

---

**CEQA MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION/INITIAL STUDY**

**Prepared For**

**Sonoma County  
Department of Transportation and Public Works**

**Todd Road / Standish Avenue Signalization Project**

Publication Date: XXXX 2021  
Sch. No. 202102XXXX

*Prepared by  
T.Y. Lin International  
1545 River Park Drive, Suite 201  
Sacramento, CA 95815*



*This page intentionally left blank*

**Project Title:** Todd Rd/Standish Ave Signalization Project

**Lead Agency Name and Address:** Sonoma County Transportation and Public Works  
2300 County Center Dr, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

**Contact Person and Phone Number:** Olguin P. Caban, Assistant Engineer  
Phone: (707)565-2857  
Olguin.Caban@sonoma-county.org

**Project Location:** Todd Road at Standish Avenue

**APN:** 134-102-070, 134-102-071, 134-102-084, 134-102-014, 134-171-052, 134-171-049, 134-171-050, 134-171-051

**Zoning:** M2: Heavy Industrial District, M3: Limited Rural Industrial District, and RR: Rural Residential District

**Project Purpose:** The purpose of the proposed Todd Road/Standish Avenue Signalization Project (project) is to improve the intersection of Todd Road at Standish Avenue to meet current Sonoma County standards and signalize the intersection to facilitate current and projected traffic movements including large truck traffic.

This Initial Study is required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and was prepared by T.Y Lin International with supporting documentation from Rincon, Inc. and TJKM, Inc. Information on the proposed project was provided by the Project Applicant and T.Y. Lin International engineers. Technical studies referenced in this document are available for review at the Sonoma County Transportation and Public Works Department and include:

- Biological Resources Assessment, Rincon Inc., January 2021
- Cultural Resources Assessment, Rincon Inc., January 2021
- Construction Noise Assessment, Rincon Inc., January 2021
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Rincon Inc., January 2021
- Traffic Management Technical Memorandum, TJKM Inc., February 2021

**Environmental Finding:** Based on the attached Initial Study, the proposed project described above will not have a substantial adverse impact on the environment, provided that the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study are included in the Project.

**Initial Study:** See attached. For more information, call Olguin P. Caban, Phone: (707) 565-2857.

**Mitigation Measures:** Included in the attached Initial Study. The project applicant has agreed to implement all mitigation measures.

# Table of Contents

ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATED TERMS .....	1
PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	3
Project Purpose.....	3
Project Location and Existing Conditions .....	3
Proposed Project Elements.....	3
Project Construction .....	4
Construction Best Management Practices .....	5
Possible Required Permits and Approvals.....	9
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST .....	10
NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION .....	10
1.1 AESTHETICS .....	13
1.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES .....	15
1.3 AIR QUALITY .....	17
1.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES .....	23
1.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	27
1.6 ENERGY .....	30
1.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS .....	31
1.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS .....	34
1.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS .....	37
1.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY .....	42
1.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING.....	45
1.12 MINERAL RESOURCES .....	46
1.13 NOISE .....	47
1.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING .....	53
1.15 PUBLIC SERVICES .....	54
1.16 RECREATION.....	55
1.17 TRANSPORTATION .....	56
1.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	58
1.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	60
1.20 WILDFIRE.....	62
1.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	63
REFERENCES.....	65
APPENDICES.....	68

**Figures**

Figure 1 Vicinity Map.....7  
Figure 2 Project Limits and Conceptual Design .....8

**Tables**

Table 1 Anticipated Construction Sequence Activity, Duration and Equipment .....5  
Table 2 Possible Permits and Approvals for the Proposed project.....9  
Table 3 Criteria Air Pollutant Significance Thresholds .....18  
Table 4 Estimated Project’s Daily Construction Emissions .....20  
Table 5 Consistency with Local GHG Reduction Plans .....36  
Table 6 Project Vicinity Sound Level Monitoring Results .....48  
Table 7 Sound Level Monitoring Traffic Counts.....49  
Table 8 Construction Noise Levels at Receivers .....50

**Appendices**

Appendix A.....Air Quality Modeling Outputs  
Appendix B .....Special Status Species Tables

## ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATED TERMS

AB	Assembly Bill
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
AC	Asphalt Concrete
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADL	Aerially Deposited Lead
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BMP	Best Management Practices
BRA	Biological Resources Assessment
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CALFire	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CCAP	Community Climate Action Plan
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDC	California Department of Conservation
CDFW	California Department Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFGC	California Fish and Game Code
CGS	California Geological Survey
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
CMP	Construction Management Plan
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	Carbon Dioxide
CRA	Cultural Resources Assessment
CRPR	California Rare Plant Rank
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CTS	California Tiger Salamander
DPM	Diesel Particulate Matter
DOC	Department of Conservation
DOT	Department of Transportation
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
EDR	Environmental Data Resources
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
ESL	Environmental Screening Levels
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
LOS	Level of Service
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zones

MT	Metric Ton
MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NM	Noise Measurement
NO <sub>x</sub>	Nitrogen Oxides
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen Dioxide
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	National Resources Conservation Service
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OSRC	Open Space and Resource Conservation Element
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric Company
PM	Particulate Matter
PPV	Peak Particle Velocity
PRC	Public Resources Code
RCEM	Roadway Construction Emissions Model
RCNM	Roadway Construction Noise Model
RCRA	Resources Conservation and Recovery Act
REC	Recognized Environmental Conditions
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RR	Rural Residential
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SFBAAB	San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin
SLF	Sacred Lands File
SMP	Soil Management Plan
SO <sub>2</sub>	Sulfur Dioxide
SR	State Route
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TAC	Toxic Air Contaminant
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UST	Underground Storage Tank
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
WPT	Western Pond Turtle

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Sonoma County is proposing to upgrade the intersection at Todd Road and Standish Avenue with the installation of a traffic signal, storm drain inlets and sidewalk improvements. The Todd Road/Standish Avenue Signalization Project (project) is identified in the County of Sonoma and Sonoma Water Five Year Capital Improvement Plan 2020-2025.

### **Project Purpose**

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve the intersection of Todd Road at Standish Avenue to meet current Sonoma County standards and signalize the intersection to facilitate current and projected traffic movements including large truck traffic.

### **Project Location and Existing Conditions**

The proposed project is located south of the City of Santa Rosa in an urbanized area within the southern portion of unincorporated Sonoma County (Figure 1: Vicinity Map). Project limits and conceptual design are shown in Figure 2 Project Limits and Conceptual Design. The existing intersection of Todd Road and Standish Avenue is a three-legged intersection with Standish Avenue under stop control. Todd Road is a two-lane east-west major collector that includes 150-foot long left turn lanes in each direction at the intersection with Standish Avenue. Standish Avenue is a two-lane north-south rural major collector and it is stop controlled at the intersection with Todd Road. A private property owner, Ghilotti Construction Inc., will align their private road, referred to as Ghilotti Avenue, directly opposite Standish Avenue and the realignment of the roadway is not part of this Project. Ghilotti Avenue is also stop controlled at Todd Road. Only the northeast quadrant of this intersection contains a sidewalk, however it is substandard and has an overhead power line pole and fire hydrant located within the sidewalk, reducing the passage. There are no pedestrian crosswalks at this intersection. The Todd Road and Standish Avenue intersection is located approximately 1,900 feet west of the Highway 101 and approximately 600 feet west of the railroad tracks upon which the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit runs regular passenger train service.

The proposed project would be constructed within an approximate 2.66-acre area and primarily within existing Sonoma County transportation rights-of-way. Existing land uses adjacent to the project site include light manufacturing and industrial use in the northwest corner and warehouse land use to the southeast corner with rural residential properties located at both the northeast and southwest corners. The broader project area includes a mixture of residential land uses to the east and rural residential and agricultural lands to the south and west.

Along the west side of Standish Avenue, a business sign, minor landscaping, and a few small diameter trees are present. A substantially larger tree along with moderate landscaping are present along the south of Todd Avenue. Above ground power utility lines run parallel to north side of Todd Road and west side of Standish Avenue. Other underground utilities within this intersection include water, gas, sanitary sewer, and storm drain systems.

### **Proposed Project Elements**

The intersection improvements would include a traffic signal, standard curb radii improvement with sidewalk improvements and standard curb ramps at each leg of the intersection, including the connection to the privately developed road at Ghilotti Avenue, and pedestrian crossing improvements including striping and push button crossings at each of the four new crossings. The existing sidewalk in the northeast quadrant would be upgraded to Sonoma County standards for approximately 85 feet east of the intersection and can be widened while still allowing the utility pole to remain in place. The fire hydrant would be relocated to the back of the sidewalk. All curb ramp improvements would meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. The majority of improvements would be within existing Sonoma County right-of-way, with the exception of a small area to install the curb ramp at the northwest Todd Road/Standish Way intersection quadrant. The partial acquisition would equal a total of less than one-



tenth of an acre of land.

Construction of the proposed project would involve roadway excavation at the intersection to install the signal power, signal mast arms and new drainage inlets to connect with the existing and/or relocated storm drain lines. The depth of excavation would be approximately 10 feet for the signal mast arms and between 4 to 5 feet for the drainage improvements. The drainage improvements would occur within the existing right-of-way and the project improvement limits shown in Figure 2 and no construction activities would occur within the drainage ditches along Todd Road. Vegetation removal is expected to include the removal of five trees along the south side of Todd Road and to the northeast curb return. A business sign on the northwest corner of the intersection is located within existing right-of-way and would also be relocated in cooperation with the property owner. The intersection pavement would be excavated within the project limits and new asphalt would be laid to conform to the four legs of the intersection to complete the construction process.

### **Project Construction**

The Conceptual Construction plan would maintain traffic operations through the Todd Road and Standish Road intersection, including the private roadway Ghilotti Avenue, at all times with the assistance of flaggers as necessary to facilitate movements through narrowed lanes. Turn lanes would be temporarily eliminated to make room for two lanes of traffic. This may result in longer delays for turning movements. Construction phasing would identify quadrants or one-half of each travel way and shift traffic onto the opposite side. The proposed project is expected to require approximately 40 – 50 working days to complete, dependent on variables such as weather and availability of needed materials. Due to heavy daytime traffic, the Contractor may be permitted to conduct nighttime construction activities or construction activities on Saturdays to reduce construction duration. A Construction Management Plan (CMP) would be prepared consistent with Caltrans Standards Specifications and Standard Plans with some exceptions to meet Sonoma County modifications. The CMP would be submitted to and approved by Sonoma County Public Works in advance of notice to proceed construction. The CMP would include construction sequence, traffic management plan, public outreach and notification plan and details on compliance with necessary permits as well as avoidance measures with regard to noise, dust and debris management.

Property access would be maintained during construction. The existing Sonoma County Transit bus stop for Route 42 (Santa Rosa, Industry West Business Park) on the north side of Todd Road and east of Standish Avenue, would need to be temporarily relocated east of the construction area during construction. The bus stop on the south side of Todd Road is outside of the project site and would not be affected by construction activities.

The following provides a brief overview of anticipated construction practice to construct an intersection. Advanced notification of construction would be provided to property owners via signage postings a minimum of two weeks in advance of starting construction. Coordination with Sonoma County Transit in advance of construction would also occur to coordinate the temporary relocation of the bus stop as well as providing advance notice to transit users by placing signage at the bus stop. Prior to mobilization, erosion control best management practices would be installed consistent with permit requirements and confirmed relocation of migratory bird nests in advance of nesting period would be completed. Construction would occur within a dry season (from late spring through early fall). Construction staging for the proposed project would be minimal and remain within the project site (Figure 2) and within the existing transportation right-of-way.

Table 1 outlines the anticipated construction activities, duration and associated construction equipment needed for each task. Preparing the road right-of-way or construction area is referred to as clearing and grubbing. During the clearing phase, trees are felled. Grubbing refers to the clearing and removal of stumps and organic debris. Following removal of vegetative matter, the subgrade would be excavated,

underground utilities would be exposed and relocated and/or adjusted to grade, and extension of the storm drainage lines and inlets would be installed. Water would be used to reduce dust. During this time, power and foundations for traffic signal masts would be installed. Once utilities are tested, concrete curbs, gutters, sidewalks and driveways curb cuts would be installed. The existing electrical power poles would be protected in place.

