



Mitigated Negative Declaration

Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department
2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

Publication Date:
Adoption Date:
State Clearinghouse:

This statement and attachments constitute the **Mitigated Negative Declaration** as proposed for or adopted by the Sonoma County decision-making body for the project described below.

File No.: MNS05-0048

Project Planner: Sigrid Swedenborg

Project Name: Minor Subdivision

Project Description: Request for a Minor Subdivision of +/-320 acres creating 2 lots; 135 and 185 acres in size

Project Location: 3000 Sweetwater Springs Road, Healdsburg
See Location Map - Attached

Environmental Finding:

Based upon the information contained in the Initial Study included in the project file, it has been determined that there will be no significant environmental effect resulting from this project, provided that mitigation measures are incorporated into the project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed in compliance with CEQA State and County guidelines and the information contained therein has been reviewed and considered.

There will not be a potential impact on biotic habitat of concern to Fish & Game.

Initial Study: Attached

Other Attachments:

Decision-making Body: Project Review Advisory Committee

Lead Agency: Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

FILE #: MNS05-0048

PLANNER: Sigrid Swedenborg

PROJECT NAME: Minor Subdivision

LEAD AGENCY: Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

PROJECT LOCATION: 3000 Sweetwater Springs Road, Healdsburg

APPLICANT NAME: Glenda Martin

APPLICANT ADDRESS: 2400 Lytton Springs Road, Healdsburg, CA 95448

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: Resources and Rural Development; 160 acres density

SPECIFIC/AREA PLAN: None

ZONING: RRDWA B6-160 (Resources and Rural Development – Agricultural Preserve; 160 acres/residential unit)

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: Request for a Minor Subdivision +/-320 acres creating 2 lots; 135 and 185 acres in size

SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

The project site consists of an approximately 320-acre project site located along Sweetwater Springs Road, approximately 4 miles west of Westside Road and 8 miles southwest of Healdsburg. Surrounding land uses include a vineyard to the south, timber and grazing lands to the north and west, and very rural uses to the east. The project site consists primarily of steeply sloping lands (slopes often in excess of 50%), with the project site bisected by a perennial stream (Porter Creek) and, along the banks of the stream, Sweetwater Springs Road. Slopes closer to the roadway provide smaller pockets of moderately-sloping land. The stream corridor and road run on a northwest-to-southeast alignment. Elevation of the project site ranges from a high of just over 800 feet in the northwest corner to a low of 170 feet in the southeast corner. Sweetwater Springs Road transects the site which is developed with a well (located on proposed Parcel 1, in the southwest corner of the project site). Vegetation on site consists of dense tree and brush cover (including rolling oak woodlands), with some smaller areas of open grasslands at the southwest corner of proposed Parcel 1 and areas below Sweetwater Springs Road. Water is available to the site via the on-site well and from the Sweetwater Springs Road Mutual Water Company.

Other Public Agencies whose approval is required (e.g. responsible/trustee agencies issuing permits): None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None with Mitigation | | |

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

Initial Study Checklist

Page 3

File No. MNS05-0048

- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- 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 by 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.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, all potentially significant effects were previously analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable standards and potential impacts 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. There are no changes in the project, no new information related to potential impacts, and no changes in circumstances that would require further analysis pursuant to Section 15162 of CEQA Guidelines, therefore no further environmental review is required.

The checklist below is taken from 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.

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated: The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. One or more mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Potentially Significant Impact: The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. The impact cannot be reduced to less than significant by incorporating mitigation measures. An environmental impact report must be prepared for this project.

Incorporated Source Documents

The checklist includes a discussion of the impacts and mitigation measures that have been identified. Sources used in this Initial Study are numbered and listed below. Following each checklist question one or more sources used are cited in parentheses.

In preparation of the Initial Study checklist, the following documents were referenced/developed, and are hereby incorporated as part of the Initial Study. All documents are available in the project file or for reference at the Permit and Resource Management Department.

1. Initial Data Sheet.
2. County Planning Department's Sources and Criteria Manual.
3. Flood Insurance Rate Maps, 1991, FEMA.
4. Sonoma County Rare Plant Site Identification Study.
5. Project Referrals from Responsible Agencies.
6. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
7. Full record of previous hearings on project in file.
8. Correspondence received on project.
9. Sonoma County CEQA Implementing Ordinance, 1985 and 1991.

