



## ***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:           | 2/18/2022             |
| Public Review Period:       | 2/18/2022 – 3/21/2022 |
| State Clearinghouse Number: |                       |
| Permit Sonoma File Number:  | UPC18-0023            |
| Prepared by:                | Crystal Acker         |
| Phone:                      | (707) 565-8357        |

Pursuant to Section 15071 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and the attached Expanded Initial Study, including the identified mitigation measures and monitoring program, constitute the environmental review conducted by the County of Sonoma as lead agency for the proposed project described below.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Project Name:</b>                      | UPC18-0023; Sevenfold Dispensary   |
| <b>Project Applicant/Operator:</b>        | John Lobro, Chief Executive Officer for Sevenfold  |
| <b>Project Location/Address:</b>          | 15 Fremont Drive, Sonoma   |
| <b>APN:</b>                               | 128-461-014  |
| <b>General Plan Land Use Designation:</b> | Limited Commercial (LC)  |
| <b>Zoning Designation:</b>                | Limited Commercial, with Scenic Resources – Scenic Corridor, and Valley Oak Habitat Combining Districts (LC, SR VOH) |
| <b>Decision Making Body:</b>              | Sonoma County Board of Zoning Adjustments  |
| <b>Appeal Body:</b>                       | Sonoma County Board of Supervisors   |
| <b>Project Description:</b>               | <b>See Item III, below</b>   |

# **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> |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|------------|-----------|
| Aesthetics                         | VIS                  |            | X         |
| Agricultural & Forest Resources    | AG                   |            | X         |
| Air Quality                        | AIR                  |            | X         |
| Biological Resources               | BIO                  |            | X         |
| Cultural Resources                 | CUL                  |            | X         |
| Energy                             | ENERGY               |            | X         |
| Geology and Soils                  | GEO                  |            | X         |
| Greenhouse Gas Emission            | GHG                  |            | X         |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials    | HAZ                  |            | X         |
| Hydrology and Water Quality        | HYDRO                |            | X         |
| Land Use and Planning              | LU                   |            | X         |
| Mineral Resources                  | MIN                  |            | X         |
| Noise                              | NOISE                |            | X         |
| Population and Housing             | POP                  |            | X         |
| Public Services                    | PS                   |            | X         |
| Recreation                         | REC                  |            | X         |
| Transportation                     | TRANS                | X          |           |
| Tribal Cultural Resources          | TCR                  |            | X         |
| Utility and Service Systems        | UTL                  |            | X         |
| Wildfire                           | FIRE                 |            | X         |
| Mandatory Findings of Significance | MFS                  |            |           |

## RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

Table 2 lists other public agencies whose approval is required for the project, or who have jurisdiction over resources potentially affected by the project.

**Table 2. Agencies and Permits Required**

| Agency   | Activity   | Authorization   |
|--|--|---|
| California Bureau of Cannabis Control (BCC)        | Storefront Cannabis Retailer   | Type 10 storefront retailer License   |
| State Water Resources Control Board                | Generating stormwater (construction, industrial, or municipal) SWPPP | National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requires submittal of NOI |
| Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)  | Stationary air emissions   | Authority to Construct/ Permit to Operate   |
| Sonoma County Fire Prevention Division             | Building and infrastructure construction                             | Sonoma County Fire Safety Ordinance and Hazardous Materials regulations           |
| California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) | Access and frontage improvements                                     | Encroachment Permit   |

## ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING:

Based on the evaluation in the attached Expanded Initial Study, I find that 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 included as conditions of approval for the project and a Mitigated Negative Declaration is proposed. The applicant has agreed in writing to incorporate identified mitigation measures into the project.

[Blank Page]



## ***Expanded Initial Study***

### **Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department**

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Sevenfold proposes to operate a commercial cannabis dispensary including retail storefront and delivery service on a developed commercial parcel, as permitted by the Sonoma County Cannabis Ordinance. A referral letter was sent to the appropriate local, state and federal agencies and interest groups who may wish to comment on the project.

This report is the Initial Study required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The report was prepared by Crystal Acker with the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, Project Review Division. Information on the project was provided by Sevenfold. Technical studies were provided by qualified consultants to support the conclusions in this Expanded Initial Study. Technical studies, other reports, documents, and maps referred to in this document are available for review through the Project Planner, or the Permit and Resource Management Department (Permit Sonoma) Records Section.

Please contact Crystal Acker, Planner III, at (707) 565-8357 or [crystal.acker@sonoma-county.org](mailto:crystal.acker@sonoma-county.org) for more information.

## **II. EXISTING FACILITY**

The project site is located at 15 Fremont Drive, immediately east of the intersection of State Route 116 (SR 116) with State Route 121 (SR 121) in an unincorporated area of Sonoma County approximately 2.5 miles south of the City of Sonoma (Figure 1). The 5.09-acre site is located in a cluster of seventeen commercially zoned parcels often called Big Bend, and is developed with an existing commercial retail building, a detached restroom building, accessory structures including a garage and several storage buildings, and a single-family dwelling (Figures 2 & 3). All buildings are located in the northern half of the parcel near SR 121 (also called Fremont Drive at this location). The main commercial building, restroom building, and several of the accessory structures were formerly used as a pottery and garden shop and as a salvage and design company. The three-bedroom single-family residence and detached garage are used as a rental unit. Primary access to the commercial portion of the project site is from a paved driveway off SR 121/Fremont Drive on the northeastern property frontage. The existing customer parking lot is partially improved, located to the west and south of the main commercial building, and accessed from the main commercial driveway. A smaller, unpaved driveway about 130 feet to the west of the commercial driveway serves the residential unit. The site is served by a private well and a commercial mound septic system. The southern half of the parcel contains no structural development, but does contain septic tanks and leach fields, and is vegetated primarily by non-native grasses. A row of trees (mostly eucalyptus) occurs on the western property boundary, with a few other trees and shrubs scattered around the property.

### **III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Sevenfold proposes a commercial cannabis dispensary operation utilizing multiple existing structures. The dispensary would include onsite retail sales and delivery service. Storefront dispensary services and delivery service would be available during regular hours of operation 7:00 am to 7:00 pm Monday through Saturday, and 10:00 am to 6:00 pm on Sundays. The operator anticipates an average of 300 patrons per day would visit the dispensary, and that the operation would have a maximum of 11 employees on-site per shift, including delivery drivers. Structures used in the operation would be redeveloped in two phases. See Figure 4. Site Plan Set for details.

The Phase I operation would include the 1,328-square-foot commercial retail building, 48-square-foot detached restroom building, and a 630-square-foot storage building located behind (south of) the retail building. The restroom building would be used by customers and employees, while the separate storage building would be used only by employees for secure product storage and office space. The existing parking area would be reconfigured and repaved, as needed, to provide 22 parking spaces, including 1 van-accessible space. Phase I structural improvements include only interior tenant improvements and exterior concrete work around the retail and restroom buildings to provide accessible access from the parking lot. No new structures or substantial physical changes to building exteriors are proposed. Frontage improvements (curb, gutter, and sidewalk) along the project's SR 121 frontage would be constructed in coordination with the State's proposed roundabout project to be located at the SR 116/SR 121 intersection.

The Phase II operation would incorporate additional structures on the property, as they are needed for ancillary uses. Phase II would not include any changes to the overall operation; the size of the retail building and hours of operation would remain unchanged. All Phase II improvements are associated with employee and support uses, such as additional storage and office space. The 1,205-square-foot single-family dwelling may be used as an employee residence, or may be converted to employee office and break room space. Other existing accessory structures may also be incorporated into the operation for additional storage space or left vacant, depending on need. Structures include: a 204-square-foot storage building, 533-square-foot storage building, 51-square foot restroom, and a 600-square-foot detached garage. As with Phase I, no substantial changes would be made to the building exteriors or the property overall.

## IV. SETTING

The project site is located within a small commercial area surrounded primarily by agricultural areas.

### Area Context and Surrounding Land Uses


| Direction | Land Uses   |
|-----------|---|
| North     | SR 121/Fremont Drive; hayfields, row crops, vineyards, and agricultural processing (wineries) on Land Intensive Agriculture (LIA) and Diverse Agriculture (DA) zoning   |
| South     | Hayfields, vineyards, and residential uses on LIA and DA zoning; Cornerstone on Limited Commercial (LC) zoning; Sonoma Valley Airport on Public Facilities (PF) zoning  |
| East      | Musea, mini storage, and warehousing on LC zoning; Hayfields, vineyards, and residential uses on LIA and DA zoning  |
| West      | SR 121; Vineyard Inn on Recreation & Visitor-Serving Commercial (K) zoning; Bonneau's gas station and Carneros Deli on LC zoning; hayfields, row crops, vineyards, and agricultural processing (wineries) on DA zoning; hayfields, small animal husbandry and residential uses on Agriculture and Residential (AR) zoning |

The project would be served by an existing private well and existing commercial mound septic system.

