

REVISED CEQA Environmental Checklist and Initial Study

Project Title / File #	Riverfront Mixed Use Development / 11-TSM-0130 [SCH# 2013062004]
Lead Agency and Address	City of Petaluma 11 English Street Petaluma, CA 94952
Contact Person & Phone	Olivia Ervin, Environmental Planner; (707) 778-4556
Project Location	500 Hopper Street (APN 36-010-025)
Project Applicant	Basin Street Properties 1838 N. McDowell Blvd., Suite 200 Petaluma, CA 94954 CONTACT: Vin Smith AICP; (707) 795-4477
General Plan Designation	Mixed Use; the site is located within the Central Petaluma Specific Plan area.
Zoning	Urban General (T-4), Urban Center (T-5), Urban Core (T-6) and Civic Space (CS)
Project Description Overview	The project consists of a Tentative Subdivision Map to create 144 lots and four parcels on an existing 35.7-acre site. The project would allow for future development of a mix of land uses with a maximum project buildout of 273 residential units, 90,000 square feet of commercial space, a 120-room hotel, approximately 4.0 acres of parks and a system of multi-use trails. Offsite improvements include an emergency access route and a riverfront park. See PROJECT DESCRIPTION section for details.
Setting Summary	The 35.7±-acre project site is situated north of the Petaluma River and west of Highway 101 near the Lakeville Highway interchange. The project area is characterized by existing and former industrial uses. See PROJECT SETTING section for details.
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval or Review is Required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</i>: Verification of Wetlands Delineation (COMPLETE); Approval of Section 404 Nationwide Permit #29 for minor wetland fill. • <i>California Regional Water Quality Control Board</i>: Approval of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharge of stormwater into Petaluma River, Section 401 Water Quality Certification; Review of Notice of Intent & Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) filed by Applicant. • <i>California State Lands Commission</i>: Approval of development of the Riverfront Park on state-owned riverfront property. • <i>California Department of Fish & Wildlife</i>: Future approval of Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) for construction of a small boat launch to the Petaluma River and potential approval of SAA for Riverfront Park development. • <i>Sonoma County Water Agency</i>: Review of Project Drainage Plans

CONTENTS:

- I. Environmental Setting & Project Description
- II. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected
- III. Determination
- IV. References
- V. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts
- VI. FIGURES

I. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING & PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Background

An Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS-MND) were prepared in June 2013 and circulated for a 30-day public review period from June 6 through July 5, 2013. The review period was extended July 25, 2013 due to a public request for extension. Upon the close of the public review period, the City reviewed comments received on the IS-MND and determined that an EIR should be prepared to address potentially significant impacts. Thus, this is a revised Initial Study that identifies the topics to be further reviewed in an EIR.

Project Setting

The 35.71-acre (gross area) project site is situated north of the Petaluma River and west of Highway 101 near the Lakeville Highway interchange (see Figure 1¹). The site extends south from Hopper Street, which is south of Lakeville Street, to the Petaluma River. The property is bounded by the Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) rail corridor on the north, Highway 101 on the east, Petaluma River on the south, and industrial uses on the west. SMART is a passenger train and multi-use pathway that will provide passenger and freight rail service along 70 miles of the historic Northwestern Pacific Railroad alignment within Sonoma and Marin Counties that has been dormant for the past several years (Also see the City of Petaluma's SMART Station Area Master Plan, June 2013). Vehicular access to the site is provided via an extension of Hopper Street at the northern perimeter of the site.

The project site is currently undeveloped and is generally flat. The site is a former marshland that was filled between 1914 and 1944 by hydraulic dredge spoils from the Petaluma River; the placement of hydraulic dredge spoils has been the primary use of the site over the last 50 years (Kleinfelder, May 2001²). Since 2005, the site has been used for the crushing and storage of roadbed materials (Iris Environmental, 2012). The site has an active permit from the City of Petaluma for storage and removal of up to 75,000 cubic yards of material, which will be removed prior to commencing project improvements. Gravel roads, concrete slabs, and gravel piles occupy about a third of the site, and the remainder of the site is dominated by invasive non-native plant species.

¹ All figures are included at the end of the document in Section VI for ease of reference as some figures are referenced in several sections.

² Project studies and references are identified in Section IV.

The project vicinity contains a mix of uses. Vacant industrial lands (the former Pomeroy Corporation concrete works) and City's former wastewater treatment facility (now a pump station) are located to the west. The former Pomeroy Corporation cement plant is located to the west of the project site. Commercial and industrial businesses are located to the north of the rail corridor, and a marina and business center is located east of Highway 101. South of the project site is a state-owned property and the Petaluma River. Adjacent uses across the Petaluma river include single-family residential.

Petaluma River, a traditional navigable water (TNW) serving the City of Petaluma and Sonoma County for transportation of goods and recreation, is located immediately south of the Project Site. The river is within the jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission and the US Army Corps of Engineers (as a navigable waterway). The state-owned property that borders the project site on the south is undeveloped and consists primarily of ruderal and non-native grassland with some seasonal wetlands. A row of pine and cypress trees on the riverfront property provides a separation between the project sit and slightly steeper banks leading to the Petaluma River channel.

The Caltrans Highway 101 right-of-way is located to the east of the project site and has been disturbed and is partially being used as a construction staging area for the Caltrans Highway 101 widening project that is currently in progress (2013). The Caltrans project includes provision of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes and widening of the Highway 101 overpass bridge to the east of the project site.

Project Description

The project consists of a Tentative Subdivision Map to create 144 lots and four parcels that support a mix of land uses on the existing 35.7-acre project site. Approximately 15 acres will be developed with a mix of residential, commercial and office uses, with approximately 13 acres for right-of-way dedication and 7.5 acres for civic spaces³. The project would allow for future development of a mix of land uses, including 90,000 square feet of commercial space, a 120-room hotel, approximately 4.0 acres of parks, a system of multi-use trails and a community boathouse adjacent to the Petaluma River. The proposed project would result in the development of 134 single-family residential units, 39 townhomes, including 4 live/work units, and up to 100 units as part of the mixed-use land use designation. As such, the proposed project would allow for a maximum project buildout of 273 residential units. The proposed lots and uses are summarized on Table 1. The proposed tentative map is shown on Figure 2, and a map showing locations of planned land uses is shown on Figure 3.

