project.

**Significance Level**

No Impact

## **20. WILDFIRE**

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire severity zones, would the project:

- a) **Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**
- b) **Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?**
- c) **Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk of that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**
- d) **Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

**Comment**

The proposed project would result in the potential for one additional single-family dwelling and an accessory dwelling unit (ADU). Permitting or development approval is subject to the Sonoma County Fire Safety Ordinance (*Sonoma County Code – Chapter 13*), including compliance with access, water supply and vegetation clearance requirements. The proposed project site is designated within a state moderate fire hazard area and is located in the State Responsibility Area (SRA). As such, the project shall be in compliance with *California Code of Regulations Title-14, Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, Articles 1-5*. The proposed project will not impair response or evacuation plans. With conditions implemented regarding defensible space, available water supply, building standards, and improved site access, the project will not exacerbate wildfire risks, require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure, or expose people or structures to significant risks.

**Significance Level**

Less than Significant Impact

## **21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

- 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?**

**Significance Level**

No Impact

**Comment**

The proposed project would not result in the potential to reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, reduce their populations below self-sustaining levels or eliminated a plant or animal community. It will not have an impact on rare or endangered plants or animals.

- 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)?**

**Significance Level**

No Impact

**Comment**

The proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable environmental impacts with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

- c) **Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

**Significance Level**

No Impact

**Comment**

The proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

### **References**

1. Association of Bay Area Governments, Manual of Standards for Erosion and Sediment Control Measures; May 1995.
2. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines; Bay Area Air Quality Management District; April 1999; California Air Resources Board (CARB) <http://www.arb.ca.gov/>.
3. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Sonoma County Important Farmland Map, 1996.

4. California Department of Fish & Wildlife, California Natural Diversity Database.
5. California Department of Water Resources, Evaluation of Groundwater Resources, Bulletin 118; 2003 (<http://water.ca.gov/groundwater/bulletin118/publications.cfm>).
6. California Environmental Protection Agency – <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/corteseList/default.htm>; California Regional Water Quality Control Board – <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/>; California Department of Toxic Substances Control – [http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese\\_list.cfm](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese_list.cfm), and Integrated Waste Management Board – <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp>
7. County of Sonoma, Assessor's Parcel Maps.
8. County of Sonoma, Heritage or Landmark Tree Ordinance, County Code Chapter 26D.
9. County of Sonoma, Valley Oak Protection Ordinance, County Code Section 26-67; December 1996.
10. Flood Insurance Rate Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency <https://msc.fema.gov/portal>.
11. Permit Sonoma and Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works, Traffic Guidelines, 2014.
12. Permit Sonoma Noise Guidelines, 2017.
13. Permit Sonoma, General Plan Environmental Impact Report (<http://www.sonoma-county.org/prmd/gp2020/gp2020eir/index.htm>).
14. Permit Sonoma, Sonoma County Bikeways Plan, August 24, 2010.
15. Permit Sonoma, Sonoma County General Plan 2020 (as amended), September 23, 2008.
16. Permit Sonoma, Visual Assessment Guidelines, no date.
17. Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan and Program EIR, 1994.
18. Sonoma County Water Agency, Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Management Plan, 2014. [http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/docs/GWMP/NC-5\\_SRP\\_SonomaCoWaterAgency\\_GWMP\\_2014.pdf](http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/docs/GWMP/NC-5_SRP_SonomaCoWaterAgency_GWMP_2014.pdf)
19. Sonoma County Water Agency, Sonoma Valley Groundwater Management Plan, 2007 and annual reports. <http://www.scwa.ca.gov/svgw-documents/>
20. Special Report 120, California Division of Mines and Geology; 1980. [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR\\_120/SR\\_120\\_Text.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_120/SR_120_Text.pdf)
21. State of California Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones; 1983. [http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cqs/rghm/ap/Pages/official\\_release.aspx](http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cqs/rghm/ap/Pages/official_release.aspx)
22. State of California Department of Transportation, Standard Specifications. (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specs.html>)
23. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey of Sonoma County, California; 1972. ([https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_MANUSCRIPTS/california/sonomaCA1972/sonomaCA1972.pdf](https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_MANUSCRIPTS/california/sonomaCA1972/sonomaCA1972.pdf)).
24. Archaeological Resource Service, A Cultural Resources Evaluation of the Lands of Barbuto, 7135 Eastside Road, Healdsburg, Sonoma County, California; May 17, 2007/
25. Wildlife Research Associates & Jane Valerius Environmental Consulting, Habitat Assessment; December 2, 2021.
26. PJC & Associates, Inc., Geotechnical Investigation, June 20, 2022.