Initial Study Checklist

Page 4

File No. MNS05-0048

10. PRMD staff evaluation based on review of the project site, project application and project description.
11. Sonoma County General Plan (as amended) and Environmental Impact Report, Sonoma County Board of Supervisors; March 23, 1989 and Revised December 1998.
12. *Sonoma County Important Farmland Map* California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program; 2000.
13. Assessor's Parcel Maps.
14. *Ozone Implementation Plan*, California Air Resources Board, 2002. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/> accessed June 23, 2005.
15. *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans*; Bay Area Air Quality Management District; April 1999.
16. *California Natural Diversity Database*, California Department of Fish & Game, 2000.
17. Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance (as amended); May 2004.
18. Guidelines for California Environmental Quality Act Section 15064.5.
19. *Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones*; State of California Division of Mines and Geology; 1983.
20. *Seismic Shaking and Tsunami Plates 1A and 1B, Geology for Planning in Sonoma County Special Report 120*, California Division of Mines and Geology; 1980.
21. *Slope Stability Plates 2A and 2B, Geology for Planning in Sonoma County Special Report 120*, California Division of Mines and Geology; 1980.
22. California Regional Water Quality Control Board <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/>; accessed June 23, 2005.
23. California Dept of toxic Substances Control www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese_list.cfm accessed June 23, 2005.
24. Integrated Waste Management Board www.ciwm.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp accessed June, 23, 2005.
25. *Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan and Program EIR*; 1994.
26. *Tree Protection and Replacement Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 4014); Sonoma County; 1989.
27. *Valley Oak Protection Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 4991); Sonoma County; December 1996.
28. *Heritage or Landmark Tree Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 3651); Sonoma County; December 1986.
29. Cultural Resources Survey, prepared by Tom Origer & Associates, February 8, 2006.
30. Fire Protection and Prevention Plan, prepared by project applicant, December 8, 2005.
31. Biological Plant Survey, Golden Bear Biostudies, March 14, 2006.
32. Groundwater Availability Letter, Matt O'Connor, March 10, 2005.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17 at the end of the checklist "Earlier Analysis", may be cross-referenced).

Initial Study Checklist

Page 5

File No. MNS05-0048

- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - A) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - B) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - C) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

1. AESTHETICS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____

1.a Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located in a rural area of Sonoma County, with surrounding uses consisting of vineyards, cattle grazing and timberlands. The site is not designated as a Scenic Resource by the Sonoma County General Plan. No adverse aesthetic impacts on a scenic vista are expected as a result of this Minor Subdivision.

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

1.b Less Than Significant Impact. The project is not expected to result in any significant impacts to scenic resources. See discussion under item 1.a, above. Some limited tree removals may occur as a result of building pad development and driveway construction, though the extent of such removals will likely be limited. There are no historic buildings on the project site. Building areas would not impact any of the rock outcroppings on the project site.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____
---	-------	-------	-------------	-------

1.c Less Than Significant Impact. With the view protection mechanisms described above under Item 1.a, the project is not expected to result in a significant impact upon the visual character of the area or its surroundings.

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

1.d Less Than Significant. The creation of two parcels with resultant construction will introduce new sources of light and glare, and may impact nighttime views, but this will not be a substantial impact to views in the area. The project is conditioned on a requirement that exterior lighting be fully shielded, and directed downward to prevent "wash out" onto adjacent properties. Generally fixtures should accept sodium vapor lamps and not be located at the periphery of the property. Flood lights are not allowed.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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? _____ X _____

2.a Less Than Significant Impact. The parcel is not designated as Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the Important Farmland maps. It is designated as Grazing Lands. Therefore, the subdivision would not result in a significant, adverse impact on farmlands. In addition, the subdivision will not preclude use for future agricultural purposes, such as grazing lands.

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

2.b Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is under a Williamson Act contract. The zoning for the property is RRDVA B6-160, which reflects the rural resource land use in the area, as well as the presence of the Williamson Act contract. The existing agricultural use is cattle grazing. Two grazing leases exist on the property, one for the upper area and one for the lower.

