



Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration

Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Phone: (707) 565-1900 · Fax: (707) 565-1103

Publication Date: July 21, 2022
Public Review Period: 30 days
State Clearinghouse Number:
Permit Sonoma File Number: PLP21-0014
Prepared by: Cecily Condon at
Phone: (707) 565-1958

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

Project Name: Glen Ellen Inn Modification
Project Applicant/Operator: Christian Bertrand
Project Location/Address: 13670 Arnold Dr. & 5465 O'Donnell Ln., Glen Ellen, CA 95442
APNs: 054-290-008 & -009
General Plan Land Use Designation: RVSC & LC
Zoning Designation: K, F2 LG/GE1 RC50/50 SR & LC, LG/GE1 RC50 SR
Decision Making Body: Sonoma County Board of Supervisors
Appeal Body: None
Project Description: See Project Description, below

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		No
Cultural Resources	CUL	Yes	
Energy	EN		No
Geology and Soils	GEO	Yes	
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 and Traffic	TRAF	Yes	
Tribal Cultural Resources	TCR	Yes	
Utility and Service Systems	UTL		No
Wildfire	WFR		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.

Table 2 list the agencies and other permits that will be required to construct and/or operate the project. Leave this section out if there are no permits required.

Table 2.

Agency	Activity	Authorization
State Water Resources Control Board	Generating stormwater (construction, industrial, or municipal)	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requires submittal of NOI

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING:

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



Digitally signed by Cecily Condon
DN: cn=Cecily Condon, o=Permit
Sonoma, ou=Planning,
email=cecily.condon@sonoma-
county.org, c=US
Date: 2022.07.21 13:58:20 -07'00'

7/21/2022

Prepared by: Cecily Condon

Date



County of Sonoma
Permit & Resource Management Department

Initial Study

Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
Phone: (707) 565-1900 · Fax: (707) 565-1103

I. INTRODUCTION:

Christian Bertrand proposes a Use Permit to replace a restaurant with three more guest rooms for the existing Glen Ellen Inn at the corner of Arnold Drive and Odonnell Lane. A zone change and amendment to the land use designated by the general plan are also required to accommodate the project. A referral letter was sent to the appropriate local, state and federal agencies and interest groups who may have an interest to comment on the project.

This report is the Initial Study required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The report was prepared by Cecily Condon, Project Review Planning Manager with the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, Project Review Planning Division. Information on the project was provided by Christian Bertrand (owner and applicant), Kate Estudillo from Tierney/Figueiredo Architects, and David Brown from Adobe Associates, Inc. (engineering and land surveying firm). All documents related to this application are available for review at the Permit and Resource Management Department (Permit Sonoma) or on the County's website at: <http://www.sonoma-county.org/prmd/divpages/projrevdiv.htm>

Please contact Cecily Condon, Planner, at (707) 565-1958, for more information.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes 1) a Use Permit modification to expand the Glen Ellen Inn by converting the existing restaurant to two new guest rooms, a new check-in and lounge area, and to also expand building D to add a new guest room, for a total of three new guest rooms; and 2) a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change on APN 054-290-009 to change the land use and zoning from LC (Limited Commercial) to RVSC (Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial) land use and K (Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial) zoning on a 0.32 acre and 0.22 acre parcel, to be merged by a subsequent Voluntary Merger. The end result would be a property with a 10-bedroom hotel (2 ADA-compliant) with an average size of 396 sq. ft. per unit, 150 sq. ft. of existing bar area, related lobby and operational areas within the main building, outdoor areas, and 15 parking spaces (6 compact, 6 standard, and 3 ADA). The height of the main building, which is the one fronting Arnold Drive and containing the existing bar and proposed two guest rooms; will remain as 24 feet from the lowest point, as only windows and doors are proposed as exterior improvements to the existing building. Building D, which is only visible through Odonnell Lane, is proposed to be expanded to accommodate one additional guest room; it will reach a maximum height of 22 ft. and will match the design of the existing buildings on-site. The existing ADA parking space adjacent to Arnold Drive will be relocated a few feet to the south in order to accommodate a bus stop.

The site is currently two assessor's parcels. The parcel on the west contains the existing lodging facilities,

and the east parcel contains the restaurant with bar and related areas. The western parcel has the zoning and land use designation of Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial district, which allows the establishment and operation of a hotel with a use permit. The eastern parcel has the zoning and land use designation of Limited Commercial district, which does not allow a hotel. The zone change and land use amendment would result in both parcels having the Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial district designations and K zoning. Upon the conversion of the restaurant space to hotel rooms, a bar would remain, which is conditionally allowed in the Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial district.

Proposed construction includes the Building D expansion, internal remodel of the main building and external addition of doors and windows, new hardscape area, concrete walking path and bike racks over previous parking spaces no longer required. Calabazas Creek crosses the property on its western portion. Construction will occur not closer than 70 ft. from the top of bank, outside of the 50 ft. riparian corridor setback. The parcels are also located within a Scenic Resources combining district, since Arnold Drive is identified as a scenic corridor; which imposes a setback of 30% of the depth of the lot to a maximum of 200 ft. on most new construction. Besides replacing matching doors and windows on the existing main building, the only new construction proposed for this project is the expansion of Building D, which would be located about 100 ft. from Arnold Drive, representing a compliant setback over 40% of the depth of the entire property. Furthermore, the site is entirely within the Glen Ellen Development and Design Guideline Subarea I (LG/GE1), which requires that built environment maintains and enhance Glen Ellen's unique and small town character. The only proposed building addition will be constructed following the design and colors of the other structures on the property; therefore, the project complies with the Glen Ellen local guidelines.

PROJECT SITE AND SURROUNDING LANDS:

The ± 0.55-acre project site is located at the northwest side of the Arnold Drive and Odonnell Lane intersection, approximately 150 feet south of the intersection of Arnold Drive and Warm Springs Road, and about 0.8 miles south from Highway 12. The site is mostly level with gentle sloping down from east to west, and a defined creek bank at Calabazas Creek along the western boundary of the parcel. The property is bordered to the north and west with single-family residences, across Odonnell Lane to the south by a restaurant, and across Arnold Drive to the east by a wine tasting room and retail shops.

