

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION / INITIAL STUDY

Huntley Square
7950 Bodega Avenue

CITY OF SEBASTOPOL
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CITY HALL
7120 BODEGA AVENUE
SEBASTOPOL, CALIFORNIA 95472

September 27, 2021

I. Environmental Checklist Forms - Mitigated Negative Declaration

1. Project Title	Huntley Square
2. Lead Agency Name and Address	City of Sebastopol 7120 Bodega Avenue Sebastopol, CA 95472
3. Contact Person and Phone Number	Kari Svanstrom (707) 823-6167
4. Project Location	7950 Bodega Avenue Sebastopol, CA 95472
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address	Bob Massaro/Huntley Square LLC 630 Airpark Road, Suite A Napa, CA 94558
6. General Plan Designation	High Density Residential (HDR)
7. Zoning	R7 (Existing); PC (Proposed)
8. Description of Project	<p>The project proposes to construct two ownership residential buildings on a 0.39-acre parcel. Each building will include five studio “townhome” units for a total of ten units. All units will be under 600 sq. ft. Six of the units will include lofts, while the remaining four units will be single story units. The residential structures would be located along the southern two thirds of the property. The driveway entrance to the resident parking is off Golden Ridge Avenue across a deeded easement along the northern third of the property and includes 10 carport-covered parking spaces. The project includes nine parallel parking spaces on Bodega Avenue for guests. There will be a landscaped pedestrian access path going from Bodega Avenue that connects to a shared courtyard between the residential structures and to the resident parking area. The project will be designed to mitigate urban runoff and includes a Priority 1 Swale with Bioretention for on-site stormwater treatment so that overland runoff is minimized before being dissipated off-site.</p> <p>Currently, there are no sidewalks on the south side of Bodega Avenue and on a section of the north side of Bodega Avenue from 260 feet east of Pleasant Hill Avenue North to approximately 100 feet west of Golden Ridge Avenue. As part of the project improvements, Bodega</p>

	<p>Avenue will be widened along the project frontage to accommodate bike lanes, on-street parking, and a new sidewalk to fill this gap.</p> <p>The project includes multiple entitlements, which require hearings by different City bodies. The entitlements include: 1) a request to modify the zoning from R7 to a Planned Community; 2) a Use Permit; 3) a Tentative Map; 4) and Design Review.</p> <p>While much of the project conforms with the standards and context of the existing R7 zoning district, there are key elements essential to the configuration of proposed project that fall outside the parameters of the current R7 zoning standards. Specific changes that will enable development of project include subdividing with reduced minimum lot size, reduced setbacks and reduced minimum yards, including zero lot line construction, and reduced minimum usable private outdoor space requirements.</p> <p>The zoning change requires Planning Commission and City Council approval to ensure that it is consistent with General Plan land use goals and policies and will not negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood. The project will also require Design Review Board approval to ensure that it meets the City’s design objectives.</p>
<p>9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting</p>	<p>The property is one of the few remaining vacant parcels in an established residential neighborhood fronting on the north side of Bodega Avenue about a mile west of downtown Sebastopol. The tract on the south side of Bodega Avenue is the privately owned Sebastopol Memorial Lawn Cemetery. To the east of the cemetery is the City’s Burbank Farm historic site and city park and Burbank Heights & Orchards senior housing complex. The project site is presently notable for its elevation above the street level and the prominent embankment that interrupts the pedestrian sidewalk and supports a thick a cluster of mature oak trees. The neighborhood is notable for its residential environment amid a consistent canopy of mature trees, with small neighborhood commercial developments interspersed along the corridor. The surrounding properties are all residential in character occupied by one- and two-story structures. The current underlying zoning of the properties along the north side of Bodega Avenue is R7 Multifamily Residential, and within that district are several planned community developments. The adjacent parcel on the east side at 120-132 Golden Ridge Avenue is a planned community of six two-story townhome condominiums on small zero lot line lots with a common area. The adjacent parcel on the north side is</p>

	<p>also a planned community of seven one- and two-story condominium residences. The adjacent parcel on the west side is also occupied by several multiple family residences. There is another planned community of residential apartments on the north side of the block at 220 Golden Ridge Ave.</p>
<p>10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (Permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)</p>	<p>No outside public agency approval is required for the proposed project.</p>
<p>11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?</p>	<p>Yes, a referral letter and attachments were sent to the Tribal Heritage Preservation Office for the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria on April 6, 2021. No response has been received as of compiling this study.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Please see the checklist that follows for additional information.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input 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.



Kari Svanstrom, CEQA Coordinator

9/27/2021

Date

II. Project Description

The project proposes to construct two ownership residential buildings on a 0.39-acre parcel. Each building will include five studio “townhome” units for a total of ten units. All units will be under 600 sq. ft. Six of the units will include lofts, while the remaining four units will be single story units. The residential structures would be located along the southern two thirds of the property. The driveway entrance to the resident parking is off Golden Ridge Avenue across a deeded easement along the northern third of the property and includes 10 carport-covered parking spaces. The project includes nine parallel parking spaces on Bodega Avenue for guests. There will be a landscaped pedestrian access path going from Bodega Avenue that connects to a shared courtyard between the residential structures and to the resident parking area. The project will be designed to mitigate urban runoff and includes a Priority 1 Swale with Bioretention for on-site stormwater treatment so that overland runoff is minimized before being dissipated off-site.

Currently, there are no sidewalks on the south side of Bodega Avenue and on a section of the north side of Bodega Avenue from 260 feet east of Pleasant Hill Avenue North to approximately 100 feet west of Golden Ridge Avenue. As part of the project improvements, Bodega Avenue will be widened along the project frontage to accommodate bike lanes, on-street parking, and a new sidewalk to fill this gap.

The property is the last vacant parcel in an established residential neighborhood fronting on the north side of Bodega Avenue about a mile west of downtown Sebastopol. The tract on the south side of Bodega Avenue is the permanent open space of Sebastopol Memorial Lawn Cemetery. The project site is presently notable for its elevation above the street level and the prominent embankment that interrupts the pedestrian sidewalk and supports a thick a cluster of mature oak trees. The neighborhood is notable for its quiet residential environment amid a consistent canopy of mature trees. The surrounding properties are all residential in character occupied by one- and two-story structures. The current underlying zoning of the properties along the north side of Bodega Avenue is R7 Multifamily Residential, and within that district are several planned community developments. The adjacent parcel on the east side at 120-132 Golden Ridge Avenue is a planned community of six two-story townhome condominiums on small zero lot line lots with a common area. The adjacent parcel on the north side is also a planned community of seven one- and two-story condominium residences. The adjacent parcel on the west side is also occupied by several multiple family residences. There is another planned community of residential apartments on the north side of the block at 220 Golden Ridge Ave.

The applicant is requesting to modify the zoning from R7 to Planned Community. While much of the project conforms with the standards and context of the existing R7 zoning district, there are key elements essential to the configuration of proposed project that fall outside the parameters of the current R7 zoning standards. Specific changes that will enable development of project include subdividing with reduced minimum lot size, reduced setbacks and reduced minimum yards, including zero lot line construction, and reduced minimum usable private outdoor space requirements.

The zoning change requires Planning Commission and City Council approval to ensure that it is consistent with General Plan land use goals and policies and will not negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood. The project will also require Design Review Board approval to ensure that it meets the City’s design objectives.

The following pages contain images showing the existing and proposed conditions.

Existing Condition – Aerial View



Existing Condition – View from Bodega Avenue



III. Evaluation of Potential Environmental Impacts

I. **AESTHETICS:** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Discussion:

Items a & c: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

A scenic vista is a public view of a valued visual resource. Scenic vistas generally include public views that provide visual access to large panoramic views of natural features, unusual terrain, or unique urban or historic features, for which the field of view can be wide and extend into the distance, and focal views that focus on a particular object, scene, or feature of interest.

The proposed project will introduce residential development on a site that is currently vacant. The project site is surrounded by existing residential development to the north, east and west. The applicant is requesting to modify the zoning from R7 to Planned Community. The zoning change requires Planning Commission and City Council approval to ensure that it is consistent with General Plan land use goals and policies and will not negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood. The project will also require Design Review Board approval to ensure that it meets the City's design objectives.

The project site's High Density Residential (HDR) Land Use Designation is in accordance with the City's General Plan and will be in conformance with the Zoning Code upon adoption of the Planned Community rezone. Furthermore, consistency with the General Plan and compliance with the provisions of Zoning Ordinance are in place to guide future development in a manner that will result in less than significant impacts on the visual character of the area.