Under Section 66474.4 (a) of the Subdivision Map Act a Tentative or Parcel Map must be denied if the resulting parcels are too small to sustain their agricultural use or the subdivision will result in residential development not incidental to the commercial agricultural use of the land. Agricultural land is presumed to be in parcels large enough to sustain their agricultural use if the land is at least 40 acres in size for Type II Agricultural contracts. The propose parcel sizes are 135.0 acres and 185.0 acres. The parcels are of a sufficient size to sustain an agricultural use. The subdivision includes building envelopes. These building envelopes do not remove land from agricultural production and represent less than 0.75% of the total land area of each parcel. The subject property is currently vacant. Under the RRDWA zoning district, the granting of the subdivision would allow for the construction of a single-family residence on each parcel as well as a manufactured home for a full-time agricultural employee and a guesthouse. § 51230.1 of the Government Code requires the following findings of compatibility be made for uses approved on contracted

- land. 1. The use will not significantly compromise the long-term productive agricultural capability of the subject contracted parcel(s) or on other contracted lands in agricultural preserve.
2. The use will not significantly displace or impair current or reasonably foreseeable agricultural operations on the subject contracted parcel(s) or other contracted land in agricultural preserve.
3. The use will not result in the significant removal of adjacent contracted land from agriculture or open-space use.

The subject parcels are 135 acres and 185 acres in size. The building envelope on each of the parcels are less than 0.75% of the total land area. The development areas do not impede on the grazing area, the identified vineyard area or areas necessary for the growing of nursery stock. Furthermore, development of the parcels would not require the removal of existing agricultural crops. The permitted development intensity of the parcels is of a minimal scale. This level of intensity could not result in significant removal of adjacent contracted land from agriculture or open-space.

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? _____ X _____

2.c Less Than Significant Impact. The project does not involve conversion of rural grazing lands since it will introduce one residential unit per 160 acres, allowing continuation of agricultural uses. See item 2.a, above. The following note shall be placed on the Parcel Map: "Agricultural uses occur in this area, and pesticide applications, dust, odors and other nuisances associated with agricultural uses may occur."

3. AIR QUALITY

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

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

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

3.a No Impact. The project is within the jurisdiction of the Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District (NSCAPCD). The NSCAPCD does not have an adopted air quality plan.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? _____ X _____

3.b Less Than Significant Impact. State and federal standards have been established for "criteria pollutants": ozone precursors, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide and particulates (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). The pollutants NOx (nitrogen oxides) and hydrocarbons form ozone in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight. The principal source of ozone precursors is vehicle emissions, although stationary internal combustion engines must also be considered. Detailed NOx and hydrocarbon air quality analysis is generally not recommended for projects generating less than 2,000 vehicle trips per day. Given the very low traffic generation of the project relative to the screening criteria, ozone precursor emissions would be less than significant.

Detailed air quality analysis for carbon monoxide is generally not recommended unless a project would generate 10,000 or more vehicle trips a day, or contribute more than 100 vehicles per hour to intersections operating at LOS D, E or F with project traffic. Given the very low traffic generation of the project relative to the screening criteria, carbon monoxide emissions would be less than significant.

Wood smoke from fireplaces and wood stoves are sources of pollutants receiving increasing scrutiny and generating numerous complaints. Although constituting a very small percentage of the total PM₁₀ emissions on an annual basis, wood smoke is a major contributor to reduced visibility and reduced air quality on winter evenings in both urban and rural areas. Sonoma County building regulations restrict fireplaces to natural gas fireplaces, pellet stoves and EPA-Certified wood burning fireplaces or stoves. With the restriction on fireplace design, this would be a less than significant impact.

- c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

 X

3.c Less Than Significant Impact.

Northern Sonoma County APCD is in attainment of both the NAAQS and the CAAQS for NO₂, SO₂, CO, and lead. The District is in attainment of the NAAQS for PM₁₀ and ozone, but is in nonattainment of the CAAQS for PM₁₀ and ozone. It is recognized that the non-attainment status of the District with respect to the state ozone standard is primarily a result of pollutant transport from the Bay Area District and not locally generated. Therefore, an air quality plan for ozone is not required and no PM₁₀ plan is required under state law.