The site contains five buildings in total and are all part of the existing operation (four lodging and one restaurant with bar). There are multiple trees, walking pathways and parking spaces across the property. The site is located in a Class 3 groundwater availability area, but the proposed project will maintain its service by Valley of the Moon Water District, and sewer provided by Sonoma County Water Agency.

Existing Uses: The property is currently being operated by the applicants as the Glen Ellen Inn, which consists of a restaurant with bar and seven guest units.

Topography: The subject property has minimum slope with an elevation of 240 ft. mean sea level on most of the property, which is a drop of approximately 10 ft. from Arnold Drive within the property's easternmost 30 ft. The Calabazas Creek that runs across the site on the western side has a defined bank with a grade change sloping downward from 240 ft. msl to about 225 ft. msl.

Drainage: The site is relatively level with slopes less than 5% as the site is already developed with structures, pavement and drainage inlets across the property.

Vegetation: There are multiple trees, bushes and flower plants across the property; none of which are proposed to be removed.

Proposed Buildings and Uses: The project consists of the continued operation, as modified of the Glen Ellen Inn, including a hotel with a bar open to the public:

The existing hotel will increase its guest units across five existing buildings from seven to ten units totaling 3,961 sq. ft. of area. Building "D" will be extended by adding one unit. The hotel will replace its existing 880 sq. ft. restaurant area with two units, but will retain 1,159 sq. ft. of lobby and bar area, which will be open also for non-guests of the hotel. There is also approximately 1,500 sq. ft.

of communal outdoor areas in the forms of gravel and concrete patio, deck and enclosed decks. An office and storage area is located on the lower floor of the main building, the only two-story building on-site.

Employees: Two full-time employees.

Hours of Operation: The inn check-in lobby and bar area will be open daily from 3:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Parking: 15 spaces total (10 for hotel guests, 3 for bar guests, 2 for employees, and 1 bonus) including 3 ADA, 6 standard, and 6 compact spaces.

Design Style: The project existing buildings are cottage-style, a mix of Craftsman and Mediterranean architectural styles, which is consistent with the Glen Ellen town design guidelines. The buildings are covered with a warm yellow stucco, details in white and dark reds. Some stone bricks accentuate corners and edges on the buildings, and a couple of stone planters front Arnold Drive. The buildings use vegetation in the form of trees, shrubs, and flowers to complement their style. The building addition and remodel will follow the existing design on-site, and will not require any building demolition.

Access: All access and egress for vehicles will be from Odonnell Lane at the southern side of the property. The site also has one ADA parking spot adjacent to Arnold Drive, which will be relocated from its current position a few feet to the south in order to make room for a bus stop and circulation. The relocated parking spot will remain adjacent to the property.

Sewage Disposal: The site will maintain its sewage disposal service provided by Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District, through a connection under Odonnell Lane.

Water supply: The site will maintain its water supply service provided by Valley of the Moon Water District.

Landscape: Landscaping will remain as existing, with multiple adult trees, native vegetation, and ornamental species complementing the architectural design of the structures.

III. SETTING

The site is located within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area and will maintain its service by the Valley of the Moon Water District. The site is developed, and located in the heart of the town of Glen Ellen. The property is surrounded by single family residences to the west and north. Retail shops and cafes are found to the east and south. The western side of the site includes a portion of Calabazas Creek. No development is proposed within the riparian corridor 50-ft. setback.

IV. ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC OR AGENCIES

A referral packet was circulated to inform and solicit comments from selected relevant local, state, and federal agencies; and to stakeholder groups that were anticipated to take interest in the project. No comments were received other than noting that agency regulations and standards must be met.

V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would have the impact described, but the impact would

not be significant. Mitigation is not required, although the project applicant may choose to modify the project to avoid the impacts.

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

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

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

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

1. AESTHETICS:

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

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

Comment:

The project is within an area designated as visually sensitive by the Sonoma County General Plan, due to its location fronting Arnold Drive, a designated Scenic Corridor in the County. The purpose of County scenic corridors is to preserve the visual character of lands in the county and to implement the provisions of Section 2.3 of the general plan open space element. Said section sets policies for new construction on parcels within a scenic corridor, including establishing a special setback of 30 % depth of the parcel to a maximum of 200 ft. The only new construction proposed at this developed site is the expansion of Building D, which would be located about 100 ft. from Arnold Drive, representing a compliant setback over 40% of the depth of the entire property. Furthermore, the site is entirely within the Glen Ellen Development and Design Guideline Subarea I (LG/GE1), which requires that built environment maintains and enhance Glen Ellen's unique and small town character. The only proposed building addition will be constructed following the design and colors of the other structures on the property; therefore, the project complies with the Glen Ellen local guidelines. The site is not located on a scenic hillside, nor would it involve tree removal, construction or grading that would affect a scenic vista. Using the County of Sonoma's Visual Assessment Guidelines, the project site's sensitivity is High, because it is within a zoning designation protecting scenic corridors. The project's visual dominance is Subordinate, because it will be minimally visible from public view, and will repeat the form of the existing buildings and surrounding landscape. Using these guidelines, and as the project is designed, the impact is less than significant because the project is subordinate in a high sensitivity area for visual impacts.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

Arnold Drive intersects scenic State Highway 12; however, the project site is located approximately 0.8 miles south of the intersection. Therefore, there is no impact on to the closest State scenic highway.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project is located in an area designated as urbanized by the US Census, and is not in conflict with applicable local requirements governing scenic quality. The site is already developed with inn cottages, main building (which includes restaurant, bar, and lobby area), paved parking lot, and associated improvements. The site is surrounded by trees and built-environment of similar design. The planned remodel and addition to building "D" will be similar in design to the existing buildings on-site. Given the context of surrounding development, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would degrade the visual character of the area. Furthermore, the only remodel visible from the scenic corridor of Arnold Drive is the addition of windows and doors on the northern face of the main building, which is mostly covered by existing trees on that side. The design of the proposed improvements were reviewed by staff, and they are found to be acceptable due to their design being in harmony with the environment on-site and in the vicinity.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The improvements will introduce minimal new sources of light and glare. Lighting from inside the new guest rooms may affect nighttime views on both Arnold Drive and Odonnell Lane. No new exterior light sources are proposed at this time; however, per County Policy and Glen Ellen design guidelines, any new exterior light source has to be dark sky compliant, fully shielded and directed downward. Likewise, Glen Ellen design guidelines discourages aluminum frames for doors and windows, to reduce glare. Therefore, impacts from glare and night lighting will be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:

