



Draft 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: 4/29/2020
 Public Review Period: 30 days
 State Clearinghouse Number:
 Permit Sonoma File Number PLP18-0013
 Prepared by: Doug Bush, Planner
 Phone: (707) 565-5276

Pursuant to Section 15071 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, this proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and the attached 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:

Project Name: Boyes Springs Food Center Mixed-Use Project
Project Applicant/Operator: KS Mattson Partners, LP
Project Location/Address: 18201, 18271, 18275, 18279 & 18285 Highway 12; 30 & 320 Arroyo Road; 12, 14, 15 & 16 Calle Del Monte, El Verano
APN: 056-415-016, -017, -018 & -020
General Plan Land Use Designation: Limited Commercial, Traffic Sensitive and Urban Residential
Zoning Designation: Limited Commercial, Traffic Sensitive and Low Density Residential (R1 B6 5DU). The project includes a rezoning to the Planned Community District.
Decision Making Body: Board of Supervisors
Appeal Body: None

Project Description:

The applicant is requesting the following approvals from the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department (Permit Sonoma): 1) General Plan Amendment to add the Limited Commercial zoning designation to an additional 0.08 acres and to change the residentially zoned portion of the site from Medium Density Residential allowing 5 units per acre to 12 dwelling units per acre, 2) Zone Change from Limited Commercial/Low Density Residential to Planned Community, 3) Major Subdivision to create 11 parcels, 4) Preliminary and Precise Development Plan for Planned Community Zoning, and 5) Design Review and Sign Program located at 18201, 18271, 18275, 18279 & 18285 Highway 12; 30 & 320 Arroyo Road; 12, 14, 15 & 16 Calle Del Monte, El Verano.

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

Topic Area	Abbreviation*	Yes	No
Aesthetics	VIS		No
Agricultural & Forest Resources	AG		No
Air Quality	AIR	Yes	
Biological Resources	BIO	Yes	

Cultural Resources	CUL	Yes	
Energy	EN		No
Geology and Soils	GEO		No
Greenhouse Gas Emission	GHG		No
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	HAZ		No
Hydrology and Water Quality	HYDRO		No
Land Use and Planning	LU		No
Mineral Resources	MIN		No
Noise	NOISE	Yes	
Population and Housing	POP		No
Public Services	PS		No
Recreation	REC		No
Transportation	TRAF		No
Tribal Cultural Resources	TCR		No
Utility and Service Systems	UTL	Yes	
Wildfire	WF		No
Mandatory Findings of Significance			No

RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

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

Agency	Activity	Authorization
Caltrans Encroachment	Activities within a state highway	California Transportation Department encroachment and right of way requirements

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING:

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



Prepared by: Doug Bush, Planner

April 23, 2020



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:

Permit Sonoma has prepared an Initial Study for the mixed-use project described in Section II below. This report is the Expanded Initial Study required by CEQA. The report was prepared by Doug Bush, Planner for Permit Sonoma. Information on the proposed project was provided by KS Mattson Partners, LP and their representatives. Technical studies provided by qualified consultants which support the conclusions of this report are available to review by contacting the Project Planner, Doug Bush at doug.bush@sonoma-county.org or (707)565-5276. Other reports, documents, maps and studies referred to in this document may also be available through the County's website at: www.PermiSonoma.org

A project referral letter was sent to the appropriate local, state and federal agencies and interest groups who may wish to comment on the project.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project would redevelop an existing mixed-use development in an urban service area by increasing the total number of housing units and increasing the amount of commercial space on the site. The project is located in the Boyes Springs area, approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile north of the City of Sonoma. The site currently has four parcels (APNs 056-415-016, -017, -018, and -020) totaling approximately 1.26 acres located at 18201, 18271, 18275, 18279, and 18285 Highway 12; 30 and 320 Arroyo Road; and 12, 14, 15, and 16 Calle Del Monte, in Boyes Springs. Current uses on the project site include seven single-family residences and the existing 8,000 square foot, two-story Boyes Springs Food Center. The Food Center is currently comprised of 3,000 square feet of commercial retail space plus two studio apartment units on the ground floor and three rental apartment dwelling units plus additional single room occupancy dwelling units on the second floor.

The proposed redevelopment of the project site would result in 37 total residential units, including eight for-sale townhomes divided between two detached buildings and 29 rental units distributed between two mixed-use buildings. Eight units, or 21.6% of the residential units would be offered at rents affordable to low-income tenants. None of the residential units would be used as vacation rentals. The redevelopment would also include 7,000 square feet of commercial retail/restaurants. This would include 3,000 square feet of existing commercial space on the ground floor of the existing Boyes Springs Food Center building and 4,000 square feet of new commercial retail/restaurant use within a new three-story, mixed-use building. 87 parking spaces would be provided throughout the site, including stacked parking inside the new commercial building. Open space would be provided for all tenants including some private yards, private rooftop patios and shared patio areas. All existing tenants would be relocated as needed to complete construction and would be offered first right of refusal of new units at comparable sizes and rents, as detailed in the affordable housing program submitted with the application.

III. SETTING

The existing site includes a two-story building with a grocery store on the first floor, apartments on the first and second floors and eight small detached single-family residences. A majority of the site is paved. There are eleven mature trees distributed throughout the site, all of which are considered "protected

species” by the Sonoma County Tree Ordinance, including three Valley Oaks. Nearby properties include a mix of single-family residences to the east, professional offices across Highway 12 to the west, and restaurants and small food markets to the north and south. The site is bordered by Highway 12 to the west and two residential streets, Arroyo Road and Calle Del Monte, to the north and south respectively (Figure 1). The subject property is level with a gentle slope to the southwest and at a consistent grade with all adjacent properties. The property is outside the 500-year and 100-year flood zones, and is located in a Sonoma County Local Fire Protection Response Area (LRA) that is not a designated fire hazard severity zone.



Figure 1 Site Overview (TLCD Architecture)

IV. ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC OR AGENCIES

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

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

The project was discussed at initial public meetings with the Sonoma County Design Review Committee on March 7, 2018, the Sonoma County Development Coordinating Committee on April 17, 2018, and the Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Commission on April 25, 2018. Discussion included impacts on residents of the existing development, introduction of permeable surfaces, delivery and refuse areas, provision of parking, and aesthetic design considerations. These discussions primarily resulted in improved clarification of the application including demonstrating that required parking would be provided. In addition, the applicant provided a more robust affordable housing program to address concerns regarding the displacement of existing tenants by proposing to house existing tenants throughout the life of the project and by making dwelling units available first to existing tenants after completion of construction.

No other comments were received from the referring agencies other than noting that agency regulations and standards must be met.

V. OTHER RELATED PROJECTS

The site is within the boundaries of the Springs Specific Plan that is currently being drafted. The Springs Specific Plan will be the primary planning document and reference guide for future development in the Springs area, including the project site. At this time however, the plan has not been adopted, is not in effect and this project is not subject to the draft document. Projects submitted after a future Springs Specific Plan has been adopted will be required to adhere to the applicable provisions of that plan. There are no other known private or public projects in the area that may affect the proposed project.

VI. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

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

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

Each question is answered by evaluating the project as proposed, that is, without considering the effect of any added mitigation measures. The Initial Study includes a comment on 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.

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

1. AESTHETICS:

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The project site is located in a developed commercial corridor of Highway 12 and not within a scenic vista. The project site is level and sits at similar grade to adjacent properties. It is primarily viewed from the public right-of-way from Highway 12, and secondarily from Calle Del Monte and Arroyo Road. The project site is located in the Scenic Resources District with a Scenic Corridor designation.

The existing Boyes Springs Food Center building is two stories tall and similar in height and massing to the commercial building across Highway 12; both structures establish the character of this section of the Highway. Some structures on the existing site extend to two stories, while some proposed structures would include a third story. The three-story structure planned along Highway 12 would be

set back 21 feet from the public right-of-way, limiting the visibility of the highest elevation. With a minimal change in height, and no clear scenic vistas in the vicinity, the proposed project would be compatible with the existing character of this corridor of Highway 12 and would not impede views of scenic vistas from the public right of way.