PM₁₀ is a criteria pollutant that is closely monitored in the NSCAPCD. Readings in the district have exceeded state standards on several occasions in the last several years. The high PM₁₀ readings occurred in the winter and are attributed to the seasonal use of wood burning stoves. The project will not have a significant long-term effect on PM₁₀, because all surfaces will be paved or landscaped, and dust generation will be insignificant.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

 X

3.d Less Than Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors are facilities or locations where people may be particularly sensitive to air pollutants such as children, the elderly or people with illnesses. These uses include schools, playgrounds, hospitals, convalescent facilities and residential areas. Because of its rural setting, the project site is not located in proximity to any sensitive receptors, nor includes any substantial pollutant concentrations. There will be no significant, long term increase in emissions.

- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

 X

3.e Less Than Significant Impact. Construction equipment may generate odors during project construction. The impact would be less than significant and it would be a short-term impact that ceases upon completion of the project. The ultimate residential uses would have no known or anticipated sources or activities that could create objectionable odors.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

_____ X _____

4.a Less Than Significant Impact. A biological site assessment was completed by Gold Bear Biostudies on March 14, 2006. The study included a review of the CDFG Natural Diversity Data Base, as well as a review of pertinent literature, and an on-site reconnaissance. The study found no special status plant species on-site. Wetland habitat types were observed in the channel areas of Porter Creek, the perennial stream on the site, and in ditches alongside the roadway. No seeps or seasonal wetlands were observed in the likely areas of development. The study concluded "it appears from this initial survey that the proposed development areas are situated in locations where they will not directly impact sensitive habitats (streams, wetlands, serpentine chaparral)."

In order to insure that there are no impacts to special status species, building envelopes have been established in those areas determined by the study to be unlikely to have an occurrence of special status species because non-native grassland species occupy the majority of the area.

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

_____ X _____

4.b Less Than Significant Impact. The project site contains a perennial stream, Porter Creek, that bisects the property. The Creek is located approximately 80 to 200 feet below road grades, and it would not be practical to place the buildings and driveways in proximity to or even across the stream corridor. See discussion under item 4.a, above. Additionally, mitigation measure GEO-3 (under item 6.b, below) requires use of protective measures for stream corridors during site grading and construction. The established building envelopes are over 100 feet from the creek. No significant impacts to wetlands are expected as a result of the project.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

_____ X _____

4.c Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion above, under items 4.a and 4.b.

- 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?

_____ X _____

4.d Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located in a very rural area consisting of substantially open lands which allow for wildlife movement. Construction would involve limited site disturbance related to development of a project driveway and building pad, and as such, would not result in substantial alteration or removal of site vegetation, or place barriers in fish or wildlife migration corridors.

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

_____ X _____

4.e Less Than Significant impact. While it is unlikely, some tree removals may occur in developing the driveways and building envelopes. The extent of tree removals is expected to be limited, and would not affect the overall rural resource quality of the project site or surrounding lands. The County also regulates tree removals (Tree Protection and Replacement Ordinance (Section 26C-88-010(m)); proposed tree removals must be shown on grading and building plans, and replaced consistent with Ordinance

requirements. There are no known Heritage or Landmark Trees on the project site that would be impacted by development within the proposed building envelopes.

- 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? _____ X

4.f No Impact. Habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans are site-specific plans to address take of listed species of plants and animals. The project site is not located in an area subject to a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

- 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES** Would the project:
- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |

5.a No Impact. A cultural resources survey was conducted for the project by Tom Origer & Associates (February 8, 2006). The survey included a review of historic records (Northwest Information Center; National Register of Historic Places; California Historical Landmarks; California Register of Historic Places; and California Points of Historical Interest) and site inspection. There are two recorded cultural resources on the project site – a large boulder with petroglyphs, and a rock shelter containing minimal archaeological material. No artifacts or archaeological specimens were found during the site inspection. The most prudent means of mitigation with respect to cultural or historic resources is avoidance. The survey concludes that "the current project will not impact the sites identified within the study area because both archaeological resources are located outside proposed (possible) building envelopes. If project plans change to include development in the site areas, then a treatment plan should be developed by a qualified archaeologist to address potential impacts at the site."

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

5.b Less Than Significant. It was determined that no significant impacts to cultural resources were likely to occur with the project. However, as required for all discretionary projects, a standard condition of approval shall be applied requiring that the following note be placed on the map: "If human remains or other historic artifacts are encountered, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovered remains and the County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist must be notified immediately so that an evaluation can be performed. If the site is found to be significant, additional work (i.e., a test excavation) could be necessary to mitigate impacts to portions of the site disturbed by the proposed project. If the remains are deemed to be Native American and prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted by the Coroner so that a "Most Likely Descendant" can be designated.", reducing potential impact to a less than significant level.

