

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

4.0.1 INTRODUCTION

This section presents an analysis of each resource topic that has been identified through past environmental analyses including the public scoping process as likely to be affected by the proposed Scott Ranch Project. Each subsection describes the environmental setting of the proposed project as it relates to that specific environmental topic; the impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed project; and mitigation measures that would avoid, reduce, or compensate for the significant impacts of the proposed project.

4.0.2 LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a variety of terms are used to describe the levels of significance of adverse impacts. The definitions of terms used in this Revised Draft EIR (RDEIR) are presented below.

Significant and Unavoidable Impact. An impact that exceeds the defined standards of significance and cannot be avoided or reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of potentially feasible mitigation measures.

Significant Impact. An impact that exceeds the defined standards of significance and that can be avoided or reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

Potentially Significant Impact. Potentially Significant Impacts are impacts where there is uncertainty whether or not they exceed the defined standard of significance; however, for the purpose of this RDEIR, they are considered significant. Such impacts are equivalent to Significant Impacts and require the identification of feasible mitigation measures.

Less Than Significant Impact. Impacts that are adverse but that do not exceed the specified standards of significance.

No Impact. The project would not create an adverse impact to any degree.

4.0.3 FORMAT OF RESOURCE TOPIC SECTIONS

Each environmental topic considered in this section of the RDEIR is addressed under six primary subsections: Introduction, Environmental Setting, Regulatory Considerations, Project Impacts and

Mitigation Measures, Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures, and References. An overview of the information included in these sections is provided below.

4.0.3.1 Introduction

The introduction section describes the topic to be analyzed and the contents of the analysis. It also provides the sources used to evaluate the potential impact of the proposed project.

4.0.3.2 Environmental Setting

This section describes the existing conditions in the area of the project site. The environmental setting section for each environmental topic provides a description of the applicable physical setting of the project area and its surroundings (e.g., existing land uses, existing soil conditions, existing traffic conditions).

4.0.3.3 Regulatory Considerations

The overview of regulatory considerations for each environmental topic is organized by agency, including applicable federal and state laws and regulations, and regional and local laws, regulations and policies.

4.0.3.4 Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This subsection lists the significance criteria that are used to evaluate impacts, followed by a discussion of the impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project. Impacts are numbered and shown in bold type, and the mitigation measures are numbered to correspond to the impact. Impacts and mitigation measures are numbered consecutively within each section.

4.0.3.5 Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

CEQA requires that EIRs discuss cumulative impacts, in addition to project-specific impacts. According to Section 15355 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*:

“Cumulative impacts” refer to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.

- (a) *The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects.*
- (b) *The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.*

In accordance with CEQA, the discussion of cumulative impacts must reflect the severity of the impacts and the likelihood of their occurrence; however, CEQA recognizes that the analysis of cumulative impacts need not be as detailed as the analysis of project-related impacts, but instead should “be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness” (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15130(b)).

Additionally, if the combined cumulative impact associated with the project’s incremental effect and the effects of other projects is not significant, Section 15130(a)(2) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires a brief discussion in the EIR of why the cumulative impact is not significant and why it is not discussed in further detail.

The fact that a cumulative impact is significant does not necessarily mean that the project’s incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact is significant in and of itself as well. Instead, under CEQA, a project-related contribution to a significant cumulative impact is only significant if the contribution is “cumulatively considerable.” Section 15130(a) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that EIRs discuss the cumulative impacts of a project when the project’s incremental effect is “cumulatively considerable.”¹ Where a Lead Agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable, it need not consider the effect significant but must briefly describe the basis for its conclusion. Section 15130(a)(3) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires supporting analysis in the EIR if a determination is made that a project’s contribution to a significant cumulative impact is rendered cumulatively not considerable and, therefore, is not significant.

Section 15130(b) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* defines consideration of the following two elements as necessary to provide an adequate discussion of cumulative impacts: “(A) a list of past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including those projects outside the control of the Agency, or (B) a summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional or statewide plan, or related planning document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect. Such plans may include: a general plan, regional transportation plan, or plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. A summary of projections may also be contained in an adopted or certified prior environmental document for such a plan. Such projections may be supplemented with additional information such as a regional modeling program.”