The Scenic Corridor designation would typically require a setback of 30% of the depth of the lot, up to 200 feet. However, because this project is in an Urban Service Area and is associated with existing structures, this increased setback does not apply pursuant to Municipal Code Section 26-64-030(a)(5).

Although not located within a scenic vista, the project site is located within a character-establishing section of the Highway 12 corridor. The proposed development has incorporated structural elements that are consistent with the form, massing, and height of the current building. The proposed project proposes to restore the current façade with no substantial change in color or architectural style along the scenic corridor; therefore, this project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

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:

Natural Features. The site includes 11 trees which are 9 inches or greater in diameter at breast height. Eight of these trees would be removed and three would be maintained. The visibility of these trees is limited by their distance from the street and because many trees are screened from view by existing structures. The project would introduce trees along the Highway 12 frontage and throughout the site, supporting the scenic quality of the corridor. For further discussion see section (c) below.

Built Features. A historic resource survey was provided which concluded that no historic resources were found on the site (Evans & De Shazo, 2018). The existing Boyes Springs Food Center was built in 1949 and over time many of the original features have been changed, including a majority of the windows, doors, ground floor porch and awning. The existing food center would be updated to modernize the façade while retaining a Mediterranean architectural style consistent with the area. The blade sign that states “Boyes Springs Food Center” on the southwest corner of the building, is original and would be restored and maintained as part of the project. All other structures, including the existing cottages, do not represent historic or scenic resources.

The project site is adjacent to Highway 12, a State-designated scenic highway. The project has incorporated the Highway 12 Design Guidelines into the design elements and the proposed design is compatible with the Highway 12 corridor within the vicinity of the project site. There are no scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, that would be affected by the project.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Comment:

A Visual Assessment was prepared by TLCD Architecture on 5/29/2019, in conformance with the County's Visual Assessment Guidelines. The determination of visual impact significance is made by establishing the level of visual sensitivity of the site, characterizing the visual dominance of the project in terms of its form, line, color, texture, and lighting and determining the significance of the visual impact by comparing site sensitivity with visual dominance of the project.

Visual Sensitivity: The Visual Sensitivity of the project site can be considered “high” because the project lies within a Scenic Resources District and is adjacent to Highway 12, a designated scenic corridor. The project vicinity also includes one historic resource – the Sonoma Mission Inn at 18140 Highway 12. Aside from this historic resource, a majority of the buildings in the vicinity are simple, rectangular, and lack any distinguished ornamentation or clear architectural significance.

Visual Dominance: The visual dominance of the proposed project can be considered “co-dominant” as defined by the Sonoma County Visual Assessment Guidelines because the proposed project will be prominent within its setting but has incorporated a number of design features that make it compatible with its surroundings. As designed, the proposed project is expected to attract attention equal to surrounding uses.

The form and height of the existing Boyes Springs Food Center building, at two stories tall, is similar in height to the two-story building on the west side of Highway 12. These two buildings are currently the predominant structures on Highway 12 in the vicinity of the proposed project and establish the character of this commercial corridor. Several new buildings would extend to three stories however the third story would be setback 21’ from Highway 12 which results in decreased massing that is similar to the existing building. The proposed buildings will use similar architectural style and color pallet as the existing buildings on site and other buildings in the vicinity - a hybrid of Art Deco and Mission style with light cream colors.

When the high visual sensitivity of the site is considered relative to the prominence of the proposed project, the visual impact of the project is considered “significant” per the County’s Visual Assessment Guidelines. The visual impact of the project has been determined to be Less Than Significant due to the incorporation of the following design approaches:

- Several existing trees will be preserved and eight new 36 inch box Valley Oak trees have been proposed to replace trees proposed for removal. New trees and other landscaping will be placed throughout the site as demonstrated in the proposed planting plans.
- The new buildings have been stepped back from their respective street frontages. Along Highway 12 the building has been set back beyond the ten feet specified in existing design guidelines and the third floor is stepped back out of sight from the street. Roof garden vegetation will further soften the top of the building. Mature and new trees along Arroyo Road will screen the building, and new trees, plantings, and stepped back massing has been incorporated at Calle Del Monte as well.
- Awnings, signage, porches, and other street-level design elements have been incorporated into the project design to reduce the perceived height of the new mixed-use building and townhomes.
- The project includes pedestrian improvements including new street trees, landscape buffers, and new pedestrian pathways through and around the site.
- Materials, colors, and finishes have been chosen that are compatible with and complimentary to existing buildings in the project vicinity.
- Exterior lighting will be shielded and down-lit, limiting glare and minimizing spillover onto adjacent properties.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

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

Comment:

The project will utilize earth tones similar to the existing structures on the site and similar to those colors used in development on adjacent lots. These earth toned colors would no contribute to substantial light or glare. The project would include lighting for visitor and residential safety, ample enough to illuminate the sidewalks, public spaces, parking areas, and support the commercial uses, while preventing direct glare and illumination onto adjacent properties through Dark Sky-compliant

fixtures. A photometric lighting diagram and lighting schedule were submitted as part of the project application. The proposed lighting will be shielded or recessed to limit glare on adjacent properties and will not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:

Would the project:

- a) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

Comment:

The project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The parcel is mapped by the California Resources Agency primarily as Urban and Built-up Land, and not classified as Farmland.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project site is not zoned for agricultural use or in a Williamson Act Contract. The project would not conflict with the existing zoning, agricultural use, or Williamson Act Contract.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project is not within a Resource and Rural Development land use designation or Timberland Production District. The Project is consistent with the site's land use designation. The proposed project would have no foreseeable impact on forest lands or Timberland Production zones.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

See Comment in 2(c), above.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

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

Significance Level: No Impact

3. AIR QUALITY:

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The project is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), which is currently designated as a nonattainment area for state and federal ozone standards, the State PM 10 standard, and the State and federal PM 2.5 standard. The District has adopted an Ozone Attainment Plan and a Clean Air Plan in compliance with Federal and State Clean Air Acts. These plans include measures to achieve compliance with both ozone standards. The plans deal primarily with emissions of ozone precursors (nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and volatile organic compounds, also referred to as Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)). The project would not conflict with the District's air quality plans because the proposed use is well below the emission thresholds for ozone precursors or involve construction of transportation facilities that are not addressed in an adopted transportation plan (see Comment in 1(b) below).

Significance Level: No Impact

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Comment:

State and federal standards have been established for "criteria pollutants": ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide and particulates (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). The pollutants NO_x (nitrogen oxides) and reactive organic gases (ROG) form ozone in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight. The principal source of ozone precursors is vehicle emissions, although stationary internal combustion engines are also considered a source. In their 2017 update to the CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, BAAQMD identified the threshold sizes for various types of land uses. The projected emissions for this project have been established using the current CalEEMod program developed for this purpose by the California Air Resources Board.

BAAQMD has recommended a threshold of significance for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions at 1,100 annual metric tons of CO₂e (Carbon dioxide equivalent). This threshold is limited to operational GHG emissions. The BAAQMD recommends using this threshold or compliance with a qualified Climate Action Plan (CAP) for evaluation of projects. If the project is part of a qualified CAP, or emissions are less than the threshold of significance (1,100 metric tons CO₂e/yr.) it can be considered to have a less than significant GHG impact.

A GHG emissions study was prepared for the Boyes Springs Food Center Mixed Use project by Gilleran Energy, Inc. The report, dated July 30, 2018, includes an Annual Operational GHG Emissions in Metric Tons of CO₂. Table 2 provides the GHG emissions of the project during construction and operation. The annual operational emissions are estimated to be 365.0 metric tons CO₂ equivalent (MTCO₂e). The maximum annual project construction emissions are estimated to be 316.9 MTCO₂e. The annual GHG emissions during construction and operation are both under the BAAQMD defined threshold of significance. The unmitigated annual emissions during operation are estimated to be 624.5 MTCO₂e, also well under the BAAQMD threshold of significance. This project is below these thresholds and therefore would not emit significant criteria pollutants.