Visual resources are primarily limited to those located adjacent to the project site due to the existing developments in the surrounding areas. To the south of the project site is Sebastopol Memorial Lawn Cemetery, which is designated as Community Facility zoning. The project site is not viewable from any panoramic vistas located nearby. The increase in development at the project site would be difficult to discern within the greater fabric of the surrounding development. The two-story units would be similar in height as the existing adjacent development and would not interfere with skyline views that are available from neighboring parcels.

Construction activities generally cause a temporary contrast to, and disruption in, the general order and aesthetic character of an area. Although temporary in nature, construction activities may create a visually unappealing look on the project site. During construction activities for the project, the visual appearance of the site would be altered due to the presence of construction equipment and activities. Some of the activity would be visible from the roadway (Bodega Avenue) located to the south of the project site, as well as from neighboring parcels. However, temporary construction fencing would be placed along the periphery of the project site to screen much of the construction activity from view at the street level.

Overall, while affecting the visual character of the project area on a short-term basis, project construction activities would not substantially alter or degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and surrounding area, for the following reasons: 1) views of construction would be limited in duration and locations; 2) the project site appearance would be typical of construction sites in urban areas; 3) construction fencing would be placed along the periphery of the project site to screen much of the construction from view at street and bike path level.

Mitigation:

- AES-1: Construction fencing shall be placed along the periphery of the project site to screen construction activity from view.

Item b: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

The project site is not located along a state scenic highway. The nearest officially designated scenic highway (Highway 116) is 0.5 mile north of the project site, and views of the project site are not available from Highway 116; therefore, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources located within a state scenic highway.

The project site currently contains numerous mature trees including native coast live oaks. Six of the eight coast live oaks present are planned for removal, including several large trees of diameter at breast height (DBH) ranging from 21" to 42". Two apple trees will also be removed. Other trees may be damaged by grading and construction. All trees on the project site are regulated under the City's Tree Protection Ordinance, which includes trees on a Protected Native Tree list with a DBH of 10" or greater, or any tree with a DBH of 20" or greater (except those identified as "escaped exotics"). Most of the trees proposed for removal meet these criteria for protection, so proposed removals will require a permit from the City with review by the Tree Board, and replacement trees or fees as determined by the Tree Board. Impacts are expected to be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measure BIO-3, detailed in Section IV. Biological Resources. Additionally, any impacts to off-site trees from the project would require a Tree Permit, which requires authorization from the property owner as well as the project advocate.

Item d: Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will include exterior lighting typical of residential developments such as LED wall lights and address numbers, which will be reviewed by the Design Review Board to ensure that there is no substantial increase in light levels on adjacent properties and to minimize overspill and impacts on the night sky. As a standard condition of approval, all lighting will also be required to be dark-sky compliant. No substantial light or glare will result, and impacts will be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 nonagricultural 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"/>

Discussion:

Item a: No Impact.

The project site is located at the edge of an urbanized area within the City of Sebastopol. As discussed in the project description, the project site is surrounded on three sides by existing residential development. No agricultural uses or operations occur on the site or in the vicinity of the project site. The project site and surrounding area are also not mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and

Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency Department of Conservation. As such, the project would not convert farmland to a nonagricultural use. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

Item b: No Impact.

The project site is currently zoned by the City of Sebastopol as multifamily residential. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use. Furthermore, none of the surrounding properties are zoned for agricultural use. The project site and surrounding area are also not enrolled under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act Contract. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

Item c: No Impact.

As previously discussed, the project site is located in an urbanized area surrounded by residential development. The project site is currently zoned for residential use and is not zoned and/or use as forest land. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland as defined by the Public Resources Code. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

Item d: No Impact.

As previously discussed, the project site is located within an urbanized area, zoned as multi-family residential, and does not include any forest land or timberland. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

Item e: No impact.

The project site is located in an urbanized area of the City of Sebastopol and does not include farmland. The project site and surrounding area are not mapped as farmland, are not zoned as farmland or agricultural use, and do not contain any agricultural uses. As such, the project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project site is in central/southern Sonoma County, where air quality is regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The region is designated as nonattainment for the federal and state ozone standards, the state PM10 standards, and the federal and state PM2.5 standards. The region is designated as attainment or unclassified for all other ambient air quality standards. BAAQMD prepares air quality plans (AQPs) that include projected emissions inventories and account for emission reductions strategies to demonstrate how the region will achieve the ambient air quality standards by the given deadlines.

Item a: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not exceed thresholds of significance of the BAAQMD, nor will it obstruct air quality plans. Impacts will be less than significant.

Item b: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

The project will not violate any BAAQMD standard, nor will it contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The project would result in increased air pollutant emissions from the project site during construction (short-term) and operation (long-term). Construction-related pollutants would be associated with sources such as construction worker vehicle trips, the operation of construction equipment, site grading and preparation activities, and the application of architectural coatings. During project operation, air pollutants would be minimal and would mainly be associated with pollutants emitted daily from motor vehicle travel. With incorporation of mitigation measure AQ-1, the project will have a less than significant impact as it relates to community risk caused by constructions activities.

Mitigation:

- AQ-1: Basic measures to control dust and exhaust shall be utilized during construction. During any construction period ground disturbance, the applicant shall ensure that the project contractor implement measures to control dust and exhaust. Implementation of the measures recommended by BAAQMD and listed below would reduce the air quality impacts associated with grading and new construction to a less than significant level. The contractor shall implement the following best management practices that are required of all projects:
 - All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, and 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 week. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
 - All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph).
 - All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- 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.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the City regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Item c: Less Than Significant Impact.

Operational-period emissions for the project would be less than significant due to its size and nature. The project would not 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).

Item d: Less Than Significant Impact.

Sensitive receptors are groups of individuals, including children, the elderly, the acutely ill, and the chronically ill, that may be more susceptible to health risks due to chemical exposure, and sensitive-receptor population groups are likely to be located at hospitals, medical clinics, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, residences, and retirement homes. There are no existing senior residential apartments, schools, day care centers, playgrounds, hospitals, or medical clinics adjacent to the project site. On the north, east and west there are multifamily residential developments, including a senior housing complex (Burbank Heights). The proposed project is a residential development, and there will not be any on-site Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) emission sources during operation. Because most passenger vehicles are gasoline-combusted, the project would not generate significant amount of Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) emissions during operation. Therefore, the project would not result in significant health impacts on sensitive receptors during operation.

Item e: Less Than Significant Impact.

Land uses typically considered to be associated with odors include wastewater treatment facilities, waste-disposal facilities, or agricultural operations. The project does not contain land uses typically associated with emitting objectionable odors. During operation of the project, odors would primarily consist of vehicles traveling to and from the project site. Diesel exhaust and volatile organic compounds would be emitted during construction of the project, which are objectionable to some; however, emissions would disperse rapidly from the project site and therefore would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. As such, construction odor impacts would be less than significant. These occurrences would not produce significant odors; therefore, operational impacts would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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?	<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, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Discussion:

The responses to the biological resources questions are based upon findings within the Biological Resources Assessment prepared by Prunuske Chatham, Inc. (PCI) in August 2021, included as Exhibit A, the Tree Preservation and Mitigation Report prepared by John C. Meserve in August 2020, included as Exhibit B, and Peer Review of the Tree Preservation and Mitigation Report prepared by Ben Anderson in September 2021, included as Exhibit C.

The Biological Resources Assessment describes biological resources observed on the site, reviews potential for special-status species occurrence, and provides general recommendations

to protect biological resources during project implementation. The assessment determined the impacts of the proposed project on sensitive biological resources and whether there are any biological constraints associated with the proposed project.

Items a, b & d: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

In California, special-status plants and animals include those species that are afforded legal protection under the federal and California Endangered Species Acts (ESA and CESA, respectively) and other regulations. These species must be considered during project evaluation to comply with CEQA, during consultation with State and federal resources agencies, and in development of specific mitigation and avoidance measures for resource protection.

Special-status species were evaluated for their potential to occur within the project site, and the findings are detailed below.

Special-status Plants

Based on a background literature review, a number of special-status species were identified as having the potential to occur within the project vicinity. Based on a field assessment of the suitability of habitat within the project site completed on July 7, 2021, in combination with the proximity of recorded sightings, no special-status plant species were found to have potential to occur, and none were observed. The site's highly disturbed nature and urban setting strongly limit plant diversity. No mitigation measures are recommended.