In this RDEIR, a combination of these two methods is used, depending upon the specific environmental issue area being analyzed. For instance, the cumulative traffic analysis uses a list of projects to estimate traffic under “pipeline” or near-term cumulative conditions. However, for longer term cumulative traffic impacts, the analysis is based on growth projections associated with the buildout of the City under the 2025 General Plan, which at the time of preparation of the City of Petaluma 2025 General Plan was predicted to occur by 2025. Due to economic factors and a slowdown in the economy, buildout of the City of Petaluma

¹ Under Section 15065(a)(3) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, “cumulatively considerable” means that “the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.”

as set forth in the General Plan 2025 likely will not be reached until after 2025. Therefore, the cumulative traffic analysis is assumed as 2025 or later, based on buildup of development foreseen in the City of Petaluma 2025 General Plan.

The projects listed in **Table 4.0-1, Approved and Pending Projects**, are included in the cumulative analysis for the proposed project. Reasonably foreseeable future projects are defined to include projects that are approved and under construction, approved but not built projects, and projects for which applications have been submitted but have not yet been approved. As the construction of some of these projects has the potential to overlap with that of the proposed project, the potential for the construction impacts of these projects to cumulate with the impacts of the proposed project are evaluated in this RDEIR. These projects are also considered in the evaluation of cumulative operational impacts.

**Table 4.0-1
Approved and Pending Projects**

Project	Location/(Distance from Project Site)	Description	Status
Commercial Projects			
Adobe Road Winery	1 C Street/ (1.2 miles to the northeast)	New construction of a two-story 15,848-square-foot building containing a winery, tasting room, private event space and a motorsports gallery, collectively operated as the Adobe Road Winery.	In Plan Check; Waiting on revisions
Washington Square Sign Program	373 McDowell Boulevard/ (2.4 mile to the northeast)	Update to existing sign program to increase maximum letter heights for major and junior anchors.	SPAR approved with conditions on 3/27/2018
1395 N. McDowell Boulevard SPAR	1395 N. McDowell Boulevard/ (4.0 miles to the north)	New 6,378-square-foot commercial restaurant building.	SPAR approved with Conditions on 9/11/2018
Valero Gas Station	523 E. Washington Street/ (1.5 miles to the northeast)	Demolition of existing gas station and construction of new one in its place, including a convenience store and smog station	In Plan Check; Waiting on revisions
Plaza North Sign Program	259 N. McDowell Boulevard/ (2.2 miles to the northeast)	Update to existing sign program to allow freeway facing signs.	Continued indefinitely from Planning Commission hearing on May 22, 2018; Waiting on applicant response.
McDonald's Remodel	259 N. McDowell Boulevard/ (2.2 miles to the northeast)	Demolish and reconstruct the existing McDonald's Restaurant. Net increase of 14 square feet.	Building Permit Issued
Washington Square Façade Remodel	373 South McDowell Boulevard/ (2.4 miles to the northeast)	Façade remodel for a portion of the Washington Square Shopping Center.	SPAR approved with Conditions on March 27, 2018.
Riverfront Courtyard Marriot	500 Hopper Street/ (1.4 miles to the northeast)	122-room, 4-story hotel and associated parking.	In Plan Check