Next, fill can be compacted, and road base material installed. The Contractor may choose to switch travel lanes onto roadbed material or install a base layer of asphalt. Typically, grade asphalt layer is installed for the entire roadway in one to two days, with traffic shifting with the assistance of flaggers. Exposed soil areas within the construction area would be seeded with native-grass seeds. Final activity includes striping, testing signal operation, and transitioning traffic flow to a fully functional roadway.

*Table 1 Anticipated Construction Sequence Activity, Duration, and Equipment*

<b>Construction Sequence of Activities</b>	<b>Duration (Days)</b>	<b>Associated Equipment</b>
Underground service alert to identify utilities	1-2	None
Construction area Signs	1	None
Fence Environmentally Sensitive Areas	1	Hand tools
Reconfigure lanes (if needed)	1	portable grinder, Paint over existing paint
Clear & Grubbing	1-2	1-Backhoe, 2- 10-yard trucks
Sawcut existing pavement	1-2	Gas operated AC saw, wet vacuums
Place temporary barrier rails to delineate traffic	1	2-semi trailers, Backhoe/forklift
Remove existing drainage facilities	2	Backhoe/excavator, 2-10-yard trucks
Excavate drainage (Reinforced Concrete Pipes)	2	Backhoe/excavator
Install drainage pipes and backfill	1	Backhoe, compactor, water trailer tank
Electrical conduit and boxes	5	Small excavator/ditch witch, flatbed truck
Signal pole foundations excavate	1	Truck-mount auger, loader, 10-yardtruck
Signals foundation cages and template	1	Backhoe, flatbed
Signal pole foundation concrete	1	concrete truck
Drainage boxes	5	Backhoe, concrete truck
Place and compact base	3	Backhoe, compactor, water trailer tank
Grade and form curb and gutter	4	Backhoe, flatbed truck
Place concrete curb and gutter	1-2	concrete trucks
Remove temporary rail	1	Backhoe/forklift, semi-truck
Finish roadway	2	Backhoe, 10-yard truck, compactor
Repair existing pavement	1-2	Jackhammer, backhoe, 2-10-yard trucks, compactor
Asphalt Concrete overlay	1-2	Paver, 2-drum rollers, 3 semi-trucks, sweeper
After 21 days of curing, install poles	1-2	Truck-mount crane, flatbed
Install signals	2-3	Truck-mount crane/ bucket-truck, flatbed
Adjust manhole covers and survey monuments	3-5	Jackhammer, plate compactor, flatbed truck
Install roadway striping	1	Striping rig

### Construction Best Management Practices

Best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented as part of construction to minimize and/or avoid potential impacts during construction. BMPs would include, but not limited to, the following:

- Minimize the potential for erosion including the use of silt fencing
- Prepare and implement an approved SWPPP
- Ensure proper storage and disposal of hazardous materials



Fugitive dust control BMPs during site preparation and grading activities that would be implemented, as recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) include:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times daily.
- 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 miles per hour.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- 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 with the telephone number and person to contact at the Sonoma County regarding dust complaints shall be posted. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Figure 1: Vicinity Map



Imagery provided by Esri and its licensors © 2020.



Ref: Fig 1 Regional Location



Figure 2 Project Limits and Conceptual Design



## Possible Required Permits and Approvals

State and local agencies may potentially have jurisdiction regarding the development of the Project. Sonoma County Public Works will comply with all applicable regulations.

*Table 2 Possible Permits and Approvals for the Proposed Project*

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Permit/Approval</b>
Sonoma County Transportation and Public Works	Property Easements
Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department	Grading Permit
Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department	Tree Protection and Replacement Ordinance No. 4014
Regional Water Quality Control Board	Construction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit
Regional Water Quality Control Board	Waste Discharge Requirements

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Provided on the following pages is an Environment Checklist, based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. For each item, one of four responses is given:

- **No Impact:** The project would not have the impact described. The project may have a beneficial effect, but there is no potential for the project to create or add increment to the impact described.
- **Less Than Significant Impact:** The project would have the impact described, but the impact would not be significant. Mitigation is not required, although the project applicant may choose to modify the project to avoid the impacts.
- **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation:** The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. One or more mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce the impact to a less than significant level.
- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact:** The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant and unavoidable. The impact cannot be reduced to less than significant by incorporating mitigation measures. An environmental impact report must be prepared for this project.

Each question on the checklist was answered by evaluating the Project as proposed, that is, without considering the effect of added mitigation measures. The checklist includes a discussion of the impacts and mitigation measures that have been identified.

The Project Applicant, Sonoma County Transportation and Public Works Department, has agreed to accept all mitigation measures listed in this checklist as conditions of approval of the proposed project and to obtain all necessary permits.

## NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

**Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) section 21080.3.1?**  Yes  No

**If yes, ensure that consultation and heritage resource confidentiality follow PRC sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 and California Government Code 65352.4**

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least on impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials    | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |



## DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
  
- I find that although the proposed project COULD have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
  
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
  
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
  
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
Sonoma County

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

## 1.1 AESTHETICS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code section 21099 (where aesthetic impacts shall not be considered significant for qualifying residential, mixed-use residential, and employment centers), would				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The project site is within an urbanized area of unincorporated Sonoma County south of the City of Santa Rosa. The visual landscape is largely rural in nature with larger parcels of light industrial and the project site is located at an existing intersection with development at each of the four corners. Todd Road has a sidewalk on the northeast corner, but otherwise no sidewalks exist. Overhead utilities lines are positioned primarily along the north side of Todd Road. At the northwest side of the intersection, one street light is mounted on a utility pole. The terrain is flat with interspersed trees and vegetation consisting primarily of landscaping. The visual landscape includes a mixture of rural residences, agricultural lands and light industrial buildings. The west horizon provides views of the coastal mountains and the eastern views of the Sonoma Mountain range.

The project site is relatively flat and the surrounding area is undeveloped allowing for unobstructed views of the surrounding landscape of distant mountains. Visible elements of the proposed project would include the new signal lights on poles and mast arms and removed vegetation. Project elements would be at-grade are therefore not expected to impair surrounding views.

### Impact Analysis

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

**No Impact.** There are no designated scenic vistas in the project area. Based on the information on the locations of scenic landscape units identified on Figure OSRC-1, Scenic Resource Areas, in the Open Space and Resource Conservation Element of the Sonoma County General Plan (Sonoma County 2020), the project site is not located within an area designated as a Scenic Landscape Unit or Scenic Corridor. The proposed project is located within a developed area of unincorporated Sonoma County with largely industrial related development adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within or near a State Scenic Highway (Caltrans 2019) and does not contain scenic resources such as trees of scenic value rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. No impact would occur.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is located within an urbanized area of unincorporated Sonoma County in an area where the land uses are associated with primarily industrial related uses and is zoned for industrial related uses. There are no publicly accessible vantage points located within the project site. The proposed project is within the existing transportation right-of-way and does not result in a change the overall setting since the project remains primarily within the existing right-of-way. Because the proposed project does not result in a change to the overall setting and there are no scenic resources or vistas, a visual assessment consistent with Sonoma County Visual Assessment Guidelines (Sonoma 2019) was not conducted. Impacts would be less then significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is located in an area of light industrial development and residences on larger parcels. Vehicle headlights and taillights and lighting associated with private residences and local businesses are primary existing sources of light and glare. Construction activities would not result in a new source of substantial light or glare, because construction activities would occur primarily during daylight hours. If nighttime construction is required given the overall short duration of construction impacts would be limited. Impacts during construction would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

During operation, the lighting within the project site would be the same as existing conditions and does not create a new source of substantial light or glare. The proposed project would replace the existing roadway intersection with a new signalized intersection, which would not cast light onto adjacent uses. No light standards would be installed, and no other light sources would be included, therefore, the proposed project would not create a new source of light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views. There would be no impacts during operation.

## 1.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The project site consists of developed areas including the existing roadway, industrial uses, and one residential building. Areas to the west of the project site are associated with agricultural uses. The project site is not mapped by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as containing Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (CDC 2020). The project site is identified primarily as "Urban and Built-Up Land" and a small area "Farmland of Local Importance" is located in the southwest section (CDC 2020).

### Impact Analysis

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

**No Impact.** There are no areas identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance within the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use. No impact would occur.

- b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?*

**No Impact.** The project site is zoned M2: Heavy Industrial District, M3: Limited Rural Industrial District, and RR: Rural Residential District and none of the parcels within the project site are under a Williamson Act contract (Sonoma County 2020). The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning or a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

- c) *Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?*

**No Impact.** The project site contains no forest or timberland and is not zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland production. As described above under b), the project site is zoned for M2: Heavy Industrial District, M3: Limited Rural Industrial District, and RR: Rural Residential District and none of the surrounding properties are zoned for forestry or timberland uses. The proposed project has no potential to conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)). No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** As noted in response c), the project site is not located on or near forest land. The proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or convert forest land to a non-forest use. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project improves an existing unsignalized intersection with a signalized intersection. The proposed project does not impact Farmland or forest land and would not involve other changes in the existing environment. No impact would occur.

## 1.3 AIR QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Methods

Emissions for construction of the intersection improvements were estimated in Road Construction Emissions Model (RCEM) Version 9.0.0 from the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. The RCEM model was used for the intersection improvements because it was designed specifically for linear construction projects. The modeling outputs are included in Appendix A of this document.

The proposed project would comply with applicable regulatory standards and best management practices as outlined in BAQQMD guidance. This would include watering twice daily, a 12 percent unpaved road moisture content, and a 15-mph speed limit on unpaved roads. In addition, construction equipment would be required to meet at a minimum Tier 2 off road diesel engine standards as defined by the US EPA (USEPA 2016). RCEM does not allow for specifying Tier 2 or Tier 3 equipment thus, "Model Default Tier" was selected which is based upon current regulations and is assumed to be a mix of tiers based on CARB's database.

The proposed project would not result in the generation of new vehicle trips and therefore would not result in an increase in long-term operational emissions. Therefore, no impacts from operation would occur.

### Setting

The project site is located just south of the City of Santa Rosa in central Sonoma County, which is a subregion of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB) that is under the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).

As the local air quality management agency, the BAAQMD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that state and federal air quality standards are met and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet them. The BAAQMD is also responsible for adopting and enforcing rules and regulations concerning air pollutant sources, issuing permits for stationary sources of air pollutants, inspecting stationary sources of air pollutants, responding to citizen complaints, monitoring ambient air quality and meteorological conditions, awarding grants to reduce motor vehicle emissions, conducting public education campaigns, as well as many other activities.

Depending on whether or not standards are met or exceeded, a local air basin is classified as in "attainment" or "non-attainment." The BAAQMD is in non-attainment for the national standards for

ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and particulate matter smaller than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and in non-attainment for the state standard for O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and particulate matter smaller than 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>) (BAAQMD 2017a).

### Air Quality Management

The most recently adopted air quality plan in the SFBAAB is the 2017 Clean Air Plan. The 2017 Clean Air Plan is a roadmap showing how the San Francisco Bay Area will achieve compliance with the State one-hour ozone standard as expeditiously as practicable, and how the region will reduce transport of O<sub>3</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> precursors to neighboring air basins.

The 2017 Clean Air Plan provides a regional strategy to protect public health and the climate. Consistent with the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets adopted by the state, the 2017 Clean Air Plan lays the groundwork for a long-term effort to reduce Bay Area GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. To fulfill state O<sub>3</sub> planning requirements, the 2017 control strategy includes all feasible measures to reduce emissions of O<sub>3</sub> precursors—reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>)—and reduce transport of ozone and its precursors to neighboring air basins. In addition, the 2017 Clean Air Plan builds upon and enhances the BAAQMD’s efforts to reduce emissions of fine particulate matter and toxic air contaminants (BAAQMD 2017a).