Special-status Animals

Based on the background literature review, a number of special-status animal species were identified as having the potential to occur within the project vicinity. Based on a field assessment of the suitability of habitat within the project site completed on July 7, 2021 and surrounding lands and proximity of recorded sightings, these species were evaluated for potential occurrence. Species known from the region but with limited or no potential for occurrence within the project site due to the lack of suitable habitat or those species not formally listed are not described further.

The background review identified two special-status bat species, one amphibian, and one mammal. Additional special-status aquatic species, California freshwater shrimp, California red-legged frog, coho salmon, green turtle, western pond turtle, are reported in the vicinity of the project; however, suitable aquatic habitat is not present within the project site. Additional bird species of concern are reported for the project site. Some of these species may occur within the project site on a regular basis (i.e., Allen's hummingbird, Nuttall's woodpecker, oak titmouse, wrentit) and others are highly unlikely. Vegetation removal and/or construction activities in areas with suitable nesting habitat during the breeding period, typically mid-February to mid-August in this area, could result in nest abandonment or loss of native nesting birds. Impacts are expected to be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2.

Mitigation:

- BIO-1: Special-status and Common Bats

To avoid impacts on special-status and common bat species within the project site, the following protection measures shall be implemented.

Prior to tree removal or trimming (for all trees greater than 6 inches DBH), a qualified biologist shall survey for bat roosts. If active bat roosts area identified, disturbance shall not be allowed until the roost is abandoned or unoccupied. If

the qualified biologist determines special-status bat species area present, CDFW consultation may be required.

If occupied roosting habitat is identified by the qualified biologist, disturbance of roost trees shall not be allowed until the roost is abandoned or unoccupied and/or CDFW is consulted. If bats are present, a number of deterrent methods can be used to encourage bats to relocate (for non-CDFW listed species). This could include changes to lighting, air flow patterns, and noise disturbance. Exclusion methods shall be developed based on the species present and location of occupied roosts. Bat exclusion shall not be performed during the maternity season (June through August) or during winter hibernation (November through February). Bat exclusion shall be overseen by a qualified biologist. This could only occur in March, April, May, September, and October.

If tree trimming or removal is postponed or interrupted for more than two weeks from the date of the initial bat survey, the biologist shall repeat the pre-construction survey.

Construction shall be limited to daylight hours to avoid interference with the foraging abilities of bats and other nocturnal wildlife.

- BIO-2: Nesting Birds

To the extent feasible, vegetation and tree removal shall occur during the non-breeding season (late August to early March) to limit the potential for birds to nest within the project site.

To avoid potential losses of nesting native birds, if work occurs from February through August, preconstruction breeding bird surveys shall be completed for special-status, migratory birds, and raptors. The preconstruction surveys shall be conducted within two weeks prior to initiation of vegetation clearing, tree removal and trimming, or other construction related activities within vegetated areas. The survey shall be completed within the construction area and an appropriate buffer around it.

- If the biologist finds no active nesting or breeding activity, then work can proceed without restrictions.
- If active raptor or owl nests are identified within 100 feet of the construction area or active nests of other birds are identified within 50 feet of the construction area, a qualified biologist shall determine whether or not construction activities may impact the active nest or disrupt reproductive behavior. If it is determined that construction would not affect an active nest or disrupt breeding behavior, construction can proceed without restrictions. The determination of disruption shall be based on the species' sensitivity to disturbance (which can vary among species); the level of noise or construction disturbance and the line of sight between the nest and the disturbance.
- If a qualified biologist determines that construction activities would likely disrupt breeding or nesting activities, then a no-disturbance buffer shall be placed around the nesting location. The no-disturbance buffer shall include the active nest or breeding areas plus a 50-foot buffer for small

songbirds and a 100-foot buffer for larger birds (e.g., raptors, owls); buffer distances are applicable for urban settings with existing levels of human disturbance. Construction activities in the no disturbance buffers shall be avoided until the nests have been vacated.

- If the site is left unattended for more than one week following the initial surveys, additional surveys shall be completed. If state and/or federally listed birds are found breeding within the area, activities shall be halted, and consultation with the CDFW and USFWS should occur to identify how to proceed.

Item c: No Impact.

The project site is outside of the wetlands area shown in the City's adopted Laguna Wetlands Preserve Restoration and Management Plan. No grading, separation, fill or removal of wetlands is associated with the project.

Item e: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

The project site currently contains numerous mature trees including native coast live oaks. Six of the eight coast live oaks present are planned for removal, including several large trees of diameter at breast height (DBH) ranging from 21" to 42". Two apple trees will also be removed. Other trees may be damaged by grading and construction. All trees on the project site are regulated under the City's Tree Protection Ordinance, which includes trees on a Protected Native Tree list with a DBH of 10" or greater, or any tree with a DBH of 20" or greater (except those identified as "escaped exotics"). Most of the trees proposed for removal meet these criteria for protection, so proposed removals will require a permit from the City with review by the Tree Board, and replacement trees or fees as determined by the Tree Board or City Arborist. Impacts are expected to be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measure BIO-3.

Mitigation:

- BIO-3: Native Trees

Where compatible with safety requirements, pruning instead of removal for mature oaks shall be considered. To offset the impacts from removal of protected trees, replacement trees shall be planted, following the Tree Ordinance ratios and species with replacement of native oaks with native oaks, to provide similar benefits to the site and community. If on-site planting of an adequate number of native trees is not possible, off-site planting of native oaks in a suitable nearby location (e.g., a City park) shall be considered.

Protective measures defined in the Tree Preservation and Mitigation Report shall be followed during construction activities to minimize impacts to trees that will be retained.

Item f: No Impact.

The project site is within an urbanized area and is not located within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 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"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The responses to the cultural resources questions are based upon findings within the Cultural Resources Study (CRS) completed by Evans & De Shazo, Inc. (EDS) in July 2021, included as Exhibit D.

Items a, b, c & d: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

NWIC/CHRIS Record Search

EDS completed a record search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information Systems (CHRIS) on July 1, 2021 (NWIC File No. 20-2451). This included a review of previous cultural resource studies and primary resource records pertaining to properties located within 0.5 miles of the project area, as well as additional documentation pertaining to listed or eligible cultural resources located in the vicinity. The NWIC/CHRIS record search indicates that the project area has not been subject to a previous cultural resource survey; however there have been 15 previous cultural resource studies completed within 0.5-mile of the project area. Four cultural resources have been identified within 0.5 miles of the project area including one contemporary obsidian workshop, one prehistoric archaeological resource, and two historic built-environment resources. The Built Environment Resource Directory (BERD) was also reviewed to identify built-environment resources near the project area. The BERD lists 19 resources along Bodega Avenue. There are four properties in Sebastopol that are listed on the NRHP, including the Luther Burbank's Experimental Farm and Cottage, approximately 975 feet southeast of the project area.

Review of Geology, Soils, and Geoarchaeological Information

EDS reviewed geological and soil/sediment studies in the region and a regional geoarchaeological study (Meyer and Rosenthal 2007) that focuses on landform evolution and the potential/sensitivity for encountering archaeological resources, in order to assess the project area's potential/sensitivity for buried prehistoric archaeological resources.

The review of geological maps, soil maps, and regional geoarchaeological study indicates that the project area has a low potential/sensitivity for containing buried prehistoric archaeological

resources based on the Pliocene (5.333 million to 2.58 million years ago) and Miocene age (23.03 to 5.333 million years ago) of the landform on which the project area is situated, and the presence of residuum soils that lack buried A horizons (paleosols).

Review of Historical Maps, Aerial Photographs, and Other Documents

EDS reviewed various historical maps and aerial photographs dating from 1867 to 1980, as well as other documents to determine past land use activities within the project area that could indicate the likelihood of encountering historic-period archaeological resources, as well as researching for any historical persons associated with the project area. The detailed results of this review are presented in Exhibit D.

The review of historical maps, aerials, and other information indicates that the project area was part of *Rancho Cañada de Jonive* that was owned by James Black from 1845 until 1848, then Jasper O'Farrell from 1848 to ca. 1860. By 1867, the project area was part of a 120-acre parcel owned by J.H.P. Morris, one of the first settlers of Sebastopol. By 1877, the project area was part of a 76-acre property owned by A. Crawford, until 1882, when the land was purchased by George Washington Huntley. Huntley used the land to grow a variety of fruit trees and berries. George died in 1901, and it is not known who owned the land after his death. By 1952, one building had been constructed within the project area, which appears to have been a house. By 1993, the building was no longer present. Based on the agricultural use of the project area during most of the historic-period and the lack of buildings within the project area until ca. 1950, it was determined that the project area has a low potential/sensitivity to contain buried historic-period archaeological resources.