4.0 Environmental Impact Analysis

Project	Location/(Distance from Project Site)	Description	Status
Cagwin and Dorward	0 Lakeville Highway/ (3.2 miles to the east)	New commercial building to accommodate Cagwin and Dorward Landscaping. Project includes office and landscape maintenance operations for approximately 100 employees	Under construction
Spring Hill School	705, 709, 735 N. Webster Street/ (1.0 miles to the north)	New private school. Project includes demolition of existing classrooms and construction of new 6,594-square-foot classroom.	Under construction
Labcon Warehouse Addition	3200 Lakeville Highway/ (2.8 miles to the northeast)	Expanded building footprint and associated site improvements including landscaping, parking facilities, frontage improvements along Cedar Lane and Lakeville Highway.	Under construction
76 Gas Station Remodel	4998 Petaluma Boulevard North / (3.8 miles to the north)	Demolition of gas station and construction of a convenience store, self-serve car wash, and storage area.	Under construction
Floathouse	150 Weller Street/ (1.2 miles to the northeast)	Floating rental office and dock in the turning basin and restroom facility in Cavanagh Landing Park.	In plan check
Hansel Toyota Expansion and Remodel	1125 Auto Center Drive/ (3.3 miles to the north)	Expansion from 14,786 square feet to 25,404 square feet to the north and west for showroom, sales and offices.	Under construction
Petaluma Poultry Expansion	2700 Lakeville Highway/ (2.5 miles to the northeast)	Addition for office space, parking, and site design modifications and addition of second shift.	Under construction
Petaluman Hotel	2 Petaluma Boulevard South/ (5,104 feet to the north)	Construction of a new boutique hotel (54 rooms).	In planning process; Waiting on revisions
Safeway Fuel Center	335 South McDowell Boulevard/ (2.3 miles to the northeast)	New gas station including 8 dispensers, 16 fuel stations, canopy, and convenience store.	Approved by the City Council on April 1, 2019
Home 2 Suites	1205 Redwood Way/ (3.8 miles to the north)	New construction of an 85,802-square-foot hotel (140 rooms) on a vacant pad.	Approved by the Planning Commission on April 23, 2019
Mixed-Use Projects			
Haystack Pacifica	215 Weller Street (block between Weller, E. Washington, Copeland, & E D, excepting 1 parcel)/ (1.2 miles to the north)	178 new residential units with 14,516 square feet of commercial at corners.	SPAR approved by Planning Commission on May 28, 2019
Riverfront 2010	500 Hopper Street/ (1.4 miles to the northeast)	Tentative Subdivision Map for mixed-use development	Under construction
North River Apartments	368 & 402 Petaluma Boulevard North/ (1.4 miles to the north)	184 new residential units.	In plan check
Deer Creek Village	North McDowell Boulevard between Lynch Creek Way and Rainier Avenue/ (2.5 miles to the north)	345,000-square-foot commercial center and associated site improvements.	Under construction

Project	Location/(Distance from Project Site)	Description	Status
132 Petaluma Blvd. Historic SPAR	132 Petaluma Boulevard North/ (1.0 miles to the northeast)	SPAR for renovation of a commercial building with a new residential component.	In planning process.
Omahony Mixed Use Building	131 Liberty Street/ (1.0 miles to the north)	Tentative Subdivision Map/SPAR for mixed-use development	In plan check
Residential			
East Washington Commons	817, 822, and 825 East Washington Street/ (1.8 miles to the northeast)	SPAR and CUP for 24-unit residential project on 3 parcels, with 2 floors for the residences over ground floor parking and street-level tenant amenities.	In plan check
Brody Ranch Subdivision	360 Corona Road/ (3.3 miles to the north)	Development of 199 units consisting of 59 detached single-family residences, one duplex, and 138 condominiums.	In plan check; Under construction
Riverbend Crossing PUD and Subdivision	1 & 16 Cedar Grove Parkway, 529 Madison Street/ (1.6 miles to the north)	Tentative map, PUD Zoning Amendment (PUD and SPAR for a 29-lot single-family residential development).	In planning process
Altura Apartments	Vacant lot at the northeast corner of Baywood Drive/Perry Lane/ (1.9 miles to the east)	150 apartment units and associated site improvements.	Under construction
Addison Ranch Apartments	200 Greenbriar Circle (2.5 miles to the north)	Additional 100 multi-family units in an existing apartment complex.	Under construction
Quarry Heights (Lomas)	Petaluma Boulevard South (Dutra Quarry) (1.3 miles to the east)	272 new single family and townhomes. 90 single-family dwellings to be constructed.	142 townhome units and 40 single-family dwellings are complete; Remaining 90 single-family dwellings planned for construction
Sid Commons	End of Graylawn Avenue at Petaluma River/ (1.9 miles to the north)	New 278-unit apartment complex	In planning process
Sunnyslope II	674 Sunnyslope Road/ (closest point where construction could occur is about 1,680 feet)	18 single-family parcels in multiple phases. SPAR required for 17 lots and existing historic house on lot 18. Lots 1-6 and 10-18 have received SPAR approval as of October 2018. Site grading and construction of lower homes is underway.	Lower homes have received building permits and have begun construction; Upper homes still require SPAR approval
109 Ellis Street	109 Ellis Street/ (1.9 miles to the northeast)	13-unit apartment complex	City Council approved density bonus and adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration on May 6, 2019. SPAR approved by Planning Commission tentative scheduled for June 25, 2019
Deer Creek Residential	0 N McDowell/ (2.3 miles to the northeast)	New construction of a 129-unit residential development within five three-story buildings on 4.71 acres. The project will provide up to 194 off-street parking spaces.	CUP approved by Planning Commission May 14, 2019. Still requires SPAR approval.

