



Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration

Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

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

Publication Date: October 31, 2022
Public Review Period: 30 days
State Clearinghouse Number:
Permit Sonoma File Number: MNS19-0005
Prepared by: Derik Michaelson
Phone: 707-565-3095
Email: derik.michaelson@sonoma-county.org

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 DATA

Project title: Mountain View Avenue Minor Subdivision
Project Contact: Hogan Land Services (on behalf of John & Maria Fagundes)
1702 4th Street, Santa Rosa CA
Project location: 182 Mountain View Ave, Santa Rosa
APN(s): 045-022-019
General Plan Designation: Rural Residential (3-acre density)
Zoning Designation: RR B6 3 (Rural Residential, 3-acre density), VOH (Valley Oak Habitat)
Decision Body: Project Review Advisory Committee (PRAC)
Appeal Body: Planning Commission
Description: Minor Subdivision of 8.52 acres into two parcels of 5.18 and 3.34 acres.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

This project potentially affects the following environmental factors as discussed within the attached Initial Study. Those checked under "Yes" involve at least one impact that is either "Potentially Significant" or "Less than Significant with Mitigation". Those checked under "No" involve either "No Impact" or has been determined "Less than Significant".

Table 1. Summary of Environmental Factors

Environmental Factors	Abrv.	Yes	No
1. Aesthetics	VIS		X
2. Agricultural & Forest Resources	AGR		X
3. Air Quality	AIR	X	
4. Biological Resources	BIO	X	
5. Cultural Resources	CUL	X	
6. Geology and Soils	GEO		X
7. Greenhouse Gas Emission	GHG		X
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	HAZ		X
9. Hydrology and Water Quality	HYD		X

Environmental Factors (Continued)	Abrv.	Yes	No
10. Hydrology and Water Quality	HYD		X
11. Land Use and Planning	LUP		X
12. Mineral Resources	MIN		X
13. Noise	NOI	X	
14. Population and Housing	POP		X
15. Public Services	PUB		X
16. Recreation	REC		X
17. Transportation and Traffic	TRA		X
18. Tribal Resources	TRI	X	
19. Utilities and Service Systems	UTL		X
20. Wildfire	FIRE		X
21. Mandatory Findings of Significance			

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. Agency List

Agency	Activity	Authorization
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers	Dredge or fill potential on US waters / wetlands	Clean Water Act, Section 401
Regional Water Quality Control Board (North Coast)	Discharge potential into State waters / wetlands	California Clean Water Act (Porter Cologne)
State Water Resources Control Board	Generating stormwater	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Incidental take permit for listed species	California Endangered Species Act
Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)	Stationary air emissions	

Based on the evaluation in the attached Initial Study, I find that the project described above could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration is proposed. 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 to incorporate identified mitigation measures into the project.



Prepared by:
Derik Michaelson, Planner III

10/31/2022
Date



I. INTRODUCTION:

Property Owners John & Maria Fagundes propose a Minor Subdivision of 8.52 acres into two separate parcels of 5.18 and 3.34 acres in size. A referral letter was sent to the appropriate local, state and federal agencies and interest groups who may wish to comment on the project.

This report is the Initial Study required by the California Environment al Quality Act (CEQA). The report was prepared by Derik Michaelson, Project Review Planner with the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, Project Review Division. Information on the project was provided by the applicant and the applicant's consultants. This initial study provides analysis and conclusions based on technical studies (see Section VIII. References) submitted by the applicant as part of the project.

These studies are available for review at the Permit and Resource Management Department (Permit Sonoma) office. Please contact the Project Planner, Derik Michaelson at derik.michaelson@sonoma-county.org, or direct at (707) 565-3095, for more information.

II. EXISTING FACILITY

The existing parcel is 8.52 acres. The current landowner maintains the site for existing residential use and active cattle grazing. The existing residence, barn and other accessory structures are located toward site frontage on Mountain View Avenue at the north-westerly corner of the parcel. The remaining easterly portion of the site remains undeveloped consisting of grassland used for cattle grazing. No evidence of prior grading or other ground disturbing activity on this portion of the property has been identified.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes a minor subdivision of 8.52 acres into two parcels, including a 5.18-acre developed parcel (Lot 1) for continued residential and agricultural use, and a new 3.34-acre parcel (Lot 2) with single-family development potential. The developed Lot 1 portion of the site includes an existing residence, barn, septic field, private well, and driveway improvements. The Lot 2 portion of the site is currently undeveloped and comprised of mostly non-native annual grassland habitat. Mountain View Avenue runs parallel to the northerly frontage of the parcel and will provide public access to both lots via separate driveways.

Lot 1:	5.18 acres	Developed; residential and agricultural use
Lot 2:	3.34 acres	Undeveloped; non-native grassland

Site Development

Development potential for Lot 2 includes future construction of one primary residence, one accessory dwelling unit, and related site improvements for a new access entry and driveway, septic system, and private well. The tentative map identifies the proposed size and location of the Lot 2 building envelope areas and septic system boundary. The combined site area proposed for Lot 2 development, including the building envelope anticipated improvements for a 12'-wide driveway and a 10' x 10' area for well construction, is approximately ±0.6 acres. No other buildings or site development potential is planned for Lot 2 under this tentative map proposal.

All new lot development will conform to Sonoma County zoning requirements for Rural Residential (RR), and current standards for site grading, storm water management, emergency vehicle access, and water

storage for fire suppression. The Permit Sonoma Well and Septic Section has reviewed and accepted related permit requests for soil percolation (WSR18-0235) and groundwater (SEV15-0202) testing on the portion of property proposed for division as Lot 2.

Development Standards

The County's Rural Residential (RR) zoning designation for the property provides for allowable lot creation and development potential conforming to the following standards:

Maximum density:	1 primary dwelling per 3 acres (8.52 acres / 0.3 = 2.84 primary dwellings);
Minimum lot standards:	1.5-acre parcel size / 80-foot lot width;
Building setbacks:	45 feet from street centerline, 20 feet from front and rear lot lines, and 5 feet from side lot lines;
Minimum septic size:	3-bedroom capacity with 200% reserve area footprint
Minimum well footprint:	10 feet x 10 feet

IV. SETTING

The Project site is located in eastern Santa Rosa, east of Highway 101 in a rural residential area. The site is surrounded by rural residential housing to the east and west, and open grassland and agricultural land to the north and south. Surrounding parcel sizes range from 5 to 150 acres.

The site is within the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Basin and its groundwater availability classification is Zone 1 (major groundwater basin). The project site is also within the Santa Rosa Plain critical habitat area for the California tiger salamander, and subject to the Conservation Strategy program. The Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy identifies the site and its surroundings as critical habitat for the California Tiger Salamander (CTS).

V. 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 special interest groups that were anticipated to take interest in the project. Permit Sonoma has received no public or agency responses raising concerns or issues of any notable significance. No California Native American tribe affiliated with the cultural region has requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1.

VI. OTHER RELATED PROJECTS

No other projects are currently active within the vicinity of the subject property.

VII. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

DRAFT

VIII. SOURCE DOCUMENTS

The following documents were referenced or developed in preparation of the Initial Study checklist, and are hereby incorporated as part of this publication. Items 1 through 4 may be downloaded from the link location referenced below. All other documents are available by reference at the Permit and Resource Management Department via PermitSonoma.org, or as listed on the website of the Individual public agency referenced below.

Available for download at: _____

1. Minor Subdivision Tentative Map
2. Submitted Technical Reports
 - a. Hydrogeologic Assessment Report, Hurvitz Environmental Services Inc., March 18, 2019
 - b. Biological Resources Report, Sol Ecology, January 4, 2019
3. Draft Initial Study/MND
4. Public Comments

Available by reference on Permit Sonoma website: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/Permit-Sonoma/>

5. Sonoma County General Plan and EIR
6. Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance
7. Tree Protection and Replacement Ordinance (Ordinance No. 4014); Sonoma County.
8. Heritage or Landmark Tree Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3651); Sonoma County.
9. Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan and Program EIR, 1994
10. Streamside Conservation Plan and Zoning Permit submittal guide and attachments
11. South Santa Rosa Area Plan

Available by reference on Public Agency website

12. Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones; State of California; 1983.
www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/alquist-priolo
13. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines; Bay Area Air Quality Management District
www.arb.ca.gov/
14. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
www.califaep.org/docs/2020_ceqa_book.pdf
15. California Environmental Protection Agency
www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/corteseList/default.htm;
16. California Regional Water Quality Control Board
geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/;
17. California Department of Toxic Substances Control Management Board
<https://dtsc.ca.gov/dtscs-cortese-list/>
18. North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
<https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/>
19. Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), September 2014.
<https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management>
20. Santa Rosa Plain Watershed Groundwater Management Plan, Advisory Panel, 2014
https://rpcity.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=4&clip_id=518&meta_id=43080

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 not in an area designated as visually sensitive by the Sonoma County General Plan. It is not located on a scenic hillside, nor would it involve tree removal, construction or grading that would affect a scenic vista. The viewshed of the project area as seen from public roads will not substantially change as a result of the project.