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? _____ X

5.c No Impact. There are no unique geological features on the property. The geology of the site and the nature of the project make it extremely unlikely that paleontological resources would be encountered or destroyed.

- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? _____ X

7.d No Impact. No burial sites are known in the vicinity of the project. In the event that human remains are unearthed during construction, state law requires that the County Coroner be contacted in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code to investigate the nature and circumstances of the discovery. At the time of discovery, work in the immediate vicinity would cease until the Coroner permitted work to proceed. If the remains were determined to be native American interment, the Coroner will follow the procedure outlined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15065.5(e).

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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

_____ X _____

6.a.i No Impact. The site is not located within an Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault zone, and there are no other known active or potentially active faults on the property.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

_____ X _____

6.a.ii Less Than Significant Impact. All of Sonoma County is subject to seismic shaking that would result from earthquakes along the San Andreas, Healdsburg-Rodgers Creek and other faults. Predicting seismic events is not possible, nor is providing mitigation that can entirely reduce the potential for injury and damage that can occur during a seismic event. However, using accepted geotechnical evaluation techniques and appropriate engineering practices, potential injury and damage can be diminished, thereby exposing fewer people and less property to the effects of a major damaging earthquake. The design and construction of future dwellings on new parcels are subject to load and strength standards of the Uniform Building Code (UBC), which take seismic shaking into account. Project conditions of approval require that a building permit be obtained for all construction and that the project meet all standard seismic and soil test/compaction requirements. The project would therefore not expose people to substantial risk of injury from seismic shaking.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

_____ X _____

6.a.iii Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is not located within an area subject to liquefaction as shown on the Sonoma County Relative Hazard from Seismic Shaking map. However, strong ground shaking during an earthquake can result in ground failure and/or settlement, and can also cause deformation of slopes, particularly fill slopes. Therefore the property has the potential to experience settlement during a seismic event. All structures will be required to meet building permit requirements, including seismic safety standards and soil test/compaction requirements. Based on standard permitting requirements, the project will have no significant risk of loss, injury or death from seismic ground failure or liquefaction. Also see mitigation measures included in item 6.a.ii, above.

iv) Landslides?

_____ X _____

6.a.iv Less than Significant with Mitigation. The project applicant prepared a geological water availability study (The Geoservices Group, July 29, 2005) that acknowledged the presence of a deep-seated, rotational landslide zone in the lower northeast portion of the project site. The following mitigation measure will reduce the potential impact from landslides to levels of insignificance

Mitigation Measure:

NOTE ON MAP: "Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant shall submit for review and approval the grading and drainage improvement plans necessary for the proposed project. Drainage improvements shall be designed in accordance with the Sonoma County Water Agency Flood Control Design Criteria. The improvement plans shall also include erosion control measures, notes, and details to prevent damages and minimize adverse impacts to the environment."

Mitigation Monitoring: PRMD Plan Check staff will ensure that the note is on the map prior to granting clearance.

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

6.b Less Than Significant Impact. The subdivision of land does not include any construction, but the resulting parcel could have a residence constructed on it which could require grading, cuts and fills for access drive way improvements and future homesite development. An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan prepared by a registered professional engineer is required as an integral part of the grading plan. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan is subject to review and approval of the Permit and Resource Management Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The plan must include temporary erosion control measures to be used during construction of cut and fill slopes, excavation for foundations, and other grading operations at the site to prevent discharge of sediment and contaminants into the drainage system.

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? _____ X _____

6.c Less than Significant with Mitigation. The project site is subject to seismic shaking as described in item 6.a.ii, above. No further mitigation is required.

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

6.d Less than Significant Impact. Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code is an index of the relative expansive characteristics of soil as determined through laboratory testing. For the proposed project, soils at the site were not tested for their expansive characteristics. No substantial risks to life or property are expected as the project is located on expansive soil. Soils testing may be required for building or grading permits.