The project also includes several offsite improvements. The adjacent state-owned property along the Petaluma River will be developed into an approximate 3.6-acre passive Riverfront Park, and a secondary offsite emergency access route will be provided. Offsite improvements are further described below.

The Tentative Map proposes future development in eight phases, as shown on Figure 2, although the plans do not specify a phasing order or timeframe. City staff discussions with the Applicant indicate that it is anticipated that the single-family housing and hotel components will be constructed first. City regulations

³ The Central Petaluma Specific Plan [Appendix A-SmartCode] sets forth standards for civic spaces, including natural parks, greens, squares, plazas, playgrounds, and public open spaces.

require that all subdivision improvements be completed to accommodate development phases, which according to the project applicant, will occur in response to market conditions. Each phase and/or project component will require Planning Commission Site Plan & Architectural Review approval in accordance with the City’s Zoning Ordinance requirements. Future buildings will be designed in accordance with the SmartCode requirements set forth in the *Central Petaluma Specific Plan*. The site is expected to be built out within six years.

TABLE 1: Summary of Proposed Lots and Uses

Proposed Uses	Size	Acres	Proposed Lots
Residential			
▸ Single-Family Lots	134 lots	12.31	1-124, 127-130, 138-144
▸ Townhomes	39 units (includes 4 live-work units)	2.59	131-132, 138
Commercial & Mixed Use			
▸ Mixed Use	30,000 sq. ft. + 100 apartments	1.18	125-126
▸ Office	60,000 sq. ft.	2.09	134-137 Including street parking & office expansion area
▸ Hotel	120 rooms	0.64	133
Parks & Dedication			
▸ Parks-Civic Space Active Park	2.27 acres	3.81	Parcel A
Central Green	0.38 acres		Parcel B
Public Path	1.16 acres		Parcel C
▸ Boathouse Parcel		0.16	Parcel D
▸ Street Rights-of-way		12.87	
		TOTAL ONSITE	35.7
Offsite Improvements			
▸ Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) & Multi-Use Path		0.33	
▸ Riverfront Park		3.5	
▸			
		TOTAL OFFSITE	3.83
SOURCE: Acreages are from Application Materials: “Riverfront Project Narrative” (January 2013) and Project Maps (TM-4 and TM-8)			

Summary of Proposed Land Uses

The proposed detached single-family residential lots dominate the southern portion of the site adjacent to the Petaluma River, and a medium-density townhome development is planned in the northeastern corner of the site. A hotel and office complex are proposed in the northwestern portion of the site, and would be separated from the single-family residential area by an active park and sports field. In the central portion of the site, a “Central Green” urban park will be encircled by mixed uses (commercial and apartments) and project streets. A parcel in the southeast corner of the site will be dedicated to the City to facilitate Petaluma Small Craft Center (PSCC) construction of a community boathouse and launch for small craft access to the Petaluma River. Further details are provided below. A site plan showing a conceptual layout of structures is shown on Figure 6.

- **Single-Family Residential Lots:** The proposed tentative map includes 134 detached single-family residential lots, averaging 4,000 square feet. Streets will be constructed in a grid with a frontage street adjacent to the proposed Petaluma Park along the Petaluma River. The street grid also includes a trails system running along the project’s frontage with the SMART Rail Line and leading from Hopper Street around both the eastern and western boundaries of the site to the adjacent proposed Riverfront trail. (The proposed trails are further described below.)
- **Townhouse Residential Lots:** A medium density townhome development consisting of 35 residential units and four live/work units would be located in the northeastern corner of the project site. The area will be served by an internal street that connects to the single-family development.
- **Hotel Lot and Office Lots:** Development would consist of a 4-story hotel and a 3-story office complex consisting of a 120 room hotel and 60,000 square feet of office space located off of Hopper Street at the entrance to the project site in the northwestern corner of the site.
- **Commercial & Residential Mixed Use:** A 1.18-acre area in the central portion of the site would consist of 30,000 square feet of ground floor commercial space with 100 apartment units located on the second and third floors. The retail component would consist of a mix of neighborhood serving commercial opportunities.
- **Community Areas:** Open space and community areas consists of a 98,916 square foot (2.27 acres) active park with sports field and a 16,448 square foot “Central Green” passive park space encircled by the access streets to the commercial and residential mixed use component. The active park is located between the single-family development and the hotel and office complex. A multi-use trail is planned on the perimeter of the property.
- **Boathouse Parcel:** A community boathouse facility is planned in the southeastern corner of the site for small-craft access to the Petaluma River. The Boathouse and launch facility would be built and operated by the Petaluma Small Craft Center (PSCC). The building is expected to be approximately 15,000 square feet in size, and would be used to store approximately 100 small boats, from 60' long eight oared shells down to 10' stand up paddle boards. A conceptual building footprint is shown on Figure 4.

There are no conceptual or engineered design plans available at this time for the boathouse or planned launch facility. The PSCC will design and construct both facilities at an unknown future date. Other than creating the parcel, the design and development of this element is not part of the proposed project, but the City has included it in this environmental analysis to help facilitate future development. The City’s General Plan encourages provision of access to the river (I-P-45 and 2-P-12).

At this time, it is expected that the facility will be a small dock(s) similar to other docks used along the river that will accommodate small boats that range from one- person kayaks and canoes to up to 8-person racing sculls that can be 60 or 80 feet long, but are very light. The dock would be supported by piers and is expected to be approximately 10 feet wide and 150 feet long with expansion capacity up to 300 feet. The facility would be positioned parallel to the riverbank approximately 30 feet off shore and kept clear of the 100-foot navigable channel.

Construction of the docks will require a Conditional Use Permit from the City, and the Boathouse will require Site Plan & Architectural Review approval. The City's General Plan encourages provision of access to the river (I-P-45 and 2-P-12). This Initial Study generally reviews the type of potential impacts that could result from construction of the facility, however, further environmental review would be required once the facility is proposed for construction and the location, design and construction methods are known.