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

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The parcel is not designated as Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the Important Farmland maps. It is designated as Urban Lands reflecting the existing use of the site. There are already a considerable number of small parcels and lack of significant agricultural operations in the area.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project site is not included in a Williamson Act contract.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

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

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

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

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

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

Significance Level: No Impact

3. AIR QUALITY:

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

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The project is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 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 will not conflict with the District's air quality plans because the proposed use is below the emission thresholds for ozone precursors (see Comment in 3(b) below).

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The project is expected to generate less traffic, as the existing use of restaurant will be replaced with three new lodging units. The project will have no long-term effect on fugitive dust, as most of the site is already developed. However, there could be a short-term emission of dust (which would include PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) during construction. These emissions would be less than significant with BAAQMD's recommended dust control measures.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

Mitigation Measure AIR-1:

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

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

Mitigation Monitoring AIR-1:

Dust control measures shall be listed on all grading, building or improvement plans prior to issuance of grading or building permits.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Comment:

Sensitive receptors include hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas. The nearest sensitive receptors to the construction area are residences adjacent to the north of the site. Although there will be no long term increase in emissions, during construction there could be significant short term dust emissions that would affect nearby residents. Dust emissions can be reduced to less than significant by implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 described in item 3(b) above.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

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

Comment:

The project is not an odor-generating use, nor located near an odor-generating source that may affect the use, and would have no odor impact. Construction equipment may generate odors during project construction. The impact would be less than significant as it would be a short-term impact that ceases upon completion of the project.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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:

The project proposes additions to a developed site within an urbanized area. Consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the United States Fish and Wildlife Services was made via project referral. No comments were received from either agency. Furthermore, Permit Sonoma own in-house Biologist accessed the California Natural Diversity Database and found no special status species within 0.5-mile radius of the proposed disturbed area.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

All blueline streams shown on the USGS maps are designated for protection in the Sonoma County General Plan. Streamside Conservation Areas have been established in the riparian corridor overlay zone to protect riparian habitat. Removal of vegetation must comply with General Plan and Riparian Corridor Ordinance policies that govern riparian corridors for a distance of 50 feet from the top of bank. In compliance with these policies, the project-related construction is outside the required setback. Therefore, the project has a less than significant impact on the riparian area.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The site is developed and adjacent to Calabazas Creek; however, no work is proposed near the creek. There are no wetlands in the area of the proposed construction.

Significance Level: Less than Significant 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:

The project site includes a riparian corridor containing the seasonal Calabazas Creek. No work is proposed within the riparian corridor buffer measured from top of bank, reducing impacts to salmon and migratory fish to a less than significant level.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The project would require the removal and relocation of a couple trees; however, these trees are not the County-endorsed special trees of *Quercus lobata* (Valley Oaks).

Significance Level: No Impact

- f) **Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan?**

Comment:

There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plans within the project area.

Significance Level: No Impact

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Background

Before the European settlement, the Pomo, Miwok, and Kashaya Indians inhabited what is today Sonoma County. In 1812, the Russians established the short-lived Fort Ross along the coast north of the Russian River. Further east, the Sonoma Mission was established during the Mexican period in 1823. Shortly afterwards, Sonoma became the county's first town, a pueblo, under General Mariano Vallejo. During that time, sections of the county were transformed into vast land-grant ranchos, such as Vallejo's holdings that extended from today's Petaluma to the town of Sonoma. Most of the construction during the first half of the nineteenth century was adobe and wood. These construction methods drew on the Mexican tradition while incorporating some of the features and floor plans of the Anglo Americans.

After statehood, logging along the coast hills, cattle ranching, wheat and potato farming, and the early development of the wine industry supported the sparsely settled county. During this time, commercial and industrial buildings used local stone or brick, while most residences were built of wood. During the 1860s to the 1890s, Petaluma, at the head of navigation on the Petaluma Creek, enjoyed rapid economic growth that fueled the construction of [its] downtown with sophisticated iron-front commercial buildings and elegant residences nearby.

Later the railroads facilitated the movement of goods and people leading to the establishment of processing plants and factories along the rail lines.

Around the turn of the century, the Russian River developed as a vacation resort, a destination for those in the San Francisco Bay Area. During this time, Santa Rosa also enjoyed an increase in population and importance as the center of finance and county government. Until World War II, the poultry industry, the processing of local fruit, and the production of hops sustained the economy throughout the county. In 1935, Sonoma County ranked tenth in the nation in overall agricultural production.

During the first half of the twentieth century, many of the stylish buildings were designed by local architects such as Brainerd Jones in Petaluma and William Herbert in Santa Rosa. After World War II, Clarence Caulkins and J. Clarence Felciano worked on many projects in the county. With reference to residential,

commercial, and industrial architecture, many of the towns still retain excellent examples of both high style and vernacular building examples from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Today the southwestern part of the county continues to support cattle grazing and dairy farms. Toward the north many of the ranches and orchards have been replaced with acres of vineyards and thriving winery operations that rival Napa County. Over the years many of the poultry farms, fruit growers, and dairy operations have relocated to the Central Valley or sold their businesses completely. In their place, small specialty farms and ranches now operate sustainable and organic endeavors. Dotting the countryside throughout the county are modern residences where rural homesteads used to be. The Russian River area still caters to vacationers, but on a smaller scale, and the cities along the freeway continue to expand to provide housing and services with new subdivisions, business parks, and strip-mall shopping centers.

With 467,000 residents, the county has doubled its population since 1980. Part of the challenge has been to retain its agricultural and small-town character while providing for the livelihood of the expanding population. Related to this is the specific challenge of encouraging new development that complements both the physical beauty of the countryside and the county's rich heritage (Hurley 2020).