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? _____ X _____

6.e Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is not in an area served by public sewer. Preliminary review by the PRMD Project Review Health Specialist indicates that the soils on site would likely support a septic system and the required expansion area. Standard conditions of project approval would apply to ensure soils are capable of supporting use of a septic system.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Initial Study Checklist

Page 13

File No. MNS05-0048

Mitigation

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

7.a No Impact. The project is for a minor subdivision to create one parcel and a designated remainder. The proposed project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

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

7.b Less Than Significant Impact. The project is not expected to involve significant use of hazardous materials, and therefore would have an unlikely potential impact involving release of hazardous materials. Mitigation measures under item 7.a, above, would further reduce the possible release of hazardous materials to the environment. The proposed project would therefore not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from upset or accident involving hazardous materials.

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

7.c No Impact. The project is not located within one quarter mile of any existing or proposed school.

- 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? _____ X

7.d No Impact. The project site is not included on lists of sites containing hazardous materials that are maintained by the California Water Resources Control Board, California Department of Toxic Substances Control or California Integrated Waste Management Board.

- 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 for people residing or working in the project area? _____ X

7.e No Impact. The site is not within an airport land use plan as designated by Sonoma County.

- f) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? _____ X

7.f No Impact. There are no known private airstrips within the vicinity of the proposed project.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? _____ X

7.g No Impact. The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the County's adopted Emergency Operations Plan. There is no separate emergency evacuation plan for the County. In any case, the project would not change existing circulation patterns and would have no effect on emergency response routes. See item 15.e, below, for discussion of emergency access.

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

7.h Less Than Significant Impact. The project is located in a wildland area, most of which has dense vegetative cover, and would therefore be subject to wildland fire risk. All project construction will be required to conform to Fire Safe Standards related to fire sprinklers, emergency vehicle access and water supply, making impact risk from wildland fire less than significant.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

Potential/ Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? _____ X _____

8.a Less Than Significant Impact. Erosion control measures discussed under item 6.5, above, will reduce the potential for site run-off and sedimentation related to development of proposed Parcel 1. While it is unlikely, should development areas and ground disturbance exceed one acre or more, construction activities will be subject to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board – General Permit for Construction Projects, as well as the Drainage Review Section of PRMD.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? _____ X _____

8.b Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located in County Groundwater Availability Zone 4, which typically requires the proposed project to establish availability and reliability of groundwater supplies to support proposed development projects. A March 10, 2006 letter from geologist Matt O'Connor addressed groundwater availability, finding adequate supplies exist on the proposed 135-acre parcel to support the proposed residential development. County PRMD – Health staff reviewed and accepted the letter findings. County PRMD - Health staff have recommended a number of standard conditions of project approval, including provision of results of a test well on the proposed lot prior to recordation of the Final Parcel Map. Additionally, water may be available to the site at a future date through the Sweetwater Springs Road Mutual Water Company. The water provider does not yet have an operating permit from the Health Department. Health Department approval would be required if the Water Company ultimately serves five or more parcels.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? _____ X _____

8.c No Impact. The project was reviewed by the Sonoma County PRMD Drainage Review Section and a condition of approval requires that grading and drainage improvement plans be reviewed and approved by PRMD prior to the issuance of any development permits. Erosion and sediment control measures are required to be included in the plans. Mitigation included under item 6.b, above, will further limit possible drainage impact to Porter Creek.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

8.d No Impact. See discussion under item 8.c, above.

e) 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?

8.e Less Than Significant Impact. The creation of new lots does will not substantially alter drainage patterns or capacities of this project site. Development would only be permitted after review of engineered development plans by PRMD to ensure adequate management of stormwater runoff. See discussion under items 6.b and 8.c, above.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

8.f No Impact. The project does not involve significant changes in the environment that could result in substantial degradation of site or area water quality. See discussion under item 6.b, above.

g) Place housing within a 100-year hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

8.g No Impact. The project site is not located in a flood hazard area.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

8.h No Impact. The project site is not located in a flood hazard area.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

8.i No Impact. The project site is not located in an area subject to flooding as a result of dam failure.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

8.j No Impact. The project site is not located in an area subject to seiche or tsunami. See discussion of landslide impacts under item 6.a.iv, and related mitigation.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project: Potentially Less than Less than No

	Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation	Significant Impact	Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
9.a No Impact. The project would not divide a community.				
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

9.b No Impact. The project site is designated Resources and Rural Development – one unit per 160 acres by the Sonoma County General Plan. The proposed project is consistent with general plan goals, policies and objectives, which provide for very low residential uses along with certain agricultural and resource-based activities. Key applicable General Plan goals and policies include:

Goal LU-4.1: Maintain adequate public services in both rural and urban service areas to accommodate projected growth.