4.0 Environmental Impact Analysis

Project	Location/(Distance from Project Site)	Description	Status
Olin Residential	118 Kimberly Way/ (1.4 miles to the east)	New 2,461-square-foot single-family home within the South Hills General Plan sub area, subject to hillside ordinance.	In planning process; Waiting on applicant response
Baywood Apartments	2592 Casa Grande Road/ (2.2 miles northeast)	Proposal for 299 apartments in 27 different three-story buildings. Project includes a recreation center and indoor pool and all associated site improvements.	In planning process; Revisions recently submitted and under review
Campbell Family ADU	516 Howard Street (formerly 520 Howard)/ (1.4 miles to the north)	New two-story ADUs in Oakhill-Brewster Historic District. Proposed unit is attached to the existing residence by a common deck.	Under construction
PEP Housing Senior Housing	951 Petaluma Boulevard South/ (1.2 miles to the northeast)	Demolition of all existing buildings/site features and construction of affordable housing units in new two- to three-story structure with a manager's unit and one two-story community building.	SPAR approved with conditions on August 14, 2018
Sepaher Residential Building	315 Lakeville Street/ (1.4 miles to the northeast)	New building containing 4 residential units and associated parking on site. Application includes a CUP to allow for residential use on the ground floor.	SPAR and CUP approved with Conditions on June 12, 2018
Williams Residential Historic	331 Kentucky Street/ (1.3 miles to the north)	Modifications to an existing single-family residence including 1 st floor rear addition and conversion of existing attic space into 2 nd floor living space.	All Planning Entitlements Approved. Next step is building approval.
Dailey Single Family Dwelling	123 Kimberly Way/ (1.4 miles to the east)	Major SPAR for a new single-family home in the Country Club Estates PUD	In planning process
Sartori Historic SPAR	1416 Casa Grande Road/ (2.6 miles to the northeast)	Proposal to retain existing historic house, subdivide property into seven parcels, rezone to a PUD, and pursue SPAR for development of six new homes.	In Planning Process; Study Session with HCPC on May 15, 2019
Luchetti Residence Garage Replacement	245 Keokuk Street/ (1.1 miles to the north)	Removal of addition at rear, new construction of garage and an ADU	Approved at HCPC Hearing on April 9, 2019
107 6 th Street	107 6th Street/ (0.8 miles to the north)	Approximately 480-square-foot ADU on top of a new garage. Includes interior remodel and 2-story expansions at the side and rear.	In planning process; Recently resubmitted revisions
Corona Station SPAR	890 North McDowell Boulevard/ (3.3 miles to the north)	Zoning Text Amendment, Major Subdivision, and SPAR of new 112-unit single-family residential development adjacent to the future SMART station.	In planning process

Project	Location/(Distance from Project Site)	Description	Status
Pettigrew ADU and Porch, Historic SPAR	309/307 Walnut Street/ (1.2 miles to the north)	Construction of a new ADU at the location of an existing ADU on the property. Proposal also includes construction of a carport and a restoration of the front porch on the primary dwelling.	In planning process

Source: City of Petaluma, 2019.

Notes:

ADU: Accessory Dwelling Unit

CUP: Conditional Use Permit

HCPC: Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee

PUD: Planned Unit District

SPAR: Site Plan and Architectural Review

Additionally, cumulative projects within Helen Putnam Regional Park were also considered when conducting the cumulative analysis. The three cumulative projects considered include the following:

Helen Putnam Park Expansion Project (under construction): The Helen Putnam Park Expansion Project is located 0.5 mile west of the project site. The Helen Putnam Park Expansion Project will provide a new access route to the existing network of trails at the northwest corner of Helen Putnam Regional Park (near the intersection of Windsor Drive and West Haven Way). The proposed construction will include a trail and a parking lot, with a portable restroom, trailhead signage and a trail map. This new park access provides dedicated parking close to the community and a new trail which is designed to roll and flow up the hill, minimizing steep climbs so that it can be enjoyed by trail users of all abilities.