Pedestrian Field Survey

A Secretary of Interior-qualified archaeologist with EDS conducted a pedestrian field survey to physically inspect the project area for potentially significant cultural resources. The surveyor examined the ground surface for evidence of cultural materials and changes in soil color, texture, or composition. This included examining the ground surface for any prehistoric artifacts and sediment discolorations that could indicate the presence of prehistoric-era cultural features. Additionally, the field surveyor inspected the project area for evidence of historic-era artifacts; features such as alignments of stone or brick, foundation elements from previous structures; minor earthworks; and historic-era plantings.

The pedestrian survey did not result in the identification of any prehistoric artifacts or changes in soil color, texture, or composition that could indicate the presence of prehistoric-era cultural features; however, one fragment of a saw-cut rib bone (possibly domestic sheep or pig), a concrete perimeter foundation and various construction materials, and two apple trees were identified within the project area. These historic-period resources were determined ineligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) and are not considered historically significant in accordance with CCR § 15064.5 or PRC § 5020.1(k).

In conclusion, the CRS did not result in the identification of any significant cultural resources that have the potential to be impacted by the proposed project. No project-specific recommendations are warranted at this time; however, general recommendations are provided in the (low potential) event that buried archaeological resources are encountered during earthmoving activities.

Sacred Lands Inventory and Tribal Outreach

EDS performed a Sacred Lands inventory and conducted outreach with each tribal organization and individual on the Native American contact list provided by the Native American Heritage

Commission (NAHC). This is discussed in more detail in Section XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources.

Mitigation

- CR-1: Post-Review Discovery

If a prehistoric or historic-era resource(s) is encountered by equipment operators during project-related ground-disturbing activities, work shall be halted within 50-feet of the discovery area until a Secretary of Interior-qualified Archaeologist is retained to inspect the material and provide further recommendations for appropriate treatment of the resource.

- CR-2: Human Remains

If human remains are encountered within the project area, all work shall stop within 100-feet of the discovery area, the area shall be secured to prevent further disturbance, and the Sonoma County Coroner shall be notified immediately. The Coroner will determine if the remains are pre-contact period Native American remains or of modern origin and if there are any further investigation by the Coroner or Sonoma County Sheriff is warranted. If the remains are suspected to be those of a pre-contact period Native American, the Coroner shall contact the NAHC by telephone within 24-hours. The NAHC will immediately notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendant (MLD) of the remains. The MLD has 48-hours to make recommendations to the landowner for treatment or disposition of the human 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 further disturbance. If the landowner does not accept the descendant's recommendations, the owner or the descendant may request mediation by NAHC. According to the California Health and Safety Code, six (6) or more human burials at one (1) location constitute a cemetery (Section 8100), and willful disturbance of human remains is a felony (Section 7052). An archaeologist shall also be retained to evaluate the historical significance of the discovery, the potential for additional remains, and to provide further recommendations for treatment of the site in coordination with the MLD.

VI. ENERGY: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:**Items a & b: Less Than Significant Impact.**

The means to achieve the goal of conserving energy include decreasing overall energy consumption, decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources.

Construction

Construction of the project would result in fuel consumption from construction tools and equipment, vendor and haul truck trips, and vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the project site. Construction activities and corresponding fuel energy consumption would be temporary and localized. The use of diesel fuel and heavy-duty equipment would not be a typical operational condition of the project. Construction equipment used during the construction phase would conform to CARB regulations and California emissions standards and is evidence of related fuel efficiencies. There are no unusual project characteristics that would cause the use of construction equipment that would be less energy efficient compared with other similar construction sites in other parts of the State. Therefore, the project's construction-related fuel consumption would not result in inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary energy use compared with other construction sites in the region.

The project would comply with applicable CARB regulation regarding retrofitting, repowering, or replacement of diesel off - road construction equipment. Additionally, CARB has adopted the Airborne Toxic Control Measure to limit heavy - duty diesel motor vehicle idling in order to reduce public exposure to diesel particulate matter and other Toxic Air Contaminants. Compliance with these measures would result in a more efficient use of construction related energy and would minimize or eliminate wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy. Idling restrictions and the use of newer engines and equipment would result in less fuel combustion and energy consumption.

Additionally, as required by California Code of Regulations Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling, limits idling times of construction vehicles to no more than five minutes, thereby minimizing or eliminating unnecessary and wasteful consumption of fuel due to unproductive idling of construction equipment. Enforcement of idling limitations is realized through periodic site inspections conducted by City building officials, and/or in response to citizen complaints.

Operations

Energy consumption related to project operations would include typical transportation energy demands (energy consumed by resident, visitor, and delivery vehicles accessing the project site) and typical residential energy demands.

The project is required to comply with the California Green Building Standard Code (CalGreen) requirements for energy efficient buildings and appliances, including Tier 1 standards required by the City of Sebastopol (which are higher than the base State requirements for green design). Additionally, the City of Sebastopol has mandatory solar photovoltaic system requirements the project must comply with. CalGreen Standards require that buildings reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant - emitting finish materials. The project also incorporates many sustainable features which help reduce energy consumption, such as:

- A highly insulated, tightly sealed building envelope, with heat recovery fresh air ventilation

- High quality windows
- Solar photovoltaic system
- LED lighting throughout
- Energy efficient appliances and low flow water fixtures
- Durable and low maintenance exterior materials
- There will be No Natural Gas installed at the site, which coupled with the solar array will push the project to true “Zero Net Energy” which are homes that produce as much energy as they consume

As demonstrated in Section VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the project would be consistent with the applicable strategies of the City’s General Plan. The proposed project would not violate local, State, or federal energy standards and/or result in significant adverse impacts related to project energy requirements, energy inefficiencies, energy intensiveness of materials, cause significant impacts on local and regional energy supplies or generate requirements for additional capacity, fail to comply with existing energy standards, otherwise result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources, or conflict or create an inconsistency with applicable plan, policy, or regulation.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Discussion:

The responses to the geology and soils questions are based in part upon findings within the Soil Engineering Consultations prepared by Reese & Associates in October 2015 (Exhibit E) and August 2020 (Exhibit F), and the Initial Storm Water Low Impact Development Submittal prepared by Robertson Engineering, Inc. in May 2020 (Exhibit G). The applicant will be required to submit a detailed soils report certified by an engineer registered in the State of California and qualified to perform soils work to the City for its review. The soils report would include geotechnical investigation with details on liquefaction, expansive soils, and seismic safety. Site preparation and construction would be required to comply with the recommendations identified in the report and by the City Engineer.

Item a.i: Less Than Significant Impact.

The geologic maps reviewed as part of the Soil Engineering Consultation did not indicate the presence of active faults at the project site, and the property is not located within a presently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Therefore, there is little risk of fault-related ground rupture during earthquakes. In a seismically active region such as Northern California, there is always some possibility for future faulting at any site. Because the site will be subject to strong ground shaking during earthquakes, it will be necessary to design the project in strict accordance with current standards for earthquake-resistant construction and procedures outlined in Section 1613 of the 2019 California Building Code (CBC).

Item a.ii: Less Than Significant Impact.

The Healdsburg-Rodgers Creek and the San Andreas Fault, which are the nearest active faults, are located approximately 8 miles northeast and 12 miles southeast of Sebastopol, respectively. The project site would be subjected to very strong ground-shaking during a major to moderate earthquake along these faults. It is reasonable to assume on the basis of current technology and historical evidence that the project site will be subjected to at least one moderate to severe earthquake that could produce potentially damaging ground shaking. It is also anticipated that the project site will periodically experience small to moderate magnitude earthquakes; however, adherence to the CBC will reduce potential impacts from seismic activity at the project site to a less than significant level.

Item a.iii: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is located in an area with low to very low susceptibility to liquefaction according to the Hazard Viewer Map¹ as published by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission / Association of Bay Area Governments. The new buildings will be developed to address potential impacts from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, and will be required to comply with current CBC seismic safety standards.

¹ <https://abag.ca.gov/our-work/resilience/data-research/hazard-viewer>

Item a.iv: Less Than Significant Impact.

There are no identified landslide hazards on the project site. The project site consists of predominantly flat terrain with an approximate eleven (11) foot elevation change along the frontage, placing the project approximately 9' above the proposed sidewalk grade. To improve site drainage frontage access, the sloped area will be excavated and a 6-8' tall retaining wall along Bodega Avenue will be constructed.