### Air Emission Thresholds

Table 3 presents the significance thresholds for construction/demolition-related criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions used for the purposes of this analysis. These represent the levels at which a project’s individual emissions of criteria air pollutants or precursors would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the SFBAAB’s existing air quality conditions. For the purposes of this analysis, the proposed project would result in a significant impact if construction emissions would exceed one or more of the thresholds shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Criteria Air Pollutant Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction Thresholds
	Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day)
ROG	54
NO <sub>x</sub>	54
PM <sub>10</sub>	82 (exhaust)
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	54 (exhaust)
Fugitive Dust	Construction Dust Ordinance or other Best Management Practices

Source: BAAQMD 2017a

### Sensitive Receptors

Ambient air quality standards have been established to represent the levels of air quality considered sufficient to protect public health and welfare, with a margin of safety. They are designed to protect that segment of the public most susceptible to respiratory distress, such as children under 14, the elderly over 65, persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. Therefore, most of the sensitive receptor locations are schools, hospitals, senior living centers, and residences. The nearest sensitive receptor is one residence located within the project site on northeast corner of Todd Road and Standish Avenue. There are other residences located about 500 feet from the project site and other sensitive receptors including schools, hospitals, and senior centers are located about 0.5 miles from the project site.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is charged with implementing national air quality programs. USEPA’s air quality mandates are drawn primarily from the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), passed

in 1963 by the U.S. Congress and amended several times. The federal CAA requires USEPA to establish primary and secondary National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for several criteria air pollutants. The air pollutants for which standards have been established are considered the most prevalent air pollutants known to be hazardous to human health. NAAQS have been established for ozone, CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and Pb.

The California CAA, signed into law in 1988, requires all areas of the State to achieve and maintain the CAAQS by the earliest practical date. CARB is the State air pollution control agency and is a part of CalEPA. CARB is the agency responsible for coordination and oversight of State and local air pollution control programs in California, and for implementing the requirements of the California CAA. CARB oversees local district compliance with federal and California laws, approves local air quality plans, submits the State implementation plans to the USEPA, monitors air quality, determines and updates area designations and maps, and sets emissions standards for new mobile sources, consumer products, small utility engines, off-road vehicles, and fuels.

### **California Ambient Air Quality Standards**

The California CAA requires CARB to establish ambient air quality standards for California, known as CAAQS. Similar to the NAAQS, CAAQS have been established for criteria pollutants and standards are established for vinyl chloride, hydrogen sulfide, sulfates, and visibility-reducing particulates. In general, the CAAQS are more stringent than the NAAQS on criteria pollutants. The California CAA requires all local air districts to endeavor to achieve and maintain the CAAQS by the earliest practical date. The California CAA specifies that local air districts focus attention on reducing the emissions from transportation and area-wide emission sources and provides districts with the authority to regulate indirect sources.

### **Impact Analysis**

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Under BAAQMD's methodology stated above in Methodology, a determination of consistency with CEQA Guidelines thresholds should demonstrate that a project:

1. Supports the primary goals of the 2017 Clean Air Plan,
2. Includes applicable control measures from the 2017 Clean Air Plan, and
3. Does not disrupt or hinder implementation of any 2017 Clean Air Plan control measures.

The following includes a discussion of consistency with these criteria. The primary goals of the 2017 Clean Air Plan are to:

1. Protect air quality and health at the regional and local scale; and
2. Protect the climate.

A project that would not support these goals would not be considered consistent with the 2017 Clean Air Plan. On an individual project basis, consistency with BAAQMD quantitative thresholds is interpreted as demonstrating support for the 2017 Clean Air Plan goals. As shown in the response to impact *b* and *c*, with implementation of BMPs the proposed project would not result in exceedances of BAAQMD 2017 thresholds for criteria air pollutants and thus would not conflict with the 2017 Plan's goal to attain air quality standards.

Therefore, consistent with the BAAQMD's CEQA thresholds, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the 2017 Clean Air Plan. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Project construction would have the potential to generate criteria air pollutant emissions. The construction activities listed in Table 1 in the Project Description were combined into four main construction activities: site preparation, grading, trenching, and paving.



These phases were modeled for the proposed project and would have the potential to generate fugitive dust (PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>) through the exposure of soils to wind erosion and dust entrainment. Exhaust emissions associated with heavy construction equipment would also occur. Equipment as listed under the Project Description was inputted into the RCEM model to estimate project construction emissions.

As shown in Table 4, the proposed project would not exceed BAAQMD thresholds to criteria pollutants. Therefore, construction impacts related to criteria air pollutant emissions would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

*Table 4 Estimated Project's Daily Construction Emissions*

	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Average Daily Construction Emissions (lbs/day)	4	33	30	<1	2	1
<b>BAAQMD Thresholds</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>54</b>
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	No

ROG = reactive organic gases, NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides, CO = carbon monoxide, SO<sub>2</sub> = sulfur dioxide, PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or less, PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter; lbs/day = pounds per day, BAAQMD = Bay Area Air Quality Management District

N/A = Not available. The BAAQMD has not established recommended quantitative thresholds for CO and SO<sub>2</sub>.

Notes: All emissions modeling was completed using RCEM in accordance with applicant-provided information and data. See Appendix A for model output results.

The 2017 Clean Air Plan control strategy includes mobile-source control measures to be implemented through incentive programs and other activities; and transportation control measures to be implemented through transportation programs in cooperation with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), local governments, transit agencies, and others. The 2017 Clean Air Plan also represents the Bay Area's most recent triennial assessment of the region's strategy to attain the state one-hour ozone standard.

### **Fugitive Dust**

Site preparation and grading may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter to the local atmosphere. The BAAQMD has not established a quantitative threshold for fugitive dust emissions but rather states that projects that incorporate best management practices (BMP) for fugitive dust control during construction, such as watering exposed surfaces and limiting vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour, would have a less than significant impact related to fugitive dust emissions.

The Project Description commits the County and the contractor to fulfill the BAAQMD's proposed BMPs during construction phase.

Implementation of the construction BMPs for fugitive dust control identified in the project description would reduce air quality impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** As described above, the nearest sensitive receptor is one single-family residence in the northeast corner of the project site. The next closest residences are over 500 feet from the project site and other sensitive receptors (schools, healthcare facilities, parks, etc.) are located about 0.5 mile from the project site.

## **Carbon Monoxide Hotspots**

**Less than Significant Impact.** As identified in the BAAQMD 2017 CEQA Guidelines, a project would result in a less than significant impact related to CO concentrations if it is consistent with an applicable congestion management program; would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour; and would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections more than 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited (e.g., tunnel, parking garage, bridge underpass, natural or urban street canyon, below-grade roadway).

The busiest intersection identified in the surrounding area is the Santa Rosa Avenue and Todd Road intersection about 2,600 feet to the east of the project site. Based on information in the Traffic Management Technical Memorandum (TJKM 2020), traffic volumes scenario at the Santa Rosa Avenue and Todd Road would be 3,053 vehicles in 2021 traveling through the intersection in the p.m. peak hour (4:00 to 6:00) (which represents a higher volume of traffic than at the Todd and Standish roads intersection (1,205 in the p.m. peak hour). Even as such, this traffic volume is substantially below the 44,000 vehicle per hour threshold described above; in addition, the proposed project does not add capacity nor would it provide new access that may result in generating new vehicle trips. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in individually or cumulatively significant impacts from CO emissions, and impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

## **Toxic Air Contaminants**

**Less than Significant Impact.** A toxic air contaminant (TAC) is defined by California law as an air pollutant that may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. Certain population groups, such as children, older adults, and people with health problems, are particularly sensitive to air pollution.

Construction-related activities would result in short-term emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM) exhaust emissions from off-road, heavy-duty diesel equipment for site preparation (e.g., excavation, grading, and clearing), building construction, and other miscellaneous activities. DPM was identified as a TAC by CARB in 1998. The potential cancer risk from the inhalation of DPM, as discussed below, outweighs the potential non-cancer<sup>1</sup> health impacts (CARB 2020).

Generation of DPM from construction typically occurs in a single area for a short period. Construction of the project would occur over approximately 40 to 50 days and would cease when construction is completed. The dose to which the receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health risk. Dose is a function of the concentration of a substance or substances in the environment and the extent of exposure that person has with the substance. Dose is positively correlated with time, meaning that a longer exposure period would result in a higher exposure level for the Maximally Exposed Individual. The risks estimated for a Maximally Exposed Individual are higher if a fixed exposure occurs over a longer period. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), health risk assessments, which determine the exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic emissions, should be based on a 70-year exposure period; however, such assessments should be limited to the period/duration of activities associated with the development (OEHHA 2015).

The maximum PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions, which is used to represent DPM emissions for this analysis, would occur during site preparation and grading activities. While site preparation and grading emissions represent the worst-case condition, such activities would only occur for 40 to 50 days. A

---

<sup>1</sup> Non-cancer risks include premature death, hospitalizations and emergency department visits for exacerbated chronic heart and lung disease, including asthma, increased respiratory symptoms, and decreased lung function (CARB 2020).

construction period of this length would represent a small percentage of the typical health risk calculation periods. Therefore, DPM generated by construction of the project would not create conditions where the probability that the maximally exposed individual would contract cancer is greater than 10 in one million or to generate ground-level concentrations of noncarcinogenic TACs that exceed a hazard index greater than one for the maximally exposed individual. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

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

**No Impact.** BAAQMD odor screening distances for land uses with the potential to generate substantial odor complaints. Those uses include wastewater treatment plants, landfills or transfer stations, refineries, composting facilities, confined animal facilities, food manufacturing, smelting plants, and chemical plants, none of which are part of this project. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people during operation. During construction activities, heavy equipment and vehicles would emit odors associated with vehicle and engine exhaust both during normal use and when idling. However, these odors would be temporary and transitory and would cease upon completion. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. No impact would occur.

# 1.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Methods

The biological resources section is based upon the Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) prepared for the proposed project by Rincon. The BRA was prepared consistent with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and guidelines. The BRA included a review of relevant literature and background information followed by a reconnaissance-level biological resource site visit on December 1, 2020 to document site conditions, assess the habitat suitability for special-status species, and evaluate the potential for special-status species and other sensitive biological resources to occur on the project site.

Special-status species have been identified for the analysis as those plants and animals listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing as Threatened or Endangered by the USFWS under the ESA; those listed or candidates for listing as Rare, Threatened, or Endangered under the CESA or Native Plant Protection Act; those identified as Fully Protected by the California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515); those identified as Species of Special Concern or Watch List species by the CDFW; and plants occurring on lists 1 and 2 of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) system.

## Setting

### Vegetation and Other Land Cover Types

A majority of the 2.66 acre project site is developed (approximately 1.67 acre of developed land and approximately 0.61 acre of landscaped areas); the rest is natural vegetation or part of the designated ditch. Scattered trees, such as coast live and valley oak and other ornamental trees are growing along the roadside. Drainage ditches at the western end of the project site are bordered by ruderal vegetation. Trees also occur throughout the project site, individually or in low density, including coast live oak, valley oak, and red willow. The agricultural fields adjacent to the project site show evidence of mowing or disking.

### Topography and Soils

The site's elevation ranges from approximately 99 to 105 feet (30 to 32 meters) above mean sea level and the topography of the site and its immediate surroundings are generally flat. Adjacent land uses include rural residential, industrial, commercial and undeveloped lands. The site is located on the Santa Rosa Plain valley floor. Based on the most recent Natural Resources Conservation Service soil survey for Sonoma County (USDA 2020a), the study area contains one soil map unit: Wright loam, shallow, wet, 0 to 2 percent slopes: a deep, somewhat poorly drained soil that occurs on gently undulating or hummocky low terraces. It is formed in alluvium from mixed sources. A typical soil profile consists of loam to 15 inches, sandy clay loam to 25 inches, and clay to 98 inches. with several layers of clay loam and sandy clay loam from 5 to 55 inches, and gravelly clay from 55 to 60 inches. Soil layers vary from neutral to medium acidity. This soil type is well drained and is included on the hydric soils list (USDA 2020b).

### Impact Analysis

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

**Impacts Less than Significant with Mitigation.** The biologist identified and documented 62 special status plant species and 27 special status wildlife species within the identified study area. There was only 1 plant special-status plant species and 3 special-status wildlife species were identified that have the potential to occur within the project site and could be impacted by the proposed project. Appendix B includes the complete listing of special status plants and wildlife and the determination of the potential for each to occur in the study area. The findings concerning the special-status plants and wildlife in the project site are summarized below.

#### Special-Status Plants

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would result in direct impacts to special-status plant species if they are present within the project site due to removal of dirt or crushing by heavy equipment. Species that are recognized by California Native Plant Society (CNPS) as CRPR 1B, to potentially occur in or nearby the project site consist of the congested-headed hayfield tarplant (*Hemizonia congesta* ssp. *congesta*; 1B.2). The hayfield tarplant is rare, but more broadly distributed in California than other federal or State listed species. All other special-status species known to occur in this region are not expected to occur within the project site. There is low potential for the hayfield tarplant to occur within the project site because this species is not conducive to growth on the ruderal grasslands (non-native weeds) along roadsides and the proposed project would only affect existing roadway, urban landscaped areas and a small area that has been heavily trafficked by equipment and persons.

