

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 PURPOSE

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provides an assessment of the potentially significant environmental effects from implementation of the proposed Scott Ranch Residential Development project (“Scott Ranch project” or “proposed project”). This EIR also presents an assessment of the potential environmental impacts of a related project - the Helen Putnam Regional Park Trail project (“regional park trail”), a regional trail segment proposed by Sonoma County Regional Parks in collaboration with the project applicant on parkland to the west of the Scott Ranch project. This Executive Summary is intended to provide the decision makers, responsible agencies, and the public with a clear, simple, and concise description of the proposed project and the potential significant environmental impacts that could result from its implementation.

The *State CEQA Guidelines* (Section 15123) require that a summary be included in an EIR that identifies all major conclusions, identifies each significant effect, recommended mitigation measure(s), and alternatives that would minimize or avoid potential significant impacts of the proposed project. The summary is also required to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public and issues to be resolved. These issues can include the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant effects. All of these requirements of an EIR summary are addressed in the sections below. This summary focuses on the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for the proposed project and utilizes non-technical language to promote understanding. The City of Petaluma City Council is the CEQA lead agency for the proposed project.

The City of Petaluma has prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) to provide an assessment of the potentially significant environmental effects of the Scott Ranch project (referred to as the “proposed project”) located at the corner of Windsor Drive and D Street in the City of Petaluma. The Scott Ranch project consists of the Davidon (28-lot) Residential Project component and the Putnam Park Extension Project component. This document also provides an assessment of potential environmental impacts of the off-site Helen Putnam Regional Park Trail project (“regional park trail”); a regional trail segment proposed by Sonoma County Regional Parks. The regional park trail is analyzed as a related project (also referred to as the “related project”) because it would provide a connection from proposed trails in the Putman Park Extension Project component to existing trails in Helen Putnam Regional Park.

This DEIR is a Revised DEIR (RDEIR), which analyzes a reduced development at the project site from what was analyzed in the 2013 DEIR (93-lot residential project) and in the 2017 DEIR (66/63-lot residential project).

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The approximately 58.66-acre project site is located in the southwestern portion of the City at the corner of the intersection of Windsor Drive and D Street. It is accessible by US 101 Highway (US 101) to the east, a major freeway in the Bay Area and Highway 116 to the north. The main arterial street that provides access from the freeway to the project site is D Street. Direct access to the site is provided by Windsor Drive and D Street. The site is currently an undeveloped property with a barn complex (consisting of three barns and an old dairy equipment cleaning shed) an unoccupied mobile home, and remnants of a collapsed farm house that was destroyed by fire.

There are single-family homes developed to the north, northwest (Victoria Subdivision), and east (Pinnacle Heights Subdivision) of the project site. Helen Putnam Regional Park, maintained by the Sonoma County Regional Parks, is located to the west of the project site. Agricultural uses or rural residences on large parcels in private ownership are located to the south and southwest in unincorporated Sonoma County.

2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The residential project component would develop approximately 25 percent of the project site (15 acres) with 28 single-family residences, streets, and common open space. The single-family residences would be developed along two new proposed streets— one new street would branch north of Windsor Drive and a second new street would branch south of Windsor Drive. The homes would be arranged in clusters off each of the two proposed streets. Other infrastructure improvements (i.e., sewer, water, and storm drainage facilities, including detention basins) needed to serve the proposed project would also be constructed. A roundabout on City right-of-way at the intersection of D Street and Windsor Drive would be developed as part of the residential project component. A six-foot wide sidewalk would be provided on the south side of Windsor Drive from the new intersection to D Street, in addition to an off-site sidewalk between Windsor Drive and Sunnyslope Avenue running along the east side of D Street.

The proposed Putnam Park Extension Project component would extend the existing Helen Putnam Regional Park eastward to D Street by developing a park area on the approximately 44-acres that constitute most of the project site. The proposed project would develop a barn center that would include the renovation of the existing barn complex and the cleaning shed, pathways between the structures, bike parking, information kiosks, vegetable gardens, demonstration and working corrals, antique farm equipment with a hand pump, and an amphitheater for outdoor learning activities. Access to the barn center is currently provided via D Street by a driveway, which would be improved and used as a service vehicle entrance with removable bollards. The barn center would be visible from D Street and accessible from the main parking lot (or lower parking lot). The proposed project would include a multi-use trail of

approximately 0.7 mile that would run along the north side and south side of Kelly Creek. A 0.35-mile section of the loop trail along the north side of Kelly Creek (north trail) would connect Helen Putnam Regional Park on the west end of the project site to the barn center on the east end of the project site. Access to this trail section would be from the upper parking lot through a four-foot-wide, 0.02-mile-long, ADA-compliant trail. A 300-foot Urban Separator would be maintained between the proposed development and the southern boundary of the project site. See **Section 3.0, Project Description**, for further information about the project characteristics.

The project Applicants have requested the following approvals for the proposed project: (1) a General Plan Amendment to modify and clarify General Plan Policy 2-P-68, (2) Amendment of General Plan Figure 5-2, (3) a rezoning from Residential 1 (R1) to a Planned Unit District (PUD), (4) adoption of Planned Unit Development Plan and Guidelines; and (5) a Vesting Tentative Map to subdivide the project parcels into residential, open space, public access and parking lots. Each of these discretionary approvals is described in detail below. In addition, Site Plan and Architectural Review (SPAR) will be required for development of the single-family homes, associated landscaping, and lighting in the residential component and for public improvements proposed as part of the Putnam Park Extension Project component.

2.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The City of Petaluma has developed the following primary objectives for the proposed project to satisfy *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15124(b). The City's objectives are to:

- provide development consistent with the City's long-term development goals, especially as related to the provision of additional housing;
- develop the project site in a manner that preserves the uniqueness and gateway value of the site;
- implement General Plan policies related to establishment of an Urban Separator and the Petaluma ring trail system; and
- provide improved recreational access to the Helen Putnam Regional Park.

The project applicants' key objectives for the proposed project are to:

- promote and maximize new housing opportunities within the urban growth boundary thereby discouraging urban sprawl;
- develop a high-quality residential project on the west side of Petaluma, compatible with existing residential subdivisions in the neighborhood and with rural and park areas to the south and west of the site;
- permanently preserve sensitive biological and geological areas of the site as protected open space;

- preserve and enhance Kelly Creek in its natural state;
- preserve the barn complex;
- provide a public pedestrian/bicycle trail connecting to Helen Putnam Regional Park; and
- provide a large extension of the Helen Putnam Regional Park, incorporating new trails, a restored barn complex, habitat and waterway enhancements, and related features.

2.5 ALTERNATIVES

A Draft EIR was previously published and circulated in 2013 for a larger 93-lot residential development project on the project site. In response to comments received on the 2013 Draft EIR, the applicant for this development (Davidon Homes) modified the project to a development of 66-single family homes that was analyzed as an alternative in the 2013 DEIR. This 66-single family homes project was analyzed in a Draft EIR that was published and circulated in 2017. In June 2018, following public hearings on the 2017 Draft EIR, Kelly Creek Protection Project (KCPP) of Earth Island Institute announced that it had entered into an agreement with Davidon Homes to purchase approximately 44 acres of the project site to develop it as an extension to the Helen Putnam Regional Park. Davidon Homes then modified the residential project analyzed in the 2017 Draft EIR to propose a smaller development of 28 single-lot homes on approximately 15 acres of the project site. If the City approves both components under the proposed project (Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project component and the Putnam Park Extension Project component), then the 44-acre park portion of the property would be transferred to KCPP and developed as an extension of Helen Putnam Regional Park.

This RDEIR and alternatives analysis takes into account the comments received on the NOP for the 2013 Draft EIR, the comments received on the 2013 Draft EIR, and the comments received on the 2017 Draft EIR. The Davidon (28-lot) Residential Project component analyzed in this RDEIR was considered as a reduced development alternative in the 2017 DEIR. Therefore, this RDEIR does not put forth a reduced alternative for the Davidon (28-lot) Residential Project component as the proposed project analyzed in this RDEIR includes a residential component that is in itself a reduced project alternative and has been significantly reduced from the originally proposed 93-lot residential development. The project site could be developed at a higher density by right (up to 110 unit), and it is not feasible to reduce the residential density of the project more than currently proposed. That said, the Alternatives chapter analyzes two alternatives that represent a reduction in overall project size: the 28-Lot Residential Project and the Putnam Park Extension Project.

Consistent with CEQA requirements, a reasonable range of alternatives was evaluated that could feasibly avoid or lessen any significant environmental impacts while substantially attaining the basic objectives of the proposed project. The alternatives analyzed in detail in this RDEIR are presented below.

2.5.1 Alternative 1: No Project/No Development

The *State CEQA Guidelines* require the analysis of a No Project Alternative (Section 15125.6(e)). This analysis must discuss existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not to be approved, based on current plans, site zoning, and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. The purpose of describing and analyzing a No Project Alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project.

The project site is currently zoned Residential 1 (R1) on the City's Zoning Map and designated Very Low Density Residential (0.6 to 2.5 dwelling units per acre) in the City's General Plan. Given the project site zoning and General Plan designation, if the proposed project were not to be approved, the site could still be developed with 28-110 single-family homes¹ without requiring a General Plan amendment or rezoning. Such a No Project Alternative could result in the development of a subdivision that is comparable to or even larger than the proposed project and is, therefore, not evaluated in this RDEIR. Instead, the No Project Alternative analyzed in this RDEIR is the No Development Alternative, under which no alterations would be made to the project site, the existing barn complex and mobile home would remain in place, and the site would continue to be used as grazing land.

The analysis of the No Project/No Development Alternative assumes the continuation of existing conditions on the project site, as well as development of the cumulative projects listed in Table 4.0-1 of this RDEIR. The potential environmental impacts associated with the No Project/No Development Alternative are described in Chapter 5.0 and are compared to the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.

2.5.2 Alternative 2: Davidon (28 Lot) Residential Project

The Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project Alternative would develop 28 single-family homes in the same lot configuration as the current project (Figure 5.0-1, Davidon [28-Lot] Residential Project Site Plan). Development of this alternative would be on approximately 15 acres of the project site, north of Kelly Creek, with 12 acres for the residences and approximately 3 acres of open space. This alternative would not include

¹ The net acreage of the site is 45.154.23 acres (excludes public or private rights-of-way, public open space and floodways, but does not exclude the Urban Separator per Policy 1-P-19). As such, the number of units allowed to be developed on the project site ranges between 276 and-110 dwelling units.

the Putnam Park Extension Project component. Under this alternative, the multi-use trails and pedestrian and livestock bridges would not be developed, the barn complex would remain in place and would not be restored, and there would be no pasture improvements or stock pond enhancements. This alternative would construct the roundabout at D Street and Windsor Drive and the detention and infiltration facility located south of Windsor Drive. It would also include a new off-site sidewalk improvement along the east side of D Street between Windsor Drive and Sunnyslope Avenue, for a distance of approximately 800 feet, to connect with the existing sidewalk. Storm drains would be installed in the new streets that serve the proposed residences to collect the runoff generated by new impervious surfaces. Collected storm water would be detained and infiltrated onsite before eventual discharge into Kelly Creek via a new outfall. A detention and infiltration facility would be constructed south of Windsor Drive. Another detention and infiltration basin would be installed at the southwest corner of Windsor Drive and D Street to capture existing, untreated runoff from Windsor Drive. The runoff would be intercepted on Windsor Drive in a newly constructed drop inlet and flow into a vegetated swale leading to the proposed infiltration basin. The potential environmental impacts associated with this alternative are described in Chapter 5.0 and are compared to the environmental impacts of the proposed project to determine to what extent this alternative would reduce or avoid the proposed project's significant impacts.