Item b: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site does not contain any streams or rivers, and the existing drainage sheet flows from the center of the site in a northeasterly and southeasterly direction. With proper site grading and subgrade preparation, the potential for erosion or siltation on- or off-site will be very low. Final elevations on the project site will be planned so that drainage is directed away from all foundations. The parking area will be sloped, and drainage gradients maintained to carry all surface water off site. Ponding of water or concentrated seepage will not be permitted under buildings, adjacent to the foundation systems, or under paved areas. Final grading plans will be reviewed by the City Engineer prior to project approval and issuance of grading and building permits. The applicant will be required to submit an erosion control plan as part of the Improvement Plan submittal, as conditioned by the Engineering Department.

Item c: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project. The soils underlying the project site are considered adequate for the support of the proposed units.

Item d: No Impact.

The project site is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code.

Item e: No Impact.

The project will be connected to the City's wastewater system.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

Discussion:

Items a & b: Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is consistent with the 2016 City of Sebastopol General Plan. The greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions anticipated by the implementation of the General Plan fall

below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas emissions.

Additionally, the General Plan incorporates provisions to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In 2016, the City of Sebastopol partnered with the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority (RCPA) to produce personalized goals that will reduce greenhouse gases in each city and town as part of the Climate Action Plan 2020 (CAP). Most of the policies in the CAP are related to transportation, “green building”, energy efficiency, and renewable energy. The CAP is not included in the General Plan itself, but integrates the strategies and actions identified in the relevant elements of the General Plan. The Project incorporates many of the sustainable features which help reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as:

- A highly insulated, tightly sealed building envelope, with heat recovery fresh air ventilation
- High quality windows
- Solar photovoltaic system
- LED lighting throughout
- Energy efficient appliances and low flow water fixtures
- Durable and low maintenance exterior materials
- There will be No Natural Gas installed at the site, which coupled with the solar array will push the project to true “Zero Net Energy” which are homes that produce as much energy as they consume

The proposed project would comply with Green Building Code requirements, would have a less than significant impact on the environment, and would have no impact on implementation of plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The responses to the hazards and hazardous materials questions are based in part upon findings within the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment prepared by Environmental Geology Services (EGS) in August 2015 (Exhibit H) and the Limited Phase 2 Investigation prepared by Environmental Geology Services in October 2015 (Exhibit I).

The Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment determined there were no active or historical environmental investigations documented at the project site. As part of the records review, EGS researched the California State Geotracker Database and the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Database to identify current or historic environmental concerns at or near the project site, and found no investigations reported. The only investigation within 1,000 feet of the project site appears on the Geotracker Database as follows:

- 1) Fujihara & Zettler Properties, located at 8031 Bodega Avenue, approximately 500 feet west of the project site, Geotracker Global ID T0609700397, former UST site, case closed as of June 19, 1996.

Based on site research, file reviews, site reconnaissance, and in accordance with the US EPA's All Appropriate Inquiries (AAI) and ASTM E1527-13 Standard of Practice, EGS provided the following conclusions:

- **Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC)²:** There were no REC's observed on or nearby the project site;

² The terms Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC), Historical REC's (HREC's), Controlled REC's (CREC's), migrate/migration (related to VEC's), and de minimis conditions are defined, pursuant to the ASTM E1527-13 Standard of Practice, in section 2.1.1 of the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment.

- **Historical REC's (HREC's):** There were no HREC's observed on or nearby the project site;
- **Controlled REC's (CREC's):** There were no CREC's observed on or nearby the project site;
- **Vapor Encroachment Conditions (VEC's):** There were no VEC's observed on or nearby the project site;
- **De minimus Conditions:** Since the project site was vacant at the time of inspection, EGS did not observe conditions that would be considered *de minimus*.

EGS concluded that under the US EPA's All Appropriate Inquiry rule and the ASTM E1527-13 Standard of Practice (discussed further in Section 2.1 of Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment), there were no current conditions observed at this site, and adjacent sites, at the time of their site reconnaissance that were indicative of an existing release, a past release or a material threat of a release of hazardous substances including petroleum products to the environment.

Based on EGS's property inspection, it appears that there has been some dumping of soil and other construction debris on the project site. Since the source of this soil and debris is unknown, there is a potential that this material may be impacted with residual contaminants. Based on a historic review of the property, an orchard was located on the site dating back to at least 1942. Since there had been an older orchard on the site, there is a potential for residual pesticide and/or herbicide contamination to shallow soils. EGS recommended that since the site was a former, older orchard, conducting shallow soil sampling should be conducted on the project site for analysis of pesticides and herbicides, and, since there has been dumping on the project site by and from an unknown source, these soils should be sampled to identify potential contaminants.

EGS conducted a Limited Phase 2 Investigation to perform the recommended soil sampling and laboratory analysis and found the following:

There were no detections of compounds analyzed for in the composite soil samples collected from the soil stockpiles on site. The concentrations of metals detected appear to be within background levels for this region with the exception of lead. However, the concentration of lead detected (30 mg/kg or parts per million, ppm) is below the State Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Environmental Screening Level (ESL) for lead which is 80 ppm. The level of pH detected was low (5.81) but not considered to be harmful to human health.

There were no detections of herbicides or arsenic in the composite upper soil samples collected from the former orchard area of the site. Additionally, there were no detections of pesticides from the composite upper soil samples collected from the former orchard area of the site with the exception of 4,4-DDE at a concentration of 2.5 ug/kg (or parts per billion, ppb) and 4,4-DDT at a concentration of 3.4 ppb. However, the concentration of DDE and DDT are well below the State RWQCB ESL for these compounds which is 1.7 ppm.

Based on EGS's review, the analytical results of soil samples collected from the subject property were favorable, and additional investigation of the project site is not warranted at this time.

Item a: No Impact.

The residential nature of the proposed project will not involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous resources on a commercial scale. Households would use chemically based products and pesticides in small amounts, which may be defined as hazardous. A Condition of Approval has been added which requires the CC&Rs for this development to include details regarding the maintenance of common and/or private open space located on the project site, which must also include a prohibition of the use of nonbiodegradable and toxic chemicals in maintenance of both common and private open space areas.

Item b: No Impact.

The residential nature of the proposed project will not involve uses that could potentially produce accident conditions that could cause a release of hazardous materials.

Item c: No Impact.

While the project site is less than a quarter mile south of Brook Haven School, there are no uses associated with the proposed project that produce, use, or transport hazardous materials, so no impact upon the school would result.

Item d: No Impact.

The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

Item e & f: No Impact.

The project site is not located within an area subject to an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport, nor in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The closest airport is the Charles M. Schulz – Sonoma County Airport located approximately seven miles from the project site. Given the distance between the project site and the Sonoma County Airport, the project would not have the potential to result in a safety hazard, and no impact would occur.

Item g: No Impact.

The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the City or County’s adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The City’s Police and Fire Departments have reviewed the application and reported no concerns with emergency vehicle access, detailed in Section XVI. Transportation/Traffic, item e.

Item h: No Impact.

The project site is not located in a Wildland Urban Interface Zone.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The responses to the geology and soils questions are based in part upon findings within the Soil Engineering Consultations prepared by Reese & Associates in October 2015 (Exhibit E) and August 2020 (Exhibit F), and the Initial Storm Water Low Impact Development Submittal prepared by Robertson Engineering, Inc. in May 2020 (Exhibit G). The applicant will be required to submit a detailed soils report certified by an engineer registered in the State of California and qualified to perform soils work to the City for its review. The soils report would include geotechnical investigation with details on liquefaction, expansive soils, and seismic safety. Site preparation and construction would be required to comply with the recommendations identified in the report and by the City Engineer.

Items a & f: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site has no existing natural water features. The project will be required to meet all City of Sebastopol urban runoff/storm water requirements as set forth in the Municipal Code and in addition may be required to obtain a Construction General Storm Water Permit from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board to ensure compliance with State requirements.

Item b: Less Than Significant Impact.

The City's Public Works Department produces an annual Level of Service (LOS) Report which includes statistics for water production, usage, and wastewater flow. The report also contains information about groundwater levels in City wells. The total annual water production was approximately 27% of maximum potential production in 2019, according to the LOS Report. Sebastopol's water demand remains significantly lower than when production peaked at 500 million gallons in 2004. The estimated water demand from projects currently approved by the City but not yet constructed (including Huntley Square) is 6.4 million gallons per year. This represents the equivalent of approximately 2% of total production in 2019. The water demand for projects pending approval is estimated at an additional 1.5 million gallons per year. This is equivalent to an additional 0.5% of 2019 annual production. There is substantial remaining production capacity sufficient to accommodate the proposed project. The City has determined that there is adequate water system capacity, production, and distribution to accommodate this project. Additionally, the City of Sebastopol is part of the Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) which is one of three new GSAs created to manage groundwater in Sonoma County as required by the State of Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.