Objective LU-4.1: Assure that development occurs only where physical services and infrastructure, including school and park facilities, public safety, access and response times, water and wastewater management systems, drainage and roads, are planned to be available in time to serve the projected development.

Land Use Policy 2.8.1 (Resources and Rural Development Areas). Intended to allow very low residential development, protect lands from intensive development constrained by steep slopes, and protect County residents from proliferation of growth in areas which have inadequate public services and infrastructure.

Residential development is required to utilize appropriate grading and building foundation construction practices (per item 5, above) to protect against hazards of building on steeper slopes. The project would not conflict with the adopted General Plan and related development ordinances of the County.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
---	-------	-------	-------	----------

9.c No Impact. See item 4.f, above. Habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans are site-specific plans to address effects on sensitive species of plants and animals. The project site is not located in an area subject to a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>
10.a No impact. There are no known mineral resources on the project site.				
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?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>

10.b **No Impact.** The project site is not locally designated as a mineral resource.

11. NOISE Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—

11.a Less Than Significant Impact. The Noise Element of the Sonoma County General Plan establishes goals, objectives and policies including performance standards to regulate noise affecting residential and other sensitive receptors. The General Plan sets separate standards for transportation noise and for noise from non-transportation land uses. Given the rural setting of the project site and low potential for vehicle noise (due to very low traffic volumes along Sweetwater Springs Road), the resultant residences will not experience noise levels exceeding County standards.

Temporary increase in noise levels from equipment operation that could exceed County standards are expected to occur during construction. This would be a short-term, temporary impact that will cease when construction is complete.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	—	—	<u>X</u>	—
--	---	---	----------	---

11.b Less Than Significant. The project includes construction activities that may generate groundborne vibration and noise. These levels would not be significant because they would be short-term and temporary, and this area of the County is very rural.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
--	---	---	---	----------

11.c No Impact. The project would not create or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. The project site is in a rural area with low ambient noise levels.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
--	---	---	---	----------

11.d No Impact. See discussion under item 11.a, above.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such 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?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
---	---	---	---	----------

11.e No Impact. The site is not within an airport land use plan as designated by Sonoma County.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	—	—	—	<u>X</u>
--	---	---	---	----------

11.f No Impact. There are no known private airstrips within the vicinity of the proposed project.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial 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)?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

12.a No Impact. The project would not include construction of a substantial number of new residences or installation of new infrastructure, and therefore would not induce substantial population growth. Primary new infrastructure would consist of a private on-site well and septic system, which would be limited to serving only the residence on the project site. Project area densities would remain at 160 acres/residential unit.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
--	-------	-------	-------	--------------

12.b No Impact. The project would not displace any existing housing. No housing exists on the project site.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
---	-------	-------	-------	--------------

12.c No Impact. The project would not displace any people. No housing exists on the project site.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the project would not involve substantial adverse physical impacts associated with provision of government facilities, and the impact would be less than significant.

Residential development will be required to comply with County Fire Safe Standards to ensure adequate use of fire safe construction and in maintaining fire safe site conditions, including vegetation clearance around structures and provision of emergency water supplies. Fire protection services would be available through the Forestville Fire Protection Department, located approximately 12 minutes away from the project site. Backup fire service will be provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention.

Police protection?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
--------------------	-------	-------	--------------	-------

Less Than Significant Impact. The Sonoma County Sheriff and the California Highway Patrol will continue to provide law enforcement in the area.

Schools? _____ X _____

Less Than Significant Impact. The creation of one residential lot will not adversely impact local schools. Development fees to offset potential impacts to public services include school and park mitigation fees.

Parks? _____ X _____

Less Than Significant Impact. Development fees to offset potential impacts to public services include school and park mitigation fees. The project will not result in a substantial increased demand for public park facilities.

Other public facilities? _____ X _____

No Impact. No other public facility demands would be created by the project.