2.5.3 Alternative 3: Putnam Park Extension Project

The Putnam Park Extension Project Alternative would only include the features of the Putnam Park Extension Project component and no residential homes would be developed. As shown in Figure 5.0-2, Putnam Park Extension Project Alternative Site Plan, this alternative would construct multi-use trails and the upper and main parking lots. The barn complex under this alternative would be preserved and may be relocated for purposes of stabilization and preservation. The barn center would include the renovation of the existing barn complex and the cleaning shed (one of the barns would be converted into an agricultural museum), pathways between the structures (surfaced with ADA-compliant material), bike parking, information kiosks, vegetable gardens, demonstration and working corrals, antique farm equipment with a hand pump, and an amphitheater for outdoor learning activities. Under this alternative, a playground and picnic areas would be constructed south of Kelly Creek. This alternative would also include a multi-use loop trail circling the north and south sides of Kelly Creek. A short trail from the loop trail that connects to the upper parking lot would also be installed. A Class I trail would be constructed from the southeast corner of the project site along D Street that travels northerly through the park, along the west side of the main parking lot, through a proposed playground area, over a footbridge crossing Kelly Creek, and through the barn center. A Class I trail would also be constructed at the project frontage along D Street. This alternative would include pasture improvements, stock pond enhancements, and features to protect and conserve habitat for the California red-legged frog. A stormwater treatment facility may be required

to treat runoff from the proposed main parking lot (south of Kelly Creek). The potential environmental impacts associated with this alternative are described in Chapter 5.0 and are compared to the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.

2.6 REGIONAL PARK TRAIL

The Helen Putnam Regional Park Trail project (“regional park trail”) is an approximately 0.5-mile-long trail segment proposed by Sonoma County Regional Parks (SCRIP) in collaboration with the project Applicants on parkland offsite to the west of the Scott Ranch project site. Although not being proposed jointly with the project, the Helen Putnam Regional Park Trail is considered a related project because it would provide a connection from proposed trails onsite north and south of Kelly Creek to existing offsite trails in Helen Putnam Regional Park. Construction of the proposed multi-use trail on the project site would create conditions that could lead to the construction of the regional park trail on the Helen Putnam Regional Park property. While there is no guarantee that the regional park trail would be constructed, with the access provided by the project site multi-use trail between D Street and the eastern boundary of the regional park, the probability that the regional park trail would be constructed would increase. Therefore conservatively, this RDEIR analyses the regional park trail as a related project and presents the environmental consequences that could result from its construction and operation. This EIR may be used by the SCRIP if and when it decides to construct the regional park trail.

2.7 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED/AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

In 2004, the project applicant, Davidon Homes, began processing a complete application for a 93-lot residential development project to be located on the same site as the currently proposed project. A NOP was issued for the EIR for the 93-lot project, and the Draft EIR was completed in February 2013 and circulated for 60 days. Approximately, 300 written comments were received on the 2013 Draft EIR from agencies and the public during the public review period and during the Planning Commission and City Council meetings. The project received substantial community opposition and ultimately the City Council found the 2013 Draft EIR inadequate.

In response to the comments received on the 2013 Draft EIR, Davidon Homes modified and put forth a reduced development proposal that was analyzed in a RDEIR released for public review in 2017 (2017 Draft EIR). The development analyzed in the 2017 Draft EIR included up to 66 single-family homes with private and public open space, a public park with multi-use trail, a Class I trail section along D Street, trailhead parking lots, and other infrastructure such as sidewalks, a roundabout, sewer, water, and storm drainage. The 2017 Draft EIR was circulated for public review for 60 days. Comments received provided opinions related to the project merit, expressed concerns regarding the project analysis, and requested clarification

to CEQA topics especially those related to open space and aesthetics, biological and cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, public utilities, and traffic. The project faced substantial community opposition and the City Council found the 2017 Draft EIR inadequate.

Following KCPP agreement with Davidon Homes in June 2018 to purchase approximately 44 acres of the project site to develop it as an extension to Helen Putnam Regional Park, Davidon Homes then modified the residential project analyzed in the 2017 Draft EIR to propose a reduced development of 28 single-family homes on a little less than 15 acres of the project site. KCPP and Davidon Homes are working collaboratively, but each submitted an application for its respective component of the Scott Ranch project. If the project is approved, each applicant will receive separate approvals. The 44-acre park portion of the property will be transferred to KCPP and developed as an extension of Helen Putnam Park only if the City approves both the residential and park components of the Scott Ranch project. As City Council found the 2017 Draft EIR inadequate, the City of Petaluma has determined to prepare this RDEIR to analyze the revised project and address comments received on the 2017 Draft EIR. Concerns raised during the preparation of the 2013 and 2017 Draft EIRs were considered in the preparation of this Revised Draft EIR.