Proposed Access & Onsite Trail Improvements

Access to the project site is provided from Hopper Street, primarily from its intersection with Caulfield Lane. Hopper Street, from Caulfield Lane to the project site, would be widened to 45 feet to accommodate two travel lanes, landscaping, and pedestrian/bicycle access from Caulfield Lane to the project site. The plans also provide an internal network of streets that consist of one primary north-south street and several minor north-south connections. The primary north-south road between the sports park and the office/hotel complex would be a segment of the planned extension of Caulfield Lane through the project site and ultimately to Petaluma Boulevard South, located south of the Petaluma River, as further described in the City's General Plan and shown on Figure 5-1 therein. The at-grade crossing of the SMART rail tracks at Lakeville Street has been relocated to Caulfield Lane northeast of the project site. Onstreet parallel parking is proposed along both sides of all internal streets except for the alleys behind the retail-residential mixed use area, between the Central green and river road, and along the emergency vehicle access (EVA) street along the western property boundary.

An approximate 10-foot- wide, Class I multi-use path is proposed around the perimeter of the site and would connect to other planned paths. The proposed street through the middle of the site would serve as a Class II bicycle and pedestrian path. Additional multi-use pathways through the site would connect the trails on the proposed Riverfront Park to the south to Hopper Street. An existing public vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle easement that runs north-south through the site will be relocated to align with the proposed plan line for a future bridge (Caulfield Lane extension) to connect to Petaluma Boulevard South, as described in the City's General Plan. The future bridge is not part of the proposed project.

Proposed Offsite Improvements

Proposed offsite improvements include a 26 to 30-foot wide Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) to connect D Street to Hopper Street (See Figure 3). Old Lakeville Street will be widened from 14 to 20 feet to provide this access to meet Fire Department access requirements.

The property to the south of the project site (and planned single-family residential area) is adjacent to the Petaluma River and is owned by the State of California (under the jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission). The project proposes development of a passive "Riverfront Park" in this area on

approximately 3.6 acres. The park includes walking trails, outlooks and landscaping improvements, including planting of additional riparian trees to enhance the area (See concept plan, Figure 4). Design plans for the path have not been developed, but it is expected to be approximately 10 feet wide and constructed in accordance with the design guidelines and other provisions in the adopted *Petaluma Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan* (2008) and the *Petaluma River Access and Enhancement Plan* (1996). The conceptual design for the Riverfront Park and trail system will preserve the existing trees on the site and on the common property line with the Pomeroy property to the west. The conceptual design is presented on Figure 5. The development of onsite parks and trails in combination with the offsite Riverfront Park will result in approximately 7.5 acres of new parkland.

Development of an offsite multi-use trail that that would extend east from the southeast corner of the proposed Riverfront Park under Highway 101 was formerly under consideration. However, the trail is not proposed by the Applicant and is not currently being proposed by the City. Thus, this potential future improvement has been eliminated from review within this environmental document.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Land Use & Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7. Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> 13. Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Population & Housing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8. Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> 14. Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. Geology & Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> 15. Mineral Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4. Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10. Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 16. Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 11. Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> 17. Agriculture & Forestry Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6. Hydrology & Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> 12. Public Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 18. Mandatory Findings of Significance |

III. DETERMINATION

	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 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.

Olivia Ervin, Environmental Planner

Date

* Topics to be addressed in the EIR include:

- Biological Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Cultural Resources
- Traffic Circulation /Transportation
- Noise
- Land Use – Review of potential project conflicts with adopted policies and plans

IV. REFERENCES

The following City plans and project studies and reports were utilized in the preparation of this Initial Study. The documents are incorporated by reference and are available for review during normal business hours at the City of Petaluma Community Development Department, Planning Division, located at 11 English Street in Petaluma.

CITY OF PETALUMA

1. *City of Petaluma General Plan 2025:*
 - a) Adopted May 19, 2008 and took effect on June 18, 2008. *City of Petaluma: General Plan 2025*
 - b) September 2006. "Petaluma General Plan 2025 Draft Environmental Impact Report." Prepared by Dyett & Bhatia.
 - c) November 2007. "Petaluma General Plan 2025 Air Quality – Greenhouse Gas Emissions Section. Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report." Prepared by Winzler & Kelly Consulting Engineers. [State Clearinghouse No. 2004082065]
 - d) February 14, 2008. "City of Petaluma General Plan 2025 Final Environmental Impact Report" [State Clearinghouse No. 2004082065]. Certified on May 19, 2008.
2. *City of Petaluma Central Petaluma Specific Plan:*
 - a) Adopted June 2, 2003. *Central Petaluma Specific Plan.*
 - b) March 2003. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Central Petaluma Specific Plan. Prepared by Wagstaff and Associates
 - c) April 2003. Final Environmental Impact Report for the Central Petaluma Specific Plan. Prepared by Wagstaff and Associates. [State Clearinghouse No. 2002112039]. Certified on June 2, 2003.
3. City of Petaluma. Water Resources and Conservation. June 2011. "City of Petaluma 2010 Urban Water Management Plan." Prepared by J. Crowley Group.

OTHERS

4. Archaeological Resource Service. April 23, 2013. A Cultural Resources Evaluation of the Proposed Riverfront Development, Petaluma, Sonoma County, California."
5. Biotic Resources Group. May 2013. "Proposed Offsite Trail Connection Within Caltrans Right-of-Way Biological Review."
6. California Air Resources Board. December 2008. *Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan – A Framework for Change.*" December 2008. Online at:
http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/adopted_scoping_plan.pdf

7. Holmes Fire.
 - a) October 11, 2011. "Emergency Vehicle Access Assessment, Riverfront Mixed-Use Development."
 - b) May 24, 2013. "Riverfront Mixed-Use Development, 500 Hopper Street, Petaluma, CA: Adjusted EVA Review."
8. Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc.
 - a) March 5, 2012. "Riverfront Mixed Use Development in Petaluma, CA – Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis."
 - b) March 8, 2013. "Riverfront Development Noise and Vibration Assessment, Petaluma, California."
9. Iris Environmental. March 17, 2012. "Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Petaluma Riverfront Property, Petaluma, California."
10. Kleinfelder.
 - a) May 14, 2001. "Summary of Findings, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Riverfront Project, Parcel A, Pomeroy Site, Petaluma, California."
 - b) January 17, 2001. "Phase II Soil and Groundwater Investigation, Pomeroy Site, Petaluma, California."
11. Steven J. Lafranchi & Associates, Inc.
 - a) September 2011. "Storm Water Mitigation Report."
 - b) September 2011. "Water Distribution Calculations."
 - c) June 2012. "Riverfront Sanitary Sewer Calculations."
12. Miller Pacific Engineering Group.
 - a) March 23, 2006. "Preliminary Geotechnical Report Riverfront Residential Development, 500 Hopper Street, Petaluma, California."
 - b) July 7, 2009. "Geotechnical Discussion, Portion of Riverfront Subdivision, Petaluma, California."
 - b) August 25, 2011. Letter to Basin Street Properties regarding "Geotechnical Update of Preliminary Geotechnical Report Riverfront Residential Subdivision Petaluma, California."
 - c) January 17, 2013. Letter to Basin Street Properties regarding: Influence of New Foundations on Existing Underground Utilities."
13. Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc.
 - a) March 5, 2012. "Traffic Impact Study for the Petaluma Riverfront Project."
 - b) April 3, 2013. "Riverfront EVA Modification Traffic Analysis."