Impacts to this species due to the proposed project would not result in a loss of, or risk to the entire regional population. Due to the small size of the project site and surrounding development, and the low potential for this species to occur, impacts to what would be at most a very few individuals of congested-headed hayfield tarplant are unlikely to result in an adverse effect to a regional or local

population. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

### **Special-Status Wildlife**

Three special-status wildlife species, California Tiger Salamander (CTS), western pond turtle, and Cooper's Hawk, have potential to occur within the project site based upon known ranges, habitat preferences, species occurrence records in the vicinity of the study area used for analysis, and presence of suitable habitat. Potential impacts for these species and native birds with potential to occur within the project site are discussed below.

#### **California Tiger Salamander**

**No Impact.** California Tiger Salamander are unlikely to breed or estivate within the project area; however, this species may move through the drainage ditches within the project site during migration from breeding to estivation areas or during dispersal. The proposed project requires Sonoma County construction BMPs as part of the grading permit and the SWPPP to install silt fencing at the limits of construction as indicated on the project site plans and project description to prevent construction impacts to ditches and adjacent uplands and prevent CTS from entering the project site. The requirement to conform to erosion prevention and sediment control are recorded in Sonoma County Code Chapter 11 and 11a of the code (Sonoma 2016). These requirements would be included in the construction contract requirements as shown on the project plans and specifications. Therefore, no impacts to CTS would occur.

#### **Western Pond Turtle**

**No Impact.** Western pond turtles (WPT) are unlikely to lay eggs or winter within the larger study area used for the analysis; however, they may move through the drainage ditches within the project site. Installation of Sonoma County construction BMPs as part of the grading permit and the SWPPP that would include silt fencing at project limits would prevent construction impacts to ditches and adjacent uplands and prevent WPT from entering the project site. No impacts to WPT would occur.

#### **Nesting Birds and Raptors**

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** Special-status raptors such as the Cooper's hawk, and other native birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treat Act (MBTA) and CFGC Section 3503, are likely to nest within the project site and the surrounding area. Impacts would occur through removal of trees and vegetation if active nests are present. Impacts would also occur if active nests are present in undeveloped and landscaped areas adjacent to active construction or staging through disturbance and nest abandonment. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, impacts to nesting birds would be reduced to less than significant level.

#### **Mitigation Measure**

##### **BIO-1 Nesting Birds**

To avoid disturbance of nesting and special-status birds including raptorial species protected by the MBTA and Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the CFGC, activities related to the proposed project, including, but not limited to, vegetation removal, ground disturbance, and construction shall occur outside of the bird breeding season. For construction activities occurring during the nesting season (generally February 1 to August 31), surveys for nesting birds covered by the MBTA and CFGC shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 14 days prior to initiation of construction activities for the intersection improvements, including construction staging and vegetation removal. The surveys shall include the entire disturbance areas plus a 200-foot buffer around any disturbance areas. If active nests are located, all construction work shall be conducted outside a buffer zone from the nest to be determined by the qualified biologist. Larger buffers may be required depending upon the status of the nest and the construction activities occurring in the vicinity of the nest. The biologist shall have full discretion for establishing a suitable buffer. The buffer area(s) shall be closed to all construction personnel and equipment until the adults and young are no longer reliant on the

nest site. A qualified biologist shall confirm that breeding/nesting is completed, and young have fledged the nest prior to removal of the buffer.

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

**No Impact.** There are no CDFW-listed sensitive natural communities or riparian habitats present within the project site. Therefore, no impacts to sensitive natural communities would occur. Critical habitat for CTS overlaps within the larger study area; however, with implementation of Sonoma County construction BMPs included as part of grading permit as well as measures identified in the SWPPP, impacts to CTS would be avoided, as discussed above under a). No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The drainage ditches drain from upland (higher ground) areas and are not adjacent to, or flow into a body of water such as into a river, canal or lake; therefore, these features are unlikely to be under USACE or CDFW jurisdiction. The drainage ditches may be considered waters of the State and fall under the jurisdiction of the RWQCB under the Porter-Cologne Act. This would result in impacts requiring a Waste Discharge Requirements permit. No construction activities would occur within the drainage ditches consistent with NPDES general permit by the State of California, and silt fencing would be installed at the project boundary perimeters as part of the BMPs implemented as part of the proposed project to avoid impacts to the ditches. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** No significant wildlife movement corridors or habitat linkages are present in the study area. Due to the relatively small size of the project footprint, and its location in existing development, the proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of wildlife species. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The project site is located in Sonoma County and is subject to the Sonoma County General Plan and County Ordinances. Chapter 26D of the Sonoma County Code, Sonoma County Heritage or Landmark Tree Ordinance, identifies policies for protected tree species in Sonoma County. Valley Oak trees are planted along the roadside within the project site. No removal of these trees is expected to occur. However, if any of the trees proposed for removal have been designated as heritage and/or landmark trees, a tree permit would be required to be obtained prior to removal. The project site is also covered under the Santa Rosa Conservation Strategy's CTS Conservation Area. The project limits, where construction would occur, does not support CTS habitat; therefore, no impacts to CTS and no conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The Santa Rosa Conservation Strategy requires mitigation for all projects within 1.3 miles of known CTS breeding sites. The study area used for the biological resources analysis is within 1.3 miles of known breeding sites; however, the project limits, where construction would occur, does not support CTS. Therefore, no conflicts with State, regional, or local habitat conservation plans. No impact would occur.

## 1.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The project site is located in a low-density industrial, light manufacturing, and residential use area in an unincorporated portion of Sonoma County. The project site is centered on the intersection of Todd Road at Standish Avenue and a small portion of a private driveway known as Ghilotti Avenue. The project site is surrounded by a meat and food service distributor to the northwest, a residential property to the northeast, and a construction contractor and vacant land to the south.

A Cultural Resources Assessment (CRA) prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. included a cultural resources records search, Sacred Lands File (SLF) search, and field survey for the proposed project and did not identify any cultural resources within the project site (Rincon 2021). Rincon Consultants, Inc. conducted a pedestrian field survey of the project site for cultural resources. Areas of exposed ground were inspected for prehistoric artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools, ceramics, fire-affected rock), ecofacts (marine shell and bone), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a cultural midden, soil depressions, and features indicative of the former presence of structures or buildings (e.g., standing exterior walls, postholes, foundations) or historic debris (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics) (Rincon 2021).

The properties at the northwest and southeast corners of the intersection of Todd Road and Standish Avenue are less than 45 years old. The property at the northeast corner of the intersection contains a residential building constructed in 1927; however, no physical alterations are proposed to the property or other potential impact to the building would occur, and no acquisition of property would occur as part of the project warranting an evaluation of the building. No other properties were

### Impact Analysis

- a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*

**No Impact.** The California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search conducted for the proposed project identified three built environment resources recorded within a 0.5-mile radius, none of which are directly in the project site. Construction on the project site would occur on three properties located on the south side of Todd road and at the northwest corner of the intersection, but none of these properties are over 45 years of age. The property at the northeast corner of the intersection contains a residential building over 45 years of age; however, no physical alterations are proposed to the property as part of the project. In addition, no other properties were formally recorded or evaluated as none of the properties within the project site are



over 45 years old. Most of the project would include primarily low-scale sidewalk, curb and drainage inlet improvements and a traffic signal; these are consistent with the existing streetscape and would not result in considerable changes in setting or cause visual or auditory impacts to adjacent properties. No impact would occur.

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

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The CHRIS records search did not identify any recorded archaeological sites within 0.5 mile radius of the project site. Results of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) did not identify any cultural resources within the project site. However, there is the potential for previously undiscovered archaeological resources to be encountered during construction. If archaeological resources are discovered during construction the impacts would be potentially significant. If archaeological resources are identified during construction, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would be implemented. Impacts associated with the discovery of archaeological resources would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1.

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

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** Although no evidence of human remains was identified there the potential for human remains to be discovered during construction. If human remains are discovered the impact would be potentially significant. If human remains are identified during construction, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would be implemented. Impacts associated with the discovery of human remains would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1.

## **Mitigation Measures**

### **CUL-1**

In the event of discovery of archeological resources and/or human remains within the project site, adherence to the following requirements shall be implemented to avoid disturbance or damage to archeological resources or human remains. The County of Sonoma Municipal Code (Chapter 11 as amended by Ordinance No. 6331) establishes the following County requirements for the protection of archaeological resources and human remains discovered during construction grading and drainage:

Where human remains or archaeological resources are discovered during construction grading and drainage, all work shall be halted in the vicinity of the find, the director shall be notified, and the following shall occur before work may be resumed:

- **Human Remains.** If human remains or suspected human remains are discovered, the permittee shall notify the county coroner and comply with all state law requirements, including Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code section 5097.98, to ensure proper disposition of the human remains or suspected human remains, including those identified to be Native American remains.
- **Archaeological Resources.** If archaeological resources or suspected archaeological resources are discovered, the director shall notify the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University, and the permittee shall retain a qualified archeologist to evaluate the find to ensure proper disposition of the archaeological resources or suspected archaeological resources. All costs associated with the evaluation and mitigation of the find shall be the responsibility of the permittee. The director shall provide notice of the find to any tribes that have been identified as having cultural ties and affiliation with the geographic area in which the archaeological resources or suspected archaeological resources were discovered, if the tribe or tribes have requested notice and provided a contact person and current address to which the notice is to be sent. The director may consult with and solicit comments from notified tribes to aid in the

evaluation, protection, and proper disposition of the archaeological resources or suspected archaeological resources. The need for confidentiality of information concerning the archaeological resources or suspected archaeological resources shall be recognized by all parties. For the purposes of this section, archaeological resources include historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, pottery, arrowheads, midden, or culturally modified soil deposits. Artifacts associated with prehistoric ruins include humanly modified stone, shell, bone, or other cultural materials such as charcoal, ash, and burned rock indicative of food procurement or processing activities. Prehistoric domestic features include hearths, fire pits, or floor depressions; mortuary features are typically represented by human skeletal remains. (Ord. No. 6331, Exhibit B (12-15-2020))

If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD has 48 hours to make recommendations for the disposition of the remains. The MLD has 48 hours from being granted site access to make recommendations for the disposition of the remains. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the landowner shall reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from subsequent disturbance.

## 1.6 ENERGY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve the intersection of Todd Road at Standish Avenue to meet current Sonoma County standards and signalize the intersection to facilitate current and projected traffic movements including large truck traffic. This is consistent with the objective of avoiding wasteful and inefficient use of energy resources attributed to long delays at this intersection.

### Impact Analysis

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction equipment would consume energy associated with the movement of equipment and materials. The proposed project would comply with local, state, and federal regulations related to (limiting engine idle times, recycle construction debris) which would minimize wasteful or inefficient use of energy. Overall construction duration is only expected to last between 40 to 50 days and energy consumption associated with construction would end after completed. Operation of the proposed project would result in avoiding wasteful and inefficient use of energy resources attributed to long delays at this intersection by improving the balance of traffic movements at this intersection. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

**No Impact.** The Sonoma County Open Space & Resource Conservation Element of the General Plan includes goals and policies related to energy conservation and reduced energy demand, but these are not applicable to roadway projects. Regulations at the state level are intended to reduce energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions including California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 6-Energy Code which are primarily related to the construction of buildings. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plans related to renewable energy or energy efficiency because construction would comply with applicable regulations. No impact would occur.

# 1.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

The project site is located in southern Sonoma County in the Sonoma Valley. The Sonoma Valley runs north-south between the Sonoma Mountains on the west and the taller Mayacamas Mountains to the east. The San Pablo Bay and associated wetlands bound the County to the south. The Pacific Ocean forms the western county boundary, including an interesting assemblage of steep hills, marine terraces, beaches, and offshore sea stacks. The San Andreas Fault trends along the western margin of the County. In addition to the San Andreas Fault, the Healdsburg, Rodgers Creek, and Mayacamas faults are located within the County and are all considered active faults. The project site is not located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (California Department of Conservation 1983).