Regional access to the project site is from either SR 116 or SR 121, both of which are state highways. A Sonoma County Transit bus stop and a Caltrans park and ride are present at the SR 116/121 intersection, approximately 300 feet west of the project customer driveway entrance.

The General Plan Land Use Designation on the parcel is Limited Commercial. The General Plan and Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identify a proposed Class II bikeway (on-street bike lanes for one-way travel on either side of a street) along SR 121 in the project area; currently, cyclists use the road shoulder. The bikeways will be constructed as part of the State's proposed roundabout project at the SR 116/121 intersection.

According to the Wildland Fire Hazard Area map in the Sonoma County General Plan, the project site is located in a Local Responsibility Area, and is not within a designated Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Land to the west of SR 121 is in a State Responsibility Area and is within a designated Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone.




**15 Fremont Drive, Sonoma  
UPC18-0023 Sevenfold Dispensary**

**Figure 1.  
Vicinity Map**



15 Fremont Drive, Sonoma  
UPC18-0023 Sevenfold Dispensary

Figure 2.  
Aerial Map




**15 Fremont Drive, Sonoma  
UPC18-0023 Sevenfold Dispensary**

**Figure 3.  
Aerial Blow Up**



Copyright 2020 Hogan Land Services, Inc. This drawing is a representation of design and is the sole property of Hogan Land Services, Inc. Any use of this drawing without written consent by Hogan Land Services, Inc. is prohibited.



THIS PLAN WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECTION AT THE REQUEST OF ART FIGHTENBERG, IN NOVEMBER, 2019.

DATE: 11-05-21  
JOB # 4005

**HOGAN LAND SERVICES**  
A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION  
1702 4TH STREET  
SANTA ROSA, CA 95404  
TEL (707) 532-2105  
WWW.HOGANLAND.COM

APN: 128-461-014  
15 FREMONT DRIVE  
SONOMA, CA

**SITE PLAN  
PHASE I**

2 OF 3

Figure 4. Site Plan Set



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

### **Agency Referral**

On October 12, 2018, a referral packet was circulated to inform and solicit comments from selected relevant local and state agencies and to special districts and special interest groups that were anticipated to take interest in the project. The project planner has received responses to the project referral from:

- Sonoma County Fire and Emergency Services
- Sonoma County Department of Transportation & Public Works
- Permit Sonoma Project Review Health Specialist
- Sonoma County Environmental Health
- Permit Sonoma Natural Resources Professional Geologist
- State Water Resources Control Board
- Northwest Information Center
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

The referral responses included several requests for further information and included recommended draft use permit conditions of approval.

### **Tribal Consultation Under AB52**

Referrals were sent to the following Tribes on October 12, 2018:

- Cloverdale Rancheria of Pomo Indians
- Dry Creek Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians
- Lytton Rancheria of California
- Kashia Pomo Stewarts Point Rancheria
- Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
- Middletown Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians
- Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley
- Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians

No Tribe requested further information and no Tribe requested formal consultation.

### **Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Commission**

On November 28, 2018, the project was reviewed by the Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Commission, a joint advisory agency with representation from the County of Sonoma and the City of Sonoma. The Commission discussed several topics, but mostly focused on concerns related to trip generation, traffic circulation, and ingress/egress safety due to the site access off SR 121 near a major intersection where a future roundabout is proposed. Two members of the public provided comments: one concerned about traffic safety and the other in support of the project due to its location away from dense residential neighborhoods. Ultimately, the project received a 9:1 vote (9 Yes; 1 No), and was recommended for approval by the Commission.

## Public Comments

A neighborhood notification was distributed to residents within 300 feet of the subject property line on October 12, 2018. Two written public comments on the proposed project have been received, which were subsequently registered to the project file. One comment cited general opposition to all cannabis permits along the SR 121 corridor. The other, from the neighboring Vineyard Inn property owners, raised a few areas of potential concern including business incompatibility with a family hotel, traffic safety related to driveway ingress/egress, and property ownership. These comments were not in response to a formal public review period or County action.

## VI. OTHER RELATED PROJECTS

There are no operating dispensaries in the Sonoma Valley area or in the City of Sonoma. However, two have been recently approved and are likely to begin operations within the next year. The City of Sonoma approved an application by Sparc for a new dispensary at 19315 Sonoma Highway on May 13, 2021. The Board of Supervisors approved the new Loe Firehouse dispensary at 15499 Arnold Drive in Glen Ellen on September 14, 2021.

## VII. 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 incrementally add 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.

# 1. AESTHETICS:

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

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

Comment:

The Sonoma County General Plan does not explicitly identify scenic vistas, but does divide the scenic resources of Sonoma County into three categories: Community Separators, Scenic Landscape Units, and Scenic Corridors. The project site is located in a designated Scenic Corridor for State SR 12/121, which prohibits most new development within the scenic corridor to preserve visual quality, but allows maintenance, reconstruction, and minor expansion of existing structures already located within the corridor. The project proposes only tenant improvements to the existing structures, including interior modification and exterior accessibility improvements. The project site is not located on a scenic hillside, nor would it involve tree removal, grading, or construction that could affect a scenic vista. The project would not result in any impacts to scenic vistas.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project is not located on or visible from a state scenic highway. The two designated state scenic highways in Sonoma County are SR 12 in Sonoma Valley, north of the city of Sonoma, and SR 116 from Sebastopol west to Highway 1. The project would not result in any impacts to scenic resources associated with 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:

The project site is located in a pocket of commercial land uses surrounded by agricultural and residential uses. The existing visual character of the overall area is rural agricultural, but is commercial in the immediate vicinity.

No substantial changes will be made to the exterior of the dispensary building, besides minor signage, lighting, and accessibility improvements that may be required. The parking lot (located behind the dispensary building) will be re-configured and repaved, as needed. Existing landscaping will be maintained. No new landscaping is proposed.

Utilizing the County's Visual Assessment Guidelines, the site sensitivity of the project site would be Moderate, which is a category applied to rural and urban land use designations without an applicable scenic resource protection designation, and where the project vicinity is not characterized by full urban development. Although SR 121 is a designated Scenic Corridor, resource

protections do not apply to existing structures within the corridor and the project site terrain does not include any visible slopes providing an aesthetic backdrop for the scenic corridor. Only minor exterior changes are proposed to the existing commercial building, including signage and additional security lighting, which is required to be fully shielded and downward casting. The detached restroom and various accessory buildings are behind the dispensary storefront and not visible from the roadway. The single-family residence is visible from the roadway, but again, no substantial physical changes to the building exterior are proposed, as the dwelling would either continue to be used as a dwelling or converted to employee and office space.

Therefore, the project's visual dominance would be Subordinate, applied when proposed project elements would be visible within the project setting, but are not substantially different than the existing condition, and do not attract attention because the project generally repeats the form, line, color, texture, and night lighting of the existing development and surroundings.

**Table 1. Thresholds of Significance for Visual Impact Analysis**  
**PRMD Visual Assessment Guidelines**

| Sensitivity     | Visual Dominance      |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
|                 | <i>Dominant</i>       | <i>Co-Dominant</i>    | <i>Subordinate</i>    | <i>Inevident</i>      |
| <b>Maximum</b>  | Significant           | Significant           | Significant           | Less than significant |
| <b>High</b>     | Significant           | Significant           | Less than significant | Less than significant |
| <b>Moderate</b> | Significant           | Less than significant |                       | Less than significant |
| <b>Low</b>      | Less than significant | Less than significant | Less than significant | Less than significant |

Based on the project site's Moderate visual sensitivity and the proposed project's Subordinate visual dominance, the project would be considered to have a less than significant effect on the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The existing commercial building and residence both already have exterior security lighting, and both front on SR 121 with undeveloped farmland on the opposite side of the roadway. The project may install additional or new security lighting on building exteriors. Security lighting at all locations would be fully shielded, downward casting, and motion sensor-controlled to remain off unless needed. Nighttime lighting spillage from security lighting would be minimal. Therefore, any new exterior lighting would not create a new source of substantial light or glare.

Design review, required as a standard use permit condition of approval, includes review of all proposed lighting to ensure such lighting would be compatible with County design and development standards and with the surrounding area.