Impact:

No Impact

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

Comment:

The parcel is designated for Rural Residential development, is not designated as a scenic resource, and is not located on a site visible from a state scenic highway.

Impact:

No Impact

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

Comment:

The Project site is located in an unincorporated rural residential area just beyond the south-easterly urban growth boundary for the City of Santa Rosa and County urban service area, east of Highway 101. The site is surrounded by rural residential and agricultural uses with parcel sizes range from 5 to 150 acres. The portion of the site proposed for further development potential is currently characterized by open grassland land and rural fencing.

The project proposes a 3.34-acre lot to support development potential of two new residential dwellings, including one primary residence and one accessory dwelling unit. The tentative map locates a 4,550-square-foot building envelope for the primary residence located 170 feet from the roadway (Mountain View Avenue). The 1,200-square-foot accessory unit is located 60 feet closer to the road in front of the primary envelope.

Based on the location and the combined footprint area of the proposed building envelopes and additional area for driveway access utility service improvements, approximately 95 percent of the existing site characteristics is anticipated to remain as currently experienced by public views of open grassland land and rural fencing. Construction of rural residential uses and accessory uses are consistent with zoning and surrounding development.

Impact:

Less than significant

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

Comment:

Based on the location and footprint area of the proposed building envelopes, allowable development potential provides for approximately 95 percent of the existing site characteristics is anticipated to remain as currently experienced by public views of open grassland. The potential for one new primary residence and a 1,200-square-foot accessory unit to introduce new lighting sources that generate substantial light and glare to the extent that it adversely affects day or nighttime views is very low.

Additionally, The Project review section of Permit Sonoma's Planning Division reviews building permit submittals for all new proposed residential dwelling to ensure compliance with the County's exterior lighting policies and standards. These policies and standards provide that exterior lighting shall be low mounted, downward casting and fully shielded to prevent glare. Light fixtures shall not be located at the periphery of the property and shall not spill over onto adjacent properties or into the night sky. Flood lights are not permitted. Security lighting shall be motion sensor activated.

Impact:

Less than significant

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 proposed lot split is consistent with the established density requirement for this parcel and pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency, does not convert or affect any Farmland identified as Prime or Unique status, or of Statewide Importance. The site is identified as Farmland of Local Importance. The Sonoma County General Plan establishes the parcel as having Rural Residential development potential with a restricted density requirement of no more than 3 acres per dwelling unit. The project is consistent with this requirement

Impact:

No Impact

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

Comment:

The site is not subject to a Land Conservation Act contract under the Williamson Act. The Sonoma County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance establish the land use and zoning for this parcel as Rural Residential (RR3) with a 3-acre density requirement. The County's zoning code provides for limited allowable agricultural use on RR zoned parcels. The project does not preclude potential for future agricultural uses conforming to the RR zoning regulations.

Impact:

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 County does not designate the property or any nearby lands within the vicinity of the project for forestland or timberland production

Impact:

No Impact

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

Comment:

The project site consists of non-native open grassland and contains no trees

Impact:

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 scope and scale of allowable development potential created by the project is negligible with no direct or indirect association to the possible conversion or loss of existing farmland or timberland.

Impact:

No Impact

3. AIR QUALITY:

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

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The project is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), which is currently designated as a nonattainment area for state and federal ozone standards, the state PM 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 (NOx) 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 well below the emission thresholds for ozone precursors.

Impact

Less than significant

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 will not have a cumulative effect on ozone because it will not generate substantial traffic which would result in substantial emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NO_x). See discussion above in 3 (a). The project will have no long-term effect on PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀, because all surfaces will be paved gravel, landscaped or otherwise treated to stabilize bare soils, and dust generation will be insignificant. However, there could be a significant short-term emission of dust (which would include PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) during construction. These emissions could be significant at the project level, and could also contribute to a cumulative impact.

Although the project will generate some ozone precursors from new vehicle trips (discuss project trip generation if applicable), the project will not have a cumulative effect on ozone because it will not generate substantial traffic resulting in significant new emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NO_x). See discussion in 3 (a) above.

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

Impact

Less than significant with Mitigation

Mitigation

Mitigation AIR-1:

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

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

Monitoring AIR-1: PRMD staff shall ensure that the measures listed under *Mitigation AIR-1* are included on all site alteration, grading, building or improvement plans prior to issuance of grading or building permits.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Sensitive receptors include hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas. State the type and location of the nearest sensitive receptor. There are sensitive receptors consisting of residential properties located adjacent to from the proposed project. 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 the mitigation measure described under *Mitigation AIR-1* above.

Impact:

Less than Significant with Mitigation (see section 3.b)

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.

Impact:
No Impact

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

The project applicant has consulted Sol Ecology, Inc. to prepare a biological assessment of the subject property and evaluate potential impacts resulting from the proposed project. Sol Ecology submitted its findings and conclusions for the project in the Biological Resources Report dated January 4, 2019.

Existing Conditions: Soils and Vegetation

Soils at the site are mapped as Wright loam and Clear Lake clay, sandy substratum. Wright loam consists of a deep, somewhat poorly drained soils formed in alluvium from mixed rock sources. Typical vegetation is pasture. Clear Lake clay consists of a very deep, poorly drained soil formed in fine textured alluvium also derived from mixed rock sources. This soil type is found in flood plains, swales and drainage ways, often found on the Santa Rosa Plain. No sensitive vegetation communities were observed and a qualified wetland delineator confirmed no potential presence of jurisdictional features such as wetlands or waters on site.

Valley and Foothill Grassland Habitat (Non-Native Annual Grassland)

The site is dominated entirely by non-native valley and foothill grassland habitat, in which native bunch grass species have been largely or entirely supplanted by introduced annual Mediterranean grasses (non-native annual grassland). Typical vegetation includes grasses and forbs and often pasture or rangeland uses. Stands rich in natives, however, can usually found on unusual substrates, such as serpentinite or somewhat alkaline soils (CDFW 2018). These non-native grasslands (Holland/CDFW 1986) are characterized by non-native (and invasive) annual grasses and native forbs and wildflowers in this case foxtail fescue (*Festuca myuros*), cocklebur (*Xanthiumstrumarium*), Italian thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*), and chicory (*Cichorium intybus*). Common wildlife species observed in this habitat includes: Betta's pocket gopher (*Sceloporus occidentalis*), killdeer (*Charadrius vociferous*; wintering), Brewer's blackbird (*Euphagus cyanocephalus*), American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), and western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*).

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:

On November 6, 2018, the applicant's biotic consultant, Sol Ecology, Inc., conducted reconnaissance-level surveys to identify evidence of any sensitive biological communities and/or suitable habitat supporting special status species occurring on and/or adjacent to the project site, and any on- or off-site impacts the project may potentially have on those species and/or their habitats. Sol Ecology also assessed potential occurrences of sensitive biological communities and/or special-status species prior to its field reconnaissance through a preliminary review of available literature and database sources. Sol Ecology indicates the requirement for performing protocol-level surveys per the Santa Rosa Conservation Strategy does not apply in this case due to there being no evidence of seasonal wetland habitat present on the property.

SPECIAL-STATUS PLANTS

Special-status species include those plants and wildlife species that have been formally listed, are proposed as endangered or threatened, or are candidates for such listing under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) or California Endangered Species Act (CESA). These acts afford protection to both listed species and those that are formal candidates for listing. Plant species on the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Rare and Endangered Plant Inventory (Inventory) with California Rare Plant Ranks (Rank) of 1 and 2 are also considered special-status plant species and must be considered under CEQA.

The Sol Ecology report indicates potential for three special status plants on the Project Site, including congested-headed hayfield tarplant, bent-flowered fiddleneck, and two-fork clover. Two-fork clover is federal endangered, though with relatively low potential for occurring on site due prior disturbances on the developed portion of the property. Congested-headed hayfield tarplant was in bloom at the time of the site visit, allowing Sol Ecology to confirm no on-site presence of the species.