14. Winzler & Kelly Consulting Engineers. November 2003. "City of Petaluma Phase II NPDES Storm Water Management Plan." Project No. 03-205501-030.
15. WRA Environmental Consultants. March 2012. "Biological Resources Assessment-Riverfront Petaluma, Sonoma County California."
16. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and State of California Department of Transportation.
 - a) October 2007. "Marin-Sonoma Narrows (MSN) HOV Widening Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/Draft Environmental Impact Statement." [State Clearinghouse No. 2011112043]. Online at:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/msn/msn_deir_s/msn_deir.htm.
 - b) July 2009. "Marin-Sonoma Narrows (MSN) HOV Widening Project Final Environmental Impact Report/Draft Environmental Impact Statement." Online at:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/msn/msn_feir_s/msn_feir.htm

Initial Study Preparation: Strelow Consulting in association with Metropolitan Planning Group and City of Petaluma Community Development Department.

V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

■ Introduction

In analyzing the proposed project, the City may consider whether existing environmental documents already provide an adequate analysis of potential environmental impacts. An earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA provisions, if it can be determined that one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (State CEQA Guidelines section 15063(c)(3)(D)).

On May 19, 2008, the Petaluma City Council adopted the *City of Petaluma General Plan 2025* after certifying an EIR for the plan. The General Plan EIR includes the Draft EIR volume (dated September 2006), the Revised Draft EIR volume (dated November 2007) and the Final EIR volume (dated February 14, 2008). The General Plan EIR is a "program" EIR prepared pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, which reviewed environmental impacts associated with future development and buildout within the City. A program EIR can be used for subsequent projects implemented within the scope of the program/plan. Typically, site-specific impacts or new impacts that weren't addressed in the program EIR would be evaluated in an Initial Study, leading to preparation of a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR. Site-specific mitigation measures included in the General Plan EIR also would be a part of future development projects, and supplemented, as may be necessary, with site-specific mitigation measures identified in the subsequent environmental review process. In this manner, subsequent environmental documents would "tier" from the General Plan EIR by using analyses of general matters contained in an EIR for a plan with later environmental analyses for development projects, concentrating solely on the issues specific to the later project.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) also allows a lead agency to avoid repeating analyses that were already provided in a certified General Plan EIR (Public Resources Code section 21083.3) for projects that are consistent with the General Plan. Pursuant to section 21083.3(b), if a development project is consistent with the general plan of a local agency for which an environmental impact report was certified, the application of CEQA shall be limited to effects on the environment which are “peculiar to the parcel or to the project” and which were not addressed as significant effects in the prior environmental impact report. Section 15183 of the State CEQA Guidelines provides further guidance related to Public Resources Code section 21083.3 in order to streamline review of projects consistent with the General Plan for which an EIR was prepared and certified, and to reduce repetitive environmental studies.

The proposed project land uses are consistent with the land use designations in the *General Plan 2025*, which indicates that land uses, densities and FARs within the boundary of the *Central Petaluma Specific Plan* (CPSP) shall be undertaken in accordance with the CPSP. The proposed project is consistent with the mixed-use land designations in both the CPSP and General Plan.

As part of the overall estimated buildout, both the General Plan and General Plan EIR indicate that the General Plan will result in approximately 6,005 additional housing units for a total buildout of approximately 27,950 units within Petaluma in the year 2025. The General Plan is intended to accommodate an additional 6.1 million square feet of non-residential space, resulting in a total of approximately 23 million square feet of non-residential floor area in the City. Development pursuant to the General Plan includes the CPSP (the area in which the proposed project is located), as well as approved projects at the time the EIR was prepared.

Since 2005 (the General Plan EIR “baseline” year), approximately 1,000⁴ residential units have been constructed within Petaluma, and an additional 214 single-family residential units and 1,068 multi-family units are currently under construction, approved or have permit applications pending before the City. Very little non-residential space has been constructed since 2005. With approximately 785,850 square feet under construction, approved or pending permit review, it is estimated that approximately 1,000,000 square feet of non-residential space will have been constructed since 2005. The proposed project would result in development of 134 single-family residential units, 39 townhomes, 100 multi-family residential units, a 120-room hotel, and 90,000 square feet of non-residential space. With the project and other current, pending and past projects, development within the City since 2005 totals approximately about 2,555 residential units and approximately 1,000,000 square feet of non-residential uses, which is well below the buildout estimate of about 6,000 additional residential units and 6.1 million square feet of non-residential uses that was evaluated in the General Plan EIR.

Because CEQA discourages “repetitive discussions of the same issues” (CEQA Guidelines section 15152(b)), this Initial Study is being “tiered” from the City of Petaluma *General Plan 2025* EIR as the proposed project development is within the overall buildout level analyzed in the General Plan EIR and the project is consistent with the General Plan land use designations. The following issues were analyzed within the scope of the *General Plan 2025* EIR under which development of the proposed project site would be considered: flood hazards, public services, and utilities. The Initial Study reviews site-specific

⁴ Based on California Department of Finance “City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 1/1/2013.”

environmental impacts of the project that were not evaluated at a site-specific level in the General Plan EIR.

This Initial Study also draws from information and analyses contained in the *Central Petaluma Specific Plan* (CPSP) and its EIR, and pertinent information or mitigation measures are incorporated in this Initial Study where applicable. The CPSP land use designation is incorporated in the City’s General Plan. Both the CPSP EIR and the *General Plan 2025* EIR are on file at the City’s Community Development Department, Planning Division, located at 11 English Street, Petaluma, California. The documents are also available for review on the City of Petaluma Community Development Department’s website at: <http://www.cityofpetaluma.net/cdd/plan-general-plan.html>.