2.8 IMPACT SUMMARY

A detailed discussion regarding potential environmental impacts of the proposed project is provided in **Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**. A summary of the impacts of the proposed project is provided in **Table 2.0-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**. Also provided in **Table 2.0-1** are mitigation measures, which are proposed to avoid or reduce significant project and cumulative impacts. The table indicates whether implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**Table 2.0-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Aesthetics | | | | |
| Impact AES-1 | Development of the project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures AES-1a and AES-1b</p> <p>AES-1a: The following restrictions shall be placed on the design of the proposed project:</p> <p>Elements such as design, height, contouring, and massing of proposed single-family development shall comply with Hillside Protection and Tree Protection ordinances. Homes shall be designed to step with the hillside and avoid solid walls or overhangs that run against the natural slope of the site.</p> <p>Construction of Lots 1 through 10 shall be carefully evaluated during the Site Plan and Architectural Review process. These lots shall only be subdivided or developed with structures that would incorporate appropriate hillside design elements and would not substantially block or obscure views.</p> <p>The design, height, and massing of retaining walls shall be specifically reviewed during the Site Plan and Architectural Review process. Retaining walls shall not exceed 5 feet in height unless incorporating terracing with landscaping and minimum width of 3 feet. Retaining walls should conform to the slope. Treatment of retaining walls that are visible from a public street shall incorporate a veneer of natural stone, stained concrete, earth toned textured surface, or as otherwise accepted through the Site Plan and Architectural Review process such that walls blend in with the natural hillside environment and promote a rural character.</p> <p>Review during the Site Plan and Architectural Review shall include project landscape. Vegetation including woodland cover shall be reestablished on graded slopes and between existing abutting residential structures (See also Mitigation Measure BIO-2a). Reestablishment of vegetation near the project's residences shall conform to the requirement of the project's Fuel Management Program.</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | AES 1b: The architectural elevations and materials used on the exterior of the residences (including roofing materials, exterior finishing, and trim palette) shall include natural, terrain-neutral colors and prohibit the use of brightly colored terra cotta or red clay roof tiles in order to limit potential visual contrast between the proposed development and the adjacent hillsides, as determined acceptable by the Planning Commission through the Site Plan and Architectural Review process required by Petaluma Municipal Code Section 24.010. The developer shall include Codes, Covenants, and Restrictions (CC&R) that prohibit or limit roofing color changes by future owners, in accordance with the Planning Commission Site Plan and Architectural Review approval. . | |
| Impact AES-2 | Development of the project site would not have a substantial effect on scenic resources within a state scenic highway. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact AES-3 | Development of the project site would not substantially degrade the visual character and quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. | <i>Significant</i> | Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES 3b AES-3a: All construction staging shall occur within the project boundaries and on authorized road encroachment. Construction staging areas shall use appropriate screening (i.e., temporary fencing with opaque material) to screen views of construction equipment and material. AES-3b: Project landscaping and recreational features shall be designed and located in a manner to preserve the visual character of the project site and promote the view of the barn complex. As part of the SPAR, the Applicants shall submit to the City of Petaluma detailed landscape plans showing the location of the new trees and visual simulations demonstrating the preservation of the existing scenic view of the barn complex. . | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact AES-4 | Implementation of the proposed project would not create new sources of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------|--|
| RPT Impact AES-1 | The implementation of the proposed regional park trail project would not result in a significant impact on scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character and quality, or light and glare. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact AES-1 | The proposed Scott Ranch project and the regional park trail project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in a significant cumulative impact with regard to scenic vistas, visual character, or scenic resources. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact AES-2 | The proposed Scott Ranch project and the regional park trail project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in significant cumulative impact with regard to light and glare. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Air Quality | | | | |
| Impact AIR-1 | The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Impact AIR-2 | Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate emissions that would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any critical pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. | Significant | <p>Mitigation Measure AIR-2</p> <p>The construction contractor(s) shall implement the following measures during construction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. f. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. g. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. | Less than Significant |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Impact AIR-3 | Construction and operation of the proposed project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. | <i>Significant</i> | Implement Mitigation Measure AIR-2 | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact AIR-4 | The proposed project would not result in other emissions (such as leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| RPT Impact AIR-1 | The construction of the proposed regional park trail project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable national or state ambient air quality standard, expose existing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, create objectionable odors, or conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, but construction-phase emissions of fugitive dust could exceed applicable thresholds. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measure RPT AIR-1</p> <p>The construction contractor(s) shall implement the following measures during construction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All exposed surfaces (e.g., staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. A publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. | |
| Cumulative Impact AIR-1 | The proposed project and the proposed regional park trail, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in significant cumulative air quality impacts. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Biological Resources | | | | |
| Impact BIO-1 | The proposed project would not affect special-status plant species but would result in substantial adverse effects on special-status animal species, including California red-legged frog, nesting birds, and roosting bats. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures BIO-1a through BIO-1d</p> <p>BIO-1a: The project Applicants shall obtain all required permits from the USFWS, CDFW, RWQCB, and USACE (e.g., 1600 series permits, 404 and 401 permits), incidental take permits and any others. The project Applicants will submit with the permit application a Wetland Mitigation Program for review and approval by the regulatory agencies. The project Applicants shall implement mitigation measures, as required by federal and State law and included in the permits, to avoid, minimize, or offset impacts to any species listed under either the state or Federal Endangered Species Acts or protected under any other state or federal law. Evidence that the project Applicants have secured all required authorization from these agencies shall be submitted to the Community Development Department of the City of Petaluma prior to issuance of any grading or building permits for the project.</p> <p>BIO-1b: A Final California Red-Legged Frog Mitigation Plan (CRLFMP) shall be prepared by a qualified wildlife biologist to minimize and mitigate potential impacts of the project on CRLF. The Final CRLFMP shall be prepared in consultation with and be approved by the USFWS, CDFW, USACE, and City, and shall provide for the protection, replacement, and management of habitat for CRLF affected by proposed development and public open space use on the project site. The Final CRLFMP shall be required as a condition of approval for the</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>project Tentative Map, and shall include the following components and meet the following standards:</p> <p>Preconstruction and Construction Avoidance Provisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Preconstruction surveys shall be conducted by a Service-approved biologist prior to any grading or major vegetation clearance to ensure that no individual CRLF are lost during construction. The Final CRLFMP shall: 1) describe in detail the survey approach and methodology, and 2) specify that grading or vegetation clearance may not occur in any area where individual CRLF are located until such time as the individual has either moved out of the disturbance zone or has been physically relocated by a Service-approved biologist legally authorized to handle the species. b. All project-related -vegetation clearing and grading activities within potential habitat for CRLF shall be monitored by a Service-approved biologist. The Final CRLFMP shall specify the duties of the Service-approved biologist. c. All construction personnel shall be trained in CRLF identification, habitat description, legal protective status, construction restrictions, and procedures to avoid unnecessary disturbance to potential habitat or incidental take of these species. The Final CRLFMP shall describe this training program. d. Exclusionary fencing shall be installed prior to grading or major vegetation clearance where appropriate to keep CRLF out of construction areas. The Final CRLFMP shall identify where such fencing is to be installed and provide procedures for fence installation, monitoring, and maintenance. The Final CRLFMP shall require that the exclusionary fencing be installed under the direct supervision of a Service-approved biologist and shall be maintained during the course of construction activities on the site. e. If necessary, identify the locations for use of permanent exclusionary fencing or other barriers to prevent and minimize dispersal of CRLF into areas with concentrated human activity, based on input from the USFWS and CDFW. This may be particularly important at locations along segments of the multi-use trail to the south of Kelly Creek or parking lot and staging area on the east side of the D Street | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>tributary, to prevent the movement of individual frogs into areas, of intensive bike, pedestrian and vehicle activity. If used, the permanent exclusionary fencing/barriers shall be designed and installed during project construction under the supervision of a Service-approved biologist.</p> <p>f. Appropriate signage shall be designed and installed to restrict unauthorized human access into essential habitat areas for CRLF during construction.</p> <p>Habitat Avoidance and Mitigation Provisions</p> <p>g. Avoid development and associated direct and indirect impacts on CRLF in accordance with project revisions required as part of the consultation process with CDFW and USFWS. Compensatory mitigation shall be provided at a minimum of 3:1 for permanent impacts and 1:1 for temporary impacts to CRLF habitat. This may be accomplished through permanent protection and establishment of a conservation easement or other mechanisms of suitable habitat on-site and off-site, where necessary to achieve the minimum compensatory mitigation requirements.</p> <p>h. Control unauthorized access to the on-site stock pond and open space in the southwestern portion of the project site to protect these essential habitat features for CRLF. Install fencing and interpretive displays and restrictive signage along all trail systems as necessary to control access from the proposed multi-use trails and other locations where unauthorized access is likely.</p> <p>i. Where disturbance and improvements within essential habitat and movement corridors cannot be completely avoided and on-site mitigation is considered insufficient by the CDFW and USFWS, the loss shall be mitigated by permanently preserving similar quality habitat known to support CRLF at off-site locations preferably in the Petaluma vicinity of Sonoma County, as negotiated with the regulatory agencies. It is possible that the mitigation location, whether on-site or possibly off-site as well, could be used to achieve mitigation for other biological and wetland impacts, depending on its habitat characteristics, provisions for habitat creation and/or enhancement defined as part of the Final CRLFMP, and negotiations with the CDFW and USFWS.</p> | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>j. Identify methods to minimize the potential for harassment or take of listed and non-listed species as a result of increased human activity associated with development and open space use of the site. This shall include an educational program for future residents and visitors, fencing and interpretive signage at access points into natural open space, use of sensitive grade changes, culverted undercrossings, and bridged overcrossings in uplands where roadways or trails bisect movement corridors, and possible use of permanent exclusionary fencing.</p> <p>Habitat Connectivity and On-Site Management Provisions</p> <p>k. Define methods to provide connectivity for CRLF between open space areas on site and to the surrounding undeveloped lands to the west, south, and east.</p> <p>l. Provide for permanent protection and adaptive management of open space lands (both on-site and possibly off-site) intended to function as potential habitat for CRLF.</p> <p>BIO-1c: Any active nests of raptors or other birds protected under federal and state regulations in the vicinity of construction shall be avoided until young birds are able to leave the nest (i.e., fledged) and forage on their own. Avoidance may be accomplished either by scheduling grading, vegetation removal and demolition activities during the non-nesting period (August 30 through February 14), or if this is not feasible, by conducting a pre-construction survey for raptor and other bird nests. Provisions of the pre-construction survey and nest avoidance, if necessary, shall include the following:</p> <p>a. To avoid “take” of barn owls in the large barn, any relocation or restoration work shall be initiated in the non-nesting period or shall be performed in conformance with the pre-construction survey procedures detailed below.</p> <p>b. If grading is scheduled during the active nesting period (February 15 through August 31), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nest survey no more than 15 days prior to initiation of grading to provide confirmation on presence or absence of active nests in the vicinity.</p> <p>c. If active nests are encountered, species-specific measures shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and implemented to prevent abandonment of the active nest. At a minimum,</p> | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>grading and vegetation removal in the vicinity of the nest shall be deferred until the young birds have fledged or are no longer dependent on the nest. A nest-setback zone shall be established within which all construction-related disturbances shall be prohibited. These are typically at least 300 feet for all raptors and 100 feet for other birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and State Fish and Game Code, unless site-specific conditions allow for some variation from these distances as determined by the qualified wildlife biologist in coordination with CDFW. The perimeter of the nest-setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with staked flagging at 20-foot intervals, and construction personnel restricted from the area.</p> <p>d. If permanent avoidance of the nest is not feasible, impacts shall be minimized by prohibiting disturbance within the nest-setback zone until a qualified biologist verifies that the birds have either a) not begun egg-laying and incubation, or b) that the juveniles from the nest are foraging independently and capable of independent survival.</p> <p>e. Demolition of any existing buildings and removal of any trees shall also consider possible bat use of the site, as defined below in Mitigation Measure BIO-1d.</p> <p>f. A survey report by the qualified biologist verifying that the young birds have fledged shall be submitted to the Community Development Department of the City of Petaluma prior to initiation of grading and vegetation removal in the nest-setback zone.</p> <p>BIO-1d: Measures shall be taken to avoid possible loss of bats during project construction. Any buildings that are approved for demolition, rehabilitation, or relocation shall be done using the following provisions:</p> <p>a. Any buildings approved for removal shall be demolished between March 1 (or after evening temperatures rise above 45 degrees F and/or no more than ½" of rainfall within 24 hours occurs) to April 15 or from August 31 to October 15 (or before evening temperatures fall below 45 degrees F and/or more than ½" of rainfall within 24 hours occurs) to minimize the likelihood of removal during the winter roosting period when individuals are less active and more difficult to detect,</p> | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>and the critical pupping period (April 16 to August 30) when young cannot disperse.</p> <p>b. Buildings shall be surveyed by a qualified bat biologist possessing a Memorandum of Understanding with the CDFW no more than 2 weeks before demolition and/or relocation work is undertaken to avoid “take” of any bats that may have begun to use the structures for roosting subsequent to the assessments by Wildlife Research Associates (2004 and 2014). The buildings in which roosting would be most likely to occur are the large two-story barn, hay barn, and garage building.</p> <p>c. If the pre-demolition survey reveals bats or bat roosting activity, all doors and windows shall be opened and left open continually until demolition, relocation and/or rehabilitation work is to begin. Additional recommendations may be made by the qualified bat specialist following the pre-construction survey, including monitoring of demolition and/or relocation and other measures to avoid take of individual bats.</p> <p>d. A tree roost habitat assessment shall be conducted by a qualified bat biologist possessing a Memorandum of Understanding with the CDFW of any trees that will be removed as part of the project. The habitat assessment shall be conducted no more than 2 weeks prior to tree removal and vegetation clearing. Additional detailed measures may be required based on the results of the habitat assessment if evidence of bat roosting is observed. This may include supervision of tree removal by the qualified bat biologist, and systematic removal of selected trees and major limbs to encourage dispersal and avoid “take” of individual bats.</p> | |
| Impact BIO-2 | The proposed project would affect sensitive natural communities, including riparian habitat, native grasslands, and regulated seasonal wetlands. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures BIO-2a through BIO-2e</p> <p>BIO-2a: A detailed Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan (Plan) shall be prepared by a qualified landscape architect in consultation with a plant ecologist experienced with native species. The Plan shall: 1) provide for re-establishment of grassland, riparian, and oak woodland cover on graded slopes in open space areas; 2) incorporate mitigation requirements to replace and enhance wetland habitat and provide for replacement of native trees removed as part of the project; 3) provide for replacement of native grasslands lost as a result of development and trail improvements; 4) identify unsuitable species which should not be</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>used in landscaping; 5) prevent the establishment and spread of introduced broom; and 6) specify long-term management provisions to ensure re-establishment of native and ornamental landscape improvements. Aspects of the plan shall include, but will not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Graded slopes in open space areas shall be reseeded with a mixture of native perennial and annual grassland species to increase the diversity of the grassland cover. Suitable species to be used in the seed mix include: California brome (<i>Bromus carinatus</i>), purple needlegrass (<i>Stipa pulchra</i>), creeping wildrye (<i>Elymus tritichoides</i>), California poppy (<i>Eschscholtzia californica</i>), among others. Highly invasive non-native annuals, typically used for erosion control alone, should not be used. b. Landscaping and revegetation shall emphasize the use of native plant species along the fringe of proposed development, and plantings in open space areas should be restricted to native species. Suitable plant species for use in open space areas include: valley oak (<i>Quercus lobata</i>), coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>), California buckeye (<i>Aesculus californica</i>), toyon (<i>Heteromeles arbutifolia</i>), California rose (<i>Rosa californica</i>), creeping wildrye, and purple needlegrass, among other species. c. Use of non-native, invasive species which may spread into adjacent undeveloped open space areas shall be prohibited in landscaping plans. Unsuitable species include: blue gum eucalyptus (<i>Eucalyptus globulus</i>), acacia (<i>Acacia</i> spp.), pampas grass (<i>Cortaderia selloana</i>), broom (<i>Cytisus</i> spp.), gorse (<i>Ulex europaeus</i>), bamboo (<i>Bambusa</i> spp.), giant reed (<i>Arundo donax</i>), periwinkle (<i>Vinca</i> spp.), English ivy (<i>Hedera helix</i>), and German ivy (<i>Senecio milanioides</i>). This prohibition shall be included in the CC&R for the proposed residential subdivision, as well as undeveloped areas to be retained as permanent open space. d. Graded slopes and areas disturbed as part of the project shall be monitored to prevent establishment and spread of introduced broom species (<i>Cytisus</i> spp and <i>Genista monspesullana</i>). This should apply to the lands on the project site that are placed under a conservation easement as well as common open space areas. The removal and monitoring | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>program shall include annual late winter removal of any rooted plants when soils are saturated and cutting back of any remaining flowering plants in the spring before seed begins to set in late April.</p> <p>e. Provisions for maintenance of landscaping and revegetation of graded slopes shall be specified as part of the plan, with replacement plantings and seeding provided as necessary to ensure re-establishment of cover. Tree replacement shall be at ratios consistent with Mitigation Measure BIO-2d below and meet with the intent of Petaluma Municipal Code Section 20.32.320. Maintenance and monitoring of mitigation and habitat enhancement plantings in open space areas shall be provided for a minimum of five years.