Significance Level: Less than Significant 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:

According to the California Department of Conservation's Sonoma County Important Farmland Map, the project site is designated as Other Land (DOC 2016). Therefore, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The parcel is zoned Limited Commercial and is not subject to a Williamson Act Land Conservation Act Contract. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or with 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 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**

Comment:

The project site is not in a Timberland Production zoning district, and no commercial timberland is present. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project would not be located on land utilized or zoned for forest land, timberland, or timber production. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss 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. The property, itself, is not agriculturally zoned. The parcel opposite SR 121 to the north is agricultural; however, operation of the proposed project re-using existing commercial structures is not likely to have any impact on the agricultural use of any nearby agricultural parcels. The proposed dispensary project does not include new residential development that might result in a nuisance conflict with nearby agricultural uses.

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 located within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. According to California standards, the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is currently designated as a nonattainment area for particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and ozone. Under national standards, the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is currently designated as nonattainment for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and 8-hour ozone. The Air Basin is in attainment (or unclassified) for all other air pollutants (BAAQMD 2020).

The BAAQMD's 2017 Clean Air Plan (BAAQMD 2017a) is the applicable air quality plan for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The 2017 Clean Air Plan contains 85 individual control measures in nine economic sectors: stationary (industrial) sources, transportation, energy, buildings, agriculture, natural and working lands, waste management, water, and super-GHG pollutants. Many of these control measures require action on the part of the BAAQMD, the California Air Resources Board (CARB), or local communities, and are not directly related to the actions undertaken for an individual development project. The project would not prevent the BAAQMD from implementing these actions and none apply directly to the project. The project size would be well below emission threshold screening levels for ozone precursors (see discussion in 3.b below). As a result, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2017 Clean Air Plan.

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:

As summarized in Item 3.a above, the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is currently designated as a nonattainment area for PM<sub>2.5</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and ozone under State standards. Under national standards, the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is currently designated as nonattainment for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and 8-hour ozone. The Air Basin is in attainment (or unclassified) for all other air pollutants (BAAQMD 2020). Based on the current Air Basin designations, the non-attainment pollutants of concern are ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

The BAAQMD developed screening criteria to provide lead agencies and project applicants with a conservative indication of whether the proposed project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. If all of the screening criteria are met by a proposed project, then the lead agency or applicant would not need to perform a detailed air quality assessment of their project's air pollutant emissions. These screening levels are generally representative of new development on greenfield sites. For projects that are mixed-use, infill, and/or proximate to transit service and local services, emissions would be less than the greenfield type project that these screening criteria are based on.

The BAAQMD did not include cannabis dispensaries as a land use type in their screening criteria; however, a similar use can be applied. The operational criteria pollutant screening size for a pharmacy or drug store type of land use is 48,000 square feet; screening size for other retail land uses, such as a supermarket or discount store, range from 42,000 to 76,000 square feet. The dispensary would include an existing 1,328-square-foot commercial building, an adjacent 48-square-foot restroom building, and up to 3,500 square feet of additional support spaces for storage and offices in up to six other existing accessory structures. In total, less than 5,000 square feet of existing structural development would be utilized by the project, considerably smaller than the BAAQMD's operational criteria pollutant and precursor screening level, and would not result in substantial long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants. Therefore, the project's contribution to a cumulative nonattainment criteria pollutant impact would be less than significant.

The project would generate some criteria pollutants, primarily from new vehicle trips. A Traffic Impact Study prepared by W-Trans (November 22, 2021) found that the project is expected to generate an average of 448 vehicle trips per day, which translates to an average of 37 trips per hour distributed over a 12-hour day (the dispensary hours will be 7:00 am to 7:00 pm), and includes 24 trips during the weekday morning peak and 42 trips during the weekday evening peak. This increase in vehicle trips would be far below the BAAQMD screening criteria for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>, and would not result in substantial new traffic which could result in substantial emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>).

The BAAQMD screening analysis for a carbon monoxide hotspot is whether a project would increase traffic volumes at a nearby intersection to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour. County Traffic counts collected on SR 116 at two locations between 1.8 and 2.2 miles to the north of the project site in May of 2013 and October of 2015 range from 15,000 to 16,500 trips per day. Both of these daily trip numbers would equate to an hourly vehicle count far below the screening level, and the addition of

37 hourly project trips (or even the total daily trips of 448) would not be enough to approach the 44,000-vehicle-per-hour threshold. Therefore, no carbon monoxide hotspot exists in the project area.

Emissions of particulate matter from vehicle exhaust are lower than NO<sub>x</sub> emissions and are subject to higher significance thresholds; therefore, the significance thresholds for exhaust PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> would also be complied with.

Significance Level: Less than Significant

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

Comment:

Sensitive receptors include hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas. There are no hospitals, schools, or care facilities near the project site. There are some residences in the surrounding area. However, as described above, the project would not generate substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to project-generated pollutants would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant

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

Comment:

Cannabis dispensaries are not listed as an odor generating land use in the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (BAAQMD 2017b); however, cannabis odors can occur from such facilities if not properly managed. Outdoor cultivation operations typically generate the strongest cannabis odors. The project would not include any cultivation. The project would be required to comply with the following Operating Standard for commercial cannabis dispensaries contained in County Zoning Code Section 26-88-256(g)(7):

*"An exhaust and ventilation system shall be utilized to prevent off-site odors."*

Packaged cannabis products typically do not produce strong odors. However, implementation of odor controls and adherence to the County's Zoning Code is mandatory. The project proposes to install carbon filters in the existing building ventilation system to ensure that no odor is detectable at any property boundary. Therefore, any odor impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Significance Level: Less than Significant

## **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.

## 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 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 fish or 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.

### ***Critical Habitat***

Critical habitat is a term defined in the FESA 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 FESA requires federal agencies to consult with 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, whether or not those lands are occupied by the subject species. In many cases, this level of protection is similar to that already provided to species by the FESA jeopardy standard (which is applied to ensure that a federal action would not jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat).

### ***Essential Fish Habitat***

Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) is regulated through by NOAA Fisheries. Protection of Essential Fish Habitat is mandated through changes implemented in 1996 to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) to protect the loss of habitat necessary to maintain sustainable fisheries in the United States. The Magnuson-Stevens Act defines EFH as "those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity" [16 USC 1802(10)].

NOAA Fisheries further defines EFH as areas that "contain habitat essential to the long-term survival and health of our nation's fisheries" EFH can include the water column, certain bottom types such as sandy or rocky bottoms, vegetation such as eelgrass or kelp, or structurally complex coral or oyster reefs. Under regulatory guidelines issued by NOAA Fisheries, any federal agency that authorizes, funds, or undertakes action that may affect EFH is required to consult with NOAA Fisheries (50 CFR 600.920).

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

The U.S. 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 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). However, the EPA depends on other agencies, such as the individual states and the U.S. 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 U.S. may require an Individual Permit. Projects that only minimally affect waters of the U.S. may meet the conditions of one of the 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 U.S. 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 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.

### **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.

### ***Non-Game Mammals***

Sections 4150-4155 of the CFGC protects non-game mammals, including bats. Section 4150 states “A mammal occurring naturally in California that is not a game mammal, fully protected mammal, or fur-bearing mammal is a nongame mammal. A non-game mammal may not be taken or possessed except as provided in this code or in accordance with regulations adopted by the commission.” The non-game mammals that may be taken or possessed are primarily those that cause crop or property damage. Bats are classified as a non-game mammal and are protected under the CFGC.

### ***California Fully Protected Species and Species of Special Concern***

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.

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. 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.”

### ***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 contains policies to protect natural resource lands including, but not limited to, watershed, fish and wildlife habitat, biotic areas, and habitat connectivity corridors.

##### ***Riparian Corridor (RC) Combining Zone***

The RC combining zone (Zoning Code Sec. 26-65) 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.

##### ***Biotic Habitat (BH) Combining Zone***

The BH combining zone (Zoning Code Sec. 26-66) is established to protect and enhance Biotic Habitat Areas for their natural habitat and environmental values and to implement the provisions of the General Plan Open Space and Resource Conservation Element, Area Plans and Specific Plans. Protection of these areas helps to maintain the natural vegetation, support native plant and animal species, protect water quality and air quality, and preserve the quality of life, diversity and unique character of the County.

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

The VOH combining district (Zoning Code Sec. 26-67) is established to protect and enhance valley oaks and valley oak woodlands and to implement the provisions of General Plan 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 (Zoning Code Sec. 26-88-010 (m)) establishes policies for protected tree species in Sonoma County. Protected trees are defined (Zoning Code 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.