State Regulations

CEQA requires that a lead agency determine whether a project could have a significant effect on historical resources and tribal cultural resources (PRC Section 21074 [a][1][A]-[B]). A historical resource is one listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR, PRC Section 21084.1), a resource included in a local register of historical resources (PRC Section 15064.5[a][2]), or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (PRC Section 15064.5[a][3]).

If a project can be demonstrated to cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts to permit any or all these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that resources cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (PRC, Section 21083.2[a], [b], and [c]).

Impacts to significant cultural resources that affect the characteristics of any resource that qualify it for the NRHP or adversely alter the significance of a resource listed in or eligible for listing in the CRHR are considered a significant effect on the environment. These impacts could result from physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5 [b][1]). Material impairment is defined as demolition or alteration in an adverse manner [of] those characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion or eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5[b][2][A]).

California Public Resources Code

Section 5097.5 of the California PRC states:

No person shall knowingly and willfully excavate upon, or remove, destroy, injure or deface any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, archaeological or vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints, inscriptions made by human agency, or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands. Violation of this section is a misdemeanor.

As used in this PRC section, "public lands" means lands owned by or under the jurisdiction of the State or any city, county, district, authority, or public corporation, or any agency thereof. Consequently, local agencies are required to comply with PRC 5097.5 for their own activities, including construction and maintenance, as well as for permit actions (e.g., encroachment permits) undertaken by others.

Codes Governing Human Remains

The disposition of human remains is governed by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and PRC sections 5097.94 and 5097.98 and falls within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). If human remains are discovered, the county coroner must be notified within 48 hours, and there should be no further disturbance to the site where the remains were found. If the coroner determines the

remains are Native American, the coroner is responsible to contact the NAHC within 24 hours. Pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98, the NAHC will immediately notify those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native Americans so they can inspect the burial site and make recommendations for treatment or disposal.

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

Comment:

As the site is developed and not designated HD, no historical resource is expected to be found within the project site. The structures on the site associated with the current inn use established in 2000 will not be demolished or altered on the exterior.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

There are no known archaeological resources on the already developed site, but the project could uncover such materials during construction. As a standard condition of approval the proposed project would be required to comply with Section 11-14-050 of the Sonoma County Grading Ordinance which establishes uniformly applied development standards to reduce the potential for impact to cultural resources to a less than significant level by requiring that all work be halted in the vicinity where human remains or archaeological resources are discovered during construction grading and drainage and that the Director of Permit Sonoma and the County Coroner be notified to ensure compliance with state law regarding the proper disposition of human remains, including those identified as Native American. Similarly, if archaeological resources or suspected archaeological resources are discovered, the Director of Permit Sonoma shall notify the State Historic Preservation Office and Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University and the permittee shall retain a qualified archeologist to evaluate the find to ensure proper disposition of the archaeological resources or suspected archaeological resources. The Director shall provide notice of the find to any tribes that have been identified as having cultural ties and affiliation with the geographic area in which the archaeological resources or suspected archaeological resources were discovered, if the tribe or tribes have requested notice and provided a contact person and current address to which the notice is to be sent. The Director may consult with and solicit comments from notified tribes to aid in the evaluation, protection, and proper disposition of the archaeological resources or suspected archaeological resources. Archaeological resources may include historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, pottery, arrowheads, midden, or culturally modified soil deposits. Artifacts associated with prehistoric ruins may include humanly modified stone, shell, bone, or other cultural materials such as charcoal, ash, and burned rock indicative of food procurement or processing activities. Prehistoric domestic features may include hearths, fire pits, or floor depressions; mortuary features are typically represented by human skeletal remains.

Permit Sonoma staff referred the project application to locally affiliated Native American Tribes within Sonoma County to request consultation under AB-52 and SB-18. The resulting mitigation measure requires tribal monitoring of ground disturbance in native soils (Mitigation Measure TCR-1), which will help prevent impacts on unknown archaeological resources during the construction of the project.

Mitigation Measure TCR-1 would reduce the project's potentially significant impacts on unknown potential onsite archaeological resources to less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation:

See Mitigation Measure TCR-1 and Mitigation Monitoring TCR-1 in Subsection 18.b.

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

Comment:

No burial sites are known within the project boundary, and most of the project site has already been disturbed by past construction. Mitigation measure TCR-1 would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

6. ENERGY:

Would the project:

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

Comment:

Short-term energy demand is associated with the project construction activities. Construction energy usage would include vehicle trips for workers and vendors, and off-road construction equipment usage. Long-term, operational energy usage for the hotel would include vehicle trips of employees and guests, electricity for lighting, water conveyance and climate control, and natural gas usage. Similarly, the residential operational energy usage would include vehicle trips for residents and visitors, electricity for lighting, water conveyance and climate control, and natural gas usage.

Energy consumption for project construction would primarily be in the form of gasoline and diesel fuels. Standard conditions for minimization of idling would be applied to the project and would also reduce the overall fuel consumption (AIR-1). Due to the relatively small size of the project, construction would not be expected to result in a significant impact for demand on Bay Area fuel suppliers. Impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project would increase energy consumption relative to existing conditions in Sonoma County. However, this increase in energy usage would not represent a substantial increase, nor would it be inefficient because of the energy efficiency requirements required by the California Building Code and since the project is a minor expansion of the existing inn use and removal of a restaurant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The proposed project would comply with Sonoma County Ordinance 7D2-1, which pertains to energy efficiency, and Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations, Building Energy Efficiency Standards.

Significance Level: Less than Significant 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.**

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

Comment:

The project site is not within a fault hazard zone as defined by the Alquist-Priolo fault maps, and is approximately 4.9 miles northeast from the nearest known 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-Rodgers Creek, and other faults. By applying geotechnical evaluation techniques and appropriate engineering practices, potential injury and damage from seismic activity can be diminished, thereby exposing fewer people and less property to the effects of a major damaging earthquake. The design and construction of new structures are subject to engineering standards of the California Building Code (CBC), which 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. The following mitigation measures will ensure that potential impacts are reduced to less than significant levels.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation:

Mitigation Measure GEO-1:

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

Mitigation Monitoring GEO-1:

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

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

Comment:

Strong ground shaking can result in liquefaction, the sudden loss of shear strength in saturated sandy material, resulting ground failure. The project site is located within a low to very high liquefaction hazard area according to the Sonoma County General Plan 2020 public safety element. Therefore, the

property has the potential to experience liquefaction and settlement during a seismic event. All structures will be required to meet building permit requirements, including seismic safety standards and soil test/compaction requirements. Implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1, above would reduce any impacts to less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

iv. Landslides?