Soil types in this region of Sonoma County and Santa Rosa sphere of influence can vary from bedrock uplands to alluvial flatlands (Santa Rosa 2009). According to the current USGS Geologic Map (Preliminary geologic map of the eastern Sonoma County and western Napa County, 1973), the project site is underlain by alluvial fan deposits bordering uplands.

## Impact Analysis

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

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

**No Impact.** There are no known active faults at the project site and the site is not within a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (DOC 2021). The closest fault considered to be active is the Rodgers Creek fault zone located approximately three miles to the east. Therefore, there is no risk of fault rupture at the project site as the project site is not within a known area that is susceptible to strong seismic ground shaking. There would be no impact.

ii. *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

**No Impact.** See response above under a)i.

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

**No Impact.** Liquefaction is defined as the sudden loss of soil strength due to a rapid increase in soil pore water pressure resulting from seismic ground shaking. According to Figure 2.7-3 of Association of Bay Area Governments Liquefaction Map, the project site is located in an area of Medium Liquefaction Hazard level (ABAG 2017). Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to directly or indirectly cause the risk of loss, injury, or death related to liquefaction.

iv. *Landslides?*

**No Impact.** The project site is within a seismically active area in Northern California. However, the potential for a seismic-related ground failure from landslides would be low due to the relatively flat terrain of the project site and surrounding areas. No known landslides have occurred in the area as there is low potential for ground shaking. No impact.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is developed and generally level, which limits the potential for substantial soil erosion. Grading and excavation, when soils are exposed, present a potential for erosion. The proposed project would be required to obtain a grading permit, which would require submission of an erosion and sediment control plan. Sonoma County Code Section 11.04.010.A. describes requirements for erosion and sediment control plans, which include descriptions of dust control measures and vegetative measures to minimize erosion. Therefore, compliance with existing regulations would reduce impacts related to soil erosion and topsoil loss. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within an area where the soils are unstable or could become unstable as a result of the proposed project. See responses to a)i to iv above. The majority of construction activities would occur in areas previously affected by roadway construction. No impact would occur.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Expansive soils can change dramatically in volume depending on moisture content. When wet, these soils can expand; conversely, when dry, they can contract or shrink. Sources of moisture that can trigger this shrink-swell phenomenon include seasonal rainfall,

landscape irrigation, utility leakage, and/or perched groundwater. The proposed project would improve existing roadway infrastructure along Todd Road and Standish Avenue. All proposed improvements would be required to be upgraded according to applicable Sonoma County Standards. The project site is located within an urban, built-up area surrounded by other industrial uses, it is not within an area prone to soil erosion or unstable soil, on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. There are two parcels on the south side of Todd Road and to the west (304 and 306 Todd Road) identified by the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) as having expansive soils (USDA 2021). The proposed project would not extend into these parcels. Impacts related to soil erosion, landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, or expansive soils would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation beyond the required NPDES permit is needed.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not involve, or need, sewers or the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. No impact would occur.

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

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The project site is located in an area associated with Older Alluvium of the Pleistocene age (USGS 2002) which has the potential for paleontological resources. However, no known paleontological resources have been identified in the project site or the surrounding area. Additionally, project construction activities would occur primarily within areas that have been previously disturbed for roadway construction and installation of utilities which would have likely unearthed or disturbed a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Construction would include excavation at depths up to approximately 10 feet for installation of the signal pole and 4 to 5 feet for stormwater improvements. Construction would export approximately 125 cubic yards of soil with most soils expected to be reused during construction. Given the small disturbance area, shallow depth of ground disturbance, and the previously disturbed condition of the project site, it is highly unlikely that previously unknown paleontological resources would be encountered during construction activities. However, ground disturbing activities always involve the possibility of such a discovery. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant, but with the implementation of GEO-1, the proposed project would result in less than significant impact.

## **Mitigation Measures**

### **GEO-1**

In the event a previously unknown fossil is uncovered during project construction, all work shall cease until a certified paleontologist can investigate the find and make appropriate recommendations. The qualified paleontologist shall determine the significance of the discovery and identify whether additional mitigation or treatment is warranted. Measures may include testing, data recovery, reburial, archival review and/or transfer to the appropriate museum or educational institution. All testing, data recovery, reburial, archival review or transfer to research institutions related to monitoring discoveries shall be determined by the qualified paleontologist and shall be reported to the County. Work in the area of the discovery will resume once the find is properly documented and authorization is given to resume construction work.

## 1.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Methods

The analysis in this section is based in part on modeling using the Roadway Construction Emission Model (RCEM); modeling outputs are included in Appendix A. In the 2017 BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, the BAAQMD outlines an approach to determine the significance of projects. For residential, commercial, industrial, and public land use development projects, the thresholds of significance for operational-related GHG emissions are as follows:

- Compliance with a qualified GHG reduction strategy
- Annual emissions less than 1,100 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per year (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr)
- Service person threshold of 4.6 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/service person/year (residents + employees)

For this analysis, the GHG emissions thresholds contained in the BAAQMD's May 2017 *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* are the appropriate thresholds to use, specifically the annual emissions of 1,100 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr. This threshold has been reduced by 40 percent, to 660 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr, for consistency with the SB 32 goal of a 40 percent reduction in GHG emissions from 1990 levels by 2030. BAAQMD guidelines have set this threshold as a numeric emissions level below which a project's contribution to global climate change would be less than significant.

### Setting

Project construction would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through the burning of fossil fuels or other emissions of GHGs, thus potentially contributing to cumulative impacts related to climate change. In response to an increase in man-made GHG concentrations over the past 150 years, California has implemented AB 32, the "California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006." AB 32 codifies the Statewide goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 (essentially a 15% reduction below 2005 emission levels) and the adoption of regulations to require reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions. Furthermore, on September 8, 2016, the governor signed Senate Bill 32 (SB 32) into law, which requires the State to further reduce GHGs to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. SB 32 extends AB 32, directing the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to ensure that GHGs are reduced to 40 percent below the 1990 level by 2030.

On December 14, 2017, CARB adopted the 2017 Scoping Plan, which provides a framework for achieving the 2030 target. The 2017 Scoping Plan does not provide project-level thresholds for land use development. Instead, it recommends that local governments adopt policies and locally-appropriate quantitative thresholds consistent with a statewide per capita goal of six metric tons (MT) CO<sub>2</sub>e by 2030 and two MT CO<sub>2</sub>e by 2050 (CARB 2017). As stated in the 2017 Scoping Plan, these goals may be appropriate

for plan-level analyses (city, county, subregional, or regional level), but not for specific individual projects because they include all emissions sectors in the State.

The vast majority of individual projects do not generate sufficient GHG emissions to directly influence climate change. However, physical changes caused by a project can contribute incrementally to cumulative effects that are significant, even if individual changes resulting from a project are limited. The issue of climate change typically involves an analysis of whether a project's contribution towards an impact would be cumulatively considerable. "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064[h][1]).

### **Sonoma County Community Climate Action Plan**

The Sonoma County Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP) was prepared by the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority, on behalf of the City of Sonoma, Sonoma County, and other incorporated cities and towns in the county. The CCAP provides goals and associated measures in the sectors of building energy, transportation and land use, solid waste, water and wastewater, livestock and fertilizer, and advanced climate initiatives.

### **Impact Analysis**

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** GHG emissions for the construction phase of the project were calculated using the RCEM. The model calculates CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions per day and per construction phase of the project. Project construction would primarily generate GHG emissions from construction equipment operation, construction worker vehicle trips to and from the site, and from export of materials off-site. Construction input data for RCEM included anticipated start and finish dates of construction activity and inventories of construction equipment to be used. The analysis assessed maximum daily emissions from individual construction activities, including grubbing/land clearing, grading/excavation, drainage/utilities/sub-grade, and paving. Construction equipment estimates were provided by the project applicant. Construction activities associated with project construction would generate approximately 95 metric tons (MT) of CO<sub>2</sub>e for duration of project construction. Amortized over 30 years, this would equal approximately 3 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. This would not exceed BAAQMD's annual emissions significance threshold of 1,100 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

GHG emissions for the operational phase of the proposed project would not change as the improvements along Todd Road and Standish Avenue would not include the development of land uses such as housing or other buildings or other land uses that would increase traffic that generate additional GHGs. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

- b. *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** SB 32 requires GHG emissions to be reduced to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan establishes goals and policies to meet this target. In 2016, the County approved a CCAP that identifies 20 goals to achieve or exceed an emissions reduction of 838,300 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e. Table 5 provides applicable policies and an explanation of the project's consistency with these policies.



Table 5 Consistency with Local GHG Reduction Plans

Applicable Goal, Policy, or Measure	Project Consistency
<b>2017 Scoping Plan</b>	
<p><b>VMT Reduction Goals.</b> Implement and support the use of VMT as the metric for determining transportation impacts under CEQA, in place of level of service (LOS).</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> This IS provides an analysis of VMT in Section 17, <i>Transportation</i>. Since the proposed project would not result in an increase of employees or residents, there would be no change in the number of trips to or through the site, and no change in VMT associated with the proposed project</p>
<b>Sonoma County CCAP</b>	
<p><b>Goal 4: Reduce travel demand through focused growth.</b></p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> While the proposed project would modify the existing intersection, it would not result in an increase in vehicle trips or unanticipated growth.</p>
<p><b>Goal 11: Reduce Water Consumption.</b></p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project would not include the construction or operation of water intensive uses.</p>

As shown in Table 5, the proposed project would be consistent with the 2017 Scoping Plan and the Sonoma County CCAP adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

## 1.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The project site is currently in use as Todd Road, Standish Avenue, and Ghilotti Avenue and portions of one northern adjoining property and two southern adjoining properties, which are developed with a parking lot and landscaped area associated with Lepe's Meat Company (APN 134-102-070), a walkway and landscaped area associated with Ghilotti Construction (APN 134-171-052), and vacant land (APN 134-171-049). Rincon Consultants, Inc. performed a reconnaissance of the project site on December 1, 2020. The purpose of the reconnaissance was to observe existing conditions and to obtain information indicating the presence of recognized environmental conditions (RECs) in connection with the project area. Information in this section is based on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. Properties in the vicinity of the study area include commercial businesses, a construction storage yard, a gas station and auto repair, and single-family residences. A pole-mounted transformer was observed on the northeastern intersection of Todd Road and Standish Avenue. No RECs were observed in the vicinity of the transformer. In addition, a possible underground utility was observed on the north side of Todd Road adjacent to the east of the intersection of Todd Road and Standish Avenue. The current USGS topographic map (Santa Rosa Quadrangle, 2018) indicates that the study area is situated at an

elevation of approximately 100 feet above mean sea level with topography gently sloping down to the southwest. The adjacent areas consist of generally flat topography.

### **Impact Analysis**

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Project construction would involve the temporary transport, storage, and use of potentially hazardous materials including fuels, lubricating fluids, cleaners, and solvents. Heavy construction equipment would be used in project construction, the operation of which could result in a spill or accidental release of hazardous materials, including fuel, engine oil, engine coolant, and lubricants. If spilled, these substances could pose a risk to the environment and to human health. However, the transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials is subject to federal, state, and local regulations designed to reduce risks associated with hazardous materials, including potential risks associated with upset or accident conditions. Hazardous materials would be required to be transported under U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations (U.S. DOT Hazardous Materials Transport Act, 49 Code of Federal Regulations), which stipulate the types of containers, labeling, and other restrictions to be used in the movement of such material on interstate highways. In addition, the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials are regulated through the Resources Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is responsible for implementing the RCRA program, as well as California's own hazardous waste laws. DTSC regulates hazardous waste, cleans up existing contamination, and looks for ways to control and reduce the hazardous waste produced in California. It does this primarily under the authority of RCRA and in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (California H&SC Division 20, Chapter 6.5) and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations (Title 22, California Code of Regulations, Divisions 4 and 4.5). DTSC also oversees permitting, inspection, compliance, and corrective action programs to ensure that hazardous waste managers follow federal and State requirements and other laws that affect hazardous waste specific to handling, storage, transportation, disposal, treatment, reduction, cleanup, and emergency planning. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce the risk of potential release of hazardous materials during construction. Therefore, potential for a hazard impact to occur during construction would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

The proposed project would not alter the daily use of the two roadways during operation and would not alter the existing use of the affected roads for routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or risk of upset or accident, and thereby would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment. There would be no impact in regard to operation of the intersection.