## Project Analysis

### 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:

All project operations will occur within existing structures, for both Phase I and Phase II. The parking lot will be improved. However, the area is already paved and graveled; parking improvements will not extend into natural areas. The site is not located within or near a critical habitat area or the regulatory Santa Rosa Plain. There are no sensitive habitats or wildlife movement corridors within or adjacent to the project site. No impacts to special status species or their habitat would occur as a result of the project.

Significance Level: No Impact

- 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:

All project operations will occur within existing structures and existing parking areas. There are no sensitive habitats within or adjacent to the project site. No impacts to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities would occur as a result of the project.

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:

All project operations will occur within existing structures and existing parking areas. There are no wetland habitats within or adjacent to the project site. No impacts to wetlands would occur as a result of the project.

Significance Level: No Impact

- 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:

All project operations will occur within existing structures and existing parking areas. No wildlife corridors (e.g., stream channels, protected open space) or wildlife nursery sites (e.g., rookeries, barns, communal nesting areas) occur within or adjacent to the project site. Existing trees along the west property boundary could provide nesting habitat for birds. However, no tree removal is proposed. The project would have no impact on wildlife corridors or nursery sites.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project site is located in a Valley Oak Habitat (VOH) resource protection area. However, no tree removal is proposed. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any local resource protection policies or ordinances. No impact would occur.

Significance Level: No Impact

- 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:

Habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans are site-specific plans to address effects on sensitive species of plants and animals. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans covering the project area, nor is the project site located in the Santa Rosa Plain. Therefore, the proposed project would not be subject to any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan and would not conflict with any such plans.

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?**

Comments:

An Archaeological Survey Report was conducted for the project (Alta Archaeological Consulting, 11/11/2019). The study evaluated and recorded the single-family residence as a possible historical resource, given its age. The structure is a small craftsman-style home dating to the circa 1920s, but was determined to be not eligible for listing under the National Register of Historic Places, the

California Register of Historic Resources, or for local listing due to a lack of association with significant events or important persons, and extensive alterations since the original construction which substantially degraded the historic integrity of the structure. Therefore, any project-related changes to the structure would be less than significant. No other structures with potential historical significance were identified.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

There are no known archaeological resources on or near the project site and no potential cultural resources were found during the archaeological survey site inspection (Alta Archaeological Consulting, 11/11/2019). The project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance in natural areas that could disturb undiscovered buried archaeological resources.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

No human remains are known to exist within the project area. The project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance that could result in the disturbance of previously unrecorded human remains.

Significance Level: No Impact

## **6. ENERGY:**

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

Comment:

The project does not include any new construction except minor internal tenant improvements. Operation of the dispensary will result in energy use similar to any retail facility, including powering of lighting, heating/cooling systems, temperature-controlled product storage, and breakroom appliances (if the residence is converted into an employee space). Therefore, impacts due to energy consumption would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

In 2003, the California Energy Commission (CEC), the California Power Authority, and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) jointly adopted an Energy Action Plan (EAP) that listed goals for California's energy future and set forth a commitment to achieve these goals through specific actions (CEC 2003). In 2005, the CEC and CPUC approved the EAP II, which identified further actions

to meet California's future energy needs, mainly focused on the energy and natural gas sectors (CEC 2005). Additionally, the CEC also prepared the State Alternative Fuels Plan in partnership with the California Air Resources Board and in consultation with the other state, federal, and local agencies. The alternative fuels plan presents strategies and actions California must take to increase the use of alternative non-petroleum fuels in a manner that minimizes costs to California and maximizes the economic benefits of in-state production (CEC 2007).

Operation of the dispensary will result in energy use similar to any retail facility, including powering of lighting, heating/cooling systems, temperature-controlled product storage, and breakroom appliances (if the residence is converted into an employee space). No conflicts with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency have been identified.

Significance Level: No Impact

## 7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

Existing geologic conditions that could affect new development are considered in this analysis. Impacts of the environment on the project are analyzed as a matter of County policy and not because such analysis is required by CEQA.

**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. Predicting seismic events is not possible, nor is providing mitigation that can entirely reduce the potential for injury and damage that could occur during a seismic event. However, 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 take into account soil properties, seismic shaking and foundation type. Standard conditions of approval require that building permits be obtained for all construction (including internal tenant improvements and changes of occupancy) and that the project meet all standard

seismic and soil test/compaction requirements. Therefore, the potential impact from strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

Strong ground shaking can result in liquefaction, the sudden loss of shear strength in saturated sandy material, resulting ground failure. Areas of Sonoma County most at risk of liquefaction are along San Pablo Bay and in alluvial valleys. According to the General Plan Public Safety Element Liquefaction Hazard Areas Map (Figure PS-1c), the project site is not located in a Liquefaction Hazard Area. As stated above, structures are subject to engineering standards of the California Building Code, which require that the project meet all standard seismic and soil test/compaction requirements. Therefore, the potential impact from liquefaction would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

**iv. Landslides?**

Comment:

Steep slopes characterize much of Sonoma County, particularly the northern and eastern portion of the County. Where these areas are underlain by weak or unconsolidated earth materials, landslides are a hazard. The project is located in a minimal slope area. According to the General Plan Public Safety Element Landslide Hazard Areas Map (Figure PS-1d), the project site has a Slope Class of 0 and is not located in a designated Landslide Hazard Area.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project does not include any new construction involving grading or ground disturbance of native soils. The project would involve repaving the existing graveled and partially paved parking lot, where native topsoil has already been removed. Therefore, there would be no project impact from loss of topsoil or soil erosion.

Significance Level: No Impact

**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 project site is not located within a High or Very High Liquefaction Hazard Area or a designated Landslide Hazard Area. The project site is generally flat. Therefore, the potential impact from landslides or liquefaction would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

- 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. According to the National Resources Conservation Service, soils on the project site consist of Haire clay loam 0-9% slopes, a soil which has a moderate shrink-swell potential. Structures are subject to engineering standards of the California Building Code, which require that the project meet all standard seismic and soil test/compaction requirements. The existing building was legally permitted and constructed in compliance with Building Code Standards. Therefore, no substantial risks to life or property would result from the soil expansion potential at the project site.

Significance Level: No Impact

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

Comment:

The project site is not located in an area served by public sewer. The dispensary would continue to use the existing commercial mound wastewater treatment system on the property. Current capacity of the system is 1,400 gallons per day. Given the existing system capacity and the large size of the parcel (>5 acres) to allow for septic expansion, if needed, project impacts related to septic capacity would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The project does not include any new construction involving grading or ground disturbance into native soils. Therefore, there would be no project impact to paleontological resources or geologic features.

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:

Section 15064.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines assists lead agencies in determining the significance of the impacts of GHG emissions. Section 15064.4 gives lead agencies the discretion to assess emissions quantitatively or qualitatively. The CEQA Guidelines do not establish a threshold of

significance. Lead agencies are granted discretion to establish significance thresholds for their respective jurisdictions, including looking to thresholds developed by other public agencies or other experts, so long as any threshold chosen is supported by substantial evidence.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) 2017 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines establish three potential thresholds for analyzing the GHG emissions associated with land use development projects: (1) A mass emissions threshold of 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per year; (2) A GHG efficiency threshold of 4.6 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per service population (project jobs + project residents); (3) Compliance with a qualified Climate Action Plan, with a goal consistent with AB 32.

AB 32, known as the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, focused on reducing GHG emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020. The BAAQMD mass emissions threshold of 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per year was designed for the District to meet this statewide goal by accounting for the Bay Area's share of GHG emissions reduction beyond that achievable at the state level. It is based on the AB 32 GHG reduction goals and a "gap analysis" that attributes an appropriate share of GHG emissions reductions to new projects in BAAQMD's jurisdiction. The District has not yet developed a corresponding threshold that extends beyond 2020 to be aligned with the SB 32 target for 2030.

SB 32 established a new climate pollution reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. As such, an adjusted mass emissions threshold consistent with SB 32 can be calculated as 40 percent below BAAQMD's 2020 threshold, which is equivalent to 660 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per year. The County is currently in the process of adopting a Climate Action Plan in conjunction with the other local agencies in Sonoma County that will employ the requirements of CEQA Guideline 15183.5. In the interim, the County finds that the BAAQMD thresholds of significance are supported by substantial evidence and may be used as County thresholds when adjusted to meet 2030 targets established by SB 32.

Emissions are caused by natural gas combustion, electricity use, on-road vehicles, water use, wine fermentation, carbon sequestration, and existing emissions. The BAAQMD does not include a threshold of significance for construction-related GHG emissions; however, the project does not include any new construction.