Comment:

Steep slopes characterize much of Sonoma County, particularly the northern and eastern portion of the County. Where these areas are underlain by weak or unconsolidated earth materials landslides are a hazard. If the project includes structures located in the footprint of a mapped landslide or within a landslide hazard area building or grading could destabilize slopes resulting in slope failure. The project would be located in a Class 0 Landslide Hazard Area according to the General Plan Public Safety Element, Figure PS-1d. This area is characterized as having no slopes and weak rocks. Therefore, the project site would not be susceptible to landslides. All structures will be required to meet building permit requirements, including seismic safety standards and soil test/compaction requirements. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 above would reduce any impacts to less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

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

Comment:

The project includes minor grading to accommodate a 503 sq. ft. unit; which requires the issuance of grading and/or building permits meeting code requirements. The new unit would be situated on top of already disturbed ground, therefore there is no risk for substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

The project site is already developed, and virtually all ground were previously disturbed. However, as mentioned above, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 will help prevent a significant impact.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

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:

The project site is already developed, and there is no evidence of the soil being unstable. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1, combined with conformance with standard CBC and other applicable State and local regulations (all of which shall be required as conditions of approval for the project), potential hazards from expansive soils would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

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 will be served by public sewer for disposal of wastewater.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

Paleontological resources include fossil remains, and fossil localities and rock or soil formations that have produced fossil material. The site soil has already been disturbed; however, the new construction of a 503 sq. ft. unit may uncover paleontological resources. Mitigation Measure GEO-2 below will help prevent a significant impact on this area.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation Measure GEO-2:

If paleontological resources are found, all earthwork in the vicinity of the find shall cease, and Permit Sonoma staff shall be notified so that the find can be evaluated by a qualified paleontologist. When contacted, a member of Permit Sonoma project review staff and paleontologist shall visit the site to determine the extent of the resource and to develop proper mitigation measures required for the discovery. No further grading in the vicinity of the find shall commence until a mitigation plan is approved and completed subject to the review and approval of the paleontologist and project review staff.

Mitigation Monitoring GEO-2:

Permit Sonoma shall be consulted if a paleontological resource is discovered onsite, and shall review and approve paleontologist-recommended measures to recover or preserve any data or paleontological resources before ground-disturbing activities may continue.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

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

Comment:

The project site currently generates GHG emissions due to the existing use of a 7-unit inn and a restaurant with a bar. The project proposal is to close down the restaurant and add 3 more lodging units. The change in use is anticipated to produce similar or less GHG emissions than the current use. Therefore, the project would not generate substantial GHG emissions directly or indirectly that may have a significant impact on the environment, after construction.

The project requires limited construction to accommodate the three new lodging units, which would result in GHG construction emissions. However, construction emissions are not anticipated to be substantial due to the scope of the project. After construction, which could take a few months, the GHG emissions average would be expected to be lower than with the existing restaurant use.

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. The project, by implementing current county codes would be consistent with local or state plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.

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:

Construction of the project, as well as ongoing maintenance over time, may involve the intermittent transport, use and disposal of potentially hazardous materials, including fuels and lubricants, paints, solvents, and other materials commonly used in construction and maintenance. During construction activities, any on-site hazardous materials that may be used, stored, or transported would be required to follow standard protocols (as determined by the U.S. EPA, California Department of Health and Safety, and Sonoma County) for maintaining health and safety.

Construction may involve short-term transport, storage, and use of hazardous materials, but the roads and infrastructure do not propose any long-term operations that would require routine or ongoing transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials beyond periodic maintenance needs. These normal activities would be subject to applicable local, State, and federal regulations.

Operational use of any hazardous substances that may be generated, stored, transported, used, or disposed would be subject to applicable local, State, and federal regulations. These operational activities would be unlikely to involve routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or result in hazardous emissions. With existing General Plan policies and federal, State and local regulation and oversight of hazardous materials, the potential threat to public health and safety or the environment from hazardous materials transport, use or disposal would represent a less than significant impact.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

During construction there could be spills of hazardous materials, see Item 9(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The project site is not located within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school.

Significance Level: No Impact

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

Comment:

There are no known hazardous materials sites within or adjacent to the project limits.

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:

The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with the County's adopted emergency operations plan. There is no separate emergency evacuation plan for the County. The project would not change existing circulation patterns significantly, and would have no effect on emergency response routes.

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:

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

According to the Wildland Fire Hazard Area map (Figure PS-1g) in the Sonoma County General Plan, the project site is located in a Local Responsibility Area, and is not designated as a Fire Hazard Severity Zone. It is near to a pocket of a Moderate Severity Zone to the west. A Moderate and High Severity are also located approximately 500 feet to the northeast of the site on the east side of Highway 12. Moderate Severity Zones are generally located in grasslands and valleys, away from significant forested or chaparral wildland vegetation. Projects located in High and Very High Fire Severity Zones are required by state and county code to have a detailed vegetation management plan developed and reviewed by the Sonoma County Fire Prevention Division before a building permit can be issued. This requirement does not apply to projects located in an urban unclassified Zone, such as the project site.

In addition, project construction activities could increase risk of wildland fire to existing residents near the project site. The construction of the hotel project could expose people or structures to increased fire hazards due to project construction activities and conversion of the presently undeveloped area to an area with increased human activity, with increased possibility of starting a fire.