</p> <p>f. Vehicles and motorcycles shall not be allowed to travel off designated roadways and limits of grading to minimize future disturbance to grassland cover and other vegetation, and unauthorized access to the surrounding undeveloped lands and open space.</p> <p>BIO-2b: The Tree Preservation Plans shall be updated and refined to comply with the requirements of IZO Chapter 17. The Grading Plan and Landscape Plan shall include the mapped location of tree trunks, including those which will be preserved or removed, show the recommended tree protection zones, and identify locations of construction-restriction fencing.</p> <p>BIO-2c: A Tree Replacement Program shall be prepared as part of the Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan to provide for replacement of individual native trees removed by proposed development. The Tree Replacement Program shall provide for replacement of impacted individual native trees consistent with Petaluma Municipal Code Section 20.32.320 and Implementing Zoning Ordinance Section 17.065, and shall be accomplished on-site in designated open space areas. Tree plantings shall be monitored and maintained for a minimum of 5 years by a qualified biologist or landscape specialist. All water used for temporary irrigation shall be from wells and/or municipal supplies and not diverted out of Kelly Creek, the stock pond or tributary drainages to prevent any potential secondary adverse impacts to existing aquatic habitats. Any plantings lost within this monitoring period shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio on an annual basis to maintain the replacement values specified in the Municipal Code and Implementing Ordinance.</p> | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>BIO-2d: To avoid creation of informal trails through native grasslands on Helen Putnam Regional Park adjacent to the project site, the existing fence between the project site and the regional park to the north of Kelly Creek shall be maintained and strengthened to control unauthorized entry into the regional park from the terminus of the Kelly Creek multi-use trail. As and when the regional park trail project is constructed, the fence may be removed.</p> <p>BIO-2e: A Native Grassland Avoidance and Replacement Program (Program) shall be developed by a qualified biologist to address the loss of native grasslands on the site and provide for adequate replacement. The Program shall define short-term construction controls and long-term maintenance requirements necessary to ensure grasslands are successfully reestablished and existing and restored native grasslands remain viable. The maintenance and management requirements shall include provisions for annual invasive species removal, and control on the establishment of both native and non-native trees and shrubs that could eventually shade out the grassland to be protected. The Final Program shall be subject to review and approval by the City, including peer-review by a qualified biologist selected by the City. The Program shall contain the following provisions and performance standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The proposed limits of grading and enhancement tree plantings shall be modified to avoid additional areas of the stands of native grassland on the site and a compensatory mitigation component prepared and implemented to provide a minimum 1:1 replacement ratio for grasslands lost as a result of the project. b. Areas retained or restored as native grassland shall be permanently protected as open space and managed as native grassland by deed restriction or conservation easement. c. To prevent inadvertent disturbance of native grassland to be preserved, these areas shall be flagged in the field prior to any vegetation removal or grading for habitat restoration, and temporary orange construction fencing installed under supervision of the qualified biologist around all areas to be retained within 50 feet of proposed disturbance. d. Areas of native grassland within the limits of proposed grading and construction shall be salvaged and used in revegetation efforts implemented as part of the Program. Salvage material may include mature seed and intact stem and root material, which shall be stored and maintained until | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>ready for reinstallation in the late fall/early winter when conditions are optimal for successful reestablishment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. Personnel involved in habitat restoration activities shall be trained by the qualified biologist over the sensitivity of the native grasslands, purpose of the temporary orange construction fencing, and that all construction-related disturbance should be restricted outside of the fence. f. A monitoring program shall be implemented by the qualified biologist to oversee successful establishment of any native grasslands to be restored, and shall define both short-term and long-term requirements. Permanent monitoring transects shall be established as part of the program and vegetation data collected in the spring and summer months when plant identification is possible. Photo stations shall be established along each monitoring transect, and photographs taken every year during the required monitoring period. Performance standards, success criteria, and contingency measures shall be defined as part of the Program. Monitoring transects shall be established over each location to be vegetated as native grassland, and monitored on an annual basis. Within a five-year period, native grass shall be successfully established over all treatment areas and shall comprise a minimum 50 percent of the relative cover. Monitoring shall be extended where the success criteria are not met, and the minimum 1:1 replacement ratio is not reached. The Program and its requirements may be modified to require further measures if monitoring shows that performance standards are not being met. g. Annual monitoring reports shall be prepared by the qualified biologist and submitted to the Community Development Department of the City of Petaluma by December 31 of each monitoring year, for a minimum of five years or until the defined success criteria are met. The annual report shall summarize the results of the monitoring effort, performance standards, and any required contingency measures, and shall include photographs of the monitoring transects and program success. Maps shall be included in the monitoring report to show the location of monitoring transects and photo stations. | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Impact BIO-3 | The proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on state and federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. | Significant | <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-3</p> <p>A Final Wetland Replacement and Enhancement Program (WREP) shall be prepared and implemented to compensate for the loss of jurisdictional waters on the project site. The Final WREP shall be prepared by a qualified wetland consultant in consultation with the City, the RWQCB, the USACE, and the CDFW. The Final WREP shall clearly identify the total wetlands and other jurisdictional areas affected by the project, shall identify compensatory mitigation to replace wetland habitat lost as a result of development, and provide for re-establishment, enhancement, and/or replacement of wetlands. The Final WREP shall include the following performance standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify the location(s) of mitigation sites and provide for replacement of wetland habitat loss at a minimum replacement ratio of 2:1. Create or restore wetlands with high functions and values in accordance with USACE and RWQCB standards. Compensatory mitigation can be achieved through on- or off-site habitat creation or through the use of an approved mitigation bank, or a combination thereof. b. Specify performance criteria, maintenance and long-term management responsibilities, monitoring requirements, and contingency measures. This shall include expanding the compensatory mitigation to achieve a replacement ratio of at least 2:1 (or as otherwise required by regulatory agencies). Monitoring shall be conducted by the project applicant's consulting wetland specialist for a minimum of five years and continue until the success criteria are met. c. Define site grading, preparation and revegetation procedures, an implementation schedule, and funding sources to ensure long-term management of the Final WREP. d. The mitigation (habitat restoration or enhancement) effort shall be considered successful when the performance standards are met. Performance standards would be met when the habitat has sustained itself for a minimum of two years in the absence of significant maintenance measures. <p>Subsequent permitting processes with resource agencies could result in additional mitigation beyond that required by the City in the CEQA process. Any additional mitigation required by the agencies (the</p> | Less than Significant |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | RWQCB, the USACE, and the CDFW) would be incorporated as conditions of their permit authorization. | |
| Impact BIO-4 | The proposed project would interfere substantially with the movement of 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. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures BIO-4a through 4d</p> <p>BIO-4a: An interpretive program shall be developed by a qualified biologist in cooperation with the project landscape architect which serves to educate park visitors and trail users of the sensitivity of Kelly Creek and D Street tributary as wildlife movement corridors, and the importance of remaining outside the southern portion of the site to protect the stock pond and surrounding uplands to CRLF and other wildlife that are sensitive to human disturbance. The interpretive program shall be integrated into the final Landscape Plan for the project. Interpretive elements of the program shall include use of permanent signage at the trail heads, all pedestrian bridge crossings, and other critical locations. The signage shall explain the sensitivity of the open space for wildlife and the importance of staying on the improved trails and out of restricted areas. Dogs, cats, and other pets shall be leashed at all times in the open space areas on the site, and signage shall be provided at the trail heads at D Street and Windsor Drive explaining this restriction and need to prevent harassment of wildlife by unleashed pets.</p> <p>BIO-4b: The existing plywood barrier fence on the east side of the D Street concrete box culvert undercrossing shall be removed as part of initial construction activities to improve opportunities for wildlife movement along the Kelly Creek corridor. Replacement fencing at this undercrossing shall be prohibited to prevent future obstruction of wildlife movement along Kelly Creek.</p> <p>BIO-4c: Fencing, signage, dense native vegetation, and other deterrents shall be used as part of the interpretive program to adequately contain livestock, equestrians and other visitors with their pets from sensitive wildlife areas, including Kelly Creek, the D Street tributary, and stock pond. Exclusionary fencing used to contain livestock and control access by visitors and their pets shall be wildlife-friendly in design, such as barbed wire with a smooth bottom wire. Signs shall be posted along the trails limiting access of equestrian to designated trails at all times.</p> <p>BIO-4d: The existing fencing between the western boundary of the project site and Helen Putnam Regional Park south of Kelly Creek shall</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | be removed where it borders lands to be dedicated as permanent open space on the project site, and replaced with wildlife-friendly fencing, such as barbed wire with smooth bottom wire, if fencing is necessary. This would improve opportunities for wildlife movement between the existing parklands and the future open space lands on the project site. | |
| Impact BIO-5 | The proposed project would conflict with a local policy for protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. | <i>Significant</i> | Implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2c . | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact BIO-6 | The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. | <i>No Impact</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>No Impact</i> |
| RPT Impact BIO-1 | Implementation of the proposed regional park trail project could result in potential impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species, including California red-legged frog, special-status plant species, and nesting birds, which would be a significant impact. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures RPT-BIO-1a through BIO-1d</p> <p>RPT BIO-1a: Sonoma County Regional Parks or its agent shall obtain all required permits before construction from the USFWS, CDFW, RWQCB, and USACE (e.g., 1600 series permits, 404 and 401 permits), incidental take permits and any others and implement mitigation measures, as required by federal and State law, to avoid, minimize, or offset impacts to any species listed under either the state or Federal Endangered Species Acts or protected under any other state or federal law.</p> <p>RPT BIO-1b: A Final California Red-Legged Frog Mitigation Plan (CRLFMP) shall be prepared by a qualified wildlife biologist to minimize and mitigate potential impacts of the project on CRLF. The Final CRLFMP shall be prepared in consultation with USFWS, CDFW, and USACE and shall provide for the protection, replacement, and management of habitat for CRLF affected by the regional park trail. The Final CRLFMP shall include the following components and meet the following standards:</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Preconstruction surveys shall be conducted by a Service-approved biologist prior to any grading or vegetation clearance to ensure that no individual CRLF are lost during construction. The Final CRLFMP shall: 1) describe in detail the survey approach and methodology, and 2) specify that grading or vegetation clearance may not occur in any area where individual CRLF are located until such time as the individual has either moved out of the disturbance zone or has been physically relocated by a Service-approved biologist legally authorized to handle the species. b. All vegetation clearing and grading activities within potential habitat for CRLF shall be monitored by a Service-approved biologist. The Final CRLFMP shall specify the duties of the Service-approved biologist. c. All construction personnel shall be trained in CRLF identification, habitat description, legal protective status, construction restrictions, and procedures to avoid unnecessary disturbance to potential habitat or incidental take of these species. The Final CRLFMP shall describe this training program. d. Exclusionary fencing shall be installed prior to grading or major vegetation clearance where appropriate to keep CRLF out of construction areas, if required by the USFWS and/or CDFW. The Final CRLFMP shall identify where such fencing is to be installed and provide procedures for fence installation, monitoring, and maintenance, if required. The exclusionary fencing be installed under the direct supervision of a Service-approved biologist and shall be maintained during the course of construction activities on the site. e. Sonoma County Regional Parks shall prohibit access by unleashed dogs and require that dogs be leashed, and that access be limited to designated trails at all times to minimize the potential for inadvertent take of CRLF. f. Sonoma County Regional Parks shall post signs along the trails limiting access of equestrian to designated trails at all times. g. Sonoma County Regional Parks shall implement measures to minimize the potential for harassment or take of listed and non-listed species as a result of increased human activity | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>associated with the proposed trail. This shall include an educational program for future part visitors, signage at access points into open space and other key locations, and possible use of permanent exclusionary fencing, if required by the USFWS. Appropriate interpretive signage shall be provided instructing park users on access rules to prevent inadvertent take of CRLF.</p> <p>RPT BIO-1c: Active nests of raptor, loggerhead shrike, or other birds protected under federal and state regulations in the vicinity of construction shall be avoided until young birds are able to leave the nest (i.e., fledged) and forage on their own. Avoidance may be accomplished either by scheduling grading, vegetation removal and revegetation activities during the non-nesting period (August 30 through February 14), or if this is not feasible, by conducting a pre-construction survey for raptor, loggerhead shrike, and other bird nests. Provisions of the pre-construction survey and nest avoidance, if necessary, shall include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If grading is scheduled during the active nesting period (February 15 through August 31), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nest survey no more than 15 days prior to initiation of grading to provide confirmation on presence or absence of active nests in the vicinity. b. If active nests are encountered, species-specific measures shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and implemented to prevent abandonment of the active nest. At a minimum, grading in the vicinity of the nest shall be deferred until the young birds have fledged. A nest-setback zone of at least 300 feet for all raptors and 100 feet for loggerhead shrike and other birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act shall be established within which all construction-related disturbances shall be prohibited. The perimeter of the nest-setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with staked flagging at 20-foot intervals, and construction personnel restricted from the area. c. If permanent avoidance of the nest is not feasible, impacts shall be minimized by prohibiting disturbance within the nest-setback zone until a qualified biologist verifies that the birds have either a) not begun egg-laying and incubation, or | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>b) that the juveniles from the nest are foraging independently and capable of independent survival at an earlier date.</p> <p>d. A survey report by the qualified biologist verifying that the young have fledged shall be submitted to the Sonoma County Regional Parks prior to initiation of grading in the nest-setback zone.</p> <p>RPT BIO-1d: In advance of any trail construction through the Helen Putnam Regional Park, a qualified botanist shall conduct detailed preconstruction surveys in spring and summer to confirm absence of any special-status plant species along the trail alignment. The survey shall focus on special-status plant species considered to have a potential for occurrence in grassland, woodland scrub and riparian habitats from the Petaluma vicinity, and shall be conducted according to the latest CDFW survey guidelines. The surveys shall be completed and a report of findings shall be submitted to the Sonoma County Regional Parks before the start of any initial ground-disturbing activity or construction.</p> <p>If populations of any special-status plant species are encountered along the trail alignment, then Sonoma County Regional Parks shall ensure that construction-related impacts are avoided through changes in trail alignment or adequately mitigated by retaining a qualified botanist to develop and implement a Special-Status Plant Species Mitigation and Monitoring Program (Program). A Program shall only be required if a listed species or those maintained on Lists 1B or 2 of the CNPS Inventory are encountered during the preconstruction survey and cannot be avoided. Potential impacts on any species maintained on Lists 3 and 4 of the CNPS Inventory would not be considered significant and no additional mitigation would be required for these species if encountered during the preconstruction survey.</p> <p>The Program shall be prepared in consultation with the CDFW and shall be approved by Sonoma County Regional Park prior to any initial ground-disturbing activity or construction. The Program shall be based on the status and vulnerability of the species present with avoidance of all or a majority of any population(s) the preferred method of mitigation. Where complete or even partial avoidance of any special-status plant population(s) is considered infeasible, options for mitigation may include salvage and re-establishing the population at an alternative, suitable location. Details of any salvage and habitat recreation effort shall include the following criteria and performance standards:</p> | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Collection of seeds/roots/vegetative material during the appropriate developmental stage of the plant. b. Procedures for sowing/replanting techniques appropriate to the life cycle of the plant. c. Development of a maintenance and monitoring plan specific to the environmental conditions necessary for survival of the new population. Maintenance and monitoring shall be provided for a minimum of five years to determine success of re-seeding and habitat creation, and need for additional preservation. d. Identification of funding sources by Sonoma County Regional Parks to provide implementation of the Program in consultation with the qualified plant ecologist. e. In addition, preservation of another existing occurrence of the affected special-status plant species shall be required if monitoring indicates that the re-establishment efforts have not been successful after five years. The preservation program shall provide for permanent protection of a different existing population in Sonoma County, which is equal or larger in size than that encountered on the site (minimum 1:1 replacement), through land acquisition, use of a conservation easement, or some other permanent land protection method. Any off-site mitigation lands shall include establishment of a management endowment as necessary to provide for long-term management of the preserved population. | |
| RPT Impact BIO-2 | Implementation of the proposed regional park trail project would result in potential impacts to a sensitive natural community as a result of trail construction, which would be a significant impact. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measure RPT BIO-2</p> <p>RPT BIO-2: A Native Grassland Avoidance and Replacement Program (Program) shall be developed by a qualified biologist to address the loss of native grasslands along the trail alignment and provide for adequate replacement. The Program shall contain the following provisions and performance standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Under the supervision of a qualified biologist, the proposed limits of grading shall be modified and controlled to avoid areas of native grassland along the trail alignment to the maximum extent feasible and a compensatory mitigation component prepared and implemented to provide a minimum 1:1 replacement ratio for grasslands lost as a result of trail improvements. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Areas of native grassland adjacent to the trail alignment shall be flagged in the field prior to any vegetation removal or grading, and temporary orange construction fencing installed under supervision of the qualified biologist to avoid any inadvertent damage. c. Construction personnel shall be trained by the qualified biologist over the sensitivity of the native grasslands, purpose of the temporary orange construction fencing, and that all construction-related disturbance should be restricted outside of the fence. d. Areas of native grassland within the limits of proposed grading and construction shall be salvaged and used in revegetation efforts implemented as part of the Program. Salvage material shall include seed and both intact stem and root material, which shall be stored and maintained until ready for reinstallation in the late fall/early winter when conditions are optimal for successful reestablishment. e. A monitoring program shall be implemented by the qualified biologist to oversee successful establishment of any native grasslands to be restored, and shall define both short-term and long-term requirements. The Program and its requirements may be modified to require further measures if monitoring shows that performance standards are not being met. f. Annual monitoring reports shall be prepared by the qualified biologist for a minimum of five years or until the defined success criteria are met. The annual report shall summarize the results of the monitoring effort, performance standards, and any required contingency measures, and shall include photographs of the monitoring transects and program success. Maps shall be included in the monitoring report to show the location of monitoring transects and photo stations. | |