The City of Sebastopol has an adopted Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance which the project must comply with. These standards help to minimize on-going use of water resources for landscaping.

Items c, d & e: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site does not contain any streams or rivers, and the existing drainage sheet flows from the center of the site in a northeasterly and southeasterly direction. With proper site grading and subgrade preparation, the potential for erosion or siltation on- or off-site will be very low. Final elevations on the project site will be planned so that drainage is directed away from all foundations. The parking area will be sloped, and drainage gradients maintained to carry all surface water off site. Ponding of water or concentrated seepage will not be permitted under buildings, adjacent to the foundation systems, or under paved areas. Final grading plans will be reviewed by the City Engineer prior to project approval and issuance of building permits. The applicant will be required to submit an erosion control plan as part of the Improvement Plan submittal, as conditioned by the Engineering Department.

The project will be designed to mitigate urban runoff and include storm-water control measures consistent with state and local regulations. This includes a Priority 1 Swale with Bioretention for on-site stormwater treatment so that overland runoff is minimized before being dissipated off-site. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, nor will it 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.

Items g & h: No Impact.

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.

Item i: No Impact.

The project site is not located downstream from a levee or dam.

Item j: No Impact.

The project site is not located in an area that is susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Item a: No Impact.

The project is an infill development within an urbanized area of Sebastopol, and therefore will not physically divide an established community.

Item b: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project includes multiple entitlements, which require hearings by different City bodies. The entitlements include: 1) a request to modify the zoning from R7 to a Planned Community; 2) a Use Permit; 3) a Tentative Map; 4) Design Review; and 5) Environmental Review (California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA review).

General Plan Consistency

The General Plan Land Use Designation for the site is High Density Residential (HDR). The General Plan states that the HDR designation includes “areas suitable for multifamily dwellings at a density of 12.1 to 25 units per acre. This designation is suitable for duplexes, apartments, townhouses, and other attached dwelling units.” The project is consistent with the intention of the HDR designation in that the project is proposing ten (10) studio units that are less than 600 sq. ft. and therefore count as .5 of a dwelling unit. Based on five (5) dwelling units the density per acre would be equivalent to 12.8 units per acre, which is consistent with the HDR Land Use Designation.

Zoning Ordinance Consistency

The applicant is requesting to modify the zoning from R7 to Planned Community. The purpose of Planned Community zoning is to allow for comprehensively designed and well-planned residential developments. The goal is to create an integrated community wherein all land uses are planned and designed in a comprehensive “master plan” approach, including shared access and roadways, open space, infrastructure, architecture, and landscaping. While much of the project conforms with the standards and context of the existing R7 zoning district, there are key elements essential to the configuration of proposed project that fall outside the parameters of the current R7 zoning standards. Specific changes that will enable development of project include subdividing with reduced minimum lot size, reduced setbacks and reduced minimum yards, including zero lot line construction, and reduced minimum usable private outdoor space requirements.

The zoning change requires Planning Commission and City Council approval to ensure that it is consistent with General Plan land use goals and policies and will not negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood. The project will also require Design Review Board approval to ensure that it meets the City’s design objectives. With these approvals, impacts will be less than significant.

Item c: No Impact.

The City has not adopted a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan applicable to the project site.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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?	<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"/>

Discussion:

Items a & b: No Impact.

There are no known mineral resources at the project site and there are no locally important mineral resource recovery sites delineated in the General Plan.

XIII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<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 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"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:**Items a, b & c: Less Than Significant Impact.**

Long-term operation of the project would result in typical noise generated by a residential development. The City's Noise Ordinance states that noise levels in a residential zone shall not exceed 55 dBA during daytime hours or 45 dBA during nighttime hours. Based on the location and residential nature of the project, it will not result in noise levels that would contribute substantially to the noise environment. The project will not be a significant noise generator and therefore impacts will be less than significant.

Items d: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

Construction activities generally are temporary and have a short duration, resulting in periodic increases in the ambient noise environment. Construction would be limited to the permissible hours in accordance with the City's Municipal Code, excluding Sundays. To further ensure that construction activities do not disrupt adjacent land uses, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would be implemented to incorporate best management practices and ensure that noise impacts associated with project construction activities are less than significant.

Mitigation:

- NOI-1: Prior to Grading Permit issuance, the applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, that the project complies with the following:
 - Construction hours are specified as 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays.
 - During construction, the contractor shall ensure all construction equipment is equipped with appropriate noise attenuating devices that will reduce noise levels 3 to 10 dBA.
 - The contractor shall locate equipment staging areas in order to create the greatest distance between construction-related noise/vibration sources and sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.
 - Idling equipment shall be turned off when not in use.
 - Equipment shall be maintained so that vehicles and their loads are secured from rattling and banging.

Items e & f: No Impact.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Item a: Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would create 10 new units under 600 sq. ft., and based on the size of the units, result in approximately 20 new residents. This represents incremental residential growth that will not induce substantial growth in the area, and it also consistent with the City’s Growth Management Program.

Items b & c: No Impact.

The project site is currently undeveloped; therefore, the project will not displace existing housing or people.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES: 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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Item a & b: Less Than Significant Impact.

The City’s Police and the Fire Departments have reviewed the application and determined that the project can be adequately serviced by existing police and fire facilities and services. The project would not have a significant effect on acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

Item c: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project may generate an incremental increase in school-aged children to the Sebastopol Union School District; however, the applicant will be required to contribute to school resources via payment of a standard school impact fee, calculated through net new square footage of the project. Additionally, Sebastopol area schools have seen declining enrollment in recent years, so additional school-aged children could easily be accommodated within existing facilities.

Item d: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project is subject to payment of the Park In-Lieu fee, and such revenues are used for capital improvements in City parks or expansion of parkland. Impacts to the City parks are expected to be modest in scope in that this is a relatively small residential development. Routine maintenance of City parks and public facilities can be accommodated by existing public facilities and City staff. The 2016 General Plan requires one (1) acre of parkland for each 200 residents (which equates to five (5) acres for every 1,000 residents). According to the City’s 2020 LOS Report, there are a total of 23.6 acres of developed parkland, and 89.7 acres of dedicated open space in Sebastopol. With the 25% calculation for open space parks, this equates to 22.425 acres of counted open space area, for a total ‘counted’ parkland of 46.025 acres. With 7,826 residents, the total parkland ratio is 5.98 acres for each 1,000 residents, which means that the City has met the parkland General Plan standard. The proposed project would result in the addition of 10 units and approximately 20 new residents, which will not result in a significant increase to the use or deterioration of surrounding recreational facilities.

Item e: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project is subject to payment of standard City Impact Fees which provide a funding source to construct the police, fire, community amenities, government facilities, and roadway infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impacts of the growth expected in the City of Sebastopol. Therefore, no significant impacts would result with implementation of the project.

XVI. RECREATION: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Item a: Less Than Significant Impact.

The 2016 General Plan requires one (1) acre of parkland for each 200 residents (which equates to five (5) acres for every 1,000 residents). According to the City’s 2020 LOS Report, there are a total of 23.6 acres of developed parkland, and 89.7 acres of dedicated open space in Sebastopol. With the 25% calculation for open space parks, this equates to 22.425 acres of counted open space area, for a total ‘counted’ parkland of 46.025 acres. With 7,826 residents, the total parkland ratio is 5.98 acres for each 1,000 residents, which means that the City has met the parkland General Plan standard. The proposed project would result in the addition of 10 units and approximately 20 new residents, which will not result in a significant increase to the use or deterioration of surrounding recreational facilities.

Item b: No Impact.

The applicant will pay park-in-lieu fees instead of dedicating and constructing park facilities.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The responses to the transportation/traffic questions are based upon findings within the Focused Transportation Analysis prepared by W-Trans in July 2021, included as Exhibit J.

Items a, b & f: Less Than Significant Impact.

Transportation impacts used to be evaluated by examining whether the project is likely to cause automobile delay at intersections and congestion on nearby individual highway segments, and whether this delay will exceed a certain amount (this is known as Level of Service or LOS analysis).