■ **Checklist & Environmental Evaluation**

1. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?				✓
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	✓			
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓

a. Divide An Established Community. The site is undeveloped and is located at the eastern edge of the Central Petaluma Specific Plan area. The project property is part of an adopted Specific Plan, and proposed development is consistent with the development envisioned for the area. Thus, the project would not physically divide an established community and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

b. Conflict with Adopted Plans & Regulations. The proposed project is consistent with land use designations identified in the City of Petaluma’s *General Plan 2025*, the *Central Petaluma Specific Plan* (CPSP) as discussed below. Further review of adopted applicable plans, policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect will be provided in the EIR to determine whether or not the project would result in conflicts with these policies or plans.

Central Petaluma Specific Plan

The project site is located in the “Central Petaluma Specific Plan” (CPSP) area, which consists of approximately 400 acres of underutilized urban land extending west from Highway 101. The CPSP was adopted by the Petaluma City Council on June 2, 2003. A “Smart Code” (Appendix A of the Plan) addresses details of new development and redevelopment, consistent with the policies of the Specific Plan.

The project site is located at the eastern end of the “Lower Reach” subarea, and is designated MU-“Mixed Use” in the Specific Plan. The Mixed Use designation allows for a variety of residential, commercial office, retail and industrial uses consistent with the respective development regulations established within the Specific Plan area. The project is consistent with the Mixed Use designation and Policy 5.3, which calls for allowing intense mixed-use development on land not utilized for industrial purposes.

The project is also consistent with the amount of residential development envisioned for the Lower Reach subarea area. The CPSP EIR identified a potential for 2,716 new residential units in the “Lower Reach” subarea in which the project site is located, and the analysis in the CPSP EIR was based on a “cap” equal to 25% of the overall maximum development potential, resulting in a total of 679 residential units in the Lower Reach subarea. Other than the project site, the only other property designated for mixed uses is the former City wastewater treatment plant site to the west of the project site, which is now used as a pump station. The remainder of the Lower Reach area is designated for “river dependent industrial” uses. Thus, it would be expected that the residential buildout estimated for the Lower Reach area would occur primarily on the subject project site. Therefore, the proposed project development of 273 residential units is well below the potential development of 679 residential units that was estimated and analyzed for the project area in the CPSP EIR.

City of Petaluma: General Plan 2025

The project site is designated as “Mixed Use” in the City’s *General Plan 2025*. For the Mixed Use designation, the General Plan states that “densities and FARs within the boundary of the Central Petaluma Specific Plan (CPSP) shall be undertaken in accordance with the CPSP”. The project site is also within the City’s “Urban Growth Boundary.” As indicated above, the project is consistent with the designation in the CPSP, and thus, consistent with the General Plan land use designation.

2148151.1

Petaluma River Access and Enhancement Plan (1996) & City of Petaluma Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (2008)

The *Petaluma River Access and Enhancement Plan* provides a framework for preservation and restoration of the Petaluma River corridor. Adopted in May 1996, the Plan addresses corridor improvements, land uses, and accessibility along the 6.5-mile section of the Petaluma River within the city limits. Its four major components include restoration of the river’s natural resources, construction of a multi-use trail, a vibrant waterfront district adjacent to Downtown, and mixed uses along the river corridor. One goal of the River Plan is to “expand public access to and awareness of the river,” which is supported with a proposed continuous bicycle and pedestrian trail system along the entire 6.5-mile corridor.

The river trail also is supported in the City’s *Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan* (May 2008). According to this Plan, the River Trail is proposed along the entire length of the Petaluma River through the city. The Plan states that a critical gap is between Washington Street and Lakeville Street.

The project area is located within the Downstream segment of the Enhancement Plan, which depicts a future combined bicycle and pedestrian trail along the north river bank adjacent to the project site. Project plans identify a multi-use path in this location along the river, consistent with both of these plans.

(c) Habitat Conservation & Natural Community Conservation Plans. There is no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan that exists for Petaluma that would regulate the proposed development on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

2. Population and Housing

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	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)?			✓	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c. Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

a. Population Growth Inducement. The City of Petaluma had a population of 58,804 residents as of January 1, 2013 according to information provided by the California Department of Finance⁵. The City had an estimated population of 57,085 in 2005 when the General Plan and EIR were prepared. The City’s *General Plan 2025* forecasts a total population of 72,707 residents within the City in the year 2025.

Impact – Population Growth. The proposed project will result in development of additional residential units with an accompanying increase in population. However, population supported by the project is consistent with buildout estimates developed in the City’s General Plan, and the project would not result in a substantial growth inducement.

The proposed subdivision will accommodate phased development of a mixed use project, consisting of residential, hotel, office, commercial, park and open space uses. The level of proposed residential

⁵ Based on California Department of Finance “City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 1/1/2013.”

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				✓

The principle geologic hazards identified at the site are differential settlement and strong seismic ground shaking with a potential for localized liquefaction. A geotechnical report was prepared for the proposed project in 2006; supplemental reviews were conducted in July 2009 and August 2011. A subsequent review related to future foundations and underground utilities was conducted in 2013.

a.c. Seismic and Geologic Hazards. The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and no known active faults traverse the site. Therefore, the risk of ground rupture within the limits of the site is considered to be low.

The site is located within a region subject to a high level of seismic activity, and could experience strong seismic ground shaking during the lifetime of the proposed project. The three closest known potentially active faults are the Rodgers Creek, San Andreas, and Hayward faults. Due to their close proximity, the Rodgers Creek and San Andreas faults present the highest potential for severe ground shaking.