| RPT Impact BIO-3 | Implementation of the proposed regional park trail project would result in potential impacts to jurisdictional waters as a result of trail construction, | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measure RPT BIO-3</p> <p>As called for in Mitigation Measure RPT BIO-1a, authorizations shall be secured by Sonoma County Regional Parks or its agent from the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW for proposed trail improvements where they pass through jurisdictional waters, and all conditions and mitigation measures required under these authorizations shall be implemented as part of the project. Appropriate measures shall be</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | which would be a significant impact. | | developed and implemented to minimize disturbance to jurisdictional waters, prevent erosion and sedimentation, and revegetate areas disturbed by trail construction. This shall include: 1) construction during the dry season after all affected drainages are dry and surface water is absent; 2) installation of temporary orange construction fencing at the limits of proposed construction at the drainage crossings and vicinity of wetland seeps in advance of grading and other disturbance; 3) use of BMPs to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation such as installation of straw wattle, jute fabric or other surface controls on graded slopes within 30 feet of the drainage crossings; and 4) revegetation of all disturbed slopes outside the actual footprint of the trail through broadcast seeding with native grass and forb seed or other technique within 30 feet of the drainage crossings. | |
| RPT Impact BIO-4 | Implementation of the proposed regional park trail project would not interfere with wildlife movement. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| RPT Impact BIO-5 | Implementation of the proposed regional park trail project would not result in any significant conflicts with local plans and policies. | <i>Significant</i> | Implement Mitigation Measures RPT BIO-1a and RPT BIO-3 . | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact BIO-1 | The proposed Scott Ranch project and the regional park trail project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in significant cumulative impacts on biological resources. | <i>Significant</i> | Implement Mitigation Measures BIO-1a, BIO-1b, BIO-3, and HYD-1a, RPT BIO-1a, RPT BIO-1b, and RPT BIO-3 | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Cultural Resources | | | | |
| Impact CUL-1 | The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures CUL-1a and CUL-1b</p> <p>CUL-1a Prior to the relocation of the barn structures, a qualified historic preservation architect shall be selected by the City of Petaluma to review the relocation plans and verify that the relocation is not affecting the building structures and character defining features. To ensure the barn structures would retain their eligibility for the local designation, the barn structures shall be relocated within the same general area and the new location shall be compatible with their original character and use.</p> <p>CUL-1b The Applicants shall retain a qualified preservation architect to oversee the relocation process and ensure that all the relocation activities are implemented in compliance with the relocation plans reviewed under Mitigation Measure CUL-1a.</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact CUL-2 | The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures CUL-2a through CUL-2c</p> <p>CUL-2a: Prior to excavation and construction on the proposed project site, the prime construction contractor and any subcontractor(s) shall be informed by a qualified archaeologist retained by the project Applicants, on the legal and/or regulatory implications of knowingly destroying cultural resources or removing historic or prehistoric artifacts, human remains, and other cultural materials from the project site as outlined in Mitigation Measure CULT-2b below.</p> <p>CUL-2b: Prior to commencing any demolition, excavation or other ground-disturbing activities, the project Applicants shall retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor construction activity. The City shall approve the selected project archaeologist prior to issuance of the grading and/or demolition permit. The selected project archaeologist shall be present at the preconstruction meeting to discuss what protocols should be followed with respect to the potential discovery of prehistoric or historic artifacts of possible significance. The selected project archaeologist shall have the authority to perform full time or spot check monitoring of subsurface construction and watch for and evaluate artifacts or resources that may be uncovered.</p> <p>The selected project archaeologist shall have the authority to halt excavation and construction activities in the immediate vicinity (distance to be determined by the project archaeologist) of a find if significant or potentially significant cultural resources are exposed and could be</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>adversely affected by construction operations. Construction activities could continue in other areas of the project site where no cultural resources have been identified.</p> <p>CUL-2c: Should archaeological resources be encountered during ground-disturbing activities (i.e., grading and excavation), the project archaeologist shall initiate sampling, identification, and evaluation of the resources. If the archaeological resources are found to be significant, the archaeologist shall take appropriate actions in conjunction with the City for preservation and/or data recovery, including recordation with the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) and professional museum curation as appropriate. Following the completion of evaluation and data recovery, the archaeologist shall prepare a professional report detailing the results of the find and submit it to the City of Petaluma Community Development Department and to CHRIS along with a DPR form to ensure that resource inventories are accurately updated.</p> | |
| Impact CUL-3 | The proposed project could disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measure CUL-3</p> <p>Procedures to be implemented following the discovery of human remains have been mandated by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e) (CEQA). According to the provisions in CEQA, if human remains are discovered at the project site during construction, work at the specific construction area at which the remains have been uncovered shall be suspended, and the City of Petaluma and County of Sonoma coroner shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined by the County coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be notified within 24 hours, who will, in turn, notify the person the NAHC identifies as the most likely descendent (“MLD”) of any human remains. The guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and subsequent disposition of the remains. Further actions shall be determined, in part, by the desires of the MLD. The MLD has 48 hours to make recommendations regarding the disposition of the remains following notification from the NAHC of the discovery. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the owner shall, with appropriate dignity, re-inter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance. Alternatively, if the owner does not accept the MLD’s recommendations, the owner or the descendent may request mediation by the NAHC.</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Impact CUL-4 | The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. | <i>Significant</i> | Implement Mitigation Measures CUL-2a through CUL-2c, and CUL-3. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| RPT Impact CUL-1 | The implementation of the proposed regional park trail project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource but could significantly affect unknown archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains. | <i>Significant</i> | Mitigation Measures RPT CUL-1a and CUL-1b RPT CUL-1a: If archaeological materials, artifacts, culturally modified soil deposits, or other indicators of a potentially significant cultural resource are encountered anywhere in the project site, all work should be halted in the vicinity and an archaeologist consulted immediately. RPT CUL-1b: If human remains are encountered anywhere on the property, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovered remains and the County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist must be notified immediately so that an evaluation can be performed. If the remains are deemed to be Native American and prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted by the Coroner so that a “Most Likely Descendant” can be designated. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact CUL-1 | The proposed Scott Ranch project and the regional park trail project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in significant cumulative cultural resource impacts. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Energy | | | | |
| Impact EN-1 | Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Impact EN-2 | The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| RPT Impact EN-1 | Construction and operation of the proposed regional park trail project would minimally increase the consumption of energy but would not result in significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy or exceed the capacity of distribution systems. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Geology and Soils | | | | |
| Impact GEO-1 | The proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects related to fault rupture but would expose them to seismic ground shaking and/or seismic-related ground failure. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures GEO-1a and GEO-1b</p> <p>GEO-1a: The project Applicants shall submit for City’s approval a preconstruction design-level geotechnical report for the Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project component and the Putnam Park Extension Project component. The report shall include all applicable geologic report standards, reconnaissance and subsurface exploration data, laboratory test results, and conclusions and recommendations, including, but not limited to, those pertaining to: 1) site preparation, excavation, fill placement and compaction, temporary and permanent cut and fill slope inclinations (including whether slopes steeper than 3:1 can be used at the site), slope stability, slope erosion mitigation, and landslide movement mitigation; 2) surface and subsurface drainage systems, including drainage associated with grading for landslide movement mitigation and new cut and fill slopes; 3) foundations and floors for planned residential structures; 4) foundations for planned site improvements, including, but not limited to restrooms, barn, pedestrian bridges, and other structures; 5) settlement and swell estimates for planned residential structures and site improvements, including those bearing of engineered fill; 6) foundations, back-drains, and lateral earth pressures for site retaining walls; 7) seismic design parameters for the planned residential</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>structures, site improvements, and site retaining walls; 8) pavement design for driveways, parking lots, pathways and trails, where applicable; 9) utility trench backfill, including check dams and trench drainage, if appropriate; 10) geologic/geotechnical construction monitoring, testing, and certification requirements; and 11) loop trail construction and long-term maintenance requirements, including criteria for inspecting and maintaining pedestrian bridges, culverts, and pathway surfaces, as appropriate.</p> <p>The geotechnical report shall include measures, as necessary, to reduce the potential for static and earthquake-induced slope movements that may adversely impact the Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project component and the Putnam Park Extension Project component including areas currently underlain by mapped landslides. Engineering analyses shall estimate the factors of safety against slope movements within the planned development area and estimates of the magnitude and location of earthquake-induced slope deformation.</p> <p>GEO-1b: As determined by the City Engineer and/or Chief Building Official, all recommendations outlined in the preconstruction design-level geotechnical report for the Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project component and the Putnam Park Extension Project component, as described under Mitigation Measure GEO-1a, are herein incorporated by reference and shall be adhered to in order to ensure that appropriate measures are incorporated into the design and construction of the project. Nothing in this mitigation measure shall preclude the City Engineer and/or Chief Building Official from requiring additional information be provided to determine compliance with applicable standards. The project geotechnical engineer shall review the project plans and specifications and submit a letter certifying to the City that the project plans and specifications have been prepared in accordance with the geotechnical recommendations for the project. The project geotechnical engineer or personnel under their direct supervision shall inspect the construction of geotechnical and/or geologic aspects of the project and shall submit a letter certifying to the City that prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the geotechnical and geologic aspects of the project plans and specifications have been appropriately constructed at the site and are acceptable to the project geotechnical engineer.</p> | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Impact GEO-2 | The proposed project would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures GEO-2a and GEO-2b</p> <p>GEO-2a: The preconstruction design level geotechnical report, identified in Mitigation Measure GEO-1, shall include specific recommendations to mitigate surface erosion. The project geotechnical engineer or personnel under their direct supervision shall inspect the construction of geotechnical and/or geologic aspects of fill placement and compaction and surface drainage systems of cut and fill slopes to ensure that the geotechnical recommendations associated with mitigating surface soil erosion are properly implemented during construction. At a minimum, 1) slope inclinations shall be no steeper than 3:1 (horizontal to vertical), unless the project engineering geologist specifically indicates that a steeper slope would perform satisfactorily over the long term, 2) fill slope requirements shall include a process of overbuilding the fill on the slope and shaving it back to expose a well compacted fill surface that is less susceptible to surface erosion, and 3) the project civil engineer shall check the final grading of the site and the elevations of the surface drainage systems to confirm that the grading contractor graded the site and constructed surface improvement in accordance with the approved grading plans.</p> <p>GEO-2b: The project geotechnical engineer shall review the geotechnical aspects of the SWPPP and, where applicable, shall provide comments to the Qualified SWPPP Developer (QSD) to ensure that the geotechnical recommendations associated with mitigating surface soil erosion through BMPs and a long-term monitoring and maintenance program of the planned cut and fill slopes are properly incorporated into the SWPPP and/or a project specific operations and maintenance plan. As a minimum, the geotechnical aspects of the SWPPP shall include a requirement to check the condition of the slope at the beginning of the first rainy season after the completion of grading and periodic inspections until surface vegetation has been fully established on the exposed slopes.</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact GEO-3 | The proposed project would expose people and structures to substantial adverse effects from landslides and unstable slopes. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-3</p> <p>GEO-3a Landslide Remediation</p> <p>Where landslide mitigation is required under Mitigation Measure GEO-1a, the project geotechnical engineer or personnel under their direct supervision shall inspect the excavation and grading associated with the landslide removal and/or stabilization work to ensure that the geotechnical recommendations associated with mitigating landslide hazards are properly implemented during construction. As a minimum, the project geotechnical engineer shall provide project specific design-</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>level recommendations for the removal of Landslides E and F, which are located within the Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project component. The recommendations shall include, but shall not be limited to, 1) a cross-section(s) showing the limits of landslide debris, depths of planned excavation, planned toe key and benches, and configuration of planned engineered fill, 2) design criteria for surface and subsurface drainage systems, including the locations of subdrain clean-outs and drain outlets, 3) fill placement and compaction requirements, including recommendations for overbuilding, then shaving back the fill to expose a well-compacted slope surface, and 4) geologic/geotechnical observation and testing requirements during site grading activities. Where cut or fill slopes over 30 feet in height are planned, intermediate surface benches shall be incorporated into the slope design as described below, unless the project geotechnical engineer provides alternative project specific recommendations for the design of surface benches on graded slopes. The benches shall be spaced no more than 25 feet vertically on the slope. The benches shall be a minimum of 8 feet wide and include a concrete lined V-ditch to intercept surface water runoff.</p> <p>The project geotechnical engineer shall evaluate other landslides (Landslides B, G, H, L, N, O, and R), which have a potential to adversely impact the foundations of footbridges and/or the loop trail pavement. As a minimum, the project geotechnical engineer shall establish an inspection and maintenance program to ensure that any damage to the planned footbridge foundations and loop trail improvements due to landslide movements are identified and repaired.</p> <p>GEO-3b Cut and Fill Slopes</p> <p>The project geotechnical engineer, project engineering geologist, or personnel under their direct supervision shall inspect all cut slopes focusing on evidence of potential instability. If areas of adverse bedrock structure are encountered, then the project geotechnical engineer and/or project engineering geologist shall develop remedial measures for these slopes and the grading contractor shall implement the remedial activity, under the direction and supervision of project geotechnical engineer and/or engineering geologist, and acceptable by the City engineer.</p> | |
| Impact GEO-4 | The proposed project would be located on a geologic unit that could become unstable as a result of the project, and on expansive soils | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures GEO-4a and GEO-4b:</p> <p>GEO-4a: An updated preconstruction geotechnical report shall be prepared for the Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project component and the Putnam Park Extension Project component, as previously discussed in Mitigation Measure GEO-1a. Specific to site geology, bedrock shear, settlement, and expansive soil, the project geotechnical engineer shall</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | creating direct or indirect risk to life or property. | | <p>confirm that the conclusions and all applicable recommendations previously presented in the 2015 design-level geotechnical report are still applicable for the design and construction of the Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project component and the Putnam Park Extension Project component.</p> <p>GEO-4b: As a minimum, cut lots that have subgrades exposing bedrock shall be over-excavated and recompacted to a minimum depth of three feet, and backfilled as described below, unless the project geotechnical engineer provides project specific alternative recommendations to mitigate the potential for differential settlement associated with variable settlement and swell behavior between bedrock and compacted engineered fill. The exposed surface shall be scarified to a depth of about 12 inches, moisture-conditioned to not less than three percent over optimum moisture content and compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction.</p> <p>Excavation deeper than the above recommendations may be required to expose competent material under conditions where soft or saturated soil is encountered. The excavation depth will be determined in the field as part of the geotechnical analysis required under Mitigation Measure GEO-1a.</p> <p>Project site grades shall be designed to slope away from the proposed structures, and water from roof drains shall be directed to suitable outlets. Fill slopes comprised of low to moderately expansive soil shall be evaluated for stability (see Mitigation Measures GEO-1a and GEO-3a). Additional mitigations to reduce the impact of expansive soils on the proposed residences shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moisture conditioning and re-compacting low to moderately expansive soil. • Placing non-expansive fill beneath the homes and rigid surface improvements. • Designing foundations to resist or tolerate differential movement of moderately expansive soil. | |
| Impact GEO-5 | The proposed project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative | <i>No Impact</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>No Impact</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | wastewater disposal systems. | | |