As discussed in Air Quality Sections 3.a and 3.b, the proposed project would be much smaller in scale than other screened land uses and would be well below the emission threshold for greenhouse gases. The operational GHG screening size for a pharmacy or drug store type of land use is 10,000 square feet of new greenfield construction; screening size for other retail land uses, such as a supermarket or discount store, range from 8,000 to 15,000 square feet of new construction. Scaling these screening sizes down by 40 percent equates to 4,800 to 9,000 square feet of new construction. The dispensary would include an existing 1,328-square-foot commercial building, an adjacent 48-square-foot restroom building, and up to 3,223 square feet of additional support spaces for storage and offices in up to six other existing accessory structures. In total, less than 4,600 square feet of existing structural development would be utilized by the project. Given this, the project is anticipated to be well below the GHG significance threshold of 660 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year.

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 County does not have an adopted Climate Action Plan but has adopted a Climate Change Action Resolution (May 8, 2018) which resolved to reduce GHG emissions by 40% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050, and noted twenty strategies for reducing GHG emissions, including increasing carbon sequestration, increasing renewable energy use, and reducing emissions from the consumption of goods and services. The project has proposed to incorporate many GHG reduction strategies, including: energy efficient LED lighting, unplugging and turning off equipment and computers when not in use, regulation of building temperature control settings, addition of bicycle parking spaces, promotion of employee carpooling and ridesharing programs, and implementation of a local hiring program.

By incorporating multiple GHG reduction strategies, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Significance Level: No 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:

The proposed dispensary operation would not include routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Significance Level: No 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:

The project includes only minor interior tenant improvements, which could involve the use of small amounts of paints, solvents, and other materials commonly used in construction. Regular dispensary operation would not include transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Proper use of materials in accordance with local, State, and federal requirements, and as required in the construction documents, would minimize the potential for accidental releases or emissions from hazardous materials. Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol regulate the transportation of hazardous materials and wastes, including container types and packaging requirements, as well as licensing and training for truck operators, chemical handlers, and hazardous waste haulers. The California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA) enforces hazard communication

program regulations which contain worker safety training and hazard information requirements, such as procedures for identifying and labeling hazardous substances, communicating hazard information related to hazardous substances and their handling, and preparation of health and safety plans to protect workers and employees.

Because the applicant and its contractors would be required to comply with existing and future hazardous materials laws and regulations addressing the transport, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, the potential to create a significant hazard from accidental conditions would be less than significant.

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:

No existing or proposed schools are located within one-quarter mile of the project site.

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:

There are several known hazardous materials sites within 500 feet of the project well, based on a review of the following databases (commonly known as the Cortese List) on February 4, 2022.

1. The State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker database,
2. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database (formerly known as Calsites), and
3. The CalRecycle Solid Waste Information System (SWIS).

Two of the hazardous materials sites have been remediated and the cases closed after cleanup was completed; both were LUST (Leaking Underground Storage Tank) sites.

- Bonneau's Shell Station, located about 500 feet to the west, was closed on 7/17/2020. Contaminants of concern included diesel, gasoline, waste oil and other automotive fluids.
- The Vineyard Inn Hotel, located about 400 feet to the southwest, was closed on 7/12/2012. Gasoline was the contaminant of concern.

There is one hazardous materials site which is still open.

- The Spanier Property, located about 500 feet to the east, is a former fabric coating business currently undergoing remediation. Contaminants of concern include various chlorinated hydrocarbons used in the production process of military camouflage gear.

Due to these known sites, and the applicant's intent to use well water for domestic uses, a water quality analysis was included in the Hydrogeologic Study for the project (Hurvitz Environmental Services, 2/26/2020). The study collected and analyzed groundwater samples from the project well

and determined that the well was not being impacted by petroleum hydrocarbon or chlorinated hydrocarbon contamination, concluding that the identified contaminated sites are not a threat to groundwater quality at the subject property. Therefore, the project site's location near a known hazardous materials site would result in a less than significant impact to the public and the environment.

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 closest public use airport - Sonoma Valley Airport - is about 1 mile to the south. The project site is not within the Airport Referral Area or within a land use compatibility safety zone for that airport, as designated by the Sonoma County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan. The project would not expose employees or customers to aircraft-related safety hazards or excessive aircraft noise.

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. The project would not change existing circulation patterns, would not generate substantial new traffic, and would not affect emergency response routes. Refer to Section 17 - Transportation, for further discussion of emergency access and project traffic.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

According to the Wildland Fire Hazard Area Map (Figure PS-1g) in the Sonoma County General Plan, the project site is located in the Local Responsibility Area and is not within a designated Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The site is outside of but adjacent to a State Responsibility Area within a designated Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone to the west of SR 121. Moderate Zones are generally located in grasslands and valleys, away from significant forested or chaparral wildland vegetation, as is the case with the project site. The project would be required to comply with County Code Fire Safe Standards (Chapter 13). Therefore, the project would not be likely to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

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 ground water quality?**

Comment:

The project does not include any construction involving grading or ground disturbance in native soils. The project would involve repaving the existing graveled and partially paved parking lot, but would not substantially increase impervious surfaces. All operations will occur within existing structures. No waterways are present on-site or in the vicinity. Project operations would have no impact on surface water or groundwater resources in the area.

Significance Level: No Impact

- 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 site is located within a Groundwater Availability Class 1 – Major Groundwater Basin. However, the California Department of Water Resources has classified the Sonoma Valley Groundwater Subbasin as a High Priority basin under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, with groundwater levels declining in some areas. A Hydrogeologic Assessment Report was prepared to address potential groundwater impacts under CEQA (Hurvitz Environmental Services, 2/26/2020). The hydrogeologic assessment determined that the estimated Historical Site Water Use, including the domestic water uses from the residence and former retail pottery and garden operation plus the landscape and horticultural irrigation uses, was approximately 1.32 acre-feet per year. The study further determined that groundwater demand for the proposed project would likely be lower than the historic uses, at approximately 1.0 acre-feet per year due to the decrease of irrigation water previously used for the garden operation. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on groundwater supplies in the area.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant 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:

The project does not include any new construction involving grading or ground disturbance of native soils. The project would involve repaving the existing graveled and partially paved parking lot where native topsoil has already been removed, but would not substantially increase impervious surfaces or contribute to a loss of native topsoil. No changes would occur to existing drainage patterns. Project operations would not result in increased erosion or siltation.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project would involve repaving the existing graveled and partially paved parking lot, but would not substantially increase impervious surfaces. No changes would occur to existing drainage patterns. Project operations would not result in increased surface runoff or flooding.

Significance Level: No Impact

**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:

The project does not include any construction involving grading or ground disturbance and would not substantially increase impervious surfaces. No changes would occur to existing drainage patterns. Project operations would not result in increased surface runoff.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. The project does not include any construction involving grading or ground disturbance and would not substantially increase impervious surfaces. No changes would occur to existing drainage patterns. Project operations would not impede or redirect flood flows.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area or in an area that would be subject to flooding as a result of a levee or dam failure (Sonoma County General Plan Figure PS-1f). The project site is not located near a large isolated body of water that may be affected by a seiche, or within an area mapped as being at risk to tsunamis.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The California Department of Water Resources has classified the Sonoma Valley Groundwater Subbasin as a High Priority basin under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, with groundwater levels declining in some areas. The Groundwater Sustainability Plan for the Sonoma

Valley Subbasin was adopted in December of 2021. A Hydrogeologic Assessment Report prepared to address potential groundwater impacts under CEQA (Hurvitz Environmental Services, 2/26/2020) found that the project would likely have a lower water demand than the combined former uses on the project site (the pottery and garden shop and residential uses). The report also provided baseline water quality data for evaluation of seawater intrusion. Chloride concentration (often used as an indicator of seawater intrusion) in the project well was measured to be 110 milligrams per liter. The Sonoma Valley Groundwater Sustainability agency uses chloride as an indicator and has set a measurable objective of 250 milligrams per liter. The chloride concentration measured in the project well is below this threshold, indicating that seawater intrusion is not occurring at the project site. In order to support site specific and regional monitoring of groundwater level (and seawater intrusion, if applicable), the County imposes standard conditions of approval requiring groundwater monitoring for all discretionary projects relying on groundwater, as will be the case with this project. The project does not include any cultivation and all project activities will be contained inside structures, limiting any potential to impact water quality. No conflicts with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management have been identified.

Significance Level: No Impact

## 11. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

### Would the Project:

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

Comment:

The proposed project would not physically divide a community. The project would 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. No impact would occur.