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

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** Rincon Consultants, Inc. performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) in December 2020 for the project site in adherence to ASTM Practice E1527-13. The Phase I ESA identified two recognized environmental conditions (RECs):

- Due to the age of the road (in use as early as 1916), elevated concentrations of lead may exist in the soil due to the historical use of leaded gasoline in motor vehicles from aerially deposited lead (ADL).
- The project site was historically used for agriculture. Agricultural land use is typically associated with the use of pesticides and arsenic.

Based on these conditions, project construction activities that disturb soils on-site could potentially result in the release of hazardous materials associated with agricultural chemicals and ADL into the environment. The Phase I ESA recommended that the site be further evaluated for these conditions

through taking soil samples prior to construction activities and that potential impacts for identified contaminants be mitigated through proper handling and disposal. Impacts related to the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment would be potentially significant and mitigation is required. Implementation of HAZ-1, and if required HAZ-2 and HAZ-3, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level by requiring remediation if soil sampling levels are above State and local thresholds.

## **Mitigation Measures**

### **HAZ-1 Phase II ESA**

A Phase II ESA, conforming to the recommended guidelines established by the American Society for Testing and Materials in Standard E1903-11, shall be conducted prior to the start of project demolition and construction activities. The Phase II ESA shall include the collection of shallow soil samples to be analyzed for lead, organochlorine pesticides, and arsenic at the project site. The Phase II ESA shall provide recommendations to address identified hazards and indicate when to apply those recommended actions in relation to proposed project activities. As part of the Phase II ESA, analytical results will be screened against the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board environmental screening levels (ESL). These ESLs are risk-based screening levels for direct exposure of a construction worker under various depth and land use scenarios.

If contaminants are detected at the project site, appropriate steps shall be undertaken to protect site workers during project construction and if necessary, the public during project operation. This would include the preparation of a Soil Management Plan (see Mitigation Measure HAZ-2).

If contaminants are detected at concentrations exceeding hazardous waste screening thresholds for contaminants in soil (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 22, Section 66261.24 Characteristics of Toxicity), appropriate steps shall be undertaken to protect site workers during project construction and if necessary, the public during project operation (see Mitigation Measure HAZ-3).

### **HAZ-2 Soil Management Plan for Impacted Soils**

If impacted soils are present onsite, a Soil Management Plan (SMP) or equivalent document shall be prepared by a qualified environmental consultant to address onsite handling and management of soils and reduce hazards to construction workers and offsite receptors. The plan must establish remedial measures and/or soil management practices to ensure construction worker safety, the health of future workers and visitors, and the off-site migration of contaminants from the site. These measures and practices may include, but not be limited to:

- Stockpile management including dust control, sampling, stormwater pollution prevention and the installation of BMPs
- Proper disposal procedures of contaminated materials
- Monitoring and reporting
- A health and safety plan for each contractor working at the site that addresses the safety and health hazards of each phase of site operations with the requirements and procedures for employee protection
- The health and safety plan will also outline proper soil handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to hazardous materials during construction.

### **HAZ-3 Remediation**

If soil present onsite contains chemicals at concentrations exceeding hazardous waste screening thresholds for contaminants in soil (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 22, Section 66261.24), additional analytical testing will be required to determine the soil waste categorization. If analytical testing indicates that hazardous waste soils are present in the disturbed areas of the proposed project, the impacted soils shall be removed and disposed properly. Remediation of impacted soils may require

additional delineation of impacts; additional analytical testing per landfill or recycling facility requirements; soil excavation; and offsite disposal or recycling.

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

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The nearest school is the New Directions School, located approximately 0.13 miles north of the project site. The proposed project would involve installation of a traffic signal, storm drain inlets, upgrade an existing sidewalk, and remove/replant trees and ornamental landscaping. As described above, construction activities may involve the use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials. However, given required compliance with the rules and regulations described above under items (a) and (b), impacts to schools would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3. Impacts related to hazardous material use in proximity to schools would be less than significant with mitigation.

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

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** According to the Phase I ESA, there are no known hazardous materials within the project site. However, the nearest documented hazardous material cleanup site is on the adjacent property on the northern project boundary at 255 Todd Road. It is listed under various hazardous materials site databases (including Envirostor) according to the Phase I ESA (Rincon 2021). This site was identified as a potential REC. At 255 Todd Road, a release of hydrocarbons to ‘well used for drinking water supply’ was reported in 2002. A domestic water well was sampled, and the case was closed in 2003. A records request regarding the property was submitted to the Sonoma County Department of Health Services. A response has not been received as of the date of this report. Based on the proximity of this site to the study area and the lack of information regarding the release, there is a potential for this property to be impacting the study area. Therefore, the northern adjacent release site at 255 Todd Road is considered a potential REC. The properties at 3665 Standish Avenue and 260 Todd Road are hazardous material cleanup sites due to leaking underground storage tank sites (USTs). No other information regarding the location of the USTs was available in the Environmental Data Resources (EDR) report. A records request regarding the USTs were submitted to the Sonoma County Department of Health Services. A response has not been received as of the date of this report. No releases were reported regarding the USTs. However, an unreported release may have occurred and would impact the project area. Therefore, the onsite USTs are considered a potential REC. To reduce the impacts to workers during the construction phase of the proposed project, implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 to conduct soil sampling and remediate based on the results of a Phase II ESA would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

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

**No Impact.** The nearest airport the Santa Rosa Air Center is located approximately 2.7 miles northwest of the project site. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip or located in an airport land use plan. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan. Therefore, no safety hazard or excessive noise impacts would occur.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would involve improvements to an existing intersection located at Todd Road and Standish Road in unincorporated Sonoma County near

Highway 101 and Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit stations. The proposed project would maintain two lanes of traffic through construction to reduce the temporary construction traffic impacts. Prior to construction, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) would be prepared consistent with Caltrans Standards Specifications and Standard Plans. The CMP would include coordination with police and fire authorities to provide emergency vehicle and evacuation access during construction. The CMP would be submitted to and approved by Sonoma County Public Works in advance of notice to proceed construction. The CMP would include construction sequence, traffic management plan, public outreach and notification plan and details on compliance with necessary permits as well as avoidance measures with regard to noise, dust and debris management. This plan would be consistent with the local emergency response plans by Sonoma County. In addition, the proposed project would improve overall intersection operations, including for emergency access and evacuation, after completion. Therefore, impacts to an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project is located within an urbanized area of unincorporated Sonoma County and is not located within a Very High or High Severity Zone according to the CALFire California Fire Hazard Severity Zone map (CALFire 2020). In addition, the proposed project would not involve construction of new buildings or facilities that would be occupied by people. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. No impact would occur

# 1.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

The project site is generally flat and there are no waterbodies on or in close proximity to the project site. The nearest waterbody is a north-south canal located about 400 feet east of the project site. The canal has steep sides reinforced with rock to the north of Todd road and vertical concrete sides to the south of Todd Road. Drainage ditches are located on the project site along portions of Todd Road and storm inlets and catch basins are located within both Todd Road and Standish Avenue that drains to the storm drain system. There are no 303(d) waterbodies located in the project site and the nearest is about 0.5 miles to the southeast (State Water Resources Control Board 2012).

## Impact Analysis

- a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The majority of the project site currently consists of impervious surfaces associated with the existing roadways. The proposed project includes the preparation of a SWPPP that includes measures to be implemented during construction related to erosion control, sediment control, non-stormwater management, and housekeeping BMPs to prevent substantial

sediment and pollution movement from the project site and not violate water quality standards. There are no construction activities within the drainage ditches located within the project site on Todd Road and construction would occur in the dry season. Construction would require excavation depths up to 10 feet for the installation of the signal mast and up to 5 feet for installation of stormwater elements. With the implementation of BMPs during construction no violations of water quality standards or water discharge requirements are anticipated. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would require water during construction for dust suppression. Water would originate from public service utility providers and not from a local well. The amount of water needed during construction would be minimal and water use would end once construction is complete, therefore the proposed project would not result in substantial decreases in groundwater supplies during construction. During operation, the proposed project would not interfere with groundwater recharge since the project site already consists largely of impervious surfaces and minor increase in impervious surfaces (approximately 0.1 acre) would be negligible compared to the overall size of the groundwater basin. Groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge would not be substantially impacted by construction and operation of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

- i) *Result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation;*

**No Impact.** The project site is relatively flat which minimizes the potential for erosion. The proposed project includes clearing and grubbing, excavation, and soil compaction. Stormwater BMPs would be implemented as part of the SWPPP to be prepared. With implementation of stormwater BMPs construction activities would not result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation. Operation of the proposed project does not result in changes over existing conditions and the existing project site is already largely impervious surfaces. No substantial on- or office erosion or siltation impacts would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project would result in a minor increase in impervious surfaces and relocation of stormwater facilities but does not result in change in the existing drainage pattern of the project site. Stormwater flows would continue to be directed to the existing drainage ditches and the existing stormwater system. No substantial increases in the rate or amount of surface runoff impacts would occur.

- iii) *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not 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. See responses to c) i and ii above. No impact would occur.

- iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows?*

**No Impact.** The project does not include structures that would impede or redirect flood flows and based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FEMA 2012), project site and area around the project site are identified as Zone X, Area of



Minimal Flood Hazard. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in the risk release of pollutants due to project inundation because the project site is not located within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone. As noted above, the project site is within an area identified by FEMA as an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard and there are no large waterbodies within or in close proximity to the project site. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project is primarily within existing transportation right-of-way and improves an existing intersection resulting in minor increase in impervious surfaces. Construction and operation would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. No impact would occur.

# 1.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The project site is located within an urbanized area of unincorporated Sonoma County. Existing land uses within the project site include transportation related uses, industrial development, agricultural related uses, and one residential parcel. The project site is zoned for industrial and rural residential related uses.

### Impact Analysis

a) *Physically divide an established community?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project is located primarily within existing transportation right of way and does not include elements that divide an established community. Construction would be short in duration and access would be maintained during construction. The purpose of the proposed project is to improve the intersection of Todd Road at Standish Avenue to meet current Sonoma County standards and signalize the intersection to facilitate current and projected traffic movements including large truck traffic. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not result in impacts due to a conflict with land use plans, policies or regulations. There would be no changes to existing zoning and no conflicts with existing Sonoma County plans, policies, or regulations. No impact would occur.

## 1.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The project site is located within an urbanized area of unincorporated Sonoma County. There are no Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ) identified by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (CGS 2005) and there are no mineral extraction operations in or adjacent to the project site.

### Impact Analysis

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

**No Impact.** The project site is not within areas identified as MRZs and would not result in the loss of availability of known mineral resource. No impact would occur.

- b) *Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?*

**No Impact.** The project site is not within areas identified as MRZs and Sonoma County does not designate lands for mineral recovery in or adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No impact would occur.

# 1.13 NOISE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Methods

A Construction Noise Assessment was prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. to determine the potential for construction noise and vibration impacts. Sonoma County does not provide quantitative thresholds for construction noise sources. Therefore, to provide an analysis of potential construction noise impacts, Caltrans’ quantitative standards are used for the analysis. Caltrans requirements relative to the allowable noise emission of construction equipment will be applied for this project. Section 14-8, “Noise and Vibration,” sets construction noise thresholds to be applied at noise sensitive receivers. Project construction noise must conform to the provisions in Section 14-8.02 Noise Control, of the Standard Specifications (Caltrans 2018). That section states that the noise level from the contractor’s operations may not exceed 86 dBA at a distance of 50 feet during typical daylight hours and would be considered a significant impact.

The County’s Guidelines for the Preparation of Noise Analysis outlines the methods and recommendations to use when preparing an acoustical analysis in Sonoma County (Sonoma County 2019). The guidelines build off the Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Noise Element and outlines the noise analysis process, criteria for requiring a noise analysis, noise analysis protocol, and noise management methodology. This analysis has been prepared in accordance with these guidelines. The guidelines state that temporary construction noise generally needs to be evaluated at a qualitative level, given its temporary nature; however, construction noise may be considered significant if it occurs in the early morning or evening hours and would then require a quantitative analysis. The proposed project would not result in the generation of new vehicle trips or long-term operational noise and vibration sources. The proposed project involves signaling an intersection and does not include widening of vehicle lanes or operation of on-site vibration sources, and therefore would not bring vehicles closer to residential properties than existing roadways or introduce new vibration sources to the project area. Therefore, no impacts from operational noise would occur and this issue is not analyzed further. To determine if construction activities would result in vibration impacts, construction vibration estimates are based on vibration levels reported by Caltrans and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Vibration limits used in this analysis to determine a potential impact to local land uses from construction activities, such as blasting, pile-driving, vibratory

compaction, demolition, drilling, or excavation, are based on information contained in Caltrans' *Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual* and the Federal Transit Administration and the FTA *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual* (Caltrans 2013b; FTA 2018).