Table 2. Greenhouse gas emissions during construction and operation of the project.

Boyes Springs Food Center Mixed Use		
Operations Mitigated Emissions (CalEEMod)		
Emissions Category	Annual Emissions Estimates (MTCO ₂ e)	Below Threshold
Area	0.4598	
Energy	28.0467	
Mobile	306.6211	
Waste	25.7184	
Water	4.188	
Total	365.0339	yes
Construction Emissions Estimates (CalEEMod)		
Year	Annual Emissions (MTCO ₂ e)	Below Threshold
1	225.4731	yes
2	316.8813	yes
3	190.0549	yes
Maximum	316.8813	yes

Significance Level:
Less Than Significant

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

Comment:

The Bay Area is a non-attainment area for ozone and PM₁₀ (fine particulate matter). The project would not have a cumulative effect on ozone because it would not generate significant new emissions of ozone precursors (hydrocarbons and NO_x). The project would have no long-term effect on PM₁₀, because all surfaces would be paved or landscaped and dust generation would be insignificant. However, there could be a significant short-term emission of dust (which would include PM₁₀) during construction. These emissions could be significant at the project level, and would also contribute to a cumulative impact. The impact would be reduced to less than significant by including dust control mitigation measure 3.1 as described below.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

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

Mitigation Measure AIR-1:

The following dust control measures shall be included in the project:

- a) Water or alternative dust control method shall be sprayed to control dust on construction areas, soil stockpiles, and staging areas during construction as directed by the County.
- b) Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- c) Paved roads will be swept as needed to remove soil that has been carried onto them from the project site.
- d) Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles dirt, sand, etc.

Mitigation Monitoring:

Mitigation Monitoring AIR-1:

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

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

Comment:

Sensitive receptors include hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas. The project site is located in a built-up urban area along state Highway 12. The nearest receptor would be the residents located on-site during construction. As discussed above, based on the low rate of project emissions and Mitigation Measure AIR-1, the project would not expose residents to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

Mitigation:

This impact would be reduced to less than significant by including dust control measures as described in **Mitigation Measure AIR-1**, above.

Mitigation Monitoring:

See **Mitigation Monitoring AIR-1**, above.

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

Comment:

Construction equipment may generate odors during project construction. The impact would be less than significant as it would be a short-term impact related to construction. The impact would cease upon completion of the project.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

Mitigation Monitoring:

See **Mitigation Monitoring AIR-1**, above.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

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:

Wildlife: The urban build-out over most of the project site limits the habitat value for wildlife. Species found in Sonoma County which are adapted to human presence and disturbance could be found on site including the broad-footed mole (*Scapanus latimanus*), shrews (*Sorex* sp.), gophers (*Thomomys bottae*) and giant salamander (*Dicamptodon ensatus*). A number of migratory song birds may also be present on the site including the house finch (*Carpodacus mexicanus*), western meadowlark (*Sturnella neglecta*), Brewer's blackbird (*Euphagus cyanocephalus*), and various sparrows.

The potential occurrence of habitat for endangered or threatened animals or fully protected animals was evaluated using data records from the most recent California Natural Diversity Database

(CNDDDB) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Spotted Owl Observations Database. In the review of these records, there were not any candidate, sensitive, or special-status wildlife species identified as likely to occur on the project site or in the surrounding area that would be substantially adversely affected by the project.

Vegetation: The site is predominantly built up; vegetation present on the site is ornamental landscaping with scattered trees. Some non-native annual grasses and forbes grow where landscaping and hardscape is not present. No special-status plant species have been reported to the CMDDDB as occurring in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site. The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Online Rare Plant Inventory was searched for records of special-status plant species reported to occur in the region. The areas that would be affected by the Project have been subject to ongoing disturbance, which is reflected in the lack of sensitive species observed at the Project Site, and this disturbance has likely resulted in rendering the Project Site unsuitable for the special-status plant species reported to occur in the region.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1:

1. Prior to issuance of building permits or grading permits, a qualified biologist shall conduct a bird-nesting survey no more than seven days prior to ground-disturbing or vegetation removal activities in a specific construction work area, if such work is to occur between January 15 and September 15. The area to be surveyed shall include all construction activity areas, including staging areas, and soils disposal and stockpiling areas, to a distance of 250 feet outside construction areas. Survey results would remain valid for a period of seven days following the date of the survey.
2. If an active nest is found, consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine the appropriate buffer size and then establish the buffer zone using fencing, pin flags, yellow caution tape, or other CDFW-approved material. Vegetation clearing and construction activities shall be postponed within the buffer zone; no construction-related activity shall be allowed to occur within this area until it is determined that the young have fledged, the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts. A qualified biologist shall regularly monitor the buffer area during construction activities to evaluate the nest(s).
3. If an active nest is found within the survey area after the completion of the preconstruction surveys and after construction activities have begun, all construction activities shall cease immediately until a qualified biologist has evaluated the nest and, if required, an agency - approved buffer zone has been created. If establishment of a buffer zone is not feasible, contact Fish and Wildlife for further avoidance and impact minimization guidelines (e.g., acceptable noise and activity guidelines).

Mitigation Monitoring BIO-1:

If nesting surveys are required and sites are identified, Permit Sonoma staff will not issue permits for ground disturbing and vegetation removal activities until after the site has been surveyed by a qualified biologist to ensure fencing and buffers are in place as appropriate.

- 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:

There are no waterways or riparian areas on site. Most of the landscaping on site is ornamental in nature. Raingardens and detention areas would be incorporated into the project's grading plan. These features serve to help clean water run-off prior to entering the stormwater. The impact on riparian areas and/or sensitive communities would be less than significant.

Oak woodland vegetation communities are protected by state law (Public Resources Code Section 21083.4) and represent an important sensitive natural vegetation community that is relatively common within Sonoma County. Typically, oaks need to occupy at least 20% of the species composition of a continuous stand to be considered an "Oak Woodland." There are some scattered oaks on the project site, however not enough to constitute an oak woodland. The County has two particular provisions that protect valley oak trees. The Tree Ordinance (Municipal Code Sec. 26-88-010(m)) applies to this property however the separate Valley Oak Habitat District (Municipal Code Section 26-67) does not. For further discussion on these local tree preservation policies, see section (e) below.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

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

Comment:

The project site is in a predominantly built up environment and there are not wetlands on the project site. The project would not impact any wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act or those recognized by the State of California.

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:

In addition to regulations protecting special-status bird species (federal and State Endangered Species Acts), most birds in the United States, including non-status species, are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918. Under this legislation, it is unlawful to destroy active nests, eggs, and young. Furthermore, California Fish and Wildlife Code Section 3503.5 makes it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy birds in the Falconiformes (birds of prey, vultures, eagles, falcons) and Strigiformes (owls) families, which can include nest disturbance from construction and other activities.

The Project Site provides suitable foraging habitat for common bird species such as sparrows (*Passeridae* sp.), California scrub jays (*Aphelocoma californica*), and pigeons (*Columbidae*). If birds were to nest in or near the Project site during construction activities, the impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

See Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and Mitigation Monitoring BIO-1 above.