Starting on July 1, 2020, agencies analyzing the transportation impacts of new projects must now look at a metric known as vehicle miles traveled (VMT) instead of LOS. VMT measures how much actual auto travel (additional miles driven) a proposed project would create on California roads. If the project adds excessive car travel onto our roads, the project may cause a significant transportation impact.

Under Senate Bill 743³, a proposed project can demonstrate that it will generate a less than significant level of VMT if the project includes affordable housing, housing within ½ mile of

³ <https://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/updates/sb-743/faq.html>

transit, housing projects generating fewer than 110 trips per day, or new housing in existing low-VMT neighborhoods.

The anticipated vehicle trip generation for the proposed project was estimated using standard rates published in the 10th Edition of the *Trip Generation Manual*, 2018, using the rate for “Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise)” (LU #220). As shown in Table 1, the proposed project would be expected to generate an average of 73 trips per day, including five trips during the a.m. peak hour and six trips during the p.m. peak hour, which is considered less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

Table 1 – Trip Generation Summary

Land Use	Units	Daily		AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips	In	Out	Rate	Trips	In	Out
Multifamily Housing	10 du	7.32	73	0.46	5	1	4	0.56	6	4	2

Note: du = dwelling unit

Pedestrian Facilities

Currently, there are no sidewalks on the south side of Bodega Avenue and on a section of the north side of Bodega Avenue from 260 feet east of Pleasant Hill Avenue North to approximately 100 feet west of Golden Ridge Avenue. The City of Sebastopol’s [Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan](#) (amended November 2011) and Sonoma County Transportation Authority’s (SCTA) *Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan* (2019) recommends curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements on Bodega Avenue between Golden Ridge and Pleasant Hill Avenue, which includes the project frontage. The Sebastopol Municipal code also requires such frontage improvements whenever a parcel is developed (SMC 12.28). As part of the project improvements, Bodega Avenue will be widened along the project frontage to accommodate bike lanes, on-street parking, and a new sidewalk to fill this gap. The other adjacent streets near the project site including Golden Ridge Avenue and Pleasant Hill Avenue provide adequate sidewalks on both sides.

Bicycle Facilities

Currently, bicycle lanes do not exist on Bodega Avenue along the project frontage. The City of Sebastopol’s [Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan](#) (amended November 2011) and SCTA’s *Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan* (2019) includes a plan for Class II bicycle lanes on Bodega Avenue between Ragle Road and Washington Avenue, which includes the project frontage. Design plans for these bike lanes have previously been completed and the City is currently working on pavement rehabilitation plans and additional funding to complete these improvements. Other existing bicycle facilities within the project vicinity include Class III Bicycle Routes on Pleasant Hill Road, Washington Avenue, and Jewell Avenue. Bicyclists can ride in the roadway and/or on sidewalks along all other streets within the project area. As a result, access for bicyclists to and from the project site would be adequate upon completion of planned bicycle projects.

Consideration was also given to the adequacy of Bodega Avenue along the project frontage to accommodate the planned Class II bicycle lanes. The project’s Tentative Map shows widening along the project frontage which would include curb, gutter and sidewalk to match up with the existing sidewalk sections to the east and west. The 42-foot-wide road cross section from north to south indicates the following:

- 8 feet of parking
- 5-foot westbound bike lane
- 12-foot westbound vehicle lane
- 12-foot eastbound vehicle lane
- 5-foot eastbound bike lane

This proposed cross section would be adequate to match up with the proposed bike lane striping project.

Transit

The nearest transit stops are located on Bodega Avenue near the intersection of Pleasant Hill Road and Virginia Avenue. Both stops are served by Sonoma County Transit Route 24, which provides service within the City of Sebastopol. The buses for this route operate from 7:45 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. with nearly one-hour headways during weekdays and from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. with approximately one-hour headways on Saturday. These transit stops are located within one-quarter of a mile of the project site and therefore would provide adequate access for project residents.

Item c: No Impact.

The project site is not located near any public or private airstrips; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

Item d: Less Than Significant Impact.

Access

Primary vehicular access for residents will be via the existing access easement over the driveway on Golden Ridge Avenue which has a *prima facie* speed limit of 25 mph. It is noted that on Bodega Avenue, which has a posted speed limit of 35 mph, an eastbound left-turn onto Golden Ridge Avenue is prohibited, though the No Left-Turn pavement marking is extremely faded and likely unnoticed by most drivers. Mitigation measure TR-1 is incorporated to improve safety. All necessary pavement markings will be included in the scope of work for the project and all markings other than red curb paint shall be thermo-plastic.

Sight Distance

Sight distances along Golden Ridge Avenue at the project access point as well as Bodega Avenue at Golden Ridge Avenue were field measured and evaluated based on sight distance criteria contained in the Highway Design Manual published by Caltrans. The recommended sight distance at intersections of public streets is based on corner sight distances, while recommended sight distances for minor street approaches that are either a private road or a driveway are based on stopping sight distance. Both use the approach travel speeds as the basis for determining the recommended sight distance. Additionally, following sight distance was evaluated based on the stopping sight distance criteria.

For the *prima facie* 25-mph speed limit on Golden Ridge Avenue, the minimum stopping sight distance needed is 150 feet. Based on a review of field conditions, sight lines from the project driveway are more than 200 feet to the north and approximately 150 feet to the south to the intersection with Bodega Avenue, which is adequate for the posted speed limit. Additionally, given the straight, flat alignment of Golden Ridge Avenue, following sight lines exceed 200 feet, providing adequate sight distance to allow a following driver to observe and react to a vehicle slowing or stopping before turning left into the project site.

For Bodega Avenue with a posted 35-mph speed limit, the minimum corner sight distance needed for vehicles turning onto Bodega Avenue from Golden Ridge Avenue is 385 feet. Based on a review of field conditions, the available sight distance to the east is obstructed by vegetation on the northeast corner of the intersection when measured from behind the crosswalk. When measured from 15 feet back of the edge of the travel lane, or the point at which bike lane striping would be added on the corridor, the sight distance increases and provides more than 385 feet of sight distance which would meet standards.

The available sight distance to the west is slightly obstructed by the unimproved frontage of the project site, but available sight distance exceeds 385 feet. To improve safety on Bodega Avenue, white edgeline striping will be provided five feet out from the northern edge of curb which would coincide with the future bike lane striping. This striping will be provided between Virginia Avenue and Golden Ridge Avenue. The edgeline striping would provide guidance to vehicles exiting Golden Ridge Avenue when pulling forward to gain adequate sight distance.

Item e: Less Than Significant Impact.

The City’s Police and Fire Departments have reviewed the application and reported no concerns with emergency vehicle access. The Fire Department has noted that fire trucks do not typically pull up directly next to a burning building. In the event of a fire, lots 1-4 would be accessed from the driveway on Golden Ridge Avenue, and the fire truck would back out. Lots 5 & 6 could be accessed from either Golden Ridge Avenue or Bodega Avenue. Lots 7-10 would be accessed from Bodega Avenue.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as 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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Listed or eligible for a listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historic resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?	<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 asset fort in this Section, 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"/>

Discussion:

The responses to the tribal cultural resources questions are based upon findings within the Cultural Resources Study (CRS) prepared by Evans & De Shazo, Inc. (EDS) in July 2021, included as Exhibit D.

A Sacred Lands inventory request was sent by email to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on June 21, 2021, to inquire about listed sacred sites located within or near to the project area and to obtain a list of local Native American tribes who may have additional information about sacred sites, traditional cultural resources, or other properties of traditional religious and cultural importance located within or near to the project area. The NAHC works to identify, catalogue, and protect places of special religious or social significance, graves, and cemeteries of Native Americans per the authority given in PRC § 5097.9.

The NAHC responded to EDS by email on July 13, 2021, with information that the record search of the Sacred Lands File was negative for the presence of any sacred sites for the project area. In addition, the NAHC provided a list of 14 Native American tribal contacts. As recommended by the NAHC, EDS sent a letter via email or U.S. Postal Service (USPS) to the 14 individuals and organizations on the Native American contact list to request further information about sacred sites, traditional cultural resources, or other properties of traditional religious and cultural importance located within or near to the project area, and to inquire about Native American issues related to the overall project. A list of individuals contacted, and their responses are included in Exhibit D. As of the date of this report, one response has been received from Lytton Rancheria, detailed below.