As a project condition of approval, construction on the project site must comply with the Fire Safe Standards within the Sonoma County Fire Safety Ordinance No. 6184 (Sonoma County Code Chapter 13), including but not limited to, fire sprinklers, emergency vehicle access, and water supply on-site. The proposed project is not located in a High or Very High Wildland Fire Hazard Area and would comply with all Fire Safe Standards. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires and 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 groundwater quality?**

Comment:

The project is within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area and the project will connect to the Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District. Wastewater is treated by the District wastewater treatment plant. This facility has adequate capacity for the project and operates in compliance with Conditions of Waste Discharge issued by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Sonoma County requires the project applicant to prepare a grading and drainage plan (Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plan) in conformance with Chapter 11 (Construction 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 Best Management Practices for pre-construction, construction, and post-construction to prevent and/or minimize the discharge of pollutants, including sediment, from the project site. A final Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) shall be submitted with the grading permit application, and be subject to review and approval by the Grading & Storm Water Section of Permit Sonoma prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits. SUSMP features must be installed per approved plans and specifications, and working properly prior to finaling the grading permit and associated building permits. Required inspections by Permit Sonoma staff ensure that all grading and erosion control measures are constructed according to the approved plans.

All of the above ordinance requirements and adopted best management practices are specifically designed to maintain potential water quality impacts at a less than significant level during and post construction.

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:

Groundwater usage is not proposed as part of the project. Water to the project will maintain its current supply by the Valley of the Moon Water District. The District obtains water from the Russian River under contract with Sonoma County Water Agency and local groundwater production. Therefore, the project will not have a significant impact on groundwater supplies in the project vicinity.

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, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

- i. **would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

Comment:

The Calabazas Creek traverses the property along the western property boundary, then the site is relatively flat, and it slopes upwards on the eastern portion by approximately 10 feet. Stormwater from the new building area will remain draining through the existing storm drain system running through the parking lot. No grading is proposed within the riparian corridor.

Construction of the proposed project involves minor 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 Best Management Practices (BMPs) require installation of adequate erosion prevention and sediment control management practices. These ordinance requirements and BMPs are specifically designed to maintain water quantity and ensure erosion and siltation impacts are less than significant level during and post construction.

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

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 offsite;

Comment:

The project would result in an increase in the amount of impervious surface area on the project site by less than 200 sq. ft. Post-construction storm water best management practices would be utilized to maintain current storm water run-off. Standard conditions of approval require compliance with Sonoma County Low Impact Development (LID) regulations and preparation of a Final Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan prior to issuance of grading permits. Application of these standards will reduce impacts from increased surface runoff to a less than significant level.

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; or

Comment:

As discussed in 10(ii), above, the proposed project has been designed and conditioned to maintain the current rate of storm water run-off from the site.

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

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

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

iv. impede or redirect flood flows?

Comment:

The floodplain on the site is contained within the banks of Calabazas Creek, as determined by the Sonoma County Water Agency and topographic mapping. No structures are located within a flood hazard area and therefore no development would impede or redirect flood flows.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

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. According to Figure PS-1e of the General Plan, the project site is outside of the 100-year Flood Hazard Area. Although Calabazas Creek traverses the site along the western property boundary, the floodplain is contained within the creek, and no structures are located within 50 feet of the creek bank.

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

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

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

As discussed above, the project will maintain its municipal water service by the Valley of the Moon Water District, and would not have a significant impact on groundwater supplies in the project vicinity.

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. The project development does not involve construction of a physical structure (such as a major transportation facility) or removal of a primary access route (such as a road or bridge) that would impair mobility within an established community or between a community and outlying areas.

Significance Level: 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, include a change in land use and zoning from Limited Commercial to Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial 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 land use and zoning designations of Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial "K" allow the uses of lodging and bars. Currently the project site involves two separate but adjacent parcels. The western parcel is already designated K, and the eastern parcel is proposed to have its zoning changed and land use amended to also be K. The proposed change in land use and zoning, and use of the property altogether from an inn with a restaurant to an inn with a bar would comply with General Plan policies for a land use change.

Significance Level: No Impact

12. MINERAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

- a) **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

Comment:

The project site is not located within a known mineral resource deposit area (Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan, as amended 2010). Sonoma County has adopted the Aggregate Resources Management Plan that identifies aggregate resources of statewide or regional significance (areas classified as MRZ-2 by the State Geologist). Consult California Geologic Survey Special Report 205, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the North San Francisco Bay Production-consumption region, Sonoma, Napa, Marin, and Southwestern Solano Counties, California (California Geological Survey, 2013).

Significance Level: 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) (Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan, as amended 2010 and Sonoma County Zoning Code). 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 project will not introduce new operations to the site; it solely proposes to replace the current restaurant use by expanding the lodging operation, which would expect to have a similar or lower level of the existing noise on-site.

Furthermore, the operation will be conditioned to conform to the limits established by the County General Plan, located in the Noise Element Table NE-2 as shown below.

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.		

During construction, there is the potential for a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity. Mitigation measure NOISE-1 below will help prevent a significant impact for this section.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1:

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

- a) All internal combustion engines used during construction of this project will be operated with mufflers that meet the requirements of the State Resources Code, and, where applicable, the Vehicle Code. Equipment shall be properly maintained and turned off when not in use.
- 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 7:00 p.m. and motorized equipment shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays. All construction activities shall be restricted to the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. Construction activities shall be limited to non-motorized activities on Sundays and holidays, and motorized equipment shall be limited to the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. If work outside the times specified above becomes necessary, the applicant shall notify Permit Sonoma's 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 Saturdays; 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 7:00 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) Pile driving activities shall be limited to 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. weekdays.

- e) 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.
- f) Utilize reduced noise air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists. Sound blankets, shrouds, shields, or mufflers shall be used for loud operations, air compressors, or mechanical equipment wherever feasible. Construction workers' radios volume will be reduced to a point where they are not audible at existing residences bordering the project site.
- g) The developer shall designate a Project Manager with authority to implement the mitigation prior to issuance of a building/grading permit. The Project Manager will notify neighbors located adjacent to the construction site of the construction schedule in writing. 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-1:

Permit Sonoma's Project Review Division staff shall ensure that the measures are listed on all site alteration, grading, building or improvement plans, prior to issuance of grading or building permits. Permit Sonoma staff shall inspect the site prior to construction to assure that the signs are in place and the applicable phone numbers are correct. Any noise complaints will be investigated by Permit Sonoma staff.