Helen Putnam Renovation Project (under construction): Regional Parks has contracted with the Sonoma County Trails Council to begin trail improvements in the park.

- improving trails for all-season use
- trailhead staging area enhancements
- wildflower and oak regeneration management
- and way-finding and interpretive signage development.

Petaluma Sebastopol Trail (Proposed): The southern end of the proposed Petaluma Sebastopol Trail is located approximately 4 miles northwest of the project site. The proposed trail is located within the unincorporated areas of Sonoma County Supervisorial Districts 2 and 5, City of Sebastopol, and City of Petaluma. An approximately 13-mile paved trail connecting Petaluma and Sebastopol. The trail would provide bicycling, walking, jogging, horseback riding where possible, and other recreational and commuting opportunities for residents of Petaluma, Sebastopol, and unincorporated areas such as Hessel

and Cunningham. The trail will provide connections to other existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle networks such as the Laguna de Santa Rosa Trail and SMART Trail.

4.0.3.6 References Section

This subsection lists the references used to prepare the environmental setting and impact analysis for each section of the EIR.

4.0.4 TOPICS NOT DISCUSSED FURTHER

4.0.4.1 Agricultural Resources

- The proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. There would be no impact.

The project site is designated Grazing Land on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (Department of Conservation 2010). Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a nonagricultural use. There would be no impact.

- The proposed project would not conflict with a Williamson Act contract. There would be no impact.

Under the Williamson Act Program, the project site is designated as “Incorporated City Land” that is not under a Williamson Act contract (Department of Conservation 2014). In addition, there are no lands adjacent to the project site that are under Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any existing Williamson Act contract. There would be no impact.

- The proposed project would not 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)). There would be no impact.

The project site is zoned Residential 1 (R1) and therefore implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland,² or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, no impact would occur.

² Timberland is defined in PRC Section 4526 as “land designated by the board (Board of Forestry and Fire Protection) as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of a commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees.”

- The proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There would be less than significant impact.

Native tree species form woodland cover along Kelly Creek, D Street tributary, and the southwestern portion of the project site. Although this woodland cover could be considered a “land that can support 10-percent native tree cover” as defined in PRC Section 12220(g).³ The proposed project would remove 12 native coast live oak. However, approximately 159 oak trees of various sizes would be planted throughout the development areas. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

- The proposed project would not 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. There would be no impact.

As discussed above, the project site is designated as Grazing Land. Lands surrounding the project site are designated as Grazing Land or Urban and Built-Up Land (Department of Conservation 2010). Therefore, the proposed project would not involve any other changes that could directly or indirectly result in the conversion of any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use as these lands are not present in the project vicinity, and no further discussion of this issue is required. The project site does not include forest land. Therefore, the proposed project would not involve any other changes that could directly or indirectly result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There would be no impact.

4.0.4.2 Hazards and Hazardous Resources

- The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The impact would be less than significant.

Construction

Asbestos and Lead-Based Paint. Under the proposed project, the mobile home and the remnants of the collapsed farm house would be demolished. The barn complex may be relocated, as needed, for stabilization and preservation purposes; however, it would remain in the same area. Due to the age of the barn complex (19th and early 20th century) and other buildings (mobile home and the remnants of

3 Forest land is defined as “land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.”

the farm house) (pre-1977), there is a potential for asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP) to be present.⁴

In 2008, a survey of the barn complex was conducted that identified asbestos in the floor tiles and a portion of the roof (Forensic Analytical 2008). LBP was also identified in the barn complex during the survey. If the barn complex would be relocated, there is a potential for the ACM and LBP materials to be released which would result in adverse environmental impacts. The survey conducted in 2008 did not cover the mobile home nor the collapsed farm house. If ACM are present in these buildings, demolition activities could release ACM and LBP, resulting in potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 requires testing the buildings' material of the mobile home and the remnants of the farmhouse for the presence of ACM and LBP before demolition activities. **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1** also addresses removal and disposal of ACMs and LBP during the demolition of these buildings, as well as the handling of ACM and LBP materials if the barn complex is to be relocated.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 requires implementation of the City of Petaluma Lead Hazard Abatement Procedures, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) procedures, and compliance with the notification requirements of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Implementation of **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1** would reduce potential impacts from demolition and relocation of buildings containing ACMs and LBP to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Prior to commencing any demolition activity of the mobile home and the collapsed farmhouse, the project Applicants shall conduct an asbestos survey in compliance with sampling protocols outlined by the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) and screening for the presence of lead-based paint. If LBP are found the Applicants shall implement the City of Petaluma Lead Hazard Abatement Procedures.