| <p>Impact GEO-6</p> | <p>The proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features.</p> | <p><i>Significant</i></p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-6:</p> <p>GEO-6a: The project Applicants shall identify a qualified paleontologist prior to any demolition, excavation, or construction. The City shall approve the selected project paleontologist prior to issuance of the demolition permit. The paleontologist shall attend the pre-grading meeting to inform the contractor(s) how to recognize paleontological resources in the soil during grading activities. The prime construction contractor and any subcontractor(s) shall be informed on the legal and/or regulatory implications of knowingly destroying paleontological resources or removing paleontological resources from the project site.</p> <p>GEO-6b: If paleontological resources are encountered during the course of site development activities, work in that area shall be halted and the selected project paleontologist, as outlined in Mitigation Measure GEO-6a above, shall be notified of the find to determine the significance of the find and to recommend appropriate mitigation measures. Recommendations shall be presented for City approval in a Treatment and Recovery Plan. The selected project paleontologist shall have the authority to temporarily divert or redirect grading to allow time to evaluate any exposed fossil material.</p> <p>GEO-6c: If the selected project paleontologist determines that the resource is significant, then any scientifically significant specimens shall be properly collected by the project paleontologist. During collecting activities, contextual stratigraphic data shall also be collected. The data will include lithologic descriptions, photographs, measured stratigraphic sections, and field notes.</p> <p>Scientifically significant specimens shall be prepared to the point of identification (not exhibition), stabilized, identified, and offered for curation to a suitable repository that has a retrievable storage system, such as the University of California, Berkeley, Museum of Paleontology.</p> <p>The selected project paleontologist shall prepare a final report at the end of the earth-moving activities. The report shall include an itemized inventory of recovered fossils and appropriate stratigraphic and locality data. The project paleontologist shall send one copy of the report to the City of Petaluma Community Development Department; another copy</p> | <p><i>Less than Significant</i></p> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | | should accompany any fossils, along with field logs and photographs, to the designated repository. | |
| RPT Impact GEO-1 | The implementation of the proposed regional park trail project would not expose people and structures to substantial adverse effects related to fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, landslides and cut slopes, or existing geologic conditions. Project implementation would also not result in substantial soil erosion or have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks. | <i>Significant</i> | Mitigation Measure RPT-GEO-1 To reduce the potential risks of regional park trail damage as a result of earthquake-induced landslide movement, the project geotechnical engineer shall develop and submit to the Sonoma County a long-term maintenance plan, including criteria for inspecting and maintaining the planned regional park trail improvements. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| RPT-Impact GEO-2 | The proposed regional park trail could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features. | <i>Significant</i> | Mitigation Measure RPT-GEO-2 If paleontological resources are encountered anywhere in the project site, all work should be halted in the vicinity and a paleontologist consulted immediately. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact GEO-1 | The proposed Scott Ranch project and the regional park trail project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in significant cumulative geology and soils impacts. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|---------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions | | | | |
| Impact GHG-1 | The proposed project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact GHG-2 | Operation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| RPT Impact GHG-1 | The proposed regional park trail project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment, nor would the proposed regional park trail conflict with any applicable plans or policies for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact GHG-1 | The proposed project and the regional park trail would not result in a significant cumulative greenhouse gas impact. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Hydrology and Water Quality | | | |
| <p>Impact HYD-1</p> | <p>The proposed project would result in the discharge of stormwater that could violate water quality standards, degrade surface or ground water quality, and cause hydromodification.</p> | <p><i>Significant</i></p> <p>Mitigation Measures HYD-1a through HYD-1d</p> <p>HYD-1a: Prior to issuance of grading permits for the proposed project, the City of Petaluma shall verify that the Applicants have prepared a SWPPP in accordance with the requirements of the statewide Construction General Permit. The SWPPP shall be designed to address the following objectives: (1) all pollutants and their sources, including sources of sediment associated with construction, construction site erosion, and all other activities associated with construction activity are controlled; (2) where not otherwise required to be under a Regional Water Quality Control Board permit, all non-stormwater discharges are identified and either eliminated, controlled, or treated; (3) site BMPs are effective and result in the reduction or elimination of pollutants in stormwater discharges and authorized non-stormwater discharges from construction activity; and (4) stabilization BMPs are installed to reduce or eliminate pollutants after construction is completed. The SWPPP shall be prepared by a qualified SWPPP developer. The SWPPP shall include the minimum BMPs required for the identified Risk Level. BMP implementation shall be consistent with the BMP requirements in the most recent version of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Handbook-Construction or the Caltrans Stormwater Quality Handbook Construction Site BMPs Manual.</p> <p>HYD-1b: In areas within 50 feet of sensitive habitat areas, construction activities should be planned to avoid disturbance of riparian vegetation, including trees and their root systems. The SWPPP shall specifically address special considerations for controlling sediment and other pollutants within these areas, through additional erosion control measures (such as berms and temporary retention/settling basins that divert runoff away from the creek banks, limiting the use of heavy construction vehicles within the riparian zone, or conserving and replacing topsoil during grading near the riparian zone to speed up the re-establishment of stabilizing vegetation), to limit grading near riparian areas to occur only during the dry-season. Erosion control measures shall also include staged grading to reduce the area of exposed soil at any one period of time, and/or other measures specifically tailored to riparian and sensitive areas.</p> <p>HYD-1c: The project shall implement appropriate post-construction stormwater treatment measures to reduce water quality and hydromodification impacts to downstream reaches, as required by the current post construction controls requirements of the Small MS4</p> | <p><i>Less than Significant</i></p> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>General Permit. Upon completion of the final project design, the Applicants shall provide documentation to the City of stormwater management measures that show compliance with the Small MS4 General Permit. The report shall delineate individual drainage management areas (DMAs) within the project site and provide analysis to show compliance with the volumetric or flow-based treatment criteria as described in the Small MS4 General Permit and outlined in the 2019 BASMAA (2019) guidance document. The report shall also include design calculations that show post-project runoff for the 2-year, 24-hour storm event does not exceed pre-project flow for each DMA, and that each DMA has appropriate stormwater quality treatment based on flow- or volumetric-based calculation, as outlined in the Small MS4 General Permit and in compliance with the 2019 BASMAA guidance document (2019). The final documentation shall be submitted to the City for approval before the beginning of grading.</p> <p>HYD-1d: The proposed multi-use trails shall be designed to direct stormwater runoff away from Kelly Creek and D-Street tributary and/or to vegetated pervious areas not susceptible to erosion. The path shall be designed to limit the amount of runoff concentrated from any one portion of the path in order to prevent gullying. In areas close to Kelly Creek or otherwise not suitable for distributed discharge of runoff, stormwater treatment measures such as swales shall be implemented to protect the creek.</p> | |
| Impact HYD-2 | The proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that it would impede groundwater management. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact HYD-3 | The proposed project would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in substantial alteration of stream or river or through the | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures HYD-3</p> <p>Stormwater outfalls to Kelly Creek and the D Street tributary shall be designed to reduce the potential to cause bank instability. Outfall locations near (or especially across from) existing or potential bank instabilities shall be avoided so that outflows do not exacerbate erosion. Appropriate energy dissipation, such as boulder aprons, biostabilization, or directing outfalls in a downstream rather than cross-channel direction,</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | addition of impervious surfaces in a manner that would result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site. | | shall be incorporated to reduce the potential to cause erosion. | |
| Impact HYD-4 | The proposed project would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff that would result in flooding on- or off-site. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measures HYD-4a through HYD-4c</p> <p>HYD-4a: Prior to final map approval, the Applicants shall submit final detention design that shows that appropriate controls have been included to ensure that the post-project 10- and 100-year peak flows will not exceed pre-project peaks. Hydrologic analyses and final detention designs shall be consistent with the standards outlined in Sonoma Water's Flood Management Design Manual, adopted May 19, 2020. Total detention volume may be less than the volume projected in the preliminary hydrologic analysis if final analysis shows appropriate compliance through integrated LID/water quality treatment/detention features. Final hydrologic analysis and detention sizing shall include potential increases in peak flow due to all new impervious surfaces associated with the proposed project, including the parking areas.</p> <p>HYD-4b: The project Applicants shall prepare and execute, in coordination with the City Engineer or other privately funded and operated maintenance mechanism which ensures that maintenance of all detention facilities will be provided as necessary to continuously provide the required volume storage in a 10-year storm and in a 100-year storm, throughout the life of the project, and shall include a financing mechanism acceptable to the City Engineer to ensure that the required maintenance will be performed.</p> <p>HYD-4c: The project Applicants shall design, in coordination with the City Engineer, on-site detention facilities sufficient to detain on-site and release runoff from storm events such that any runoff temporarily detained on-site is released either before or after the expected peak flood flow of the Petaluma River and that any release of runoff temporarily detained on-site does not contribute to an increase in peak flood periods on the Petaluma River. Prior to final map approval, the project Applicants' final stormwater detention design calculations shall be subject to review by the City's stormwater consultant and City Engineer. The project Applicants shall be responsible for funding all costs and providing the required technical information to the City.</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Impact HYD-5 | The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact HYD-6 | The proposed project would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would redirect flood flows. | <i>Significant</i> | Mitigation Measure HYD-6 Pedestrian bridges across Kelly Creek shall be designed to fully span the channel in order to reduce the potential to impede streamflow. If full-span lengths are not feasible, bridge supports shall be designed to maximize the natural channel cross-section area in order reduce the potential obstruction to in-stream flow. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact HYD-7 | The proposed project would not risk the release of pollutants in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones that would risk release of pollutants due to project inundation. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact HYD-8 | The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| RPT Impact HYD-1 | The implementation of the proposed regional park trail project would not have a significant impact related to water quality, hydromodification, erosion, flooding, and other hazards. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact HYD-1 | The proposed Scott Ranch project and the regional park project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to hydrology and water quality. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Land Use and Planning | | | | |
| Impact LU-1 | The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. | <i>No Impact</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>No Impact</i> |
| Impact LU-2 | The proposed project could cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. Recommended Improvement Measure: IM LU-2: Rear fences of all residential lots that back on to Kelly Creek shall be open wire fences so that views of the riparian corridor continue to be available from the streets within the subdivision. This requirement will be included in the CC&Rs for the subdivision. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Impact LU-3 | The proposed project would not result in development of land uses that are substantially incompatible with existing adjacent land uses or with planned uses. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| RPT Impact LU-1 | The implementation of the proposed regional park trail project would not physically divide an established community, conflict with applicable land use or habitat conservation plans, or be incompatible with surrounding land uses. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact LU-1 | The proposed Scott Ranch project and the regional park trail project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to land use and planning. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Noise | | | | |
| Impact NOISE-1 | Noise generated by construction activities on the project site would result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measure NOISE-1</p> <p>The proposed project shall implement the following control measures during construction.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Noise-generating construction activities shall be limited to daytime, weekday hours (7 AM to 6 PM) and 9 AM to 5 PM on weekends and holidays. When construction is occurring within 100 feet of existing residences, then construction shall occur between 9 AM and 5 PM and shall be prohibited on Sundays and Holidays. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | <p>general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. High noise-producing activities, such as excavation and grading and construction finishing, shall be scheduled between the hours of 8 AM and 5 PM to minimize disruption on sensitive uses. c. All stationary noise generating equipment that generates noise levels in excess of 65 dBA Leq shall be located as far as possible from sensitive receptors. If re-locating stationary equipment is not feasible, the equipment shall be shielded from noise sensitive receptors by using temporary walls, sound curtains, or other similar devices to reduce noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors to less than 65 dBA Leq. d. The construction contractor shall implement noise controls to minimize equipment noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors. Noise controls include improved mufflers, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds. e. Equipment used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered impact tools (e.g., jack hammers) wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically-powered tools. Where use of pneumatically-powered tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used. A muffler could lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where available; this could achieve a reduction of five dBA. Quieter procedures shall be used (such as drilling rather than impact equipment) wherever feasible. f. The construction contractor shall implement appropriate additional noise reduction measures that include shutting off idling equipment after 5 minutes and notifying adjacent residences (at least one time) in advance of construction work. g. The construction contractor shall not stage equipment within 200 feet of the existing residential land uses adjacent to the project site. h. The contractor shall minimize use of vehicle backup alarms. A common approach to minimizing the use of backup alarms is to design the construction site with a circular flow pattern that minimizes backing up of trucks and other heavy equipment. Another approach to reducing the intrusion of backup alarms | |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>is to require all equipment on the site to be equipped with ambient sensitive alarms. With this type of alarm, the alarm sound is automatically adjusted based on the ambient noise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Construction worker’s radios shall be controlled so as to be inaudible beyond the limits of the project site boundaries. j. Heavy equipment, such as paving and grading equipment, shall be stored on-site whenever possible to minimize the need for extra heavy truck trips on local streets. k. Two weeks prior to the commencement of construction, notification in writing must be provided to residents within 300 feet of the project site, disclosing the construction schedule, including the various types of activities that would be occurring throughout the duration of the construction period. l. The construction contractor shall designate a city-approved "disturbance coordinator" who shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented. The construction contractor shall conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule. | |
| Impact NOISE-2 | The construction of the proposed project would result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measure NOISE-2</p> <p>NOISE-2a: Heavy construction equipment shall be prohibited from operating within 100 feet of an existing residence between the hours of 5:00 PM and 9:00 AM and on holidays.</p> <p>NOISE-2b: Operation of heavy equipment shall be prohibited within 20 feet of the barn complex. Temporary reinforcements/stabilization measures shall be installed at the barn structures, as needed, to minimize vibration damage.</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact NOISE-3 | Noise generated by project operation would not result in generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|----------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| | project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. | | | |
| RPT Impact NOI-1 | Construction and operation of the proposed regional park trail project would not increase noise levels at existing residential uses in the vicinity nor expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration. The proposed regional park trail would not expose persons on-site to excessive noise levels nor generate traffic which would substantially increase noise levels. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact NOISE-1 | The proposed Scott Ranch project and the regional park trail project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in a significant cumulative noise impact. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Population and Housing | | | | |
| Impact PH-1 | The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the area either directly or indirectly. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| Impact PH-2 | The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| RPT Impact PH-1 | The proposed regional park trail project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth or displace a substantial number of existing housing or people. | <i>No Impact</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>No Impact</i> |
| Cumulative Impact PH-1 | The proposed Scott Ranch project and the proposed regional trail project, in conjunction with other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in a significant cumulative impact with regards to population and housing. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Public Services, Including Recreation | | | | |
| Impact PUB-1 | The proposed project would not require the construction of new or physically altered fire facilities. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact PUB-2 | The proposed project would not require the construction of new or physically altered police facilities. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------|--|
| Impact PUB-3 | The proposed project would not require the construction of new or physically altered school facilities. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact PUB-4 | The proposed project would not require the construction of new or physically altered library facilities. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact PUB-5 | Development of the proposed project would increase the use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities but not result in substantial physical deterioration of the facilities. In addition, the demand created by the proposed project would not require the construction of new or physically altered parks and recreation facilities. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| PT Impact PUB-1 | The implementation of the proposed regional park trail would not cause a substantial adverse impact related to fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other governmental services. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation | |
|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Cumulative Impact PUB-1 | The proposed Scott Ranch project and the regional park trail project, in conjunction with other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on public services. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Transportation and Traffic | | | | |
| Impact TRANS-1 | Development of the proposed project would generate VMT per capita greater than the City threshold. | <i>Significant</i> | Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 The Applicants shall contribute their fair share to mitigation measures that aim to reduce Citywide VMT per capita by an equivalent amount to the reduction of project-generated VMT from 19.6 VMT per capita to a level at or below 16.2 VMT per capita. ² These mitigation measures for reducing VMT shall include funding for transit passes or multi-modal infrastructure, such as transit shelters or other accessibility improvements, to address existing capital needs determined by the City of Petaluma’s Engineer and Transit Manager. These measures, when applied to people working, living, or visiting areas of Petaluma with higher density, a greater mix of uses, and more amenities within a convenient walk, bike, or transit trip, are effective at reducing VMT. For example, constructing transit shelters and other amenities that support transit-oriented neighborhoods as outlined in the CAPCOA Strategy LUT-5 Increase Transit Accessibility are estimated to have a VMT reduction potential up to 5.8 percent. However, in the absence of a Citywide policy outlining the specific improvements and the effectiveness of these improvements at reducing VMT, the feasibility of the mitigation measure is currently unknown. | <i>Significant and Unavoidable</i> |
| Impact TRANS-2 | Development of the proposed project would | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