Congested-headed hayfield Tarplant (*Hemizonia congesta ssp. congesta*). Rank: 1B.2.

Congested-headed hayfield tarplant is an annual herb in the composite family (Asteraceae) that blooms from April through November. It typically occurs in valley and foothill grassland habitat, sometimes on roadsides, at elevations from 65 to 1,837 feet. Known associated species at similar sites include introduced annual grasses. Within nine USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles surrounding the Project Site, this plant is documented in two quadrangle(s) in Sonoma County. The plant has potential to occur in the Project Site due to habitat type, associated species and elevation. It was not observed during site visit, which occurred during this species' blooming period. Likewise, the Project Site is below the typical elevation range and as such it is likely absent.

Bent-flowered fiddleneck (*Amsinckia lunaris*). Rank: 1B.2. Bent-flowered fiddleneck is an annual herb in the borage family (Boraginaceae) that blooms from March through June. It typically occurs in coastal bluff scrub, cismontane woodland, and valley and foothill grassland habitat at elevations from 10 to 2,608 feet. Within nine USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles surrounding the Project Site, this plant is documented in one quadrangle(s) in Sonoma County. The plant has potential to occur in the Project Site due to habitat type and elevation; however, occurrence is unlikely due to very limited distribution in the area.

Two-fork clover (*Trifolium amoenum*). Federal Endangered, Rank: 1B.1. Two-fork clover is a perennial herb in the pea family (Fabaceae) that blooms from May to July. It typically occurs in coastal bluff scrub and valley and foothill grassland habitats, sometimes on serpentine soil, open sunny sites, and swales, and was most recently cited on roadside and an eroding cliff face, at elevations ranging from 16 to 1,017 feet. Known associated species in the area include *Avena barbata*, *Bromus spp*, *Vulpia spp*, *Danthonia californica*, *Unum*, *Carduus pycnocephalus*, and *Aira caryophyllaea*, with scattered Douglas-fir and coyote bush, and *Erigeron glaucus*, *Armeria maritima*, *Hordeum brachyantherum*, *Lolium multiflorum*, and *Bromus carinatus*. Within nine USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles surrounding the Project Site, this plant is documented in two quadrangle(s) in Sonoma County. The plant has potential to occur in the Project Site due to the elevation range, elevation and associated species present on-site.

A pre-construction survey for bent-flowered fiddleneck and two-fork clover shall be performed prior to any construction activities during the blooming period for these two species between May and June. If found, they should be completely avoided; because two-fork clover is federal endangered it must be avoided. If avoidance is not possible, the applicant will need to consult with USFWS and/or CDFW (for bent-flowered fiddleneck) to establish a translocation plan and appropriate compensatory mitigation for temporal impacts. Avoidance and/or consultation will ensure impacts to these species are less than significant. Avoidance and/or consultation will ensure impacts to these species are less than significant. Because no seasonal wetland habitat is present, protocol-level surveys per the Santa Rosa Conservation Strategy are not required.

SPECIAL STATUS WILDLIFE

Wildlife species listed as federal or state endangered and/or threatened, federal and state candidate species, CDFW Species of Special Concern, CDFW California Fully Protected species, USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern, and CDFW Special-status Invertebrates are all considered special-status species. Although species not listed as endangered or threatened generally have no special legal status, they are given special consideration under CEQA. The federal Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act also provides broad protections to both eagle species that are roughly analogous to those of listed species. Bat species are also evaluated for conservation status by the Western Bat Working Group (WBWG), a non-governmental entity; bats named as a "High Priority" or "Medium Priority" species for conservation by the WBWG are typically considered special-status and also considered under CEQA; bat roosts are protected under CDFW Fish and Game Code. In addition to regulations for special-status species, most native birds in the United States (including non-status species) are protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code (CFG), i.e., sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513. Under these laws, deliberately destroying active bird nests, eggs, and/or young is illegal.

The Project Site has the potential to support three special-status wildlife species, including California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), and tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*).

California Tiger Salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*) - Sonoma County Distinct Population Segment. Federal Endangered Species. State Threatened Species. The California Tiger Salamander (CTS) Sonoma County Distinct Population Segment (DPS) was emergency listed as endangered on July 22, 2002. Critical Habitat for CTS on the Santa Rosa Plain was designated on July 2011 and revised on August 31, 2011. This population is geographically isolated from other CTS in the state and known to occur in the Santa Rosa area (or Plain) and possibly the Petaluma River watershed, historically. CTS in the Santa Rosa Plain inhabits low-elevation (below 500 feet) vernal pools and seasonal pools, associated grassland, and the grassy understory of oak savannah plant communities.

CTS requires two primary habitat components: aquatic breeding sites and upland terrestrial estivation or refuge sites. Adult and juvenile CTS spend most of their time underground in upland subterranean refugia (Trenham 2001). Underground retreats in the Santa Rosa Plain usually consist of small mammal burrows (namely pocket gophers), but also under logs and piles of lumber (Holland et al. 1990). CTS emerges from underground to breed and lay eggs primarily in vernal pools and other ephemeral water bodies. Adults migrate from upland habitats to aquatic breeding sites during the first major rainfall events, between November and February (Barry and Shaffer 1994) and return to upland habitats after breeding. In drought years, seasonal pools may not hold water for sufficient period for adults to breed. Pools must remain inundated for at least 10 weeks, the minimum time needed for larvae to complete metamorphosis. Following metamorphosis, juveniles move into the surrounding uplands where they may live for several years before returning to aquatic habitats to breed. CTS may disperse into uplands up to 1.3 miles from breeding ponds, though most adults and juveniles are found within 2,200 feet (USFWS 2004, Trenham 2001, Orloff 2011).

On November 9, 2007 the USFWS issued a Programmatic Biological Opinion (2007 PBO) for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) permitted projects that may affect CTS within the Santa Rosa Plain area. The PBO prescribes graduated mitigation ratios based on distance from known breeding sites and adult occurrences. Mitigation requirements apply to the entire project area except for existing hardscape unless these areas function as a movement corridor. The PBO also prescribes minimization measures for projects within the conservation area. While not applicable to all projects unless a federal nexus is provided, measures prescribed within the programmatic may be applied to non-Corps permitted projects to reduce the significance of impacts and avoid potential take of CTS.

The Project Site is located within the designated critical habitat for CTS. The site is within the easternmost area designated as "*Potential for Presence of CTS and Listed Plants*" as shown on the revised Figure 3 Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy Map prepared by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife on April 16, 2007. However, due to the lack of potential presence for any on site breeding habitat, and no documented breeding occurrences located within 2,200 feet of the property,

the potential for CTS occurrences on site is relatively low, as most typically occur within 2,200 feet of breeding habitat. The nearest breeding occurrence is more than 2,200 feet away and is not a natural breeding habitat. Breeding habitat within 1.3 miles of the project is located on the opposite westerly side of the Highway 101. The Highway serves as a physical barrier limiting the potential for the easterly-side disturbances to impact westerly-side breeding occurrences. No breeding occurrences within 1.3 miles of the property exists on easterly project-side of the Highway. The nearest non-breeding occurrences are documented for the Horn Avenue Conservation Bank located over 500 feet away from the project site to the south. The project will not result in any permanent future dispersal barrier because the new parcel (Lot 2) allows for movement to the north and south.

The Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy provides for the overall preservation of California Tiger Salamander (CTS) habitat and the species in Sonoma County. The subject property falls within the easterly boundaries of the Conservation Strategy. Figure 3 of the Strategy identifies the project site and its surroundings as having "Potential for Presence of CTS and Listed Plants". For these areas, the Conservation Strategy requires the purchasing of mitigation credits for loss of upland habitat at a 0.2:1 ratio, or 0.2 acres of required purchase credits for every acre of disturbed habitat. In this case, the project will remove approximately 0.6 acres of critical CTS habitat and requires a credit purchase equivalent to 0.12 acres ($0.2 \times 0.6 = 0.12$ acres). Additionally, the 2007 Programmatic Biological Opinion (2007 PBO) prescribes avoidance and minimization measures to avoid potential take of CTS during ground-disturbing activities due to the proximity of the site to nearby documented occurrences.