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 General Plan Land Use designation is Limited Commercial and the base Zoning District is also Limited Commercial. The proposed dispensary use is compatible with General Plan policies and Zoning Code requirements for commercial areas. The project site is not located within the boundaries of an area or specific plan.

The project site is located on SR 121/Fremont Drive, which is a designated Scenic Corridor in the General Plan. Most structures located within Scenic Corridors established outside of Urban Service Areas are subject to setback requirements. However, Scenic Corridor policies are intended to protect rural scenic resources, and do not apply to existing structures within the corridor. All operations will occur within existing buildings; therefore, Scenic Corridor structural setbacks do not apply.

The site is also located within a designated Valley Oak Habitat protection area. However, no valley oak habitat occurs on the parcel and no tree removal is proposed by the project.

The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Significance Level: Less than Significant 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 Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan (Sonoma County 2010) identifies aggregate resources of statewide or regional significance (areas classified as MRZ-2 by the State Geologist). The project site is not located within a designated mineral resource deposit area (Sonoma County 2010), or within an area classified as MRZ-2 in the California Geologic Survey Special Report 205 (CGS 2013).

Significance Level: No 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 project site is not zoned MR (Mineral Resources), and is not located within a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. No locally-important mineral resources are known to occur at the site.

Significance Level: No Impact

## **13. NOISE:**

**Would the project result in:**

- 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:

County noise standards for non-transportation operational noise are provided in Table NE-2 of the General Plan (Table 2 below). These thresholds may be adjusted based on site-specific conditions, such as a very high or very low ambient noise level, specific types of noise (e.g., dog barking, simple tone noises), or short-term noise sources permitted to occur no more than six days per year (e.g., concerts, special events).

Sensitive receptors include hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas. There are no hospitals, schools, or care facilities near the project site; however, there are some residences in the surrounding area. Dispensaries, and retail in general, are not noise-generating uses, and all storefront operations will occur inside the existing commercial building. Proposed hours of operation for the dispensary are 7:00 am to 7:00 pm when ambient traffic noise from SR 121 would also be occurring. No nighttime operations would occur. No operational noise impacts are anticipated.

**Table 2. Maximum Allowable Exterior Noise Exposures for Non-transportation Noise Sources  
(Table NE-2 from General Plan)**

| Hourly Noise Metric <sup>1</sup> (dBA)   | Daytime (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) | Nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| L50 (30 minutes in any hour)   | 50                          | 45                            |
| L25 (15 minutes in any hour)   | 55                          | 50                            |
| L08 (5 minutes in any hour)  | 60                          | 55                            |
| L02 (1 minute in any hour)   | 65                          | 60                            |
| <sup>1</sup> The sound level exceeding n% of the time in any hour. For example, the L50 is the value exceeded 50% of the time or 30 minutes in any hour; this is the median noise level. |                             |                               |

Neither the General Plan, nor the County Code establishes any noise thresholds or standards for transportation-related noise; therefore, transportation-related noise would not exceed standards.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The project does not include construction activities involving the use of heavy vibratory equipment (such as jackhammers or piledrivers). Construction is limited to interior tenant improvements and paving of parking areas. Potential project impacts from groundborne vibration would be less than significant.

Significance Level: No Impact

**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 within an Airport Referral Area as designated by the Sonoma County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan, or within two miles of a public airport. The closest public use airport - Sonoma Valley Airport - is about 1 mile to the south. People residing or working in the project area would not be exposed to excessive aircraft noise. No Impact would occur.

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 proposed project does not involve the construction of new housing. The project would create a modest demand for new employees (approximately five new full-time employment opportunities). The increase in employment opportunities is not anticipated to result in an indirect increase in population, as it is anticipated that the employees would be existing residents of Sonoma County. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to induce substantial population growth. No new infrastructure is proposed. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The project proposes to convert the existing second floor apartment to employee support space to comply with zoning code, which disallows residential dwelling units within the same premise as a cannabis dispensary. Conversion of this single unit would not displace substantial numbers of existing people.

Significance Level: Less than Significant 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:**

Comment:

The proposed project does not involve the construction of new housing. The project would create a modest demand for new employees (approximately 11 new full-time employment opportunities). The increase in employment opportunities is not anticipated to result in an indirect increase in population, as it is anticipated that the employees would be existing residents of Sonoma County. Therefore, the proposed project would not require construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities. No impact would occur.

Significance Level: No Impact

- i. **Fire protection?**

Comment:

The proposed project is within the service area of the Schell-Vista Fire Protection District. Although the project would increase employment opportunities (approximately 11 full-time employees), it is anticipated that the project would draw from local workers in the County and no indirect increase in population would occur. Therefore, the increased demand for fire protection would be small. The County Fire and Emergency Services Department reviewed the project referral and provided conditions of approval to comply with the County Fire Safe Ordinance, including fire protection methods such as alarm systems, extinguishers, vegetation management, emergency water supply for fire protection, hazardous materials management and management of flammable or combustible liquids and gases. None of the conditions required construction of new or expanded fire protection facilities. Therefore, the project would not necessitate or facilitate construction of new fire protection facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or response times.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

**ii. Police?**Comment:

The Sonoma County Sheriff would continue to serve the project area. No housing or residential units would be constructed as part of the project. Although the project would increase employment opportunities (approximately 11 full-time employees), it is anticipated that the project would draw from local workers in the County and no indirect increase in population would occur. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with the security development standard for commercial cannabis cultivation facilities contained in County Zoning Code Section 26-88-256(g)(2), including implementation of a site security plan. The project would not necessitate or facilitate construction of new police protection facilities resulting in environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or response times.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

**iii. Schools?**Comment:

No housing or residential units would be constructed as part of the project. Although the project would increase employment opportunities (approximately 11 full-time employees) it is anticipated that the project would draw from local workers in the County and no indirect increase in population would occur. Therefore, the project would not introduce new school age children in the project area, and would not necessitate or facilitate construction of new schools resulting in environmental impacts.

Significance Level: No Impact

**iv. Parks?**Comment:

No residential units would be included in the project that would require the payment of parkland development fees. The proposed project does not involve the construction of new housing, which is the typical type of development that requires expansion of recreational facilities. Although the

project would increase employment opportunities (approximately 11 full-time employees), it is anticipated that the project would draw from local workers in the County and no indirect increase in population would occur. Given the number of existing park and recreational options available in Sonoma County, the existing park facilities would be adequate and the project would not necessitate or facilitate construction of new parks resulting in environmental impacts.

Significance Level: No Impact

**v. Other public facilities?**

Comment:

The parcel is not served by public sewer and water. No other public facilities are anticipated to be required as a result of the project.

Significance Level: No Impact

## **17. TRANSPORTATION:**

**Would the project:**

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

Comment:

Regional access to the project site is from either SR 116, SR 121, or SR 12 (via SR 121), all of which are state highways. The operator anticipates an average of 300 patrons per day would visit the dispensary and that the operation would have a maximum of 11 employees on-site per shift, including delivery drivers.

A Traffic Impact Study prepared by W-Trans (November 22, 2021) found that the project is expected to generate an average of 448 vehicle trips per day, including 24 trips during the weekday morning peak and 42 trips during the weekday evening peak.

As required by Sonoma County General Plan policies for the Sonoma Valley, the study evaluated the need for intersection improvements at three nearby intersections: SR 116/Arnold Drive, SR 116/SR 121-Bonneau Road, and SR 121/SR 12 intersection. Two of these intersections are already signalized- SR 116/Arnold Drive and SR 121/SR 12. Both of these intersections are currently operating acceptably (Level of Service B or C) and would continue to do so under existing conditions with the added project trips (Level of Service B or C). Under future conditions (horizon year 2040), operation at both of these intersections with and without the project, would be expected to worsen (Level of Service E or F). However, future turning queues would be expected to increase by five feet or less, which would not be expected to exceed existing storage capacity, and no intersection improvements were determined to be warranted.

The nearest intersection to the project - SR 116/SR 121-Bonneau Road – is an unsignalized four-legged intersection with stop controls on all approaches and a northbound channelized right-turn lane with yield controls on the eastbound through movement. The intersection is currently operating unacceptably (Level of Service E) and would continue to do so under existing plus project

(Level of Service E) and future conditions with or without the added project trips (Level of Service F). The project would contribute approximately 1.4 percent of the increase in volumes between current and future 2040 volumes. A future roundabout project is already programmed for construction at this intersection by Caltrans (scheduled for completion in 2024, but likely will be a year or two later). The proposed roundabout is a hybrid multilane roundabout with 180 degrees of the circulatory roadway having two lanes, a full right-turn bypass lane in the northbound direction, and a partial right-turn bypass lane (yield control at the exit) in the westbound direction. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 requires payment of a fair share contribution towards the cost of the future roundabout project at that intersection, estimated at approximately \$107,000.00. Implementation of this measure would reduce the traffic impacts to a less than significant level and ensure the project does not conflict with traffic-related programs, plans, ordinances, or policies.

