

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2022100452

Project Title: Creekwood Housing Development Project

Lead Agency: City of Petaluma

Contact Name: Olivia Ervin

Email: oervin@cityofpetaluma.org

Phone Number: 707-778-4556

Project Location: Petaluma, Sonoma County

City

County

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

The proposed Creekwood Housing Development Project (project) includes demolition of the on-site residence at 280 Casa Grande Road, retention of the existing residence at 270 Casa Grande Road, and development of 62 new residential dwelling units and associated improvements. The new units would be constructed across three blocks (Blocks 1, 2, and 3). Block 1 units would be arranged in tri-plex configurations. Units within Blocks 2 and 3 would primarily be arranged in duet unit configurations. Each dwelling unit would include semi-private or private yard areas. In addition, the project would include construction of various on-site road and utility improvements, landscaping, and a new off-site public multi-use pathway, with a pedestrian bridge connection over Adobe Creek.

The project requires City approval of a Vesting Tentative Parcel Map, Site Plan and Architectural Review, and a Tree Removal Permit. In addition, the project is expected to require FEMA approval of a Conditional Letter of Map Revision CLOMR, CDFW approval of a 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement, and RWQCB approval of NPDES Phase II MS4.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

Bio - potential S impact on special-status plant and animal species, with MM 4.1-1 - MM 4.1-6 that require special-status species surveys, as well as avoidance, protection, and actions to protect habitat and species, impacts reduced to LTS; potential S impact on riparian habitat or other Sensitive Natural Community, with MM 4.1-7a-c LTS; potential S on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.), with MM 4.1-8a and b reduced to LTS; potential S due to conflict with local policies or ordinance but through MM 4.1-10, impacts will be LTS;

GHG - SU + CC impact even with MM 4.2-1

Hydro - potential S impact due to water quality standards degrade surface or groundwater during construction and operation, with MM4.3-1(a) and (b) and 4.3-2 reduced to LTS

Transportation - potential S due to conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy during construction, with MM 4.4-1 reduced to LTS; SU due to VMT with no feasible MM

Cultural - potential S impact to archaeological resources, with MM V-1, reduced to LTS

Geo - potential S impact due to expansive soils, with MM VII-1 reduced to LTS

Haz Mat - potential S through accidental release, with MM IX-1 - IX-4 reduced to LTS

Noise - potential S due to construction, with MM XIII-1 reduced to LTS

Tribal - potential S due to potential historic resources, with MM XVIII-1 and MM XV-2 reduced to LTS

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

Concerns related to special-status wildlife species, such as California coast steelhead, Pacific salmon, and migratory birds protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act; special-status plant species; and designated critical habitat;
Potential impacts to Adobe Creek and associated riparian habitat;
Increased potential for flooding due to increases in impervious surface area;
Concerns related to increases in traffic and vehicle miles traveled;
Insufficient quality of Ely Boulevard in the project vicinity;
Potential impacts to emergency evacuation routes;
Safety concerns related to the lack of sidewalks in the vicinity of the proposed project;
Concerns related to access to transit connections, types of transit connections, and the connection between the project site and nearby activity centers;
Aesthetic impacts of building the proposed bridge across the Creek;

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Regional Water Quality Control Board - San Francisco Region