

**Permit Sonoma File No. PLP20-0023**

**Project Site: 3000 Sweetwater Springs Road, Healdsburg CA 95448**

**CEQA Addendum to MND adopted on August 22, 2006, under File No. MNS05-0048**

**Prepared by Josh Miranda, Project Planner**

**Date: July 20, 2023**

### **Project Description**

Request for a Certificate of Modification to relocate an existing 37,800 square foot building envelope on Lot 1 of PM05-0048 to accommodate a residential accessory structure on the 170.31-acre parcel. Project Conditions of Approval include a requirement to modify the property's Land Conservation (Williamson Act) Contract's "Land Conservation Plan". Zoning for the property is Resources and Rural Development (RRD) 160-Acre Density, Riparian Corridor (RC 50/50).

### **Existing Facilities**

The existing 170.31-acre lot is developed with a single-family dwelling, solar array, pool, pool house, carport, and power shed with onsite well and an onsite septic system. Existing access is from driveway frontage off Sweetwater Springs Road. Porter Creek runs through the property.

### **CEQA Review Background**

A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared and posted for the original project in accordance with CEQA. The Project Review Advisory Committee held a public hearing on July 20, 2006 where it was then recommended that the Board of Supervisors approved the request and on August 22, 2006 the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors heard, adopted the MND and approved the minor subdivision subject to Findings and Conditions.

The IS/MND for the project was completed in 2006 by County of Sonoma staff and circulated for public review. The Sonoma County Board of Supervisors adopted the MND and granted a minor subdivision on August 22, 2006. The Notice of Determination was filed on July 24, 2003.

The CEQA Guidelines have since been amended and went into effect in January 1, 2019. The IS/MND was adopted before the Guidelines revisions and does not conform to the amended CEQA Checklist. In addition to assessing the project modification for consistency with the 2006 IS/MND, this Addendum includes discussion of new 2019 Checklist criteria.

### **Addendum to the 2006 MND**

This Addendum addresses the potential for any environmental impacts associated with the revision to the previously approved Minor Subdivision. An Addendum is defined by CEQA as follows:

15164. Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration

(a) The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

(b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary **or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.**

(c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.

(d) The decision making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.

(e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.

Section 15164 (b) specifically indicates an Addendum may be prepared if none of the conditions described in Section 15162 do not exist requiring a subsequent Negative Declaration, as described below:

#### 15162. Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations

(a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

(b) If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required

under subdivision (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation.

In this case, none of the conditions described in Section 15162 (a) exist, as described in this Addendum. Permit Sonoma has determined that no new or significant environmental effects, no substantial changes to circumstances or to previously identified significant effects, no significant revisions to mitigation measures and no new mitigation measures or alternatives would be associated with the project revision. As described in Section 15162 (b), the Lead Agency has determined that an Addendum, consistent with Section 15164, is the appropriate course to address potential environmental impacts associated with the project revision.

## **2019 Checklist Analysis of Proposed Project Revisions**

The following sections assess the proposed project revisions according to the checklist contained in the 2019 Guidelines and the degree to which, if any, they would change the findings of the 2006 MND.

### **1. Aesthetics**

The Aesthetics findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

### **2. Agriculture and Forest Resources**

The Agriculture and Forest Resources findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

### **3. Air Quality**

The Air Quality findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

### **4. Biological Resources**

The Biological Resources findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified. The relocation of the building envelope will not result in new impacts or increase in previously analyzed impacts as documented in the Biological Resource Assessment Addendum submitted for the project.

### **5. Cultural Resources**

The Cultural Resources findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

### **6. Energy**

The Energy section of the 2019 Checklist is a new section and was not contained in the 2006 IS/MND. Two new Checklist items were included in the Energy section, and are assessed below.

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

The project addition would result in a less than significant impact. The proposal is to

relocate an existing building envelope that would accommodate an residential accessory structure. Standard construction practices would be utilized for the construction of the residential accessory structure resulting in a less than significant impact to energy resources or operation.

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

The relocated building envelope would not conflict or obstruct with a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, thus resulting in a less than significant impact.