A Sonoma County Transit bus stop and a Caltrans park and ride are present at the SR 116/121 intersection, approximately 300 feet west of the project customer driveway entrance. These transit features are proposed to be relocated to the northerly side of the intersection by the future roundabout project. The dispensary project would not conflict with the proposed transit improvements.

The General Plan and Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identify a proposed Class II bikeway (on-street bike lanes for one-way travel on either side of a street) along SR 121 in the project area; currently, cyclists use the road shoulder. Pedestrian sidewalks are absent along the entire property road frontage, and throughout the Big Bend area, but are proposed as part of the Caltrans roundabout project. The dispensary project does not propose new construction in or near the right of way which could interfere with future road widening to accommodate bike lanes or pedestrian sidewalks, and therefore, would not conflict with proposed bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

All access improvements would be coordinated with the roundabout plans through the encroachment permit process. The project is not expected to conflict with any programs, plans, ordinances or policies related to pedestrian and bicycle paths, or mass transit, and thus will not have a significant impact.

Significance Level: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation:

**Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 Fair Share Contribution for SR 116/121 Roundabout:**

Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall pay to the Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works (DTPW) a fair share of the cost of the future intersection improvements of the SR 121/SR 116 intersection. The fair share estimate for the SR 121/SR 116 intersection is 2.14%. The method for calculating equitable fair share is based on the Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, Appendix "B", Methodology for Calculating Equitable Mitigation Measures, subject to the review and approval of Permit Sonoma and DTPW. The estimated contribution is \$107,000.00; DTPW will provide the final fee amount based upon the project's Traffic Impact Study prior to building permit issuance.

Mitigation Monitoring:

**Mitigation Monitoring TRANS-1 Fair Share Contribution for SR 116/121 Roundabout:**

Prior to building permit Issuance, Permit Sonoma staff shall verify that the fair share

contribution has been paid.

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

Comment:

Senate Bill (SB) 743 established a change in the metric to be applied to determining transportation impacts associated with development projects from a delay-based analysis associated with Level of Service (LOS) to an increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). VMT refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. The change to VMT was formally adopted as part of updates to the CEQA Guidelines on December 28, 2018, and took effect July 1, 2020. Agencies are directed to choose metrics that are appropriate for their jurisdiction to evaluate the potential impacts of a project in terms of VMT. The County of Sonoma has not yet adopted specific VMT policies or thresholds of significance. However, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has released technical advisory recommendations (OPR 2018) regarding the assessment of VMT.

The OPR Technical Advisory indicates that retail projects should generally be analyzed by examining total VMT, with an increase in total regional VMT being considered a significant impact. In the Technical Advisory section outlining project screening, OPR indicates that local-serving retail may be presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact and can generally be screened from further VMT analysis. OPR based this presumption on substantial research demonstrating that adding local-serving retail uses typically improves destination accessibility to customers, often reducing trip distances (i.e., the "miles" in vehicle miles traveled) since customers need to travel shorter distances than they previously did. The total demand for retail in a region also tends to hold steady; adding new local-serving retail typically shifts trips away from another location rather than adding entirely new shopping trips to the region. OPR cites a size of 50,000 square feet or greater as being a potential indicator of regional-serving retail (versus local-serving), which would typically require a quantitative VMT analysis.

Given the proposed dispensary's location in lower Sonoma Valley area as well as the proposed delivery service, further consideration was given to how the use could affect regional travel. A key component of this effort is to assess how far customers in surrounding areas must currently drive to reach a dispensary. As there are currently no operating dispensaries in Sonoma Valley or the City of Sonoma, customers from the lower Sonoma Valley would need to drive a substantially shorter distance to reach a dispensary with the proposed project than is currently the case. Using online mapping tools, W-Trans determined that the nearest dispensaries are in Napa (13 miles), just north of Petaluma (14 miles), Cotati (18 miles), Vallejo (19 miles), and Santa Rosa (26 miles). With the proposed project, the distances that residents in the lower Sonoma Valley, including the City of Sonoma, would need to drive to reach a dispensary would be cut by more than half. Further, the delivery service would result in one round trip for numerous deliveries rather than individual trips for each customer. The project would therefore be expected to lead to a reduction in regional VMT. Based on this finding, and consistent with OPR's guidance on local-serving retail, the project is expected to have a less than significant VMT impact.

Although not currently operating, it should be noted that the City of Sonoma approved a new Sparc dispensary at 19315 Sonoma Highway on May 13, 2021, and the County Board of Supervisors approved the new Loe Firehouse dispensary at 15499 Arnold Drive in Glen Ellen on September 14, 2021. Both are within 5-8 miles of the proposed project site and within the lower Sonoma Valley. As

these other dispensaries open for business, vehicle miles travelled are likely to be further reduced as customers would be most likely to frequent whichever dispensary is closest to them or along their typical commute route

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

Due to the channelized SR 121 approach and the horizontal curve in the roadway, adequate sight distance towards the west is not available at either of the project driveways. The project will not change this existing roadway condition, but could intensify an incompatible use by increasing the number of customer vehicles entering and exiting the project site (estimated to be 300 customers per day).

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-2 would reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation:

**Mitigation Measure TRANS-2 Site Access Control:**

Until such time as the Caltrans roundabout project is constructed, the Applicant shall construct or install a median on SR 121 in order to limit turning movements across the highway centerline onto the property (i.e., driveway access would be limited to right turns in and out). A median, such as a quick-curb, would be acceptable for this purpose; however, ultimate design is subject to Caltrans approval.

Mitigation Monitoring:

**Mitigation Monitoring TRANS-2 Site Access Control:**

Prior to building permit Issuance, Permit Sonoma staff shall verify that an encroachment permit for construction of the median has been applied for and is in process. Prior to granting occupancy for the dispensary use, Permit Sonoma staff shall verify that the median has been constructed and that the encroachment permit has been finalized.

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

Comment:

The project site has direct access to the state highway system. 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 (including internal tenant improvements and changes of occupancy) are required to be reviewed by a Fire Prevention Inspector during the building permit process to ensure compliance with emergency access standards.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

## 16. RECREATION:

Would the project:

- 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:

No housing or residential units would be constructed as part of the proposed project. The project would create a modest demand for new employees (approximately 11 new full-time employment opportunities). The new employees may use nearby park facilities, such as Tolay Lake Regional Park. However, the increase in the number of employees would be small, and would not be expected to contribute noticeably to the deterioration of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not involve activities that would cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of parks or recreational facilities. The project will have no impact on the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

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 proposed project does not involve or require the construction of recreational facilities. The proposed project does not involve the construction of new housing, which is the typical type of development that requires expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur.

Significance Level: No Impact

## 18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

- 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 5020.1(k), or**
  - ii. **A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource**

**Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

Comment:

No Tribal cultural resources have been identified through the referral process (project referrals sent to Tribes October 12, 2018). No Tribe requested further information and no Tribe requested formal consultation. All project operations will utilize existing structures; parking lot improvements include repaving graveled and partially paved areas which have already been disturbed. No impacts to Tribal cultural resources are anticipated.

Significance Level: No Impact

## **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, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Comment:

The project will use private well and septic systems. All other services (e.g., electrical, telecommunications) are already present at the project site. No expansion of any public services would be required.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

Water supply would be provided by an on-site well, which is located in a Zone 1 groundwater area (Major Groundwater Basin). The project would not result in a direct or indirect increase in population that would result in an increased demand for water supplies. No new regional water supply entitlements or facilities would be required. The water demand proposed for the project is sustainable based on current and future development within the cumulative impact area (Hurvitz Environmental Services 2/26/2020).

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 dispensary would continue to use the existing wastewater treatment system on the property. The project site is not located in an area served by public sewer, and therefore, would not exceed the capacity of any service provider.

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 solid waste that would result from the proposed project.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

No applicable federal solid waste regulations would apply to the project. At the State level, the Integrated Waste Management Act mandates a reduction of waste being disposed and establishes an integrated framework for program implementation, solid waste planning, and solid waste facility and landfill compliance. Sonoma County has access to adequate permitted landfill capacity and reduction, reuse, and recycling programs to serve the proposed project. Construction and operational waste generated as a result of the project would require management and disposal in accordance with local and state regulations. The project would not conflict with or impede implementation of such programs.