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

Comment:

The project includes construction activities that may generate minor ground borne vibration and noise. Standard mitigation to minimize groundborne vibration will be applied to the project; therefore, the impact from groundborne vibration would be less than significant with standard mitigation measures.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation Measure NOISE-2:

Construction activities for this project shall be restricted as follows:

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

- a) Place operating equipment on the construction site as far as possible from vibration sensitive receptors.
- b) Use smaller equipment to minimize vibration levels below the limits.
- c) Minimize use of vibrating rollers. Avoid using vibratory rollers and tampers near sensitive areas.
- d) Modify/design or identify alternative construction methods to reduce vibration levels below the limits.
- e) Avoid dropping heavy objects or materials near shared property lines.

Mitigation Monitoring NOISE-2:

Same as NOISE-1 above.

- 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.

Significance Level: No Impact

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The project would not include any construction of homes, or substantial businesses or infrastructure and therefore would not induce substantial population growth.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

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

Significance Level: No Impact

15. PUBLIC SERVICES:

Would the project:

- a) **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 project will include three additional lodging units, replacing a restaurant. The project would employ two full time employees. The project is within the projected population growth of the County's General Plan and would not require or facilitate construction of new public facilities.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

- i. **Fire protection?**

Comment:

The Sonoma Valley Fire Rescue Authority will continue to serve this area. There will be no increased need for fire protection resulting from the project.

Sonoma County Code requires that all new development meet Fire Safe Standards (Chapter 13). The County Fire Marshal will ensure that the expansion comply with Fire Safe Standards during the building permit review process, including fire protection methods such as sprinklers in buildings, new fire hydrants, 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 would not require or facilitate construction of new public facilities.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

iii. Schools?

Comment:

The project would not impact schools, or require or facilitate the construction of them.

Significance Level: No Impact

iv. Parks?

Comment:

The project would not impact parks, or require or facilitate the construction of them.

Significance Level: No Impact

v. Other public facilities?

Comment:

Connection fees for sewer and water services offset potential impacts to these service facilities within their respective spheres of influence, for projects that are consistent with the General Plan. Ongoing development and maintenance costs for services are provided in the form of fees or parcel tax. Existing sewer and water facilities are adequate for the changes on-site. The project is consistent with the General Plan and expanded facilities are not necessary to accommodate the project.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

16. RECREATION:

Would the project:

- a) **Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

Comment:

The project is replacing a restaurant with three additional lodging units for the existing inn. As a result, there may be an increase in park usage by people visiting from outside of the community. Since the

inn expansion is only by three units, it is not expected for the project to have a significant impact on the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

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 include, nor does it require construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Customers are invited to enjoy the existing amenities in the community and its vicinity including the vast offering for open space, wineries and others.

Significance Level: No Impact

17. TRANSPORTATION:

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The project involves replacing an existing restaurant by expanding an existing 7-unit inn to include 3 additional units. The project is expected to reduce traffic in the area, and the current transportation infrastructure is adequate.

An Engineer from the County's Department of Transportation and Public Works (TPW) reviewed the project proposal, visited the site with the Applicants and the Project Planner, and suggested to modify the project to improve the County Transit bus stop fronting the site. The applicants agreed to the proposal, and redesigned the frontage of the property by moving the existing ADA-compliant parking space a few feet to the south in order to make space for a bus to safely stop outside of Arnold Drive's lane. TPW recommended approval of the project subject to conditions of approval, which were accepted by the Applicants.

No additional facilities are required by the project, which could have a significant impact on the project.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

New state law also requires evaluation of a project's impact on added Vehicle Miles Travels (VMT). The County is currently developing guidelines to adopt these new regulations. The project is replacing a restaurant with three inn units. The changes are expected to reduce trips caused by the operations on-site, and therefore VMT impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

The project would not increase hazards, since it maintains the existing alignment of the roadway; it will

permanently improve circulation by making space for a safe bus stop as discussed in item 17(a) above.

Hazards to drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians could occur during construction activities. This temporary construction-related impact will cease upon project completion, and the following mitigation will reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation Measure TRAF-1:

Traffic safety guidelines compatible with Section 12 of the Caltrans Standard Specifications, "Construction Area Traffic Control Devices" shall be followed during construction. Project plans and specifications shall also require that adequate signing and other precautions for public safety be provided during project construction.

Mitigation Monitoring TRAF-1:

Site visit by staff or photographs as evidence will have to be provided during construction, showing compliance with the measure is attained.

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: Less than Significant Impact

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

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:

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

Comment:

As discussed in Section 5 above, no historical resource is expected to be found within the developed site. The structures on the site associated with the current inn use established in 2000 will not be demolished or altered on the exterior. Permit Sonoma staff referred the project application to Native American Tribes within Sonoma County. No requests for consultation were received during the AB-52 notice, likely since the site is already developed. Additionally, Section 11-14-050 of the Sonoma County Grading Ordinance established uniformly applied development standards to reduce the potential for impact to previously unknown/undiscovered cultural resources during project construction to a less than significant level by requiring that all work be halted in the vicinity where human remains or archaeological resources are discovered. There is a possibility for tribal cultural resources to be found on-site during the construction of the new unit, and therefore the standard mitigation measure TCR-1 will be implemented. This mitigation measure is also found in the project's conditions of approval.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

See Mitigation Measure TCR-1 in Subsection 18.b. below

- b) **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:

On June 25, 2021, Permit Sonoma staff referred the project application to Native American Tribes within Sonoma County to request consultation under Assembly Bill 52 (AB-52). The request for consultation period ended June 28, 2021, and no requests for consultation were received.