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

Comment:

The Sonoma County Tree Protection Ordinance (Chapter 26, Article 88. Sec. 26-88-010 (m) of the Sonoma County Code) designates trees such as Valley Oaks (*Quercus lobata*) and Coast Live Oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) with protections and mitigation standards for impacts to protected trees. Sherby Sanborn, Consulting Arborist, prepared an arborist report dated May 3, 2018, for the project site. The arborist observed ten oak trees on site, including three Valley Oaks, which would be substantially impacted by the construction of the project. These Valley Oaks and Coast Live Oaks range from 24 to 28-inch diameter at breast height (dbh). As determined by the Tree Protection Ordinance, eight of the

11 trees to be removed have an arboreal value of 28 and would be replaced with eight new 36 inch box replacement Valley Oak trees, as demonstrated in the Planting Plan (Sheet L3.0) of the project application. The project would not conflict with the Tree Ordinance because it would adhere to the replacement requirements by the Tree Protection Ordinance and standard protection measures required by the County to protect retained trees during construction.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

- 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. The project site is not located in an area subject to 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 in §15064.5?**

Comment:

On March 30, 2018, Permit Sonoma staff referred the project application to Native American Tribes within Sonoma County to request consultation under AB-52. The request for consultation ended on April 30, 2018. The Tribes did not request any further consultation. In addition, Evans and De Shazo Archaeology and Historic Preservation Consultants were contracted by the Applicant to conduct a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) of the proposed project parcels. The final report is dated May 17, 2018, and analyzed the 1949 Boyes Springs Food Center, seven cottages (ca. 1935), and a work shed (ca. 1950) located at the project site. The consultant determined that none of the buildings located within the proposed project area meet the eligibility requirements needed for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources. There is a corner "blade" sign that states "Boyes Springs Food Center" which is original to the building and is a recognizable feature of the site and the neighborhood. This original sign would be maintained in its current location.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

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

Comment:

On March 30, 2018, Permit Sonoma staff referred the project application to Native American Tribes within Sonoma County to request consultation under AB-52. The request for consultation ended on April 30, 2018. The Tribes did not request any further consultation. The project site was surveyed by Evans and De Shazo Archaeology Consultants and no archaeological specimens were observed. There are no known archaeological resources on the site, but the project could uncover such materials during construction. A standard condition of approval addresses this potential impact by requiring that the applicant halt work, notify Permit Sonoma Staff and pay any required cost to obtain professional review if sensitive resources are discovered in the course of construction.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

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

Comment:

No burial sites are known in the vicinity of the project, and most of the project site has already been disturbed by past grading activity. However, during site preparation or construction there is a possibility of encountering human remains. If human remains are encountered, work in the immediate vicinity shall be halted and the operator shall notify Permit Sonoma and the Sonoma County Coroner immediately. At the same time, the operator shall be responsible for the cost to have a qualified archaeologist under contract to evaluate the discovery. If the human remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification so that a Most Likely Descendant can be designated and the appropriate measures implemented in compliance with the California Government Code and Public Resources Code.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation:

Mitigation Measure CUL-1:

All building and/or grading permits shall have the following note printed on grading or earthwork plan sheets: "If human remains are encountered, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovered remains and Permit Sonoma Staff and County Coroner must be notified immediately pursuant to State law so that an evaluation can be performed. If the remains are deemed to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted by the Coroner so that a Most Likely Descendant can be designated and the appropriate provisions of the California Government Code and California Public Resources Code would be followed."

Mitigation Monitoring:

Mitigation Monitoring CUL-1:

Building/grading permits shall not be approved for issuance by Permit Sonoma Project Review Staff until the above notes are printed on the building, grading and improvement plans. The applicant shall notify Permit Sonoma if any human remains are discovered. All appropriate measures shall be undertaken, as required.

6. ENERGY

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The proposed project is in a location that currently has electricity and natural gas service. The project would increase the number of dwellings and commercial space and for this reason, would likely increase electricity and natural gas consumption. The project would not use energy in a wasteful manner because it would conform to California Energy Code Title 24. Minimum efficiency standards for household appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment and insulation for doors, pipes, walls and ceilings would ensure that the proposed project would not use energy in a wasteful manner.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

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

Comment:

Construction of the proposed project, due to its scale, would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Significance Level: No Impact

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

Would the project:

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

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

Comment:

The project site is not within a fault hazard zone as defined by the Alquist-Priolo fault maps or depicted in a fault zone on the General Plan Public Safety Element Figure PS-1b: Fault Zone.

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-Rogers Creek, and other faults (General Plan Safety Element Figure PS-1i). 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. Building permits must be obtained for all construction and the project must meet standard seismic and soil test/compaction requirements. The project would therefore not expose people to substantial risk of injury from seismic shaking.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

- 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. The subject property is not identified as having potential for liquefaction in Figure PS-1i: Liquefaction Hazard Area of the General Plan Public Safety Element. Structures within this area do have the potential to experience strong ground shaking during an earthquake, which could result in ground failure or settlement. The Phase I Environmental Study describes soils underlying the site as "Class D" very slow infiltration rates. Soils, include clay, have a high water table, or are shallow to an impervious layer. All structures would be required to meet building permit requirements, including seismic safety standards and soil test/compaction requirements.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

- iv. **Landslides?**

Comment:

The subject property is of minimal slope and is located in Landslide Susceptibility Zone 1 (zero landslide potential) on General Plan Public Safety Element Figure PS-1d. The project is therefore

considered to have a negligible potential for landslides.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

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

Comment:

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

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

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Comment:

The project site is not in a landslide prone or fault zone area but is in an area subject to a high potential for liquefaction and ground shaking. 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. Project conditions of approval require that building permits be obtained for all construction and that the project meet all standard seismic and soil test/compaction requirements. The project would therefore not expose people to substantial risk of injury from seismic shaking.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial 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. For the proposed project, soils at the site have not been tested for their expansive characteristics. Standard Building Code requirements applicable to the construction of this project would ensure that no substantial risks to life or property would be created from soil expansion at the proposed project, even if expansive soils were found on site.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

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 served by public sewer.

Significance Level: No Impact

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The County does not have an adopted Climate Action Plan but has established greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals (Resolution No. 18-0166). The County utilizes the GHG emissions significance thresholds recommended by the Bay Area Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The County concurs that these thresholds are supported by substantial evidence for the reasons stated by BAAQMD staff. For projects other than stationary sources, the GHG significance threshold is 1,100 metric tons per year of CO₂e or 4.6 metric tons of CO₂e per service population (residents and employees) per year. BAAQMD staff's analysis is found in the document titled "Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, October, 2009," which is a publically available document that can be obtained from the BAAQMD website or from the County.

The project applicant provided a GHG emissions analysis report prepared by Gilleran Energy Management from July 30, 2018. The report estimates the project's GHG emissions and compares the result to the BAAQMD threshold of significance for GHG annual emissions. The report found that the unmitigated annual emissions during operation are estimated to be under the BAAQMD thresholds of significance.

Construction: The proposed project would result in the generation and emission of GHGs during construction and operation. Construction would result in GHG emissions from heavy-duty construction equipment, worker trips, and material delivery and hauling. Construction GHG emissions are short term and would cease once construction is complete. Although the BAAQMD has not established thresholds of significance for GHG emissions resulting from construction activities, BAAQMD encourages the incorporation of BMPs to reduce GHG emissions during construction.

According to the Gilleran Report, the estimated maximum annual construction-related emissions would be 316 MTCO₂e. The BAAQMD has not adopted GHG thresholds of significance for construction.

Ongoing Operations: Operation of the proposed project would result in GHG emissions from onsite lighting, heating, refrigeration, and cooling of the proposed building, as well as the treatment and transport of water and wastewater. Additionally, GHGs from operation would result from vehicle trips associated with workers and customers and product delivery to and from the site. Operational GHG emissions are ongoing for the life of the project and for the purposes of this analysis are estimated to be approximately 365 MTCO₂e annually, according to the Gilleran Report.