² Based on the MTC 2015 model, the existing total Citywide daily VMT is 986,618. The project would generate 1,356 total daily VMT (19.6 VMT per capita * 28 homes * 2.47 average household size in Petaluma = 1,356 total VMT), and would be required to reduce this amount by 233 VMT (28 homes * 2.47 average household size * [19.6 VMT – 16.2 VMT per capita]). Therefore, the project would be responsible for a 0.02% reduction to total citywide VMT (233 total VMT / [986,618 total VMT + 1,356 total VMT] = 0.02%) in order to reduce citywide VMT per capita by an equivalent level of 16.1 VMT per capita for the project.

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | not result in impacts related to the internal circulation system, substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, nor substantially impact emergency access. | | Recommended Improvement Measures: IM TRANS-2: During the SPAR process, at the City engineers' discretion, the project Applicants shall fund the following measures: striping of a northbound left turn lane at the parking lot access on D Street, trimming or removing any landscaping that may grow in such a manner that could obstruct the line of sight between motorists exiting the driveway and traveling along D Street, and installing flashing warning lights, signage, and striping to warn drivers about the driveway and roundabout. The installation of this northbound left turn pocket would provide adequate space for a northbound motorist to decelerate into the turn lane prior to waiting for a gap in the southbound direction and making a turn into the project site. The length of the storage of the turn pocket and bay taper should be 100 feet and 120 feet, respectively, and should be verified during the development of final design documents. | |
| Impact TRANS-3 | Development of the proposed project would not impact access to transit facilities. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact TRANS-4 | Development of the proposed project would not impact pedestrian and bicycle facilities or create hazardous conditions for pedestrians or bicyclists that currently do not exist. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. Recommended Improvement Measure: IM TRANS-4: During the SPAR process, at the City engineers' discretion, the proposed project shall enhance the design of pedestrian facilities in manner consistent with the recommended features in the General Plan. This may include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sidewalk on the north side of Windsor Drive; b. Wider sidewalks with planter strips; c. Directional curb ramps, ADA-compliant cross slopes, and tighter curb radii; d. Crosswalks on all intersection legs; and e. Intersection crossing measures such as RRFB's and bulb-outs at the proposed crosswalk, in a manner consistent with MUTCD recommendations. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact TRANS-5 | The proposed project would cause temporary disruption to the transportation network due to construction. | <i>Significant</i> | Mitigation Measure TRANS-5: A construction management plan shall be prepared for review and approval by the City of Petaluma Public Works Department. The plan shall include at least the following items: | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Development of a construction truck route that would appear on all construction plans to limit truck and auto traffic on nearby streets. b. Comprehensive traffic control measures, including scheduling of major truck trips and deliveries to avoid peak traffic hours, detour signs if required, lane closure procedures if required, sidewalk closure procedures if required, cones for drivers, and designated construction access routes. c. Evaluation of the need to provide flaggers or temporary traffic control at key intersections along the truck route(s). d. Notification procedures for adjacent property owners and public safety personnel regarding schedules when major deliveries, detours, and lane closures would occur. e. Location of construction staging areas for materials, equipment, and vehicles if there is insufficient staging area within the work zone of the proposed project. f. Identification of truck routes for movement of construction vehicles that would minimize impacts on vehicular and pedestrian traffic, circulation and safety; provision for monitoring surface streets used for truck movement so that any damage and debris attributable to the proposed project's construction trucks can be identified and corrected by the proposed project applicant. g. A process for responding to and tracking complaints pertaining to construction activity, including identification of an on-site complaint manager. h. Documentation of road pavement conditions for all routes that would be used by construction vehicles both before and after proposed project construction. Roads found to have been damaged by construction vehicles shall be repaired to the level at which they existed prior to construction of the proposed project. | |
| RPT Impact TRANS-1 | Implementation of the proposed regional park trail project would not conflict with any applicable plans, ordinances or policies establishing measures of | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | effectiveness for the performance of the traffic circulation system; increase traffic hazards; or result in inadequate emergency access. | | | |
| Cumulative Impact TRANS-1 | Development of the proposed project and the regional park trail would generate VMT per capita greater than the project threshold under cumulative conditions. | <i>Significant</i> | Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 . | <i>Significant and Unavoidable</i> |
| Cumulative Impact TRANS-2 | Development of the proposed project and the regional park trail would not result in cumulative impacts related to the internal circulation system, substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, nor substantially impact emergency access. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. Recommended Improvement Measure TRANS-2 . | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact TRANS-3 | Cumulative development, including the proposed project and the regional park trail, would not result in cumulative impacts to public transit facilities. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact TRANS-4 | Cumulative development, including the proposed project and the regional park trail, would not result in cumulative impacts to pedestrian and bicycle facilities. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Cumulative Impact TRANS-5 | The proposed project and the regional park trail would not cause temporary disruption to the transportation network due to construction under Cumulative conditions. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Utilities and Service Systems | | | | |
| Impact UTL-1 | Development of the proposed project would not result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water supply entitlements and would not require expansion of the water delivery system. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact UTL-2 | Development of the proposed project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact UTL-3 | Development of the proposed project would require the construction of new or expanded wastewater conveyance systems. The construction of new or expanded wastewater conveyance systems would result in significant environmental effects. | <i>Significant</i> | <p>Mitigation Measure UTL-3</p> <p>UTL-3a: Prior to issuance of building permits, the project shall be required to upsize the D Street sewer between Grossland Way to the manhole west of 10th Street, subject to the review and approval by the City Public Works and Utilities Department.</p> <p>UTL-3b: Mitigation Measure AIR-2, Mitigation Measures CUL-2a through 2c, Mitigation Measure CUL-3, and Mitigation Measure NOISE-1 and NOISE-2a shall be implemented in conjunction with the sewer main upgrade project.</p> | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact UTL-4 | Development of the proposed project would require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities on site. The | <i>Significant</i> | Implement Mitigation Measures HYD-1c and HYD-4a through HYD-4c. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------|--|
| | construction of new storm water drainage facilities would not result in significant environmental effects. | | | |
| Impact UTL-5 | The proposed project would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste and would not generate solid waste that would require the expansion of the permitted capacity of a regional landfill 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. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact UTL-6 | Development of the proposed project would not result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| RPT Impact UTL-1 | The implementation of the proposed park trail project would not cause substantial adverse impacts requiring the construction or relocation of new or expanded water | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| | <p>supply or expansion of a water delivery system; result in the construction or relocation of new wastewater treatment facilities or conveyance systems; or require relocation or construction or expansion of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities. The proposed park trail project would comply with all regulations related to solid waste and there would be sufficient landfill capacity to serve the proposed park trail project would not 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.</p> | | | |
| <p>Cumulative Impact UTL-1</p> | <p>The proposed project and the regional park trail project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on utilities.</p> | <p><i>Less than Significant</i></p> | <p>No mitigation is required.</p> | <p><i>Less than Significant</i></p> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Wildfire | | | | |
| Impact WDF-1 | The proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact WDF-2 | The proposed project would not substantially exacerbate wildfire risks, or expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact WDF-3 | The proposed project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as road, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts on the environment. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Impact WDF-4 | The proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslide, as a result of landslide, runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. | <i>Potentially Significant</i> | Implement Mitigation Measures GEO-1a, GEO-3a, GEO-3b, HYD-4a, HYD-4b, and HYD-6. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