According to the City’s *General Plan 2025* EIR, the project site is located within an area that is mapped as having a very high liquefaction potential (City of Petaluma, September 2006 – Map 3.7-5). Liquefaction refers to the sudden, temporary loss of soil strength during strong ground shaking. According to the project geotechnical report, the project site is underlain by highly compressible Bay Mud deposits, which is not the type of soil that is susceptible to liquefaction, although ancient stream meanders are occasionally found in bay mud and can leave isolated deposits of saturated sands that could liquefy during strong seismic shaking. One onsite channel meander was encountered during the subsurface exploration. The site is relatively flat, so landslides are not a potential impact. Lurching and lateral spreading can occur during strong ground shaking. Lateral spreading generally occurs on slopes and near the tops of slopes where stiff soils are underlain by soft liquefiable deposits. Lurching and spreading along the bank of the Petaluma River, directly adjacent to the southern end of the property, is a potential hazard. Seismic and geotechnical hazards and constraints will be further reviewed in the EIR.

b. Soil Erosion. Sandy soils on moderate slopes or clayey soils on steep slopes are susceptible to erosion when exposed to concentrated surface water flows. Because site topography at the project site is generally flat, and evidence of significant erosion problems was not observed during the geotechnical investigation, the potential hazard to the site from erosion was determined to be low. Grading could result in inadvertent erosion or transport of sediments into the Petaluma River if not properly controlled, a potentially significant impact. Potential grading impacts during construction will be evaluated in the EIR.

c-d. Soil Constraints. As indicated above the project site is underlain by highly compressible Bay Mud deposits. Compressible bay mud deposits of variable thickness are present below the entire site. The

principle soil constraints of the site are due to total and differential settlement. Shallow groundwater may be present during and after construction and should be considered in planning and design of underground (or below current ground surface) structures and/or utilities.

The soils borings conducted as part of the project geotechnical investigation did not identify the presence of highly plastic silts or clays near-surface soil at the site, although some pockets of moderate plasticity clays and/or silts with low to moderate expansive characteristics may exist. Subsequent review in 2009 of the northern portion of the site proposed for commercial development indicated that potentially expansive soils are present.

Future structures at the project site would be subject to expansive soils and soil settlement with potential damage to structures and utilities. This is a potentially significant impact that will be evaluated in the EIR.

(e) Soil Suitability for Septic Systems. The site is within the City limits and will be served by City sewer system. There will be no septic systems or alternative sewer systems developed as part of the subject project. Therefore, there will be no impacts associated with soils incapable of supporting septic systems. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

4. 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 w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				✓
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	✓			
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			✓	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	✓			
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				✓

The project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The District is the agency primarily responsible for assuring that national and state ambient air quality standards are attained and maintained in the San Francisco Bay Area. The District's jurisdiction includes all of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, and the southern portions of Solano and Sonoma Counties.

The BAAQMD updated its CEQA Guidelines in June 2010 and in May 2011. The Guidelines included reference to thresholds of significance for the purpose of conducting CEQA air quality evaluations. The District's June 2010 adopted thresholds of significance were challenged in a lawsuit, and in March 2012, the Alameda Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the BAAQMD had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. The Court did not determine whether the thresholds were valid on the merits, but found that the adoption of the thresholds was a project under CEQA, and environmental review must be conducted. On August 13, 2013, the California Court of Appeals ruled that adoption of environmental thresholds by a public agency following the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7 is not a "project" under CEQA. The decision upheld the process followed by the BAAQMD to adopt its 2010 significance thresholds for criteria air pollutant emissions, toxic air contaminants (TAC), and greenhouse gases (GHGs).

a. Consistency with Air Quality Management Plan. On September 15, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) adopted its 2010 Clean Air Plan (2010 CAP). The 2010 CAP updates and replaces BAAQMD's 2005 Bay Area Ozone Strategy (Ozone Strategy), which formed part of the basis for study of air quality impacts in the EIR for the City's *General Plan 2025*. Based on the now-superseded Ozone Strategy, the City's General Plan EIR identified a significant and unavoidable impact from a technical conflict created by General Plan population projections being slightly above those relied on in the Ozone Strategy. With the Air District's adoption of the 2010 CAP, which reflected the population projections in General Plan 2025, that conflict no longer exists. The significant impact identified in the General Plan EIR related to a conflict with the former plan need not be carried forward to new projects implementing the general plan, as they are considered consistent under the 2010 CAP.

The 2010 CAP serves to update the Bay Area ozone plan in compliance with the requirements of the Chapter 10 of the California Health & Safety Code, and defines a control strategy that the BAAQMD and its partners will implement to: (1) reduce emissions and decrease ambient concentrations of harmful pollutants; (2) safeguard public health by reducing exposure to air pollutants that pose the greatest health risk; and (3) reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to protect the climate. The 2010 CAP provides a control strategy designed to:

- Reduce emissions of ozone precursors, PM, air toxics, and greenhouse gases;
- Continue progress toward attainment of state ozone standards;
- Reduce transport of ozone precursors to neighboring air basins;
- Protect public health by reducing population exposure to the most harmful air pollutants; and
- Protect the climate.

The control strategy proposes a total of 55 control measures, including:

- 18 Stationary Source Measures;
- 10 Mobile Source Measures;
- 17 Transportation Control Measures;
- 6 Land Use and Local Impact Measures; and
- 4 Energy and Climate Measures.

The proposed subdivision and future development of the project site with a mix of uses would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2010 Clean Air Plan. The CAP's stationary source measures are not

applicable as the project does not include any stationary sources of emissions. The mobile source control measures are directed to promoting clean, fuel-efficient engines, vehicles and fleets that would not be directly applicable to the project. The transportation measures are directed to improving transit and rail service and efficiency, as well as bike and pedestrian facilities and freeway efficiency, and also are not directly applicable to the proposed project as the project would not conflict with any planned facilities. Rather, the proposed project includes a network of bike and pedestrian paths onsite that interconnect to planned regional paths (General Plan Figure 5-2). Similarly the energy and climate measures look at improving energy efficiency and renewable energy. One measure does promote planting of “low-VOC-emitting” shade trees, and the project includes planting of street trees and native trees in the planned Riverfront Park. The land use measures direct the BAAQMD to look at certain District rules and CEQA guidelines and provide additional guidance to local governments regarding land use development. The CAP indicates that the land use measures are designed to promote mixed-use, compact development to reduce motor travel and emissions, and the project is consistent as a mix of uses and interconnecting bike, pedestrian, and multi-use trails are proposed. Therefore, the project will have no impacts due to a conflict with the CAP. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

b-d. Project and Cumulative Emissions. State and national ambient air quality standards have been established for the following pollutants: ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, fine particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and lead. For some of these pollutants, notably ozone and PM₁₀, the State standards are more stringent than the national standards. The San Francisco Bay Area air basin currently has a non-attainment status for the state 1-hour and 8-hour ozone standard, the federal ozone standard (8-hour), the state PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} standards, and the federal 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard. The basin is considered attainment for other state and national standards, except that it is unclassified for the federal one-hour nitrogen dioxide and PM₁₀ standards and unclassified for the state hydrogen sulfide and “visibility reducing particles” standards.⁶ (Basins are designated as attainment, non-attainment or unclassified for criteria pollutants addressed in state and federal air quality standards.)