14. RECREATION

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? _____ X _____

14.a No Impact. The proposed project would not involve activities that would cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of parks or recreational facilities.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? _____ X _____

14.b No Impact. The proposed project does not involve construction of recreational facilities.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? _____ X _____

15.a Less Than Significant Impact. Using the screening criteria established by the County of Sonoma Guidelines for traffic studies, the project would not cause a significant traffic impact based on traffic contributed to the street system by the project.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated

roads or highways? _____ X

15.b No Impact. The project would not exceed the level of service (LOS) standard established by the County congestion management agency for any designated road or highway. Sonoma County General Plan Circulation and Transit Objective CT-2.1 is to maintain a LOS C or better on arterial and collector roadways. The addition of new vehicle trips from two primary residences would not alter existing Level of Service readings.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? _____ X

15.c No Impact. The project does not include or otherwise create the potential to alter air traffic patterns.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? _____ X

15.d Less Than Significant Impact. Development on the site would utilize Sweetwater Springs Road for access. The roadway already exists through the project site, and any driveway encroachments onto the Road would be required to meet County construction and safety criteria. There would be a less than significant impact relative to roadway hazards.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? _____ X

15.e No Impact. Development on the site must comply with all emergency access requirements of the Sonoma County Fire and Life Safety Code, including emergency vehicle access requirements. Project development plans are routinely reviewed by a Department of Emergency services Fire Inspector during the building permit process to ensure compliance with emergency access issues.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? _____ X

15.f No Impact. The project (each residential lot) will provide on-site parking spaces that meet or exceed County standards.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? _____ X

15.g No Impact. The project will not create conflicts with County bicycle standards or plans for use alternative transportation, including bus turnouts.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact Mitigation	Less than Significant with	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	----------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? _____ X

16.a No Impact. Domestic wastewater disposal will be by septic systems, and therefore will have no impact upon a wastewater treatment system, or require action by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? _____ X

Initial Study Checklist

Page 21

File No. MNS05-0048

16.c Less Than Significant impact. The project will not contribute to the need for construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, other than construction of new septic systems. Impacts of septic system construction are addressed throughout the Initial Study with other impacts of ground disturbance such as biology, cultural resources, geology, hazards, hydrology, etc. PRMD - Health, will impose standard conditions on the project requiring evidence of each lot to support a septic system prior to recordation of the Final Parcel Map. PRMD - Health, also is imposing standard conditions of approval regarding use and testing of the well to service any residences. No significant impacts will occur with the construction of well and septic systems.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? _____ X _____

16.c Less Than Significant Impact. Grading of the site will alter the natural topography and may alter the drainage pattern and increase storm water runoff. See item 1.d, above, for analysis of construction of storm drainage facilities. Impacts of storm water drainage facilities construction are addressed throughout the Initial Study with other impacts of ground disturbance such as biology, cultural resources, geology, hazards, hydrology, etc.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? _____ X _____

16.d Less Than Significant Impact. An assessment of water supply impacts was provided under item 8.b, above. Water will be supplied by an on-site well.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which 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? _____ X _____

16.e No Impact. A new septic system will be constructed for any residential development. There will be no sewage treatment by an off-site provider.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? _____ X _____

16.f No Impact. Sonoma County has access to adequate permitted landfill capacity to serve the proposed project.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? _____ X _____

16.g No Impact. There are no federal, state or local solid waste regulations that would significantly affect the project.

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Yes

No

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered

plant or animal or eliminate important examples
of the major periods of California history or prehistory? _____ X

17.a No Impact. The subdivision will not result in degradation to the quality of the environment or otherwise create a significant impact upon wildlife habitat or species, including species of special concern. A biological survey was conducted for the project, and no special status plant species were observed in the areas defined as the building envelopes. No impacts to wetlands habitat would occur due to likely locations of the building envelopes. The project includes a number of mitigation measures designed to limit site grading and other actions that may reduce vegetative cover of the property or impact the perennial stream crossing the project site. Based on the results of a cultural resources study, the project site would not create an impact to cultural or archaeological resources.

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)? _____ X

17.b No Impact. Potential impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable were identified in the area of construction site air quality. Mitigation is proposed that would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. The project would not have a significant adverse impact on groundwater supplies, utilizing water from the Sweetwater Springs Road Mutual Water Company.

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

17.c No Impact. Potential substantial adverse effects on human beings were identified in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and noise. Mitigation is proposed that would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. The project will not have a significant impact after mitigation is implemented.