Lytton Rancheria Response

On July 16, 2021, EDS received an email response from Brenda Tomaras of Tomaras & Ogas, LLP, the law firm representing Lytton Rancheria. The email states that the Tribe has no specific information which it could provide to include in this report, but the subject property is within traditional Pomo territory and the Tribe believes there is the potential for finding tribal cultural resources within the project area. As such, the Tribe will evaluate whether further consultation on the project with the City is necessary and intends to request a copy of the CRS report at that time. Ms. Tomaras also requested that all cultural resources found within the project area, including isolated prehistoric artifacts, be documented within the CRS even if the resource does not reach the level of significance under CEQA. EDS verified that no prehistoric artifacts were identified within the project area.

Point Rancheria Kashia Band of Pomo Indians Response

On August 10, 2021, EDS received an email from Mr. Anthony Macias with the Stewarts Point Rancheria Kashia Band of Pomo Indians stating they have no comments or concerns about the project, as it is outside of their aboriginal territory.

Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria Response

On August 19, 2021, EDS received an email from Buffy McQuillen with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria stating the project area is within the Tribe's ancestral territory and there may be tribal cultural resource impacts. She requested EDS to provide the Tribe with the results of their research efforts and recommendations, which were provided via email.

The City of Sebastopol mailed a referral letter and attachments (included as Exhibit K) to the Tribal Heritage Preservation Office for the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria on April 6, 2021, to comply with PRC § 21080.3.1. No response has been received as of compiling this study.

Item a & b: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

As detailed in Section V. Cultural Resources, the CRS determined no historic-period resources were eligible for listing on the CRHR and are not considered historically significant in accordance with CCR § 15064.5 or PRC § 5020.1(k). The CRS did not identify any prehistoric artifacts or archaeological resources within the project area. Mitigation measures CR-1 and CR-2 are incorporated in the unlikely event that that buried archaeological resources are encountered during earthmoving activities.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:**Item a: Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project will discharge wastewater to the City's sewer system and will not discharge any pollutants in concentrations exceeding water quality objectives that could affect the quality of the waters of the State. It will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Items b & e: Less Than Significant Impact.

Based on the 2020 LOS Report, ample capacity remains in the City of Sebastopol's wastewater treatment allocation to serve this development and meet applicable requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The LOS Report indicates that City-wide wastewater flows were at approximately 55% of treatment capacity. That figure includes allowances for known undeveloped projects. The project is within the planned growth identified in the General Plan.

Item c: Less Than Significant Impact.

The City has a Low Impact Development (LID) program, which requires that site planning address storm water control and mitigation. According to the Initial Storm Water Low Impact Development Submittal prepared by Robertson Engineering, Inc. in May 2020 (Exhibit G), the project will be designed to mitigate urban runoff and include storm-water control measures consistent with state and local regulations. This includes a Priority 1 Swale with Bioretention for on-site stormwater treatment so that overland runoff is minimized before being dissipated off-site. Therefore, the project will not 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. In addition, a Regional Water Quality Board Construction General Stormwater Permit may be required to ensure compliance with State stormwater requirements.

Item d: Less Than Significant Impact.

The 2020 LOS Report includes statistics for water production, usage, and wastewater flow. The report also contains information about groundwater levels in City wells. The total annual water production was approximately 27% of maximum potential production in 2019, according to the LOS Report. Sebastopol's water demand remains significantly lower than when production peaked at 500 million gallons in 2004. The estimated water demand from projects currently approved by the City but not yet constructed (including Huntley Square) is 6.4 million gallons per year. This represents the equivalent of approximately 2% of total production in 2019. The water demand for projects pending approval is estimated at an additional 1.5 million gallons per year. This is equivalent to an additional 0.5% of 2019 annual production. There is substantial remaining production capacity sufficient to accommodate the proposed project. The City has determined that there is adequate water system capacity, production, and distribution to accommodate this project. Additionally, the project will be subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance requirements as specified in SMC 15.36.

Item f & g: Less Than Significant Impact.

The solid waste from the development will be collected and disposed of by the City's franchise hauler Recology. There is sufficient capacity in the disposal system to accommodate the additional solid waste that will be generated by the project, and it will be handled in compliance with federal, state, and local statutes.

XX. WILDFIRE: If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Items a, b, c & d: No Impact.

According to the General Plan and CalFire Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps, the project site is not located in or near a state responsibility area or within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ)⁴. Further, none of the properties within the surrounding area are located within a state responsibility area or within a VHFHSZ. No impact associated with wildfires would occur as a result of the proposed project.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁴ <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>

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?				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Item a: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

As discussed throughout this Initial Study, the project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment or result in significant environmental impacts that cannot be reduced to a less than significant level with compliance with the established regulatory framework and implementation of mitigation measures.

As discussed in Section IV. Biological Resources, the project would not substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The project would be required to implement mitigation measure BIO-1 to avoid impacts on special-status and common bat species, and mitigation measure BIO-2 to avoid potential losses of nesting native birds. It will also be required to implement mitigation measure BIO-3 to offset the impacts from removal of protected trees. Impacts are expected to be less than significant with incorporation of these mitigation measures.

As discussed in Section V. Cultural Resources and Section XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources, project construction activities have low potential to encounter significant cultural resources. Out of an abundance of caution, mitigation measures CR-1 and CR-2 are recommended in the event that buried archaeological resources or human remains are encountered during earthmoving activities.

With implementation of identified mitigation, the project would not 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 a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory with the implementation of mitigation measures. Impacts would be less than significant.

Item b: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

Based on the analysis contained in this Initial Study, the proposed project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts with implementation of project mitigation measures. Compliance with the regulatory requirements and implementation of mitigation measures at the project-level would reduce the potential for the incremental effects that would occur with construction and operation of the proposed project relevant to the environmental topical areas discussed within this Initial Study.

Item c: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

Previous sections of this Initial Study reviewed the proposed project's potential impacts to human beings related to several environmental topical areas. As determined throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project would not result in any potentially significant impacts that cannot be mitigated or reduced with compliance with the established regulatory requirements and implementation of mitigation measures by the City. The project would not cause a substantial adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly and impacts would be less than significant.

EXHIBITS

- Exhibit A: Biological Resources Assessment; Prunuske Chatham, Inc. (PCI); August 2021
- Exhibit B: Tree Preservation and Mitigation Report; John C. Meserve; August 2020
- Exhibit C: Peer Review of the Tree Preservation and Mitigation Report; Ben Anderson; September 2021
- Exhibit D: Cultural Resources Study; Evans & De Shazo, Inc.; July 2021
- Exhibit E: Soil Engineering Consultation; Reese & Associates; October 2015
- Exhibit F: Soil Engineering Consultation; Reese & Associates; August 2020
- Exhibit G: Initial Storm Water Low Impact Development Submittal; Robertson Engineering, Inc.; May 2020
- Exhibit H: Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment prepared by Environmental Geology Services; August 2015
- Exhibit I: Limited Phase 2 Investigation prepared by Environmental Geology Services; October 2015
- Exhibit J: Focused Transportation Analysis; W-Trans; July 2021
- Exhibit K: Tribal Consultation Letter sent by City of Sebastopol; April 2021

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, a MND may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document which is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public. Where all or part of another document is incorporated by reference, the incorporated language shall be considered to be set forth in full as part of the MND's text. The references outlined below were utilized during preparation of this Initial Study. Copies of these documents are available for review at Sebastopol City Hall, located at 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA 95472.

City of Sebastopol General Plan

The City of Sebastopol General Plan (General Plan) was adopted in 2016 and serves as a long-term policy document which identifies the community's vision for the future and provides a framework to guide decisions on growth, development, and conservation of open space and resources in a manner consistent with the quality of life desired by residents and businesses. Each General Plan element provides a set of goals, policies, and implementation actions that will guide future decisions within the City. The General Plan also includes a land use diagram, which serves as a general guide to the distribution of land uses throughout the City. The General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is also intended to be used in conjunction with the General Plan.

City of Sebastopol Municipal Code and Zoning Code

The City of Sebastopol Municipal Code (Municipal Code) consists of all the regulatory, penal, and administrative ordinances of the City of Sebastopol. It is the method the City uses to

implement control of land uses in accordance with the General Plan goals and policies. The City of Sebastopol Zoning Code (Zoning Code), Title 17 of the Municipal Code, identifies land uses permitted and prohibited according to the zoning category of specific parcels.

Annual Level of Service (LOS) Report – May 19, 2020

The City's Growth Management Ordinance requires the provision of an Annual LOS Report to the City Council. The LOS Report includes information on the status of the General Plan and progress of its implementation, as well as the status of LOS standards for City services. The LOS Report includes an update on Planning projects, annual housing totals, and the status of City services, which include water, wastewater, drainage, parks, fire, police, schools and traffic.