| Environmental Topic and Impact | | Level of Significance before Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance after Mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| RPT Impact WDF-1 | The implementation of the proposed regional park trail would not cause a substantially exacerbate wildfire risks or result in adverse impact related to an emergency response plan, or expose people or structures to significant risks. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |
| Cumulative Impact WDF-1 | The proposed Scott Ranch Project and the regional park trail project, in conjunction with other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development would not result in a significant cumulative impact on wildfire. | <i>Less than Significant</i> | No mitigation is required. | <i>Less than Significant</i> |

Table 2.0-2, Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives, presents the environmental impacts of each alternative to allow the decision makers, agencies, and the public to compare and contrast these alternatives and weigh their relative merits and demerits.

As summarized in the table below, the No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid the proposed project's impacts. However, this alternative would not achieve any of the objectives of the proposed project.

With the exception of similar significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, the Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project Alternative would reduce all other impacts of the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would achieve the project objective of promoting development within the established urban growth boundary, thereby discouraging urban sprawl. It would also achieve the objectives of developing a high-quality residential project on the west side of Petaluma, preservation of Kelly Creek in its natural state, and providing new housing opportunities while minimizing neighborhood impacts. However, this alternative would not achieve the objective of permanently preserving sensitive biological and geological areas of the site as protected open space.

The Putnam Park Extension Project Alternative would reduce or avoid all of the proposed project's impacts and is identified in this analysis as the environmentally superior alternative. This alternative would achieve the objective of implementing General Plan policies related to establishment of an Urban Separator and the Petaluma ring trail system and would provide improved recreational access to the Helen Putnam Regional Park. The Putnam Park Extension Project Alternative would also achieve the objectives of permanently preserving sensitive biological and geological areas of the site as protected open space; preserving and enhancing Kelly Creek in its natural state; preserving the barn complex; providing a public pedestrian/bicycle trail connecting to Helen Putnam Regional Park; and providing a large extension of the Helen Putnam Regional Park, with new trails, a restored barn complex, habitat and waterway enhancements, and related features. However, this alternative would not meet the project's objectives to develop a high-quality residential project on the west side of Petaluma and provide new housing opportunities while minimizing neighborhood impacts. Furthermore, this alternative would not promote and maximize new housing opportunities within the urban growth boundary thereby discouraging urban sprawl. This alternative would not provide housing units and, therefore, would not assist the City in meeting its RHNA obligation as effectively as the proposed project.

**Table 2.0-2
Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

| Project Impact | | Scott Ranch: Proposed Project (Before and After Mitigation) | No Project/No Development Alternative | Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project Alternative | Putnam Park Extension Project Alternative |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| AES-1 | Development of the project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | LTS |
| AES-3 | Development of the project site would substantially degrade the visual character and quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| AIR-2 | Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate emissions that would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any critical pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. | PS/LTS | NE | PS-/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| AIR-3 | Construction and operation of the proposed project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. | PS/LTS | NE | S-/LTS | S-/LTS |
| BIO-1 | The proposed project would not affect special-status plant species but would result in substantial adverse effects on special-status wildlife species, including California red-legged frog, nesting birds, and roosting bats. | PS/LTS | NE | PS+/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| BIO-2 | The proposed project would affect sensitive natural communities, including riparian habitat, native grasslands, and regulated seasonal wetlands. | PS/LTS | NE | PS+/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| BIO-3 | The proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on state and federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. | PS/LTS | NE | PS-/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| BIO-4 | The proposed project would interfere substantially with the movement of 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. | PS/LTS | NE | PS-/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| BIO-5 | The proposed project would conflict with a local policy for protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | PS=/LTS |
| CUM BIO-1 | The proposed Scott Ranch project and the regional park trail project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would result in significant cumulative impacts on biological resources. | PS/LTS | NE | PS-/LTS | PS-/LTS |

| Project Impact | | Scott Ranch: Proposed Project (Before and After Mitigation) | No Project/No Development Alternative | Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project Alternative | Putnam Park Extension Project Alternative |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| CUL-1 | The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. | PS/LTS | PS | PS/LTS | PS/LTS |
| CUL-2 | The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| CUL-3 | The proposed project could disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| CUL-4 | The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| GEO-1 | The proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects related to fault rupture but would cause potential substantial adverse effects related to seismic ground shaking and/or seismic-related ground failure. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | NE |
| GEO-2 | The proposed project would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | LTS |
| GEO-3 | The proposed project would expose people and structures to substantial adverse effects from landslides and unstable slopes. | PS/LTS | NE | PS-/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| GEO-4 | The proposed project would be located on a geologic unit that could become unstable as a result of the project, and on expansive soils creating direct or indirect risk to life or property. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | LTS |
| GEO-6 | The proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| HYD-1 | The proposed project would result in the discharge of stormwater that could violate water quality standards, degrade surface or ground water quality, and cause hydromodification. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| HYD-3 | The proposed project would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would result in substantial alteration of stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner that would result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| HYD-4 | The proposed project would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff that would result in flooding on- or off-site. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| HYD-6 | The proposed project would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that would redirect flood flows. | PS/LTS | NE | LTS | PS-/LTS |

| Project Impact | | Scott Ranch: Proposed Project (Before and After Mitigation) | No Project/No Development Alternative | Davidon (28-Lot) Residential Project Alternative | Putnam Park Extension Project Alternative |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| LU-2 | The proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. | LTS | NE | LTS | LTS |
| NOISE -1 | Noise generated by construction activities on the project site would result in a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. | PS/LTS | NE | PS-/LTS | LTS |
| NOISE -2 | Construction of the proposed project would result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | LTS |
| TRAN S-1 | Development of the proposed project would generate VMT per capita greater than the project threshold. | S/SU | NE | S-/SU | LTS |
| TRAN S-5 | The proposed project would cause temporary disruption to the transportation network due to construction. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| CUM TRAN S-1 | Development of the proposed project and the regional park trail could generate VMT per capita greater than the project threshold under cumulative conditions. | S/SU | NE | S-/SU | LTS |
| UTL-3 | Development of the proposed project would require the construction of new or expanded wastewater conveyance systems. The construction of new or expanded wastewater conveyance systems would result in significant environmental effects. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | LTS |
| UTL-4 | Development of the proposed project would require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities on site. The construction of new storm water drainage facilities would not result in significant environmental effects. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | PS-/LTS |
| WDF- 4 | The proposed project could expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslide, as a result of landslide, runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. | PS/LTS | NE | PS=/LTS | LTS |

Notes: This table lists only the significant or potentially significant impacts of the proposed project and not the less than significant impacts.

Key:

SU Significant and unavoidable

PS Potentially significant impact

LTS Less than significant impact

NE No Effect

= Impact similar to proposed project

- Impact less than proposed project

+ Impact greater than proposed project