Total Emissions: The project's cumulative and annual emissions relating to both construction and expected operation would both be less than the BAAQMD operational significance threshold of 1,100 metric tons per year. Therefore the proposed project GHG-related emissions are less than significant. In addition, a standard condition of approval requires the applicant to exceed the 2019 CALGreen + Tier 1 Checklist Requirements by implementing an elective in each category beyond the statutory requirement.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

- 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 established GHG reduction goals (see discussion in 8(a), above). The project, by implementing current County codes would be consistent with local or State plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Would the project:

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

Comment:

Small amounts of potentially hazardous materials could be used during construction, such as fuel, lubricants, and cleaning materials. Proper use of materials in accordance with local, State, and federal requirements, and as required in the construction documents, would minimize the potential for accidental releases or emissions from hazardous materials. This would assure that the risks of the project affecting the human or biological environment would be reduced to a less than significant level. There would be no significant increase in traffic as a result of this project, thus an increase in exposure due to the risks of transporting hazardous materials would not change as a result of the project.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

- b) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

Comment:

See discussion in 9(a) above.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The project site is not within one-quarter mile of a school.

Significance Level: No Impact

- d) **Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

Comment:

Harris and Lee Environmental Sciences, LLC conducted a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment on February 18, 2018, for the project site. The assessment concluded the project site does not currently have or previously had underground storage tanks or stored hazardous materials. There are no known hazardous materials sites within or adjacent to the project limits, based on a review of the following databases on February 16, 2018:

- The State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker database,

- The Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database (formerly known as Calsites), and
- The California Integrated Waste Management Board Solid Waste Information System (SWIS).

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

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

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

There is no separate emergency evacuation plan for the County so the project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with the County's adopted emergency operations plan. In any case, the project would not change existing circulation patterns significantly, and would have no effect on emergency response routes. The project will include improvements to rights of way which will help to improve and maintain roadways which could be utilized in case of evacuation.

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 Areas mapping, Figure PS-1i of the Sonoma County General Plan 2020, the project is not located in an area of high wildfire risk. The project is located in a relatively flat area and surrounded by urban development in a low-lying valley. Construction on the project site must conform to Fire Safe Standards related to fire sprinklers, emergency vehicle access, and water supply, making the impact from risk of wildland fire less than significant.

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 site is located in the Sonoma Creek watershed. The site drains in a southwesterly direction. The project site is not located near the riparian corridor or required setbacks for Sonoma Creek or its tributaries. The site is required to adhere to the State Water Resources Control Board and North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board under the Clean Water Act as impaired for sediment, nutrients, pathogens and temperature.

Permit Sonoma requires the project applicant to prepare a grading and drainage plan in conformance

with Chapter 11 Grading and Drainage Ordinance and Chapter 11a Storm Water Quality Ordinance of the Sonoma County Code and the Sonoma County Storm Water Low Impact Development Guide, all of which include performance standards and BMPs for pre-construction, construction, and post-construction to prevent and/or minimize the discharge of pollutants including sediment from the project site.

Permit Sonoma requires projects implementing Low Impact Development techniques to employ a site design strategy of BMPs that mimics the pre-development site hydrology through features that promote storm water infiltration, interception, reuse, and evapotranspiration. LID techniques include use of small scale landscape-based BMPs such as vegetated natural filters and bio-retention areas (e.g., vegetated swales and rain gardens) to treat and filter storm water runoff. LID also requires preservation and protection of sensitive environmental features such as riparian buffers, wetlands, woodlands, steep slopes, native vegetation, valuable trees, flood plains, and permeable soils.

As a condition of approval, the applicant would be required to submit a final Storm Water Low Impact Development Submittal (SWLIDS) for County review and approval. In addition, the BMPs identified in the SWLIDS would be required to be installed and working properly, prior to issuance of grading or building permits.

Standard County development procedures require that if a cumulative project land disturbance equals or exceeds one acre, the project is required to obtain coverage under the State Water Resource Control Board's General Construction Permit, and is required to provide documentation of coverage to the County prior to issuance of any grading permit for the proposed project.

Application of these standard County and State storm water requirements and County conditions of approval would reduce project storm water runoff impacts to a less than significant level. Also, see the Geology and Soils section for a discussion of standard County erosion control measures.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant 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 would utilize public water served by the Valley of the Moon Water District and would not utilize groundwater. The project would introduce pervious surfaces that support additional groundwater recharge beyond existing conditions.

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 result in:**

i. Substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Any future grading, cuts, and fills would require the issuance of a grading permit. Unregulated grading during construction would have the potential to increase soil erosion which leads to water turbidity and degraded water quality. Prior to grading or building permit issuance, construction details for all water quality BMPs shall be submitted for review and approval by the Grading & Storm Water Section of Permit Sonoma. The construction plans shall be in substantial conformance with the conceptual plans reviewed at the planning permit stage.

The County Grading and Drainage Ordinance and adopted BMPs require installation of adequate erosion prevention and sediment control features. Inspection by County inspectors ensures that BMPs are specifically designed to maintain potential water quality impacts of project construction at a

less than significant level during and after construction.

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

See also, discussion in section 10(a) above.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant 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 proposed project creates 52,422 square feet of new and replaced impervious surface, which could affect the quantity and/or quality of storm water run-off. However, the proposed project has been designed and/or conditioned to prevent and/or minimize the discharge of pollutants and waste after the proposed project is constructed. Conditions of approval require compliance with Sonoma County Low Impact Development regulations and preparation of a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan prior to issuance of grading permits. Application of these standards would reduce impacts from increased surface runoff to a less than significant level.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant 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:

See discussion in Section 10(a) above.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

iv. Impede or redirect flows?

There are no blue line streams on the project site and the parcel is not in the 100-year flood zone or Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). At the time of submitting a grading, drainage, or building permit application, a final drainage report for each parcel must be submitted for review. A typical drainage report would include a project narrative, on and off-site hydrology maps, hydrologic calculations, hydraulic calculations, and pre- and post-development analysis for all existing and proposed drainage facilities. The drainage report shall abide by and contain all applicable items in Permit Sonoma's Drainage Report Required Contents (DRN-006) handout.

Significant Level: Less Than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The proposed project is not subject to seiche or tsunami. The project site is not located in an area subject to seiche or tsunami. Seiche is a wave in a lake triggered by an earthquake. Mudflow can be triggered by heavy rainfall, earthquakes or volcanic eruption. See Comment of landslide in 7(a)(iv) above for areas with high potential for mudflow.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

Construction of the proposed project involves cuts, fills, and other grading. Unregulated grading during construction has the potential to increase soil erosion from a site, which could cause downstream flooding and further erosion, which could adversely impact downstream water quality. Construction grading activities shall be in compliance with performance standards in the Sonoma County Grading and Drainage Ordinance. The ordinance and adopted construction site BMPs require installation of adequate erosion prevention and sediment control management practices. These ordinance requirements and BMPs are specifically designed to maintain water quantity and ensure erosion and siltation impacts are less than significant level during and post construction. There are no blue line streams on the site.

Water drains by sheet flow in a southwesterly direction. Development of the site would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern. Application of a Standard Condition of Approval requiring compliance with the Sonoma County Grading and Drainage Ordinance would adequately address potential drainage impacts.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The project would not physically divide a community. It does not involve construction of a physical structure (such as a major transportation facility) or removal of a primary access route (such as a road or bridge) that would impair mobility within an established community or between a community and outlying areas. The project would temporarily relocate residents off site through certain phases of construction according to the tenant relocation plan discussed in section 14b of this report, however all existing tenants would be offered first right of refusal of the newly built units at comparable sizes and similar rents as their current units.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including in the Sonoma County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The proposed residential, commercial and retail uses are consistent with the proposed General Plan Land Use of Limited Commercial and Medium Density Residential, and with the proposed Planned Community Zoning District.

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 project site is not located within a known mineral resource deposit area (Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan, as amended 2010). The site is located in a developed area. The soil on the site is not considered to be of statewide significance.

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 located within an area of locally important mineral resource recovery site and the site is not zoned MR (Mineral Resources). 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:

The proposed project includes both noise generating (commercial/retail) and noise sensitive (residential) uses. An Environmental Noise Assessment was prepared for the project and is used as the basis for this analysis (Ilingworth & Rodkin, Inc. May 9, 2018.) The proposed project would result in the construction of multi-family housing near a state highway. The project will be conditioned such that noise will be controlled in accordance with Sonoma County noise standards. Below are the findings of the report and mitigation measures that would lower the exposure of residences in the proposed apartments and townhomes to less than significant levels.