Compliance with the prescribed mitigation measures above reduces potential project impacts on CTS and on CTS habitat to less than significant. These measures are also listed under the mitigation section below.

White-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*). CDFW Fully Protected Species. The white-tailed kite is a resident in open to semi-open habitats throughout the lower elevations of California, including grasslands, savannahs, woodlands, agricultural areas and wetlands. Vegetative structure and prey availability seem to be more important habitat elements than associations with specific plants or vegetative communities (Dunk 1995). Nests are constructed mostly of twigs and placed in trees, often at habitat edges. Nest trees are highly variable in size, structure, and immediate surroundings, ranging from shrubs to trees greater than 150 feet tall (Dunk 1995). This species preys upon a variety of small mammals, as well as other vertebrates and invertebrates. Whitetailed kite was observed foraging over the site during the site assessment on November 6, 2018. However, no suitable nesting substrate is present. This species may nest off-site in close proximity to proposed activities.

Tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*). State Candidate (Endangered), CDFW Species of Special Concern, USFWS Bird of Conservation Concern. The tricolored blackbird is a locally common resident in the Central Valley and along coastal California. Most tricolored blackbirds reside in the Central Valley March through August, then moving into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and east to Merced County and coastal locations during winter (Meese et al. 2014). This species breeds adjacent to fresh water, preferring emergent wetlands with tall, dense cattails or tules, thickets of willow or blackberry, and/or tall herbs. Flooded agricultural fields with dense vegetation are also used (Shuford and Gardali 2008). This species is highly colonial; nesting habitat must be large enough to support a minimum of 30 pairs, and colonies are commonly substantially larger (up to thousands of pairs). The tricolored blackbird often intermingles with other blackbird species during the non-breeding season. Individuals typically forage up to 5.6 miles (9 kilometers) from their colonies although in most cases only a small part of the area within this range provides suitable foraging (Hamilton and Meese 2006).

No suitable nesting substrate is present on the Project Site. There is a single documented occurrence within approximately 3 miles to the south of the site. However, nesting tricolored blackbirds have not been observed at this location in over 10 years. Recent nest surveys of this location reported in the database in 2013, 2014, and 2015 yielded no observations. Sol Ecology also conducted late spring nesting bird surveys at this location in 2017 and 2018 for a City of Rohnert Park funded project and found no evidence of tricolored blackbirds during any of the surveys. Because there are no recent documented sightings, occurrences of this species foraging on the Project Site are unlikely. Potential

impacts on this species are also unlikely, or less than significant. No mitigation is therefore recommended in this case.

Impact:

Less than Significant, with mitigation

Mitigation:

Bent-Flowered Fiddleneck / Two-Fork Clover

Mitigation BIO-1: Developer for Lot 2 shall perform pre-construction surveys for presence of *bent-flowered fiddleneck* and *two-fork clover* during the most recent blooming period (May through June) preceding construction, and if identified, delineate on a site plan the general location and boundary of each occurrence.

Monitoring BIO-1: Prior to issuance of any permit involving ground disturbing activities for development of Lot 2, the developer shall submit to Permit Sonoma the conclusions of the required pre-construction surveys conducted for bent-flowered fiddleneck and two-fork clover during the last blooming period between May and June.

Mitigation BIO-1.1: Final grading permit plans for Lot 2 shall provide the pre-construction survey results from *Mitigation BIO-1*, and if presence of either *bent-flowered fiddleneck* or *two-fork clover* has been identified, shall clearly demonstrate avoidance of those species locations by all ground-disturbing activities.

Monitoring BIO-1.1: Should the required pre-construction surveys under Mitigation BIO-1 identify presence of either species (*bent-flowered fiddleneck* or *two-fork clover*), applicant shall clearly demonstrate on submitted permit plans avoidance of ground disturbing activities within 25 feet of the identified species location(s).

Mitigation BIO-1.2: Should survey results identify any occurrence of bent-flowered fiddleneck, and avoidance of the species is determined infeasible, Developer shall consult with USFWS and/or CDFW to establish a translocation plan and appropriate compensatory mitigation for temporal impacts.

Monitoring BIO-1.2: Should avoidance be infeasible where concerning the surveyed presence of bent-flowered fiddleneck under Mitigation BIO-1, and where not involving any presence of two-fork clover, developer shall submit evidence of having consulted with USFWS and/or CDFW to implement an approved translocation plan and appropriate compensatory mitigation for temporal impacts prior to commencement of any ground disturbing activities requiring a permit from the County of Sonoma.

California Tiger Salamander

Mitigation BIO-2.0: To mitigate the loss of CTS critical habitat, the project sponsor shall purchase mitigation credits equivalent to a 0.2:1 ratio, or 0.2 acre-credits for every acre of land disturbed, currently proposed at 0.6 acres on Lot 2, for a required purchase amount of 0.12 acre-credits from an approved mitigation bank.

Monitoring BIO-2: Prior to issuance of a grading permit for development of Lot 2, developer shall submit evidence (such as a bill of sale) of having purchased CTS mitigation credits accordingly at a 0.2:1 ratio, as required under the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy for all identified areas of land disturbance, currently proposed at 0.6 acres, for a total purchase of 0.12 acre-credits.

Mitigation BIO-3: Developer of Lot 2 shall implement the following measures as prescribed by the 2007 Programmatic Biological Opinion to minimize potential take of CTS:

- a. Grading and clearing shall be conducted during the dry season only between April 15 and October 15, of any given year, depending on the level of rainfall and/or site conditions.

- b. A Service approved biological monitor will be on site each day during initial ground disturbing activities to monitor for CTS; if found, all work will be halted and CDFW contacted.
- c. The biological monitor will conduct a training session on CTS for all construction workers before work is started on the project.
- d. Before the start of work each day, the biological monitor will check for animals under any equipment such as vehicles and stored pipes. The biological monitor will check all excavated steep-walled holes or trenches greater than one foot deep for any CTS.
- e. All foods and food-related trash items will be enclosed in sealed trash containers at the end of each day and removed from the site every three days.
- f. No more than a maximum speed limit of 15 mph will be permitted.
- g. All equipment will be maintained such that there will be no leaks of automotive fluids such as gasoline, oils, or solvents.
- h. Project areas temporarily disturbed by construction activities will be re-vegetated with locally-occurring native plants.

Monitoring BIO-3: Prior to issuance of a grading permit for development of Lot 2, developer shall submit a tentative schedule accompanied by appropriate plans detailing the implementation of the required measures listed under Mitigation BIO-3 to minimize potential take of CTS as prescribed by 2007 Programmatic Biological Opinion.

Mitigation BIO-3.1: Should the on-site biological monitor as required under Mitigation BIO-3 identify presence of CTS during the course of activities, all work shall be halted and CDFW consulted for obtaining a CEQA Section 2081 Take Permit.

Monitoring BIO-3.1: Should the required biological monitor under Mitigation BIO-3 identify presence of CTS during the course of activities, developer shall submit a report of the incident and evidence of having halted work and consulted CDFW for obtaining a CESA Section 2081 Take Permit prior to receiving a final County inspection on the issued grading permit.

White-tailed kite

Mitigation BIO-4:

- a. To the extent practical, all construction activities should be performed outside the nesting season from February 1 through August 31.
- b. If work must be performed during the nesting season, a pre-construction nesting bird survey should be performed in all areas within the proposed Project Site.
- c. If nests are found, an appropriately sized no-disturbance buffer should be placed around the nest at the direction of the qualified biologist conducting the survey.
- d. Buffers should remain in place until all young have fledged, or the biologist has confirmed that the nest has been naturally predated

Monitoring BIO-4: Prior to issuance of a grading permit for development of Lot 2, developer shall submit a tentative schedule accompanied by appropriate plans detailing the implementation of the required measures listed under Mitigation BIO-4 to minimize potential impacts on *White-tailed kite*.

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:

On November 6, 2018, the applicant's biotic consultant, Sol Ecology, Inc., conducted reconnaissance-level surveys to identify evidence of any sensitive biological communities and/or suitable habitat supporting special status species occurring on and/or adjacent to the project site. Sol Ecology submitted its conclusions in the Biological Resources Report dated January 4, 2019. The Sol Ecology report concludes that while the project site provides suitable habitat for identified special status species, as discussed in the preceding section, no sensitive biological communities were

present on site during the time of the survey. However, construction could result in significant impacts to sensitive species as noted above, unless mitigation is implemented as noted above.

Impact:

Less than Significant with Mitigation (see section 4.a).