**7. Geology and Soils**

The Hazardous Materials findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

**8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

The Greenhouse Gas Emissions section of the 2019 Checklist is a new section and was not contained in the 2006 IS/MND. Two new Checklist items were included in the Energy section, and are assessed below.

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

Temporary increase in GHG's could occur onsite from construction phase of the project, however this increase would be temporary and once construction is completed those impacts would result in a less than significant impact.

**b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

Standard construction practices will be used for the construction of the project not resulting in additional impact other than increase time of running equipment that could be related to Greenhouse Gas emission's such as trucking in equipment or other large construction vehicles resulting in a less than significant impact.

**9. Hazardous Materials**

The Hazardous Materials findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

**10. Hydrology and Water Quality**

The Hydrology and Water Quality findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

**11. Land Use Planning**

The Land Use Planning findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

## **12. Mineral Resources**

The Mineral Resources findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

## **13. Noise**

The Noise findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

## **14. Population and Housing**

The Population and Housing findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

## **15. Public Services**

The Public Services findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

## **16. Recreation**

The Recreation findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

## **17. Transportation**

The Transportation findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

## **18. Tribal Cultural Resources**

The Tribal Cultural Resources section of the 2019 Checklist is a new section and was not contained in the 2006 IS/MND. One new Checklist items was included in the Tribal Cultural Resources section and are assessed below.

**a) 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:**

- i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5030.1(k), or**
- ii) A resource determined by the lead agency. In its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

Tom Origer & Associates conducted a historical resources evaluation of a portion of the project site in October 2021. The study did not find any prehistoric or historical archaeological site indicators within the study area. The field survey that was conducted

included an intensive field survey with surface examination. As part of the Historical Resources Study of the property prepared by Tom Origer & Associates for this project, a request was sent to the State of California's Native American Heritage Commission on September 16, 2021. The letter requested information from the sacred lands files and the names of Native American individuals and groups that would be appropriate to contact regarding the proposed project. The Native American Heritage Commission did not reply as of the date of the study.

On September 16, 2021 letters and follow-up emails were sent to the following groups requesting comments about the proposed project:

- Cloverdale Rancheria of Pomo Indians
- Dry Creek Rancheria of Pomo Indians
- Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
- Guidiville Indian Rancheria
- Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria Lytton Rancheria
- Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians
- Mishewal-Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley
- Pinoleville Pomo Nation
- Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians

On September 20, 2021, Anthony Macias, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians sent a response stating that the project area is outside of their aboriginal territory.

No other comments have been received as of the date of the report, thus resulting in a less than significant impact that standard conditions of approval for ground disturbing activities will cover.

## **19. Utilities and Service Systems**

The Utilities and Service Systems findings contained in the 2006 MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.

## **20. Wildfire**

The Wildfire section of the 2019 Checklist is a new section and was not contained in the 2003 IS/MND. Four new Checklist items were included in the Wildfire section, and are assessed below.

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones:

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

The project site is located in a State Responsibility Area (SRA) and is within a moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone however, there is no adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan for this area that the project could conflict with, resulting in a less than significant impact.

- b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?**

The project site is located in a State Responsibility Area (SRA) and within a moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Topography, weather, and fuel (vegetation or structures) contribute to wildfire risk and behavior. The project site is developed and surrounded by generally steep topography and some rural development including vineyards, agricultural land, and residences) and does contain slopes that could exacerbate wildfire risk however, the project is required to maintain compliance with the County Fire Safe Standards for buildings, hazardous materials, emergency access, water supply and vegetation management that would result in a less than significant impact.

- c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk of that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**

No such infrastructure is required for the project that would exacerbate fire risk; no impact associated with the relocated building envelope.

- 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?**

Project site and surrounding land adjacent to the project parcel is relatively steep, however downstream of the project from porter creek is developed with mostly vineyards development, resulting in a less than significant impact.

## **21. Mandatory Findings of Significance**

The Mandatory Findings of Significance findings contained in the 2006 IS/MND remain valid and no new impacts or increases in previously analyzed impacts have been identified.