Then, on March 15, 2022, an invitation to consult under Senate Bill 18 (SB-18) was sent to Sonoma County tribes. One tribe, requested consultation within the 90-day period under SB-18. On May 9, 2022, Permit Sonoma staff met virtually with Tribal representatives for consultation. The accepted Mitigation Measure TCR-1 includes the requisite to have a Tribal Monitor present onsite to monitor all project-related ground disturbing construction activities.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation

Mitigation:

Mitigation Measure TCR-1:

A Tribal Monitor from a culturally affiliated Tribe, or in the event a tribal monitor is not available an archaeological monitor shall be retained to be on site to monitor all project-related ground disturbing construction activities (i.e., grading, excavation, potholing, etc.) within previously undisturbed soils. In the event the Tribal Monitor identifies tribal cultural resources, the monitor shall be given the authority to temporarily halt construction in the immediate vicinity and within 50 feet of the discovery and to determine if it is a tribal cultural resource under CEQA in consultation with Permit Sonoma and, if necessary, the qualified archaeologist. Construction activities can continue in areas 50 feet away from the find and not associated with the cultural resource location. If the discovery proves to be significant, additional work such as testing or data recovery may be warranted. Any resources found should be treated with appropriate dignity and respect. At the completion of monitoring activities, all artifacts of Native American origin shall be returned to the culturally affiliated tribe through the tribal monitor.

Mitigation Monitoring TCR-1:

Prior to issuance of building or grading permits, the applicant shall provide appropriate agreements with a culturally affiliated Tribe, or if unavailable an archaeological firm to Permit Sonoma for review and approval. Mitigation Measure TCR-1 shall be listed as a note on all grading and building plan sheets submitted for permitting. Prior to final inspections and use permit certificate issuance the applicant shall provide documentation in writing including photos demonstrating that the mitigation was implemented during construction activities.

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 site is located in an urbanized area and served by existing utilities. As such, the project would not result in the relocation or construction of new electric, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities.

Domestic wastewater disposal will continue to be provided by the Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District. Wastewater generated by the proposed project would be conveyed to the Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District Wastewater Treatment Plant, located south of the Sonoma Skypark Airport. The treatment plant has a dry weather design capacity of 2,700,000 gallons per day, and the proposed project would be estimated to not produce a significant amount more of wastewater, if any, due to the replacement of the restaurant with three inn units.

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 will maintain its water supply from the Valley of the Moon Water District. The project referral was sent to the district, and no comments were received. Water service to the project site will be maintained subject to standard district fees and requirements.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

Refer to response for 19(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment:

Sonoma County has an existing solid waste management program 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, which may see a reduction in solid waste levels due to the change in use.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

20. WILDFIRE:

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.

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

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

Comment: 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 flat topographic 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 will trigger minor construction on a developed lot in the middle of an urban area. Connection to services such as electricity and water already exists.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Comment:

As discussed in section 9(g) above, the proposed project is not located in or near a state responsibility area, or land classified as very high fire severity zone. The project meets access requirements for emergency vehicles, and is connected to a municipal water supply. The project would utilize existing roads and power lines. The new unit addition would need to be connected to existing utilities. The project is not located on sloping land or include project components that would exacerbate fire risk. Wildfire risk impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Comment:

Potential project impacts on special status plant and fish/wildlife species and habitat are addressed in Section 4. Due to the scope of a low-scale project within a developed site located in an urbanized area, the impact to this topic would be a less than significant level. Potential adverse project impacts to cultural resources are addressed in Section 5. Implementation of the required mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure CUL-1) would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

- 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:

No project impacts have been identified in this Initial Study that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. The project would contribute with minimal impacts due to the changes in the already developed site, which may be cumulative off-site, but mitigations would reduce project impacts to less than significant levels.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

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

Comment:

Proposed project operations do not have the potential to cause substantial adverse impacts on human beings, both directly and indirectly. All potential impact and adverse effects on human beings (resulting from air quality, noise, traffic) were analyzed, and would be less than significant with the mitigations identified in the Initial Study incorporated into the project.

Significance Level: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

References:

1. Sonoma County Important Farmland Map 1996. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
2. Assessor's Parcel Maps, County of Sonoma.
3. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines; Bay Area Air Quality Management District; April 1999; California Air Resources Board (CARB): <http://www.arb.ca.gov/>
4. California Natural Diversity Database, California Department of Fish & Game: <http://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Maps-and-Data>
5. Permit Sonoma, Sonoma County General Plan 2020 (as amended); September 23, 2008.
6. California Environmental Protection Agency: <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/corteseList/default.htm>
7. California Regional Water Quality Control Board: <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/>
8. California Dept. of Toxic Substances Control: http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese_list.cfm
9. Integrated Waste Management Board: <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp>
10. Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones; State of California; 1983: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/official_release.aspx
11. Flood Insurance Rate Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal>
12. 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
13. General Plan Environmental Impact Report, Sonoma County Permit & Resource Management Department: <http://www.sonoma-county.org/prmd/gp2020/gp2020eir/index.htm>
14. Standard Specifications, State of California Department of Transportation: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/specs_html
15. American National Standard for Tree Care Operations – Tree, Shrub, and Other Woody Plant Maintenance – Standard Practices, Pruning (ANSI A300 (Part 1)-2008 Pruning), American National Standard Institute (ANSI) and National Arborist Association (NAA), 2008.
16. Best Management Practices: Tree Pruning, International Society of Arboriculture (ISA), 2008.
17. Valley Oak Protection Ordinance, County Code Section 26-67; Sonoma County, December 1996.
18. Heritage or Landmark Tree Ordinance, County Code Chapter 26D; Sonoma County.
19. Manual of Standards for Erosion and Sediment Control Measures, Association of Bay Area Governments; May 1995.
20. 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

21. Evaluation of Groundwater Resources, California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118; 2003:
<http://water.ca.gov/groundwater/bulletin118/publications.cfm>
22. Sonoma County Congestion Management Program, Sonoma County Transportation Authority;
December 18, 1995.
23. Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan and Program EIR, 1994.
24. Sonoma County Bikeways Plan, Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department,
August 24, 2010.
25. Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department and Department of Transportation
and Public Works Traffic Guidelines, 2014.
26. Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, Visual Assessment Guidelines.
27. Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department Noise Guidelines, 2017.
28. Sonoma County Water Agency, Sonoma Valley Groundwater Management Plan, 2007 and annual
reports: <http://www.scwa.ca.gov/svgw-documents/>
29. 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