- 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?**

On November 16, 2018, Sol Ecology contracted qualified wetland delineator Lucy Macmillan of Macmillan Consulting, to subsequently survey the site for any potential presence of wetlands and waters subject to jurisdiction by the U.S Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or CDFW.

The Sol Ecology report indicates Ms. Macmillan found no evidence of wetland plant indicators, hydrology or wetland soils, or presence of unvegetated, ponded areas, flowing water, or high-water mark indicating a defined drainage course.

Impact:

No impact

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

Comment:

The tentative map identifies specific building envelope sizes and locations that allow for wildlife movement to the north and south across the new parcel (Lot 2). The project does not therefore create in any permanent future dispersal barrier that would substantially interfere with existing wildlife movements.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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

Comment:

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

Development potential of the project site does not necessitate removal of any existing trees.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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

Comment:

The Project Site is located within the designated critical habitat for CTS. The site is within the easternmost area designated as "*Potential for Presence of CTS and Listed Plants*" as shown on the revised Figure 3 Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy Map prepared by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife on April 16, 2007.

The Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy provides for the overall preservation of California Tiger Salamander (CTS) habitat and the species in Sonoma County. The subject property falls within the easterly boundaries of the Conservation Strategy. Figure 3 of the Strategy identifies the project site and its surroundings as having "Potential for Presence of CTS and Listed Plants". For these areas, the Conservation Strategy requires the purchasing of mitigation credits for loss of upland habitat at a 0.2:1 ratio, or 0.2 acres of required purchase credits for every acre of disturbed habitat. In this case, the project will remove approximately 0.6 acres of critical CTS habitat and requires a credit purchase equivalent to 0.12 acres ($0.2 \times 0.6 = 0.12$ acres). Additionally, the 2007 Programmatic Biological Opinion (2007 PBO) prescribes avoidance and minimization measures to avoid potential take of CTS during ground-disturbing activities due to the proximity of the site to nearby documented occurrences.

Compliance with the prescribed mitigation measures above reduces potential project impacts on CTS and on CTS habitat to less than significant. These measures are required for the project as identified under Mitigation Nos. 2 and 3 above, and compliance with the mitigations ensure consistency with Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy.

Impact:

Less than Significant with Mitigation (see section 4.a.).

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

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

Comment:

The California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) maintains a wide range of documents and materials relating to historical resources (e.g., buildings, structures, objects, historic and archaeological sites, landscapes, districts). The CHRIS operates structurally through the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), nine Information Centers (ICs), and the State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC).

On February 4, 2019, Permit Sonoma referred the project application to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) for comments and recommendations, and to Native American Tribes within Sonoma County requesting consultation under AB-52.

On February 13, 2019, the Northwest Information Center responded to the County's project referral that the proposed project area has a low possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological site(s), and recommended that no further study for archaeological resources be required.

On February 14, 2019, all responding representatives of California Native American tribes within the area concluded consultation and requested no further information pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1.

Impact:

Less than significant

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

Comment:

On February 4, 2019, Permit Sonoma referred the project application to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) for comments and recommendations, and to Native American Tribes within Sonoma County requesting consultation under AB-52.

On February 13, 2019, the Northwest Information Center responded that the proposed project area has a low possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological site(s), and recommended that no further study for archaeological resources be required.

On February 14, 2019, all responding representatives of California Native American tribes within the area concluded consultation and requested no further information pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1.

Impact:

Less than significant

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

Comment:

No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project. Permit Sonoma requires that all grading and building permits plans involving ground-disturbing activities note the following instructions for reducing such impacts to less than significant should any human remains be uncovered during construction.

Impact:

Less than significant with Mitigation

Mitigation:

Mitigation CUL-1:

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

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

Monitoring CUL-1: Building/grading permits shall not be approved for issuance until PRMD

Project Review staff confirms these notes on submitted building, grading and improvement plans.

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:

Impact:

Less than significant

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

Comment:

New development resulting from this project must conform to all applicable state and local plans regarding the renewability and efficiency of energy use.

Impact:

Less than significant

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

Would the project:

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

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

Comment:

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

Impact

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. Check ABAG map. Predicting seismic events is not possible, nor is providing mitigation that can entirely reduce the potential for injury and damage

that can occur during a seismic event. However, using accepted geotechnical evaluation techniques and appropriate engineering practices, potential injury and damage can be diminished, thereby exposing fewer people and less property to the effects of a major damaging earthquake. The design and construction of future dwellings on new parcels are subject to load and strength standards of the California Building Code (CBC), which take seismic shaking into account. 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.

Impact:

Less than Significant

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Comment:

The project site is located within an area subject to liquefaction as shown on the Sonoma County Relative Hazard from Seismic Shaking map. Strong ground shaking during an earthquake can result in ground failure and/or settlement such as that associated with soil liquefaction, and can also cause deformation of slopes, particularly fill slopes. 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. Based on standard permitting requirements, the project will have no significant risk of loss, injury or death from seismic ground failure or liquefaction.

Impact:

Less than Significant

iv. Landslides?

Comment:

The project site is not located in a landslide prone area as shown on Geology for Planning in Sonoma County Special Report 120 Slope Stability.

Impact:

No Impact

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

Comment:

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

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

In regards to water quality impacts, County grading ordinance design requirements, adopted County grading standards and best management practices (such as silt fencing, straw wattles, construction entrances to control soil discharges, primary and secondary containment areas for petroleum

products, paints, lime and other materials of concern, etc.), mandated limitations on work in wet weather, and standard County grading inspection requirements, are specifically designed to maintain potential water quality impacts at a less than significant level during project construction.

For post construction water quality impacts, adopted grading permit standards and best management practices may require control of storm water through detention/retention and/or infiltration methods. Other adopted water quality best management practices include storm water treatment devices based on filtering, settling, or removing pollutants. These construction standards are designed to maintain potential water quality grading impacts at a less than significant level post construction.

The County adopted grading ordinances and standards and related conditions of approval also require compliance with all standards and regulations adopted by the State and Regional Water Quality Control Board, such as the Standard Urban Storm water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements, Low Impact Development and any other adopted best management practices. Therefore, no significant adverse soil erosion or related soil erosion water quality impacts are expected given the mandated conditions and standards that need to be met. For further discussion of related issues (such as maintenance of required post construction water quality facilities), please refer to section 10, Hydrology and Water Quality.

In addition, as a condition of project approval, the applicant would be required to submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan prepared by a registered professional engineer as an integral part of the grading plan. The plan would be required to contain all applicable items in the Grading Permit Required Application Contents (GRD-004) handout, and would be required to show best management practices (BMPs) to be implemented, limits of disturbed areas/total work, vegetated areas to be preserved, and pertinent details, notes, and specifications to prevent damages or minimize adverse impacts to the surrounding properties and the environment, such as temporary erosion control measures to be used during construction of cut and fill slopes, excavation for foundations, and other grading operations at the site to prevent discharge of sediment and contaminants into the drainage system.

The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan would also be required to include the following measures, as applicable, which shall be printed on applicable building, grading, and improvement plans:

- a) Throughout the construction process, ground disturbance shall be minimized, and existing vegetation shall be retained to the extent possible to reduce soil erosion. All construction and grading activities, including short-term needs (equipment staging areas, storage areas and field office locations) shall minimize the amount of land area disturbed. Whenever possible, existing disturbed areas shall be used for such purposes.
- b) All drainage ways, wetland areas and creek channels shall be protected from silt and sediment in storm runoff through the use of silt fences, diversion berms and check dams. Fill slopes shall be compacted to stabilize. All exposed surface areas shall be mulched and reseeded and all cut and fill slopes shall be protected with hay mulch and /or erosion control blankets as appropriate.
- c) All erosion control measures shall be installed according to the approved plans prior to the onset of the rainy season but no later than October 15th. Erosion control measures shall remain in place until the end of the rainy season, but may not be removed before April 15th. The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about erosion control requirement.