An air quality analysis was prepared for the proposed project (Illingworth & Rodkin, 2012). The project would result in emissions during construction and from vehicles once development is complete. Generation of fugitive dust during construction is a potentially significant impact. Air quality impacts are potentially significant and will be reviewed in the EIR to include criteria pollutant emissions and construction emissions. Additionally, the project is located within 1,000 feet of U.S. Highway 101 and Lakeville Highway (State Route 116). These are sources of toxic air contaminant (particulate and diesel) emissions that could affect new residents located at the project site. Exposure of project residents, visitors and workers to these emissions will be evaluated in the EIR.

e. Odors. None of the project uses are anticipated to create objectionable odors. During the project construction period, some objectionable odors may be generated from the operation of diesel-powered construction equipment and/or asphalt paving. However, these odors would be short term in nature and would not result in permanent impacts to surrounding land uses, including sensitive receptors. Therefore, no significant impacts related to objectionable odors would result and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

⁶ Bay Area Air Quality Management District website. “Air Quality Standards & Attainment Status.” Online at: http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm.

5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	✓			
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				✓

a. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Petaluma’s *General Plan 2025* EIR analyzes greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and compared 2005 greenhouse gas emissions (baseline for the General Plan) to 2025 emissions (buildout of the General Plan) to determine if implementation of the General Plan would make a considerable contribution to the cumulative effects of greenhouse gases. Taking into account emissions savings from programs identified in the Climate Change section of the General Plan, as well as State reduction measures that apply to the local level, the analysis found that implementation of the General Plan would decrease greenhouse gas emissions relative to 2005 levels. However, because not all the State reduction measures had been formally adopted at the time the General Plan EIR was prepared, the EIR concluded that there is a substantial level of uncertainty about their effectiveness and how they will apply to local governments. The EIR found that it cannot be determined, to a reasonable degree of certainty, that buildout under the General Plan will not result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change. Accordingly, the EIR concluded that the cumulative global climate change impacts related to General Plan buildout could remain significant and unavoidable.

The General Plan EIR was certified and the General Plan was adopted in early 2008 prior to completion of other plans and regulations, including the adoption of the State Scoping Plan, changes to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines regarding evaluation of GHG emissions, and adoption of updated CEQA Guidelines by the BAAQMD. The project would result in greenhouse gas emissions, which will be further evaluated in the EIR.

b. Conflict with Applicable GHG Emissions Reduction Plan. The State’s “Scoping Plan” includes strategies for transportation, energy, water and other sectors that are not directly applicable to the proposed project, and the project would not conflict with provisions or implementation of the State Scoping Plan.

On July 18, 2005 the City passed Resolution 2005-118, “Resolution to Establish GHG Emission Reduction Target(s) for the City of Petaluma” that established greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets of 25% below 1990 levels by 2015 for community emissions and 20% below 2000 levels by 2010 for municipal operations. The City’s reduction targets are more stringent than those passed by the State. According to the General Plan, residential and commercial buildings are responsible for about 40% of GHG emissions in the city; while transportation account for about 55 to 59%; and municipal services and solid waste management account for about 2 to 5%.

Petaluma's *General Plan 2025* and its EIR contain a quantified estimate of emissions within the City through General Plan buildout, evaluate state and local programs designed to reduce emissions, and includes a series of policies, programs, and implementation measures designed to reduce GHG emissions. Most of the policies are actions to be undertaken by the City, including preparation of a Community Climate Action Plan to meet reduction targets identified in the General Plan. The City has not adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP). Preparation of a CAP is on the City Council's goals and priorities for 2013 and 2014, so it could be completed in the next two years. Thus, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable plans, policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

6. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	✓			
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				✓
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?				✓
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?				✓
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?		✓		
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	✓			
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?			✓	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?		✓		

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				✓
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓

The project site is located adjacent to the Petaluma River. The Petaluma River watershed covers approximately 146 acres in southern Sonoma and northern Marin Counties. The lower 12 miles of the Petaluma River flow through the Petaluma Marsh. The river ultimately empties into the northwest portion of San Pablo Bay; the City is located approximately 12 miles north of San Pablo Bay. Tidal influence extends approximately 14 miles upstream of San Pablo Bay, to near the confluence of Lynch Creek above downtown Petaluma (City of Petaluma, September 2006). Within the CPSP area, the Petaluma River is restricted to a well-defined and confined channel with an average 200-foot width, and urban development extends to the river’s edge over most of its length. The depth of the channel from the top of the bank to the channel bottom ranges from 18 to 20 feet (City of Petaluma, March 2003).

a. Violate Water Quality or Waste Discharge Standards. The California Environmental Protection Agency and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) list existing beneficial uses for the Petaluma River in the Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan⁷) for the San Francisco Bay Basin to include: cold freshwater habitat, estuarine habitat, preservation of rare and endangered species, water contact recreation, non-contact water recreation, fish migration, fish spawning, warm freshwater habitat, wildlife habitat, and navigation. The Petaluma River is listed on the 2002 Clean Water Act’s section 303(d) list for nutrients, pathogens, sediment, diazinon, and nickel.

The project proposes discharge of drainage into the Petaluma River via two existing storm drain outlets, which could result in water quality degradation. Any sediments or pollutants generated by construction activities will be contained through implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans, proposed erosion control measures, and proposed design of the drainage system to pre-filter pollutants before discharge, as discussed in subsection 6f below. Additionally, development of the planned subdivision improvements (streets, utilities, parks) and subsequent development phases would be subject to City stormwater management regulations and be required to implement treatment measures for post-construction runoff so that water quality is protected. Modified or new stormwater waste discharge requirements may be required from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) due to the intensification of land use at the site and increased runoff with future development. Further review of waste discharge requirements and water quality will be provided in the EIR.