Significance Level: Less than Significant 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?**

Comment:

The project would not impair implementation of an adopted emergency response plan. There is no adopted emergency evacuation plan for the County, and the project would not change existing circulation patterns or effect emergency response routes. Project development plans (including internal tenant improvements and changes of occupancy) would be required to be reviewed by a Department of Fire and Emergency Services Fire Inspector during the building permit process to ensure adequate emergency access is provided to the site.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

- 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?**

Comment:

Wildfire risk is dependent upon existing environmental conditions, including but not limited to the amount of vegetation present, topography, and climate. The project site is located within a rural agricultural area within an unforested valley. Climate in the area is characterized as Mediterranean, with cool wet winters and hot dry summers.

The project site is not located in a State Responsibility Area or a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. According to the Wildland Fire Hazard Area Map (Figure PS-1g) in the Sonoma County General Plan, the project site is located in the Local Responsibility Area and is not within a designated Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The site is outside of but adjacent to a State Responsibility Area within a designated Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone to the west of SR 121.

Moderate Zones are generally located in grasslands and valleys, away from significant forested or chaparral wildland vegetation, as is the case with the project site. Projects located in High and Very High Fire Severity Zones are required by state and county code to have a detailed vegetation management plan developed and reviewed by the Sonoma County Fire Prevention Division before a building permit can be issued. This requirement does not apply to projects located in a Moderate Zone or outside of fire hazard zones. However, all construction projects must comply with County Code Fire Safe Standards (Chapter 13), including but not limited to, installing fire sprinklers in buildings, providing emergency vehicle access, and maintaining access to adequate water for fire-fighting purposes.

Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact regarding exposing project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

- c) **Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**

Comment:

The project does not propose infrastructure improvements, other than repaving of parking areas. The project is not anticipated to exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing environmental impacts related to fire-fighting infrastructure.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

- 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 project site is not located in an area at high risk for flooding, such as a 100-year flood hazard area. Additionally, drainage patterns at the project site would remain the same as under existing conditions. Therefore, operation of the project would not substantially alter drainage patterns or increase runoff which would expose people or structures to significant downslope flooding.

The project site is located in a valley flatland and is not located within a deep-seated landslide

hazard area or on a mapped landslide complex or debris flow source area. It is unlikely that a landslide would occur on-site as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project would expose people or structures to significant risks including flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

## 21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) **Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

Evaluation of potential biological resources in Section 4 and cultural resources in Section 5 determined that none exist and no impacts would occur.

Significance Level: No Impact

- 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)?**

Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines state: *Cumulative impacts refers to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.* Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. A search was undertaken to identify reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity of the proposed project area that might have overlapping or cumulative impacts. There are no operating dispensaries in the Sonoma Valley area or in the City of Sonoma. However, two have been recently approved and are likely to begin operations within the next year. The City of Sonoma approved an application by Sparc for a new dispensary at 19315 Sonoma Highway on May 13, 2021. The Board of Supervisors approved the new Loe Firehouse dispensary at 15499 Arnold Drive in Glen Ellen on September 14, 2021. Both are within 5-8 miles of the proposed project site and within the lower Sonoma Valley. As there are currently no dispensaries in the area, customers from the lower Sonoma Valley would need to drive a substantially shorter distance to reach a dispensary with the proposed project than is currently the case. The project would therefore be expected to lead to a reduction in regional Vehicle Miles Travelled. As the other dispensaries open for business, vehicle miles travelled are likely to be further reduced as customers would be most likely to frequent whichever dispensary is closest to them or along their typical commute route.

The project would contribute vehicle trips to a nearby intersection already operating unacceptably- State Route 116/State Route 121 (SR 116/SR 121). A future roundabout project is programmed for construction at this intersection by Caltrans (scheduled for completion in 2024, but likely will be a year or two later). Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 requires payment of a fair share contribution

towards the cost of the future roundabout project at that intersection. Implementation of this measure would reduce the traffic impact to a less than significant level.

Due to the channelized SR 121 approach and the horizontal curve in the roadway, adequate sight distance towards the west is not available at either of the project driveways. The project will not change this existing roadway condition, but could intensify an incompatible use by increasing the number of customer vehicles entering and exiting the project site (estimated to be 300 customers per day). Mitigation Measure TRANS-2 requires construction of a median on SR 121 in order to limit turning movements across the highway centerline onto the property (i.e., driveway access would be limited to right turns in and out). Implementation of this measure would reduce the traffic impact to a less than significant level.

Construction activities for the project will be minimal, consisting of internal tenant improvements, parking improvements, and frontage improvements (i.e., curb, gutter, and sidewalk) coordinated with the State's roundabout project. No substantial changes will be made to building exteriors, besides minor signage, lighting, and accessibility improvements. Therefore, the character of the area will remain virtually unchanged.

The combined project contributions are not anticipated to rise to a cumulatively considerable level.

Significance Level: Less than Significant

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

All potential environmental effects of the project were analyzed. No environmental impacts which could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings were identified.

Significance Level: Less than Significant

## References

1. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). 2017a. Final 2017 Clean Air Plan. April 19, 2017.
2. BAAQMD. 2017b. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. May 2017.
3. BAAQMD. 2019. *Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status*. Website accessed November 16, 2020 at: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/research-and-data/air-quality-standards-and-attainment-status>
4. PRMD. Sonoma County General Plan 2020 (as amended), September 23, 2008.
5. County of Sonoma. 2020. Traffic Volume Map. Website accessed November 16, 2020 at: <http://sonomacounty.ca.gov/TPW/Roads/Services/Data-and-Resources/Interactive-Maps/>
6. California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). 2018. Cortese List Data Resources. <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/>. Data resources reviewed November 16, 2020.
7. California Scenic Highway Mapping System, Sonoma County. 2011. California Department of Transportation.
8. Sonoma County Permit and Resources Management Department. Visual Assessment Guidelines. January 2019. <http://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Regulations/Environmental-Review-Guidelines/Visual-Assessment-Guidelines/>
9. California Air Resources Board. 2017. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. November 2017.
10. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Flood Insurance Rate Map Number 06097C0910E. Effective Date December 2, 2008.
11. Sonoma County Important Farmland Map. 2016. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
12. Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan and Program EIR. 1994. <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Long-Range-Plans/Aggregate-Resource-Management/>
13. California Geologic Survey. 2013. *Special Report 205, Update of Mineral Land Classification*.
14. Sonoma County. 2016. *Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies*. May 2016. <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/TPW/Roads/Services/Traffic-Engineering/#traffic-study>
15. Regional Climate Protection Authority. 2016. Climate Action 2020 and Beyond. July 2016.
16. Sonoma County. 2018. Airport Land Use Plan. Available at: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Long-Range-Plans/Comprehensive-Airport-Land-Use/Boundaries/>

17. State Water Resources Control Board. 2016. California 2014 and 2016 303(d) Combined List.
18. California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). Accessed online November 16, 2020 at <https://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/DataCentral/Facilities/>
19. Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database. Accessed online November 16, 2020 at <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>
20. State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database. Accessed online November 16, 2020 at <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
21. United States Geological Survey (USGS). 1998. *San Francisco Bay Region Landslide Information: Summary Distribution of Slides and Earth Flows*.
22. United States Geological Survey (USGS). 1997. *San Francisco Bay Region Landslide Information: Map Showing Principal Debris-Flow Source Areas*.
23. Office of Planning and Research (OPR). 2018. *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*. April 2018. <https://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/updates/sb-743/>
24. Caltrans. California State Scenic Highway System, Accessed online November 16, 2020 at <https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2e921695c43643b1aaf7000dfcc19983>
25. Climate Change Action Resolution (Resolution No. 18-0166). May 8, 2018. <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Long-Range-Plans/Climate-Change-Action-Resolution/>
26. Alta Archaeological Consulting. November 11, 2019. *Archaeological Survey Report*.
27. Hurvitz Environmental Services, Inc. February 26, 2020. *Hydrogeologic Study & Report*.
28. W-Trans. November 4, 2021. *Response to Peer Review Comments (UPC18-0023)*.
29. W-Trans. November 22, 2021. *Final Traffic Impact Study for the 27 Fremont Drive Dispensary Project*.
30. W-Trans. December 3, 2021. *Addendum to the Final Traffic Impact Study for the 27 Fremont Drive Dispensary Project*.
31. GHD, Inc. November 5, 2021. *Peer Review of Draft Traffic Impact Study for the 27 Fremont Drive Dispensary Project (W-Trans, 6/3/2021)*.