The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan would be subject to review and approval of Permit Sonoma prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The Applicant would be required to inspect all storm water BMPs annually and submit the results to Permit Sonoma annually (including but not limited to the Inspection and Maintenance Checklists, photo evidence of BMP existing conditions, and a report of any maintenance activity, remediation, or replacement of BMP features). Application of these conditions of approval would reduce risk of erosion resulting from the project and project construction, and therefore project erosion impacts would be less than significant.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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

Comment:

The project site is subject to seismic shaking as described in item 7.a.ii. above. No further mitigation is required.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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

Comment:

Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code is an index of the relative expansive characteristics of soil as determined through laboratory testing. For the proposed project, soils at the site have not been tested for their expansive characteristics. No substantial risks to life or property would be created from soil expansion at the proposed project, even if it were to be affected by expansive soils.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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

Comment:

The new proposed parcel (Lot 2) has been tested for a private sewage disposal systems. The tentative map identifies the proposed septic location and required reserve area. Preliminary documentation provided by the applicant and reviewed by the PRMD Project Review Health Specialist indicates that the soils on site would be expected to support new septic system. The Permit Sonoma Environmental Health Division of the Project Review Section has forwarded standard conditions of approval to ensure proper installation and maintenance of required systems in accordance with County regulations and current best management practices.

Impact:

No Impact

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

Comment:

No known paleontological resources or unique geologic features exist on the project site.

On February 4, 2019, Permit Sonoma referred the project application to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) for comments and recommendations, and to Native American Tribes within Sonoma County requesting consultation under AB-52.

On February 13, 2019, the Northwest Information Center informed Permit Sonoma the project area has a low possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological site(s), and recommended in favor of not requiring further study for cultural resources.

On February 14, 2019, representatives from California Native American tribes participating in the County's project referral and consultation process responded with no comments or requests for

further information regarding the current proposal.

Impact:

Less than significant with Mitigation (see section 5.c)

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

Would the project:

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

Comment:

Per CEQA guidelines- Lead agency should make good faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) resulting from a project.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District has adopted a significance threshold of 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e per year for land use projects. Emissions are caused by natural gas combustion, electricity use, on-road vehicles, water use, wine fermentation, carbon sequestration, and existing emissions. For purposes of the Negative Declaration, the project would only be considered to have a significant impact on greenhouse gases if it would conflict with the state goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020, as set forth by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. There is currently no indication the development potential resulting from the project would conflict with the Act's timeline.

The Community Climate Action Plan has provided the following four major categories of solutions that will reduce greenhouse gases if they are implemented: (1) improve efficiency in energy and water use, (2) shift transportation from fossil fuel vehicles to transit, walking, bicycling, etc. (3) invest in local renewable energy sources, and (4) protect forests and farmlands, sequester carbon, and convert waste into energy. As noted below some of these strategies are already required. Additional measures will be conditioned based on voluntary compliance by the applicant. Mandated and voluntary compliance will ensure compliance with federal, state, and, local greenhouse gas reduction targets.

The Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department supports the use of the BAAQMD's GHG thresholds to determine the significance of GHG emissions. In addition, the County requires compliance with the General Plan Open Space and Resource Conservation Element Objective OSRC-14.4, which states "reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels by 2015." Projects can demonstrate compliance with this general plan objective by complying with the BAAQMD GHG threshold and implementing mitigation measures that exceed the green building code.

The project allows maximum development potential for two additional dwellings, including one primary residence and one accessory unit, from which emitted greenhouse gas emissions do not exceed GHG thresholds of significance as established by BAAQMD.

Impact:

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 proposed project will not conflict with a plan or policy regarding greenhouse gas emissions. See

response to 7a. above.

Impact:

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:

The project is purposing to subdivide land for a 2-lot subdivision. The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Any subsequent construction would require a building permit that would require minimization and mitigation measures to alleviate the risk of hazardous materials used during construction.

Impact:

Less than Significant

- 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. Current construction best management practices are in place to ensure proper handling of hazardous materials. These practices are applied and enforced through issuance and inspection of the building permit by Permit Sonoma. The potential for hazardous spills occurring is therefore less than significant.

Impact:

Less than Significant

- 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:

This project is for a residential subdivision. Resulting development potential includes future construction of one primary residence plus one accessory dwelling. This type and intensity of development is not known to generate hazardous emissions, materials, substances, or waste that would adversely affect sensitive receptors adjacent to or within the vicinity of the project site.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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

Comment:

The project site was not identified on, or in the vicinity of, any parcels on lists compiled by the California Environmental Protection Agency, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Toxic Substances, and the California Integrated Waste management Board.

Impact:
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 an airport land use plan as designated by Sonoma County. There are no known private airstrips within the vicinity of the proposed project.

Impact:
No Impact

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

Comment:
The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with the County's adopted emergency operations plan. There is no separate emergency evacuation plan for the County. In any case, the project would not change existing circulation patterns significantly, and would have no effect outside the area. Existing public streets are available to provide the site with sufficient access away from a wildfire during or such an event.

Impact:
No Impact

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

Comment:
The project does not significantly expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because there is no immediate wildfire risk area assigned to the project site, the nearest fire hazard severity zone is 1.5 miles away and classified as only of a "Moderate" risk level, and existing public streets are available to provide the site with sufficient access away from a wildfire during or such an event.

Impact:
Less than Significant

- h) **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas of where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

Comment:
The Sonoma County Fire Protection District serves the project site with its nearest station located on Todd Road approximately 0.75 miles to the north east. The nearest fire hazard risk area is located on the opposite side of Petaluma Hill road 1.4 miles away to the east, where the assigned risk level is "Moderate". No wildfire risk level designation is assigned within the immediate vicinity of the project. Existing public streets are available to provide the site with sufficient evacuation routes away from a wildfire during such an event.

The County Fire Marshal reviewed the project description and requires that the subdivision and its resulting development potential comply with Fire Safe Standards, including evidence of an emergency water storage supply for development of each parcel, and standard fire protection

measures such as installation of building sprinklers, alarm systems, extinguishers, vegetation management, hazardous materials management and management of flammable or combustible liquids and gases.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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 proposed project is a 2-lot subdivision that could result in the grading and construction of a driveway and two building pads creating approximately ±0.2 acres (8,700sf) of new impervious surface, not including proposed area for septic improvements, which could affect the quantity and/or quality of storm water run-off.

The project site is located in an area subject to the North Coast RWQCB Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) Permit. The proposed project would involve placement of less than 10,000 square feet of impervious surface area. Therefore, it must meet the requirements of the Sonoma County Storm Water Quality Ordinance. Chapter 11A of the Sonoma County Code (Storm Water Quality Ordinance) is intended to preserve the quality of and reduce pollutants into storm water runoff in accordance with provisions of State MS4 Permits.

Chapter 11A prohibits non-storm water discharge ensures new development is designed accordingly to control storm water flow through drainage infrastructure (curb/gutter, drop inlets, culverts or roadside ditches, outlet) prohibits non-storm water discharge. Mainly limits storm water pollution; also limits storm water runoff.

Following subdivision approval and at the time of proposed construction, Permit Sonoma requires the project applicant to prepare a grading and drainage plan in conformance with Chapter 11 Grading and Drainage Ordinance) and Chapter 11a (Storm Water Quality Ordinance) of the Sonoma County Code and the Sonoma County Storm Water Low Impact Development Guide, all of which include performance standards and 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.

Permit Sonoma also requires that the applicant submit as part of the *Grading Permit Required Application Contents* (GRD-004) an erosion prevention/sediment control plan demonstrating implementation of best management practices, limits of disturbed areas/total work, vegetated areas to be preserved, pertinent details, notes, and specifications to prevent damages or minimize adverse impacts to the surrounding properties and the environment. Tracking of soil or construction debris into the public right-of-way is prohibited, as is runoff containing concrete waste or by-products draining to the storm drain system, waterway(s), or adjacent lands.

As Permit Sonoma applies and enforces County Storm Water Quality regulations and standard erosion prevention/sediment control measures through its issuance and inspection of grading permits for new lot development, the project's potential for violating current water quality standards post-construction storm water discharge requirements is less than significant.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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

Comment:

Hurvitz Environmental Services has prepared a hydrogeologic study (HES Report) for the project, dated March 18, 2018. The HES Report estimates the project resulting in up to 1.0 acre feet per year of increased groundwater pumping. The HES Report includes nearby well data and a summary of aquifer and recharge conditions based on recent investigations of the Santa Rosa Plain by HES and the USGS. The HES Report concludes that recharge is expected to be greater than or equal to the groundwater withdrawals anticipated for the project, and that there is little potential for the project to negatively impact groundwater supply, groundwater levels in neighboring wells, and surface waters. Increasing and stable patterns of water levels observed from monitoring wells within roughly 0.5 miles of the project site corroborate the HES Report findings.