**Setting**

The most common source of noise in the project site vicinity is vehicular traffic from Todd Road, Standish Avenue, and, to a lesser extent, U.S. 101 traffic noise. Medium and heavy trucks traveling on Todd Road from U.S. 101 on and off ramps were observed during noise measurements accessing light industrial uses in the project vicinity. Commercial and industrial uses also contribute to the noise setting. The nearest sensitive receiver to the project site is one single-family residence located in the northeast corner of the Todd Road and Standish Avenue intersection. The single-family residential building's facade is located about 55 feet to the existing centerline of Todd Road.

**Impact Analysis**

- a) *Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?*

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** To characterize ambient sound levels at and near the project site, Rincon Consultants conducted three 15-minute sound level measurements on November 20, 2020 using an Extech 407780A Sound Level Meter. Noise Measurement (NM) 1 was conducted in the side yard area of the residence at 285 Todd Road and NM 1 represents the ambient noise level for the residential receiver; NM 2 was conducted south of Todd Road adjacent to the vacant property, which measurement represents the ambient noise level for commercial receivers adjacent to the project site; and NM 3 represents the ambient noise level for the residential receiver located at 311 Todd Road, north of the western project area. Table 6 summarizes the results of the noise measurements, and Table 7 shows the recorded traffic volumes from the noise measurements adjacent to Todd Road.

*Table 6 Project Vicinity Sound Level Monitoring Results*

Measurement Location	Measurement Location	Sample Times	Approximate Distance to Primary Noise Source	Leq (dBA)	Lmin (dBA)	Lmax (dBA)
NM 1	North of Todd Road – side yard of 285 Todd Road residence	11:32 – 11:47 a.m.	Approximately 50 feet to centerline of Todd Road	72.0	52.5	85.6
NM 2	South of Todd Road – front yard of vacant property	10:52 – 11:07 a.m..	Approximately 50 feet to centerline of Todd Road	72.4	48.9	92.7
NM 3	North of Todd Road – front yard of 311 Todd Road residence	11:10 – 11:25 a.m.	Approximately 50 feet to centerline of Todd Road	72.4	42.6	91.4

Table 7 Sound Level Monitoring Traffic Counts

Measurement	Roadway	Traffic	Autos	Medium Trucks	Heavy Trucks
NM 1	Todd Road	15-minute count	157	16	17
		One-hour Equivalent	628	64	68
<b>Percent</b>			<b>83%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>9%</b>
NM 2	Todd Road	15-minute count	119	11	5
		One-hour Equivalent	476	44	20
<b>Percent</b>			<b>88%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>4%</b>
NM 3	Todd Road	15-minute count	95	7	1
		One-hour Equivalent	380	28	4
<b>Percent</b>			<b>92%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1%</b>

Project construction would occur nearest to noise-sensitive uses located along Todd Road. Construction would occur adjacent to single-family residences (285 Todd Road and 311 Todd Road) and to an industrial use (246 Ghilotti Ave). Over the course of a typical construction day, construction equipment would be located as close as 25 feet to the residential properties but would typically be located at an average distance of 55 feet away due to the nature of construction equipment operating at different locations on the project site throughout the day. Construction equipment would be located as close as 100 feet to the industrial property. Therefore, it is assumed that over the course of a typical construction day the construction equipment would operate 55 feet from the nearest residential property lines.

The typical construction equipment associated with the loudest intersection improvements and signalization phases are modeled for a conservative analysis and are shown in Table 8. Table 8 shows the combined hourly and maximum construction noise levels attributable to each construction sequence modeled, receivers analyzed, and resulting exterior and interior noise levels.

Table 8 Construction Noise Levels at Receivers

Construction Equipment	Land Use	Distance to Receiver, Feet	Approximate Noise Level, dBA			
			Exterior Spaces		Interior Spaces <sup>1</sup>	
			L <sub>eq</sub>	L <sub>max</sub>	L <sub>eq</sub>	L <sub>max</sub>
Remove Existing Drainage Facilities - 2 Dump Trucks, Excavator	285 Todd Ave Residential	65	77	78	52	53
	311 Todd Ave Residential	55	78	80	53	55
	246 Ghilotti Ave Commercial	100	73	75	48	50
Signal Pole Foundations Excavating – Dump Truck, Auger Drill Rig, Loader	285 Todd Ave Residential	65	77	78	52	53
	311 Todd Ave Residential	55	78	80	53	55
	246 Ghilotti Ave Commercial	100	74	78	49	53
Repair Existing Pavement – Jackhammer, Backhoe, Dump Truck	285 Todd Ave Residential	65	81	87	56	62
	311 Todd Ave Residential	55	82	88	57	63
	246 Ghilotti Ave Commercial	100	77	83	52	58

<sup>1</sup>Assuming an exterior to interior noise reduction of 25 dBA due to typical building standards and windows closed.  
L<sub>eq</sub>: one-hour equivalent noise level; L<sub>max</sub>: instantaneous maximum noise level; dBA: A-weighted decibel

As shown in Table 8, project construction hourly noise would range from 77 dBA L<sub>eq</sub> to 82 dBA L<sub>eq</sub> at the nearest residential receivers, with maximum noise levels ranging from 78 dBA L<sub>max</sub> to 88 dBA L<sub>max</sub>. Modeled project construction noise levels at the adjacent industrial property would range from 73 dBA L<sub>eq</sub> to 77 dBA L<sub>eq</sub>, with maximum noise levels ranging from 75 dBA L<sub>max</sub> to 83 dBA L<sub>max</sub>. Resulting hourly interior noise levels at residential receivers would range from 52 dBA L<sub>eq</sub> to 57 dBA L<sub>eq</sub> during to the heaviest periods of construction phases. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 2.4, ambient noise levels in the project area, and representative of residential receiver locations, is 72 dBA L<sub>eq</sub> during daytime hours. The increase in existing ambient noise levels due to the operation of project construction equipment would range from 1 to 10 dBA at noise sensitive residential uses and up to 14 dBA at adjacent industrial uses, depending on the construction phase.

The proposed project would result in the generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. However, these construction-related impacts would be temporary and would occur only during the construction

phase of the project. If the proposed project does not adhere to Section 14-8.02 Noise Control, of the Caltrans Standard Specifications, construction noise would be significant if construction operations exceed 86 dBA at a distance of 50 feet at any time during the day. Nighttime construction work may be conducted to avoid heavy daytime traffic. Therefore, construction noise impacts could be significant if conducted during the nighttime hours. Implementation of a sound barrier and/or sound blanket as described in Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would reduce noise levels by at least 5 dBA; therefore, noise levels from project construction would not exceed 86 dBA at 50 feet at a residentially zoned property with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

## Mitigation Measures

### NOI-1

A Construction Management Plan (CMP) shall be prepared consistent with Caltrans Standards Specifications and Standard Plans. The CMP shall be submitted to and approved by the Sonoma County Public Works Department. The CMP would include:

- Construction sequence;
- Hours of operation;
- Traffic management plan;
- Public outreach and notification plan;
- Details on compliance with necessary permits; and
- Avoidance measures with regard to noise:
  - Commencing any particularly noisy part of the construction activity (such as masonry sawing or jack hammering) after 9 a.m.;
  - Locating noise-generating equipment or processes so that their impact on neighboring premises is minimized by increasing distance between source and receiver or using intervening structures/barriers;
  - Shutting or throttling equipment down whenever not in actual use;
  - Ensuring that noise reduction devices such as mufflers are fitted and operating effectively;
  - Ensuring that equipment is not operated if maintenance or repairs would eliminate or significantly reduce a characteristic of noise resulting from its operation that is audible at noise-affected premises;
  - Where noise levels may expose residentially-zoned property to construction noise levels that exceeds 86 dBA at 50 feet, implement a temporary sound barrier and/or sound blanket that would break the line of sight between the construction equipment and the affected receiver(s); and
  - Operating equipment and handling materials to minimize impact noise (such as avoiding dropping materials from height).

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction activities known to generate excessive ground-borne vibration, such as pile driving, are not proposed as part of the Project. The greatest anticipated source of vibration during general project construction activities would be from a vibratory roller, which may be used during paving activities and may be used within 25 feet of the nearest off-site residential structure. A vibratory roller would create approximately 0.210 in./sec. PPV at a distance of 25 feet (Caltrans 2013b). This would be below a distinctly perceptible impact for humans of 0.24 in./sec. PPV, and the structural damage impact to residential structures of 0.4 in./sec. PPV. Therefore, although a vibratory roller may be perceptible to nearby human receivers, temporary



impacts associated with the roller (and other potential equipment) would be less than significant. The proposed project does not include substantial vibration sources associated with operation. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

- c) *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

**No Impact.** The Santa Rosa Air Center is located approximately 2.7 miles northwest of the project site. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip or located in an airport land use plan. Therefore, no substantial noise exposure would occur to construction workers or users of the intersection from aircraft noise. No impact would occur.

# 1.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The project site is largely associated with existing transportation related uses. Adjacent properties are associated with industrial related uses, agricultural, and there is one residential property. Zoning within the project site is primarily related to industrial related uses. The purpose of the proposed project is to improve the intersection of Todd Road at Standish Avenue to meet current Sonoma County standards and signalize the intersection to facilitate current and projected traffic movements including large truck traffic.

### Impact Analysis

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project will not induce unplanned population growth in the area directly or indirectly. The proposed project reconstructs an existing intersection to include a signal and the proposed project does not include new construction of homes or businesses or the extension of roads and other infrastructure that would have the potential to induce substantial unplanned population growth. Construction workers are assumed to be local and would not require additional housing. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not displace people or housing. The proposed project is primarily within existing transportation right-of-way. The acquisition of approximately 0.1 acre required for improvements is located on the edge of one property and does not impact the existing or zoned uses of the affected parcels. No impact would occur.

# 1.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

**Fire Protection** - Fire protection is provided by the Sonoma County Fire District. The nearest fire station, County Station 4, is located at 207 Todd Road about 600 feet east of the project site.

**Police Protection** - Police protection is provided by Sonoma County Sheriff. Todd Road is the boundary line between Zone 3 which provides service to areas to the north and Zone 5 which provides service to the areas to the south. Zones 3 and 5 operate from the Main Office located in the City of Santa Rosa.

**Schools, Parks, and Other Public Facilities** – there are no schools, parks, or other public facilities within the project site or in the immediate vicinity. The nearest public school, park, or other public facilities are located at least 0.5 miles from the project site.

### Impact Analysis

a) *Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection? Police protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities?*

**No Impact.** During construction, there would be the potential for traffic congestion that could affect response times for fire and police protection vehicles, but detours are not required, and travel lanes would remain open at all times during construction. Prior to construction, a CMP would be prepared and approved that would include construction sequencing, a traffic management plan, public outreach and notification plan. The traffic management plan would include coordination with fire and police protection to discuss how to manage emergency access during construction as necessary. There are no schools, parks, or other public facilities within the project site or adjacent area that would be impacted during construction. The proposed project upgrades the Todd Road/Standish Avenue intersection to meet Sonoma County standards and would not result in impacts associated with induced population growth during operation that trigger the need for new or altered government services. No impact would occur.

## 1.16 RECREATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The project site is located in an area of industrial and rural residential development. There are no parks or other recreational facilities in close proximity. The nearest parks or other recreational facility is located about 0.5 miles to the north of the project site (Andy Lopez Unity Park).

### Impact Analysis

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

**No Impact.** There are no recreational facilities in close proximity to the project site that would be affected by the proposed project. The proposed project does not result in the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that a substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated. No impact would occur.

- b) *Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur.