The project will be conditioned such that noise shall be controlled in accordance with Table NE-2 (or an adjusted Table NE-2 with respect to ambient noise as described in General Plan 2020, Policy NE-1c,) as measured at the exterior property line of any affected residential or sensitive land use:

General Plan TABLE NE-2: Maximum Allowable Exterior Noise Exposures

Hourly Noise Metric ¹ , 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 (4 minutes 48 seconds in any hour)	60	55
L02 (72 seconds in any hour)	65	60

¹ The sound level exceeded 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. The L02 is the sound level exceeded 72 seconds in any hour.

Adjusted TABLE NE-2 per Sonoma County General Plan Policy NE-1c (3) Maximum Allowable Exterior Noise Exposures exceeding ambient level by 10 or more decibels at the property line of the nearest sensitive receptor

Hourly Noise Metric ¹ , dBA	Daytime ² (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.)	Nighttime ² (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.)
L50 (30 minutes in any hour)	45	40
L25 (15 minutes in any hour)	50	45
L08 (4 minutes 48 seconds in any hour)	55	50
L02 (72 seconds in any hour)	60	55

¹ The sound level exceeded 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. The L02 is the sound level exceeded 72 seconds in any hour.
² Adjusted for proposed use exceeding ambient level by 10 or more decibels at the property line of the nearest sensitive receptor. Reduction of Table NE-2 by 5 dBA

Adjusted TABLE NE-2 per Sonoma County General Plan Policy NE-1c (2) Maximum Allowable Noise Exposures consisting primarily of speech and music

Hourly Noise Metric ¹ , dBA	Daytime ² (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.)	Nighttime ² (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.)
L50 (30 minutes in any hour)	50	45
L25 (15 minutes in any hour)	55	50
L08 (4 minutes 48 seconds in any hour)	60	55
L02 (72 seconds in any hour)	65	60

¹ The sound level exceeded 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. The L02 is the sound level exceeded 72 seconds in any hour.
² Adjusted for speech and music. Reduction of Table NE-2 by 5 dBA

General Plan Policy NE-1c (3) provides that if the proposed use exceeds the ambient noise level by 10 or more decibels then reduce the applicable standards in Table NE-2 by 5 decibels. Similarly, General Plan Policy NE-1c (2) reduces the applicable standards in Table NE-2 by five dBA for simple tone noises, noises consisting primarily of speech or music.

The noise analysis identified the project use areas and the sensitive noise receptors, which consists mainly of neighboring residences. The primary noise source affecting the project site and sensitive noise receptors is vehicular traffic on Highway 12. The noise consultants conducted a noise monitoring survey over a 47-hour period between Wednesday, February 7, and Friday, February 9,

2018, to quantify the existing noise levels at the project site. The first long-term noise monitoring station was located on a tree trunk approximately 30 feet from the centerline of the roadway across Highway 12 and 12 feet above ground level. Sound levels at this location represent the approximate setback of the proposed commercial and retail uses on the site from Highway 12.

The report demonstrates that levels at the site follow a diurnal pattern characteristic of traffic noise, with the average daytime noise levels ranging from 66 to 74 dBA L_{eq} and the average nighttime noise levels ranging from 57 to 72 dBA L_{eq} . The Day/Night Average Noise Level (L_{dn}) over the 47-hour measurement period at LT-1 was 74 dBA. Under current conditions, the facade of the proposed mixed use building (apartments and commercial) would be exposed to an L_{dn}^3 of 74 dBA.

The second long-term noise monitoring station was located on a utility pole 12 feet above ground level at the southwest corner of Calle Del Monte and First Avenue. This measurement location was approximately 20 feet from the centerline of Calle Del Monte and 280 feet to the centerline of Highway 12, and had a clear line of sight to both roadways. Sound levels at this location represent the approximate noise exposure to the proposed townhomes on the eastern portion of the site. The noise level at that monitoring site, where the proposed townhomes would be built, also follows the same diurnal pattern characteristic of traffic noise, with the average daytime noise levels ranging from 54 to 64 dBA L_{eq} and the average nighttime noise levels ranging from 44 to 57 dBA L_{eq} . The Day/Night Average Noise Level (L_{dn}) over the 47-hour measurement period was calculated to be 61 dBA.

The future noise conditions would continue to result primarily from traffic along Highway 12. Based on projected traffic volumes on Highway 12 the 2040 average is expected to raise by 1dBA. Exterior noise levels of the proposed residential and commercial facades along Highway 12 would be as high as 75 dBA L_{dn} and all portions of the site with a clear view of Highway 12 being exposed to an L_{dn} of 60 dBA or greater under future conditions.

Noise generated by this project from project-generated traffic would not result in a substantial increase in noise. This project would introduce additional noise sensitive residential uses which would be constructed in accordance with the following mitigation measures which would reduce exposure to exterior noise levels to levels consistent with General Plan noise standards.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation:

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1: The following measures are required to reduce traffic noise impacts on the interior of the proposed development to maximum acceptable levels:

Townhomes. Interior noise levels shall be maintained below 45 dBA L_{dn} . The Townhomes must be constructed using windows and doors with a minimum Sound Transmission Class of 28 and must use an adequate forced air mechanical ventilation system in each residential unit.

Grocery and Mixed Use Building. Interior noise levels shall be maintained below 45dba L_{dn} . The following building materials shall be used for the exterior surfaces of the proposed buildings:

- Cement Plaster over Plywood Sheathing at both the refurbished Grocery Building and the two-story portion the mixed-use building facing Highway 12.
- High Pressure Laminate panels over Plywood Sheathing at the three-story portion at the rear of the Mixed Use Building; and a mix of Hardipanel Vertical Siding over sheathing for the Townhome buildings.
- STC 34 rated windows will be needed at the second level residences in the mixed use and refurbished grocery buildings closest to Highway 12.

- STC 28 rated windows will be needed at the second level residences in the Mixed Use and refurbished grocery buildings not adjacent to Highway 12, the third level mixed-use building residences in the refurbished grocery building.
- Standard thermal insulating windows, which typically achieve an STC rating of 24 to 26, will be acceptable at all other residences.

Mitigation Monitoring NOISE-1:

Building/grading permits for ground-disturbing activities shall not be approved for issuance by Project Review staff until the above mitigation are printed on applicable building, grading and improvement plans. The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about building material requirements.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-2: The following mitigation measure is required to mitigate potential noise impacts related to traffic noise exposure on exterior common outdoor use areas of the Mixed Use building, the 3rd floor decks of the six-townhome building, and the outdoor use areas of the double townhome building:

1. A solid perimeter fence/railing of this upper floor outdoor use area deck of the mixed-use building should be built to a height of 42 inches (3 feet 6 inches) above the use area surface.
2. A solid perimeter fence/railing of the decks at the six townhome building should be built to a height of 36 inches (3 feet) above the deck surface.
3. These barriers must be built without cracks or gaps in the face or large or continuous gaps at the base and have a minimum surface weight of 2.5 lbs. per sq. ft.

Mitigation Monitoring NOISE -2

Building/grading permits for ground-disturbing activities shall not be approved for issuance by Project Review staff until the above mitigation are printed on applicable building, grading and improvement plans. The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about building material requirements.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-3

Interior areas of commercial buildings shall attenuate noise to meet a 50dBA standard. Storefront glazing shall be constructed with a minimum STC rating of 26.