The Permit Sonoma Natural Resources Division has reviewed the HES report findings and conclusions and recommends no additional conditions of approval necessary to address the project's water use and demand.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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

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

Comment:

The proposed project could result in the grading and construction of a driveway and two building pads creating approximately ±0.2 acres (8,700sf) of new impervious surface, not including area for septic improvements, which could result in on-site soil erosion or siltation.

As Permit Sonoma applies and enforces standard erosion prevention/sediment control measures through its issuance and inspection of grading permits for new lot development, the project's potential for resulting in substantial erosion or siltation is less than significant.

Impact:

Less than Significant

ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;

Comment:

The proposed project may result in approximately ±0.2 acres (8,700sf) of new impervious surface, , not including area for septic improvements, for grading and construction of a driveway and two building pads. This amount of new impervious surface is not expected to increase surface runoff to any extent that would otherwise likely result in on- or offsite flooding.

The parcel is not in the 100-year flood zone based on the online Sonoma County GIS tool. According to FEMA, the project is not within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA), or an "area that will be inundated by the flood event having a 1- percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year". These areas are also depicted on the zoning maps with the F1- Flood Zone and F2 – Flood Plain Combining Zones (General Plan 2020 PS-1e). Because the project site is not in 100-year floodplain and there is no other potential source of flood water in the project vicinity, the project would

not result in onsite or offsite flooding.

In addition, the project would not significantly increase the rate or amount of surface runoff because of project compliance with County Code requires the applicant to develop a storm water low impact development (SWLID) submittal and adhere to construction and operational Best Management Practices. The Best Management Practices would prevent the alteration of site drainage or increase in surface runoff and avoid flooding. Project Low Impact Development techniques would include limiting impervious surfaces, dispersing development over larger areas, and creation of storm water detention areas. Post construction storm water Best Management Practices include filtering, settling, or removing pollutants.

Impact:

Less than Significant

- i. 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:

At the time of improvement plan submittal or grading or drainage permit application, the applicant shall submit a final drainage report for the proposed project. A typical drainage report will include a project narrative, on- and off-site hydrology maps, hydrologic calculations, , pre- and post-development analysis for all existing and proposed drainage facilities to address capacity for increased runoff. The drainage report will ensure proper implementation of best management practices for minimizing potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Impact:

Less than Significant

- ii. Impede or redirect flood flows?**

Comment:

The site elevation is 100 feet above sea level. The site is not in the 100-year flood zone or Special Flood hazard Area (SFHA), and contains no intermittent streams.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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

Comment:

According to Sonoma General Plan Figure PS-1f (Dam Failure Inundation Hazard Areas), the project site is not located in an area that would be subject to flooding as a result of levee or dam failure. The parcel is not in the 100-year flood zone or Special Flood hazard Area (SFHA) (i.e., the area that will be inundated by the flood event having a 1-percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year). The project site is not located in an area subject to seiche or tsunami.

Impact:

No Impact

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

Comment:

The project is subject to 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. The site is not located in a priority groundwater basin. The project will not impede or conflict with implementation of the Sonoma County Storm Water Low Impact Development Guidelines or the goals of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, as discussed in preceding Sections 7(b), and 10(a) through (d).

The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

Impact:
Less than Significant

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

Comment:

The project would not physically divide a community. The proposed subdivision supports additional single-family development potential on a single proposed lot and does not provide for removal or new construction of such improvements (such as a primary access route or bridge crossing) that may otherwise impact mobility within or between the project surroundings and outlying areas.

Impact:
No Impact

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

Comment:

The project involves a lot split supporting continued use of existing residential development and improvements on Lot 1, and further single-family development potential on Lot 2. The project design is in substantial conformance with the current land use policies and zoning requirements established under the Sonoma County General Plan, South Santa Rosa Area Plan, and Zoning Ordinance for Rural Residential Development, including a three acres per dwelling unit density limitation, a 1.5-acre minimum lot size requirement, and an 80-foot minimum lot width requirement. Both lots are designed to ensure existing and proposed development and improvements conform to current zoning code and Area Plan urban design requirements for maximum lot coverage and minimum building setbacks, including:

Rural Residential (RR) Standards	Requirement	Lot 1 (5.18 ac.)	Lot 2 (3.34 ac.)
Lot Coverage (Max.):	35% (= 1.8 ac)	0.34 ac	0.13 ac
<i>Setbacks (Min.):</i>			
Street Centerline -	45 ft	50 ft	90 ft
Front -	20 ft	67 ft	70 ft
Side -	5 ft	75 ft	5 ft
Rear -	10 ft	300+ ft	300+ ft

Impact:
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:

There is no known mineral resource on the project site.

Impact:

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 a mineral resource recovery site.

Impact:

No Impact

13. NOISE:

Would the project:

- a) **Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

Comment:

The Noise Element of the Sonoma County General Plan establishes goals, objectives and policies including performance standards to regulate noise affecting residential and other sensitive receptors. The general plan sets separate standards for transportation noise and for noise from non-transportation land uses.

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

TABLE NE-2: Maximum Allowable Exterior Noise Exposures

Hourly Noise Metric ¹ , dBA	Daytime (7am -10pm)	Nighttime (10pm - 7am)
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 1 minute in any hour.

The project is located within a rural residential and agricultural area. The project, consisting of the

construction of new residential uses, would not generate noise sources that would expose sensitive receptors to levels in excess of any standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. However, construction activities occurring during the individual lot development may generate potential temporary noise levels exceeding County standards if not properly mitigated. Permit Sonoma recommends the following measures be implemented during development of each lot to ensure construction related noise levels do not exceed County standards as identified above.

Impact:

Less than Significant with Mitigation

Mitigation:

Mitigation NOI-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 am and 5:00 pm on weekdays and 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 pm on weekends and holidays. If work outside the times specified above becomes necessary, the applicant shall notify the Permit Sonoma Project Review Division as soon as practical.
- c) There will be no start-up of machines nor equipment prior to 7:00 am, Monday through Friday or 9:00 am on weekends and holidays; no delivery of materials or equipment prior to 7:00 am nor past 5:00 pm Monday through Friday or prior to 9:00 am nor past 5:00 pm on weekends and holidays and no servicing of equipment past 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday, or weekends and holidays. 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 8:00 am to 5:00 pm weekdays only.
- 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) The developer shall designate a Project Manager with authority to implement the mitigation prior to issuance of a building/grading permit. The Project Managers 24-hour mobile phone number shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site. The Project Manager shall determine the cause of noise complaints (e.g. starting too early, faulty muffler, etc.) and shall take prompt action to correct the problem.

Monitoring:

Monitoring NOI-1: PRMD Project Review Division staff shall ensure that the measures are listed on all site alteration, grading, building or improvement plans, and prior to issuance of grading or building permits. PRMD 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 PRMD staff. If violations are found, PRMD shall seek voluntary compliance from the permit holder, or may require a noise consultant to evaluate the problem and recommend corrective actions, and thereafter may initiate an enforcement action.

b) Exposure of persona to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Comment:

The project includes construction activities that may generate ground borne vibration and noise. These levels would not be significant because they would be short-term and temporary, and would be

limited to daytime hours. There are no other activities or uses associated with the project that would expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels

Impact:

Less than Significant

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

Comment:

The project is located within a rural residential and agricultural area. The project, consisting of the construction of new residential uses, would generate noise sources not known to expose sensitive receptors to levels in excess of any standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Construction activities occurring during the individual lot development may generate noise levels exceeding County standard, though only temporarily. Permit Sonoma recommends measures be implemented as identified under Discussion 12.a above. This study contains no evidence of noise generators resulting in any permanent increase in ambient noise levels associated with potential residential development from this project

Impact:

Less than Significant

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

Comment:

There will be potentially significant temporary noise impacts from the construction activities. This impact will cease when construction is finished. The construction immediately associated with this project would be in regards to the required infrastructure for the creation of new parcels, such as a private road to provide access and utilities. Further construction is anticipated as the individual parcels are developed. Mitigation Measure NOI 1 will reduce the noise impact from construction activities and hauling to less than significant.

Impact:

Less than Significant

- 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 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.

Impact:

No Impact

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

There are no known private airstrips within the project area.

Impact:

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 potential maximum build out of the project could result in the construction of one single family primary residence and one accessory dwelling unit. This is consistent with the current designated density of the parcel, which this project is not proposing to increase. Any impacts associated with population growth associated with the assigned density of the parcel would have been considered upon adoption of the General Plan.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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

Comment:

No housing will be displaced by the project.