In the event that such ACMs are found, the Applicants will be subject to requirements set forth by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) AHERA requirements, lead standard contained in 29 CFR 1910.1025 and 1926.62, and any other local, state, or federal regulations. Treatment, handling, and disposal of these materials will adhere to all requirements established by OSHA and other agencies. The Applicants will notify the local OSHA of asbestos abatement to be carried out. Asbestos abatement contractors must follow state regulations contained in 8CCR1529 and 8CCR341.6 through 341.14, where there is asbestos-related work involving 100 square feet or more of ACM.

⁴ ACM contain greater than 1.0 percent asbestos. Trace ACM contains less than 1.0 percent but greater than 0.1 percent asbestos. These materials may be construction debris (in which case they fall under Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act regulatory requirements), as materials in intact buildings (in which case they fall under the Toxic Substances Control Act and National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants requirements), or as geological deposits, in which case they are typically regulated by local air pollution control district standards.

Asbestos removal contractors must be certified as such by the Contractors State License Board. The owner of the property where abatement is to occur must have a Hazardous Waste Generator Number assigned by and registered with the Office of the California Department of Health Services in Sacramento. The contractor and hauler of the material are required to file a hazardous waste manifest that details the hauling of the material from the project site and the disposal of it.

The Applicants will comply with Section 19827.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, and notify the BAAQMD 10 days in advance of any proposed demolition or abatement work. Notification will include the names and addresses of operations and persons responsible; a description and location of the structure to be demolished or altered, including size, age, and prior use, and the approximate amount of friable asbestos; scheduled starting and completion dates of demolition or abatement; nature of planned work and methods to be used; procedures to be used to meet BAAQMD requirements; and the name and location of the waste disposal site to be used.

Operation

The proposed project includes development of residential uses and a public park extension. Future residents, landscapers, and park rangers would utilize limited quantities of common cleaning and maintenance materials. Based on the amounts and materials involved, the transport, use, and disposal of these materials would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The impact would be less than significant.

- The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. There would be no impact.

The proposed project consists of single-family residences and a public park extension, which do not emit or handle substantial amounts of hazardous materials, and no existing or proposed schools are located within one-quarter mile of the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur and no further discussion of this issue is required.

- The proposed project would not 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, it would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. There would be no impact.

Based on a review of the Envirostor database maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances, the project site and adjacent areas are not identified as hazardous materials sites (DTSC 2019). Therefore, no impact would occur and no further discussion of this issue is required.

- The proposed project would not be 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, and the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. There would be no impact.

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose persons to a safety hazard or excessive noise related to airports. There would be no impact.

- The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There would be no impact.

None of the project components would have the characteristics (such as road closure) to physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency access, response, or evacuation. The proposed project would include a roundabout at the intersection of Windsor Drive and D Street. The proposed roundabout would allow for a continuous flow of traffic at this intersection and would not interfere with emergency access or impair the implementation of an emergency response plan. Further provision of emergency access to the project site is provided in **Section 4.13, Transportation**, of this RDEIR.

4.0.4.3 Mineral Resources

- The proposed project would not 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. There would be no impact.

The project site has no identified mineral resources. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not create a loss of availability of known mineral resources. No impact would occur.

- The proposed project would not 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. There would be no impact.

The project site is not delineated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site in either the City's General Plan or the Sonoma County General Plan. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

4.0.5 REFERENCES

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2019. EnviroStor. <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>. Accessed September 17, 2019.

4.0 Environmental Impact Analysis

City of Petaluma. 2007. *Lead Hazard Abatement Procedures*. December.

City of Petaluma. 2019. Major Development Projects. September.

Forensic Analytic. 2008. *Pre-Demolition Asbestos and Lead Survey: 1860 D Street, Petaluma Ca.* June 6.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 2012. *Guidelines for the Evaluation and Control of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Housing*. July.