Mitigation Monitoring NOISE-3

Building/grading permits for ground-disturbing activities shall not be approved for issuance by Project Review staff until the above mitigation are printed on applicable building, grading and improvement plans. The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about building material requirements.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-4:

Construction activities for this project shall be restricted as follows:

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

- a) All internal combustion engines used during construction of this project would be operated with mufflers that meet the requirements of the State Resources Code, and, where applicable, the Vehicle Code. Equipment shall be properly maintained and turned off when not in use.
- b) Except for actions taken to prevent an emergency, or to deal with an existing emergency, all construction activities shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays and 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. If work outside the times specified above

becomes necessary, the applicant shall notify the Permit Sonoma Project Review Division as soon as practical.

- c) There will be no start-up of machines nor equipment prior to 7:00 a.m., Monday through Friday or 9:00 am on weekends and holidays; no delivery of materials or equipment prior to 7:00 a.m. nor past 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday or prior to 9:00 a.m. nor past 5:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays and no servicing of equipment past 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, or weekends and holidays. A sign(s) shall be posted on the site regarding the allowable hours of construction, and including the developer- and contractors mobile phone number for public contact 24 hours a day or during the hours outside of the restricted hours.
- d) Construction maintenance, storage and staging areas for construction equipment shall avoid proximity to residential areas to the maximum extent practicable. Stationary construction equipment, such as compressors, mixers, etc., shall be placed away from residential areas and/or provided with acoustical shielding. Quiet construction equipment shall be used when possible.
- e) The developer shall designate a Project Manager with authority to implement the mitigation prior to issuance of a building/grading permit. The Project Managers 24-hour mobile phone number shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site. The Project Manager shall determine the cause of noise complaints (e.g. starting too early, faulty muffler, etc.) and shall take prompt action to correct the problem.

Mitigation Monitoring NOISE-4:

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

Mitigation Monitoring NOISE- 1 through 4:

Permit Sonoma Project Review Division staff shall ensure compliance with project mitigations as part of condition review and project monitoring. Any noise complaints will be investigated by Permit Sonoma staff. If noise complaints are received from nearby residents, and they appear to be valid complaints in Permit Sonoma's opinion, then the applicant shall conduct a Noise Study to determine if the current operations meet noise standards and identify any additional noise Mitigation Measures if necessary. A copy of the Noise Study shall be submitted to the Project Review Health Specialist within sixty days of notification from Permit Sonoma that a noise complaint has been received. The owner/operator shall implement any additional Mitigation Measures needed to meet noise standards. (Ongoing)

b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Comment:

The project includes construction activities that may generate minor ground borne vibration and noise. These levels would not be significant because they would be short-term and temporary, and would be limited to daytime hours. There are no other activities or uses associated with the project that would expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. Ground borne vibration from construction would be mitigated under Mitigation Measure NOISE-4.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant 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 site is not within an airport land use plan as designated by Sonoma County and there are no known private airstrips within the project area.

Significance Level: No Impact

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The project would include 37 total units of housing where there are currently 12 units. This is estimated to accommodate an additional population of 52 people (22 new housing units x 2.36 persons per household). The project is within the projected population growth of the county's General Plan and is therefore less than significant.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

This project would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because it would not permanently eliminate any existing residences or residents. This project would result in a net increase of dwelling units which would be built out in phases to allow residents to move into the new available units as they are completed, and minimize the need to relocate existing residents off site. Existing residents who would be temporarily displaced by construction activity would be housed by the developer within proximity of the project site.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

This project would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because it would not permanently eliminate any existing residences or residents. This project would result in a net increase of dwelling units which would be built out in phases to allow residents to move into the new available units as they are completed, and minimize the need to relocate existing residents off site. Existing residents who would be temporarily displaced by construction activity would be housed by the developer within proximity of the project site.

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:

Construction of the project would not involve substantial adverse physical impacts associated with provision of public facilities or services and the impact would be less than significant.

The proposed project would not alter response times or cause an increase in service to the Boyes Springs area.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

i. Fire protection?

Comment:

The CalFire Protection District will continue to serve this area. There would not be a significant increase in the need for fire protection resulting from the project.

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

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

ii. Police?

Comment:

The Sonoma County Sheriff will continue to serve this area. The project is within the projected population growth of the County's General Plan and there would not be a significant increase in the need for police protection resulting from the project.

Significance Level: No Impact

iii. Schools?

Comment:

The project would provide 25 additional housing units which is within the projected population growth of the county's General Plan. This would not contribute to a significant increase in the need for expanded or additional schools. School impact fees would be required to be paid by the applicant to pay for school facilities needed to serve the additional population.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

iv. Parks?

Comment:

This project would not contribute to population growth or increase in park facility usage beyond that anticipated in the General Plan. Furthermore, the proposed project includes a public facing pedestrian promenade that would be maintained in perpetuity by the commercial landowner and the Home Owners Association. Park impact fees would be required to support park facilities that would serve

the additional population.

Significance Level: No Impact

v. Other public facilities?

Comment:

The project is a commercial/residential/visitor-serving use which would not contribute to an increase in the need for expanded or additional public facilities.

Significance Level: No 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:

The proposed project would not involve activities that would cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of parks or recreational facilities. The project would create additional housing units which may increase the use of neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities but due to minimal scale of the project and the contribution of required park fees, the project would not contribute to any substantial physical deterioration of local facilities. In addition, the site will provide an improved public sidewalk and outdoor seating area fronting the Highway 12 corridor.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant 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 construction of recreational facilities. See item 16(a) above.

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:

A Traffic Study for the project prepared by DKS, Transportation Engineers (August 2018) determined that the project would not cause a significant traffic impact to the studied intersections of Highway 12 and the side streets of Vallejo Avenue, Arroyo Road, Calle del Monte, and Thomson Avenue. The report found that the existing study intersections currently meet County operational standards. Furthermore, the report determined that pedestrian and transit facilities were adequate to serve the project site given its location and anticipated demand.

The proposed development is expected to generate approximately 30 (15 in and 15 out) AM peak hour trips and 38 total (23 in and 15 out) PM peak hour trips. The proposed land uses are not

expected to generate any additional heavy vehicles in the AM or PM peak hours because the generated trips consist of residents and customers. Any potential truck traffic, such as commercial deliveries, would likely occur outside of the peak AM and PM commuter periods. Therefore, the same heavy vehicle percentages as the existing conditions were assumed. All the study intersections meet the operating standards for the project scenarios.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

b) **Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

Comment:

Sonoma County does not have a congestion management program but LOS standards are established by the Sonoma County General Plan Circulation and Transit Element. In addition, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority adopted the Comprehensive Transportation Plan: Moving Forward 2014. All intersections would operate at or better than General Plan Standards in the Future plus Project condition.

The proposed development involves removing 7 existing single-family homes, 3 apartments and 2 studios and adding 8 townhomes, 29 multifamily units, 2,000 square feet of commercial space, and a 2,000 square foot restaurant. The 3,000 square foot refurbished convenience store would remain on the site. The development would have two access points, one located on the south side of Arroyo Road and the second along the north side of Calle del Monte.

The proposed development is expected to generate approximately 30 (15 in and 15 out) AM peak hour trips and 38 total (23 in and 15 out) PM peak hour trips. The proposed land uses are not expected to generate any additional heavy vehicles in the AM or PM peak hours because the generated trips consist of residents and customers. Any potential truck traffic, such as commercial deliveries, would likely occur outside of the peak AM and PM commuter periods. Therefore, the same heavy vehicle percentages as the existing conditions were assumed.

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:

The project would not increase hazards, since it maintains the existing alignment of the roadway and since improvements to the adjacent right-of-way would be done in consistency with standards of the County of Sonoma Department of Transportation and Public Works.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

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

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 5030.1(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 § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

Comment:

The project site is not listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and is not a significant cultural resource identified by the County.

On March 30, 2018, Permit Sonoma staff referred the project application to Native American Tribes within Sonoma County to request consultation under AB-52. The request for consultation ended on April 30, 2018. The Tribes did not request any further consultation.