Impact:

No Impact

15. PUBLIC SERVICES:

Would the project:

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

- i. **Fire protection?**

Comment:

The Sonoma County Fire Protection District provides structural protection services with its nearest operating station located within one mile of the project site on Todd Road. The nearest fire hazard risk area is located on the opposite side of Petaluma Hill road approximately 2 miles away to the east, where the assigned risk level is "Moderate". No wildfire risk level designation is assigned within the immediate vicinity of the project. Existing public streets are available to provide required access to proposed building sites.

The County Fire Marshal has forwarded conditions of approval requiring that the all resulting development potential of the subdivision comply with Sonoma County's current Fire Safe Standards. Compliance with these standards requires development of each parcel to demonstrate adequate provisions for emergency water storage supply and include evidence of meeting standard required fire protection measures as part of the permitting process. New residential building interiors will be fire sprinklered. All building exteriors and sensitive vegetation and around habitable structures will be appropriately managed per current fire safe standards to minimize hazard risk for each new parcel.

Impact:
Less than Significant

ii. Police?

Comment:
The Sonoma County Sheriff will continue to serve this area. There will be no increased need for police protection resulting from the addition of two (2) residential dwellings

Impact:
Less than Significant

iii. Schools?

Comment:
The project is located within the Sonoma Valley Unified School District. Potential enrollment growth as a result of this project is not anticipated to necessitate a demand for additional facilities in the local surrounding schools. Increased service demands associated with schools or parks will be offset through intake of required development fees as these parcels develop, including school and park mitigation fees.

Impact:
Less than Significant

iv. Parks?

Comment:
The addition of one parcel with a potential for a maximum of 2 residential unit (1 primary and 1 accessory) does not introduce an increase in population that could impact local parks. Individual building permits include development fees to offset potential impacts to public services, including park mitigation fees.

Impact:
Less than Significant

v. Other public facilities?

Comment:
The addition of one parcel with a potential for a maximum of 2 residential unit (1 primary and 1 accessory) would not significantly impact other public facilities. The proposal is consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the parcel. Other potential impacts to public facilities associated with the parcel's assigned density were considered at the time of the adoption of the General Plan. Additionally, development impact fees as noted above will be required with individual building permits to offset potential impacts to public services.

Impact:
Less than Significant

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 potential additional number of residents that could result in the maximum build out of this project would not be large enough to significantly cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of parks or recreational facilities.

Impact:

Less than Significant

- 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 potential additional number of residents that could result in the maximum build out of this project would not be large enough to significantly cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of parks or recreational facilities.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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 proposed subdivision supports a maximum development potential consisting of one primary single-family dwelling units and one accessory dwelling unit. Based on the national average of 9.5 daily trips generated per a single-family dwelling, the proposed subdivision could increase the amount of daily trip generations for the surroundings by up to almost 20 trips per day. This estimated increase would not conflict with any adopted plans, ordinances, or policies in regards to circulation. No obstructed sight lines from respective access frontages encumber the parcel configurations as proposed. The transportation element of the General Plan requires no additional circulation system improvements as a prerequisite for the project, or for supporting general build-out potential as allowed under current density and zoning requirements for this area.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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

Comment:

The increase in vehicle miles traveled per day as a result of two new dwellings as proposed is not anticipated to conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), nor with any adopted plans, ordinances, or policies in regards to circulation. No obstructed sight lines from respective access frontages encumber the parcel configurations as proposed. The transportation element of the General Plan requires no additional circulation system improvements as a prerequisite for the project, or for supporting general build-out potential as allowed under current density and zoning requirements for this area.

Impact:

Less than Significant

- 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 have no effect on air traffic patterns.

Impact:

No Impact

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

Comment:

No design features that could increase hazards or incompatible uses are associated with this project. No obstructed sight lines appear to encumber the current parcel configurations as proposed from respective access frontages. The transportation element of the General Plan requires no additional improvements to the current circulation system to support build-out potential as allowed per current density and zoning requirements.

Impact:

Less than Significant

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

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 5020.1(k), or**

Comment:

The project site contains no structures or locational significance that may otherwise be eligible for consideration as a potential historical resource.

On February 4, 2019, Permit Sonoma referred the project application to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) for comments and recommendations, and to Native American Tribes within Sonoma County requesting consultation under AB-52. On February 14, 2019, representatives of all contacted California Native American tribes within the area responded with no requests for further consultation on the project pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1.

On February 13, 2019, the Northwest Information Center informed Permit Sonoma that no further study for archaeological resources is recommended based on the low possibility of the site containing unrecorded archaeological resources.

Impact:

Less than Significant

- 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:

The project site contains no known tribal cultural resources of significance, or otherwise.

On February 4, 2019, Permit Sonoma referred the project application to the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) for comments and recommendations, and to Native American Tribes within Sonoma County requesting consultation under AB-52. On February 14, 2019, representatives of all contacted California Native American tribes within the area responded with no requests for further consultation on the project pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1.

On February 13, 2019, the Northwest Information Center informed Permit Sonoma that no further study for archaeological resources is recommended based on the low possibility of the site containing unrecorded archaeological resources.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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 would not contribute to the need for construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, other than construction of new septic systems.

Impact:

Less than significant

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

Comment:

The project is within a Class I major groundwater recharge area. The basin has been designated as a priority basin due to potential for groundwater decline. The proposed lot will be served by construction of a new on-site well to serve a single family residence and accessory dwelling. The well is required to meet standards for adequate supply including a margin for multiple dry years.

Impact:

Less than significant

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

Comment:

Residential development on the new lot includes construction of a new septic system and requires no

treatment of sewage by an off-site provider.

Impact:

Less than significant

- 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:

The scope and intensity of new single-family development resulting from the project, including one new primary residence and one new accessory dwelling unit, is not anticipated to generate any level of solid waste exceeding State or local standards, or the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Impact:

Less than significant

- 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.

Impact:

Less than significant

20. WILDFIRE

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

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

Comment:

The project site is located within a Local Responsibility Area and served by the Sonoma County Fire Protection District operating less than a mile away to the northwest. The nearest State Responsibility Area is 1.5 miles away to the east. The nearest *Very High Fire* severity zone is over 7 miles away to the north east.

The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with the County's adopted emergency operations plan. There is no separate emergency evacuation plan for the County. In any case, the project would not physically change existing circulation patterns, and would have no effect outside the area. Existing public streets are available to provide the site with sufficient access away from a wildfire during or such an event occurring from the east.

Impact:

Less than Significant

- 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 does not significantly expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because there is no immediate wildfire risk area assigned to the project site, the nearest fire hazard severity zone is 1.5 miles away and classified as only of a "Moderate" risk level, and existing public streets are available to provide the site with sufficient access away from a wildfire during or such an event occurring from the east.

Impact:

Less than Significant

- 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 provides for single-family development potential requiring no such installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities

Impact:

No Impact

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

Comment:

The project does not significantly expose people or structures to a risk of downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes because the nearest hillside and fire hazard severity zone is 1.5 miles away to the east, and has no known path of travel to direct such debris or runoff toward the project site.

Impact:

Less than Significant

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:

No. Based on the technical conclusions and recommended mitigation measures identified within this study, the project's potential for degrading the quality of the environment, substantially reducing the habitat of fish or wildlife species, causing a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threatening to eliminate a plant or animal community, reducing the number or restricting the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminating important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory is found to be less than significant.

Impact:

Less than Significant with Mitigation

- 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. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, this environmental analysis was conducted to determine if there were any project-specific effects that are cumulatively considerable. Analysis provided within this initial study found no significant project-level impacts that would be cumulatively significant with implementation of recommended mitigation measures and best management practices. The subdivision supports a fixed level of development potential that is neither growth-inducing, nor of such a type that would create an unforeseen increase in population, traffic and/or greenhouse gas levels beyond those evaluated in the submitted technical reports considered by the General Plan. The proposed project allows a fixed level of potential development that could result in cumulative impacts if not regulated. However, this study identifies specific mitigation measures that when implemented accordingly, would reduce project level and potential cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project will not therefore, result in impacts that are cumulatively considerable

Impact:

Less than Significant with Mitigation

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

Comment:

No. As discussed in the various section throughout this CEQA document, the proposed project would not include uses resulting in substantial adverse effects to human beings either directly or indirectly.

Impact:

Less than Significant