## 1.17 TRANSPORTATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

Project site public roadways include Todd Road and Standish Avenue and Ghilotti Way which is a private roadway. All roadways are two lanes and Todd Road includes two approximate 150 feet long left turn pockets at the intersection with Standish Avenue. SR 101 is located about 1,900 feet east of the Todd Road/Standish Avenue intersection. Sonoma County Transit operates one bus route (Route 42) that provides weekday service, between approximately 7:30 am to 5:30 pm, to the project site and includes a stop within the project site. There are no bicycle facilities on the project site roadways. The only pedestrian facility is a sidewalk located in the northeast corner of the intersection, and there are no marked pedestrian crossings at the intersection.

### Impact Analysis

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The proposed project would improve the existing intersection to meet current standards and improve sidewalks at the intersection by providing new sidewalks and adding striping for pedestrian crossing. The improvements in the pedestrian facilities would provide safer connection to the transit stops on Todd Road. The Sonoma County bus stop for Route 42 would be relocated outside of the construction zone to the east for the duration of the construction and returned afterwards. This would not limit or change transit accessibility nor route schedules and therefore it would not affect ridership. Advanced notification would be provided to transit riders a minimum of two weeks in advance of the bus stop relocation. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not conflict and is not inconsistent with 15064.3, subdivision (b). The purpose of the proposed project is to improve the intersection of Todd Road at Standish Avenue to meet current Sonoma County standards and signalize the intersection to facilitate current and projected traffic movements including large truck traffic. The proposed project does not result in new trips, changes in vehicle miles traveled, or changes to land use that would induce vehicle travel or increases in vehicle miles traveled. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not result in increased hazards due to a geometric design feature. The proposed project improves the existing intersection by installing a traffic signal and shifting a section of Ghilotti Way to the west to align with Standish Avenue and removing a potential hazard. No impact would occur.

- d) *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

**No Impact.** Emergency access would be maintained during construction. Construction may result in additional traffic congestion due to slower vehicular speed requirements through construction areas, but travel lanes would remain open and detours are not required. A traffic management plan would be prepared and approved in coordination with fire and police protection prior to construction. Operation does not result in changes to emergency access. No impact would occur.

## 1.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Has a California Native American Tribe requested consultation in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1(b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>
<p>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p>				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

PRC Section 21074 (a)(1)(A) and (B) defines tribal cultural resources as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” and is:

1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying these criteria, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB 52 also establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes regarding those resources. The consultation process must be completed before a CEQA document can be certified. Under AB 52, lead agencies are required to “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” Native American tribes to be included in the process are those that have requested notice of projects proposed within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

## Impact Analysis

*Has a California Native American Tribe requested consultation in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1(b)?*

On Friday, January 29, 2021, Sonoma County prepared and mailed an AB 52 notification letter to the following Native American Tribes and provided the opportunity to request a consultation:

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

No requests for consultation were received.

*Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*

*a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or*

*b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?*

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** Based on the responses under Cultural Resources (Section 1.5), there are no CRHR-eligible or listed resources within the project site. At this time, no specific tribal cultural resources have been identified. Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis, Sonoma County assumes that no tribal resources are present on the project site. However, because the proposed project involves ground disturbance, there is the possibility of encountering undisturbed subsurface tribal cultural resources during construction. Therefore, the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to tribal cultural resources and mitigation is required. The impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

## Mitigation Measure

### TCR-1

If cultural resources of Native American origin are identified during construction, all earth-disturbing work in the vicinity of the find must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find and an appropriate Native American representative, based on the nature of the find, is consulted. If the County determines that the resource is a tribal cultural resource and thus significant under CEQA, a mitigation plan shall be prepared and implemented in accordance with state guidelines and in consultation with Native American groups. The plan would include avoidance of the resource or, if avoidance of the resource is infeasible, the plan would outline the appropriate treatment of the resource in coordination with the archeologist and the appropriate Native American tribal representative.



## 1.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The City of Santa Rosa provides wastewater and water service to properties in the project site. Stormwater drainage in the project site consists of undeveloped drainage ditches and developed drainage facilities with stormwater inlets and catch basins. PG&E provides electrical and natural gas service to the project site and has below and above grade facilities. Solid waste disposal would be disposed of at the Central Disposal Site, in Petaluma, if the materials are non-hazardous. The Central Disposal Site has approximately 9.1 million cubic yards of capacity remaining (Calrecycle 2019a). If there are hazardous materials from construction that need to be disposed these would be disposed of at Altamont Landfill & Resource Recovery in Livermore. Altamont has approximately 65 million cubic yards of capacity remaining (Calrecycle 2019b).

### Impact Analysis

- a) *Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project requires the relocation and replacement of existing storm drain facilities and construction of new storm drain facilities. The proposed project does not result in new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, there no significant environmental effects. The proposed project does result in a small increase in impervious surfaces (approximately 4,000 square

feet) but the increase does not change existing stormwater drainage patterns. Other utilities within the project site would be protected in place or not impacted. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction activities would require water supplies for activities including dust control. Once construction is complete the proposed project does not require or result in changes to water supplies. The amount of water needed during construction would be minimal because the size of the project site is relatively small (about 2.66 acres) and the duration of construction would be less than two months. The proposed project does not result in changes to water supplies during operation because the proposed project would upgrade an existing intersection and does not require water supplies after construction ends. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not result in changes to the wastewater treatment system existing or future capacity. During construction, if portable toilets are required the waste would be transported to the appropriate facilities for disposal and treatment. Given the short duration of construction, no impacts are anticipated. Operation does not require wastewater treatment at the project site. No impact would occur.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction activities would generate solid waste associated with reconstruction of the roadway. The amount of solid waste generated would be minimal given the size of the project site and the type of construction required. Solid waste would be disposed of at permitted facilities, Central Disposal Site for nonhazardous materials and Altamont Landfill & Resource Recovery if there are hazardous materials. Both sites have capacity to meet the needs of the proposed project and construction would not generate waste in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure. During operation there would be no generation of solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

- e) *Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction would not result in impact on landfill capacity and would comply with the relevant statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Operation does not result in generation of waste. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

## 1.20 WILDFIRE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Is the project located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as high fire hazard severity zones? If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The project site is located within an urbanized area of unincorporated Sonoma County within a Local Responsibility Area. The Sonoma County Fire Protection District would respond to calls and the nearest station is located about 600 feet to the east on Todd Road.

### Impact Analysis

*Is the project located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as high fire hazard severity zones?*

**No Impact.** The project site is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as high fire hazard severity zones. The nearest state responsibility area and high fire hazard severity zone is about 2 miles east of the project site (CalFire 2020). No impact would occur.

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

- a) *Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*
- b) *Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*
- c) *Require the installation of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*
- d) *Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?*

## 1.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Impact Analysis

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

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** As discussed in Section 1.4, *Biological Resources*, project construction could affect special status plant and wildlife species if they are present within the project site. The project site is located within an urbanized area of unincorporated Sonoma County. Given the small size of the project site, about 2.66 acres, and the proposed project is predominantly within the existing roadway, and the development that surrounds the project site, the potential for the special status species identified to occur is low. BMPs implemented as part of construction (e.g., silt fences) would further reduce the potential impacts on special status species, if they are present within the project site. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

Based on information in Section 1.5, *Cultural Resources*, and Section 1.18, *Tribal and Cultural Resources*, there were no historical resources that would be impacted by the proposed project. In addition, there were no archaeological resources identified; however, there is the potential for unanticipated discoveries during construction. Because resources could be uncovered during construction there is the potential for significant impacts. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 and Mitigation Measure TCR-1 the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

- b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)*

**Less than Significant Impact.** Based up on the analysis conducted for this Initial Study, the majority of the resources would either result in no impact or the impact would be less than significant for construction and operation. For Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, and Hazardous Materials, the impacts during construction would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures and there are no impacts associated with operation. The proposed project would not induce population growth or result in the development of new housing or employment and would not result in cumulative impacts related to the increase in demand for public services, recreation facilities, and utilities.

The proposed project would result in impacts that are individually limited and not cumulatively considerable. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project does not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The proposed project improves the existing intersection of Todd Road at Standish Avenue to meet current Sonoma County standards and signalize the intersection to facilitate current and projected traffic movements including large truck traffic. Effects would be limited to construction which has a short duration of between 40 to 50 days and once construction is complete impacts would cease. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce the risk of potential release of hazardous materials during construction and not result in substantial adverse effects on human beings. The proposed project would not alter the daily use of the two roadways during operation and would not alter the existing use of the affected roads for routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or risk of upset or accident, and thereby would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The proposed project would result in benefits associated with the new traffic signal by reducing the potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. As noted above under a), the proposed project would have mostly no impact or a less than significant impact on most of the resources and for others with the implementation of mitigation the impacts would be less than significant. Impacts on human beings would be less than significant.

## REFERENCES

- Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2017. Plan Bay Area 2040. Adopted July 2017.  
<http://files.mtc.ca.gov/library/pub/29823.pdf>
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). 2017a. Final 2017 Clean Air Plan. Adopted April 18, 2017. [http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a\\_-\\_proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?la=en](http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a_-_proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf?la=en)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2017b. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. May 2017.  
[http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa\\_guidelines\\_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en](http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2020. Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status. <http://www.baaqmd.gov/about-air-quality/research-and-data/air-quality-standards-and-attainment-status>
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2017. The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update: The Proposed Strategy for Achieving California's 2030 Greenhouse Gas Target. Sacramento, CA. January 20, 2017.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2018. CA-Greet 3.0. Released August 13, 2018. Effective January 4, 2019.  
<https://www.arb.ca.gov/fuels/lcfs/ca-greet/ca-greet.htm>
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013. *Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol*. (CT-HWANP-RT-13-069.25.2) September. [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/TeNS\\_Sept\\_2013B.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/TeNS_Sept_2013B.pdf)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2020. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. Available at:  
<https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tcvgm-apr2020-a11y.pdf>
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2021. EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application – Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation.  
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>
- California Department of Conservation (CDC). 2020. California Important Farmland Finder. Available at:  
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.
- California Geological Survey. 2005. *Mineral Land Classification of Aggregate Materials in Sonoma County, California*. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mineralresources/#datalist>.
- CalRecycle. 2019a. SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details – Central Disposal Site. Available at:  
<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/Site/Summary/3621>.
- CalRecycle. 2019b. SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details – Altamont Landfill & Resource Recovery. Available at:  
<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/Site/Summary/7>.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2008. Sonoma County: Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA as Recommended by CAL FIRE.  
[https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6820/fhszl\\_map49.pdf](https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6820/fhszl_map49.pdf)
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2020. Sonoma County: Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA as Recommended by CAL FIRE.  
<https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414>
- California Department of Fire and Forestry Protection (CAL FIRE). 2020. *California Fire Hazard Severity Zones*. Available at: <https://hub-calfire-forestry.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/california-fire-hazard-severity-zones-fhsz?geometry=-124.122%2C38.031%2C-121.260%2C38.784>.

- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2020. Envirostor Data Management System.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2019. *Scenic Highways Systems List*. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/design/documents/od-county-scenic-hwys-2015-a11y.pdf>.
- California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2020. GeoTracker Data Management System.
- FEMA. 2012. *Flood Insurance Rate Map, Sonoma County California and Incorporated Areas. Panel 738 of 1150*. Available at: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=santa%20rosa%2C%20ca#searchresultsanchor>. Last accessed February 1, 2021.
- State Water Resources Control Board. 2012. Impaired Waterbodies. Available at: [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/tmdl/integrated2012.shtml](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/integrated2012.shtml). Last accessed January 26, 2021.
- Santa Rosa, City of. 2009. *City of Santa Rosa General Plan*. Santa Rosa, CA. <https://srcity.org/DocumentCenter/View/24327/Santa-Rosa-General-Plan-2035-PDF---July-2019>.
- Sonoma, County of. 2016. *Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Notes*. Sonoma County, <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Eng-and-Const/Grading-and-Storm-Water/Erosion-Prevention-and-Sediment-Control/>
- Sonoma, County of. 2019. *Visual Assessment Guidelines*. Available at: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Regulations/Environmental-Review-Guidelines/Visual-Assessment-Guidelines/>
- Sonoma, County of. 2020. *Open Space Scenic Resource Areas*. Available at: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Long-Range-Plans/General-Plan/Open-Space-Scenic-Resource-Areas/>.
- Sonoma, County of. 2020. *Parcel Search - Zoning and Parcel Report*. Available at: <https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/PRMD/Services/Parcel-Search/>.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS). Web Soil Survey. 2021. <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2016. *Nonroad Compression-Ignition Engines: Exhaust Emission Standards*. <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockey=P100OA05.pdf>