In addition, Evans and De Shazo Archaeology and Historic Preservation Consultants were contracted by the Applicant to conduct a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) of the proposed project parcels (final report dated May 17, 2018). No archaeological specimens were observed and none of the buildings located within the proposed project area meet the eligibility requirements needed for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources.

There are no known archaeological resources on the site, but the project could uncover such materials during construction. A standard condition of approval addresses this potential impact, which would reduce the impact to a significance level of less than significant.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant 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, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Comment:

The project is located within an urban service area on a site that is served by existing utilities. The project would not result in the relocation or construction of new electric, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities. The project would use water supplied from the Valley of the Moon Water

District through existing water lines on site. The project would incorporate bio-retention facilities to capture and treat storm water runoff and would utilize new pervious surfaces to increase groundwater recharge. Any design or modifications to the existing water system and/or wastewater system would need to be submitted for County review and approval and would be subject to existing Best Management Practices as discussed in Section 10 of this document.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The project is not located in a water scarce area. Sufficient water would be provided by the Valley of the Moon Water District; which has provided a will-serve letter.

Significance Level: No 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 project is located in one of the County's General Plan-designated urban service areas, and within the boundaries of the Sonoma Valley Sanitation District. The Sonoma County Water Agency has identified existing deficiency in the capacity of the sewer in the area that would serve this project. In a report prepared by Adobe Associates Inc. entitled "Sewer Analysis for Boyes Food Center (July 12, 2019)" a sewer pipeline upstream from the proposed project was identified as having significant inflow and infiltration during wet weather events. The Sonoma County Water Agency has determined that adequate capacity is available if the existing pipeline is replaced or repaired to eliminate extraneous infiltration.

Significance Level: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation Measure UTL-1: The pipeline identified in the report entitled "Sewer Analysis for Boyes Food Center," as prepared by Adobe Associates Inc. is required to be repaired or replaced to eliminate significant inflow and infiltration during wet weather events.

Mitigation Monitoring UTL-1. Prior to building occupancy, the applicant shall provide a letter from Sonoma Water to the Permit Sonoma Stormwater Division, confirming that the proposed replacement or repair has been completed in accordance with the Sonoma County Water Agency requirements to offset new flows from the project.

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

Comment:

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

Sonoma County has access to adequate permitted landfill capacity to serve the proposed project.

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:

According to the Sonoma County General Plan (Figure PS-1g, Wildland Fire Hazard Areas), the parcel is located in a Sonoma County Local Fire Protection Response Area (LRA) that is not a designated fire hazard severity zone and is not adjacent to a State Fire Protection Response Area.

- a) **Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

Comment: There is no separate emergency evacuation plan for the County. The proposed project would not result in a significant change in existing circulation patterns and would have no effect on emergency response routes.

Significance Level: No 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: The project is located within a level area with no heightened wildfire risk and would not expose project occupants to elevated pollutant concentrations from wildfire or exacerbate the spread of 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 of that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**

Comment: The project would utilize existing roads and power lines. The new buildings and structures would need to be connected to existing utilities.

Significance Level: No 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: This project is in a level area and not within the immediate vicinity of an area with elevated landslide risk or other post-fire slope instability or similar post-fire hazard.

Significance Level: No 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?**

Comment:

As demonstrated by this environmental checklist, the project with the proposed mitigation measures and monitoring identified in other sections of this initial study would not have any direct or indirect adverse effects that would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Mitigation measure have been included where necessary to reduce any potential impacts related to these items to less than significant levels.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant 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)?**

Comment:

The proposed project is consistent with the County’s General Plan land use designation for the site. Mitigation measure have been included where necessary to reduce any potential impacts related to these items to less than significant levels. The project does not have the potential to create impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project’s cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The project has the potential to result in adverse impacts to humans due to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geological, hydrological, and noise. With implementation of those mitigation measures set forth above, the project would have less than a significant environmental effect that would directly or indirectly impact human beings onsite or in the project vicinity. In addition to those mitigation measures set forth herein, the development project would be conditioned to achieve County standards with respect to fire safety and drainage. Building and improvement plans would be reviewed to ensure compliance with applicable building codes and standards. With implementation of mitigation measures, the project does not present potentially significant impacts that may have an adverse effect upon human beings, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts with the incorporation of all recommended mitigations.

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant Impact

References

1. Sonoma County Important Farmland Map 1996. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
2. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines; Bay Area Air Quality Management District; April 1999; California Air Resources Board (CARB) <http://www.arb.ca.gov/>
3. California Natural Diversity Database, California Department of Fish & Game. <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/data/cnddb>
4. Permit Sonoma, Sonoma County General Plan 2020 (as amended), September 23, 2008. <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Long-Range-Plans/General-Plan/>
5. California Environmental Protection Agency Cortese List <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/corteseList/default.htm>
6. California Regional Water Quality Control Board <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/>
7. California Dept. of Toxic Substances Control http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese_list.cfm
8. Integrated Waste Management Board - <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp>
9. Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones; State of California; 1983. http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/official_release.aspx
10. Flood Insurance Rate Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency <https://msc.fema.gov/portal>
11. Special Report 120, California Division of Mines and Geology; 1980. ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_120/SR_120_Text.pdf
12. General Plan Environmental Impact Report, Sonoma County Permit & Resource Management Department. <http://www.sonoma-county.org/prmd/gp2020/gp2020eir/index.htm>
13. Standard Specifications, State of California Department of Transportation, available online: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specs_html
14. Tree Protection Ordinance, County Code Section 26-88-010(m) https://library.municode.com/ca/sonoma_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CH26SOCOZO_RE_ART88GEEXSPUSST_S26-88-010GEUSPREX.
15. Manual of Standards for Erosion and Sediment Control Measures, Association of Bay Area Governments; May, 1995.
16. Soil Survey of Sonoma County, California, Sonoma County, U.S. Department of Agriculture; 1972. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_MANUSCRIPTS/california/sonomaCA1972/sonomaCA1972.pdf
17. Evaluation of Groundwater Resources, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118; 2003. <http://water.ca.gov/groundwater/bulletin118/publications.cfm>
18. Sonoma County Congestion Management Program, Sonoma County Transportation Authority; December 18, 1995.
19. Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan and Program EIR, 1994.

20. Sonoma County Bikeways Plan, Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, August 24, 2010.
21. Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department and Department of Transportation and Public Works Traffic Guidelines, 2014
22. Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, Visual Assessment Guidelines.
23. Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department Noise Guidelines, 2017
24. Sonoma County Water Agency, Sonoma Valley Groundwater Management Plan, 2007 and annual reports. <http://www.scwa.ca.gov/svgw-documents/>
25. Sonoma County Water Agency, Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Management Plan, 2014. http://www.water.ca.gov/groundwater/docs/GWMP/NC-5_SRP_SonomaCoWaterAgency_GWMP_2014.pdf
26. UC Davis Interactive Soils Map. <https://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/gmap/>
27. Tree Report for Boyes Food Center. Sherby Sanborn Consulting Arborist, May 3, 2018.
28. Boyes Springs Food Center Mixed Use Redevelopment GHG Emissions Analysis. Gilleran Energy Management, July 30, 2018.
29. Boyes Food Center Redevelopment Transportation Impact Analysis. DKS Transportation Engineers, August, 2018.
30. Environmental Noise Assessment. Illingworth & Rodkin Inc. May 9, 2018.
31. Visual Assessment, Prepared by TLCD Architecture, May, 2019.
32. Historic Resource Evaluation. Evans & De Shazo Archaeology, May 17, 2018.
33. Archaeological Resources Study. Evans & De Shazo Archaeology, April 26, 2018
34. Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. Harris and Lee Environmental Sciences LLC, February 16, 2018.
35. Water Conservation Plan. TLCD Architecture.
36. Water Will Serve Letter. Valley of the Moon Water District, February 28, 2018.
37. Sewer Analysis for Boyes Springs Food Center. Adobe Associates Inc. July 12, 2019.
38. Project Plans