⁷ San Francisco Bay Basin (Region 2) “Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan)” – Incorporating all amendments approved by the Office of Administrative Law as of December 31, 2011.

b. Groundwater Impacts. The City of Petaluma is located in the Petaluma Valley groundwater basin, which covers 46,000 acres (City of Petaluma, September 2006). The City of Petaluma uses groundwater for drinking water supply as an emergency supply and for meeting peak demands, as needed.

The project will not use groundwater. The project site is not located within an area of either confirmed or potential groundwater recharge, as shown on the City's map of Groundwater Resources.⁸ The project site is located in an area identified as a slow recharge area. The project site is expected to make a minimal contribution to recharge of the area's groundwater reserves, and future development would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Therefore, the subject project would have no impacts to groundwater recharge or availability. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

c-d. Drainage Patterns. The site and adjacent properties currently drain into the Petaluma River via drainage facilities described in subsection 6e below. The project would not alter the course of a stream or river as existing drainage patterns would be maintained with stormwater runoff being discharged into the Petaluma River. Thus, there would be no alteration to the Petaluma River or substantial erosion or siltation due to alteration of a stream course. Therefore, the subject project would not result in impacts due to alteration of a drainage pattern or stream course. Effects of increased stormwater drainage on storm drain facilities and flooding as a result from development of the project site are discussed in subsections 6e and 6g-h, respectively.

e. Stormwater Drainage. According to the Central Petaluma Specific Plan EIR, a 21-inch and a 24-inch culvert connects to a 42-inch culvert in Hopper Street that drains the Highway 116/Highway 101 interchange and conveys flows to earthen ditches leading through the adjacent former Pomeroy site to the west of project site into the Petaluma River. A drainage channel enters the project site from the west approximately 400 feet from the northern end of the Site. The drainage channel runs in a north-south direction and discharges to the Petaluma River. The project plans (Sheet TM-11) show two existing storm drains that discharge into the Petaluma River.

In September 1982, the Petaluma City Council established the Storm Drainage Impact Fee as a means of mitigating storm drainage impacts occurring as a result of development. The criteria provides for either the payment of fees or the construction of on- or off-site detention areas, based upon the type of project and amount of runoff generated, as calculated for a 100-year storm. Fees collected are used by the City for the acquisition, expansion, and development of storm drainage improvements.

The project site is currently vacant, and buildout of the project site would result in a significant increase in stormwater runoff that would ultimately discharge into the Petaluma River, and which would result in potentially significant impacts if storm drains are not properly sized. Stormwater drainage impacts will be evaluated in the EIR.

⁸ West Yost & Associates. February 26, 2004. "Technical Memorandum No. 4, Groundwater Feasibility Study," Figure 11. City of Petaluma General Plan 2025 Draft EIR Appendix F.

f. Water Quality. The federal Clean Water Act regulates discharge from storm drain systems in order to reduce surface water pollutants and improve water quality. The Phase II Stormwater Program, adopted by the U.S. EPA and administered by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, requires operators of small municipal separate storm sewer systems to obtain a NPDES permit and implement programs and activities to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff. The City of Petaluma, as an operator of a municipal storm drain system prepared a Storm Water Management Plan and began implementation of this Plan in March 2003, in order to comply with the Phase II program requirements. The Plan acts as the City's permit, describing actions that include best management practices, measurable goals, and timetables for implementation (City of Petaluma, September 2006). Chapter 15.80 of the City's Municipal Code ("Stormwater Management and Pollution Control") regulate stormwater discharges. Grading and erosion control requirements are set forth in Chapter 17.31 of the Municipal Code.

As indicated above in subsection 6a, the Petaluma River supports beneficial uses for habitat, fish migration and spawning, rare and endangered species, and recreation. The river is listed as impaired on the Clean Water Act's Section 303(d) list for nutrients, pathogens, sediment, diazinon, and nickel. Grading activities and future runoff from the developed project site could result in non-point and point source pollution into the Petaluma River, if not properly controlled. This is considered a potentially significant impact, particularly since the river is impaired for nutrients, pathogens and sediment. Potential water quality impacts related to both point and non-point source pollution as a result of development on the project site will be evaluated in the EIR.

g-h. Flood Hazards. The project site is located adjacent to, but outside of the 100-year floodplain, as shown in the City's General Plan (Figure 8-1) and General Plan EIR (Figure 3.6-4). The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and City of Petaluma are updating the City's Flood Insurance Rate Maps. FEMA has accepted the City's model and technical data and in April 2012 released draft FIRM panels. According to the project application submittals, the project site is located in Panel 1001 of the Preliminary 2012 Flood Rate Insurance Map. The Base Flood Elevation surrounding the property is 10 feet (North American Vertical Datum (NAVD), 1988m) or 7.3 feet (National Geodetic Vertical Datum, 1929). The only portion of the site affected is a narrow strip (5 feet plus or minus) along the 101 right of way which is at the toe of the bank seven to eight feet below and sixty feet away from the any development on the site.

The Riverfront site is located in the lower reaches of the City of Petaluma. The City is in the process of re-mapping its flood insurance rate maps with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, using the City's XPSWMM storm water modeling system. Generally, storm water detention provides benefit on projects in the upper reaches of the Petaluma River and its tributaries. However, it has been demonstrated with the City's XPSWMM model and recent hydrology review of the Deer Creek Plaza Shopping Center by City staff that storm water detention in the lower reaches of the Petaluma River within the City does not provide a benefit and is not necessary. It was also determined in the Deer Creek analysis, which is the most recent hydraulic analysis that evaluates flooding impacts for the Petaluma River, that detention can slightly increase the 100-year flood surface elevations of the Petaluma River if detained runoff is allowed to enter the Petaluma River at or near peak discharge volumes of the entire river watershed.⁹ Therefore, storm water detention is deemed not practical and not necessary for the proposed Riverfront project. Furthermore, the effect of increased impervious surfaces on flood elevations as a result of future

⁹ "Deer Creek Village Initial Study," prepared March 5, 2010

development accommodated by the City’s General Plan 2025 was evaluated as part of the General Plan EIR. The potential impacts associated with flood hazard will be further discussed in the EIR.

i. Flood Hazards Due to Levee or Dam Failure. The project site is not located within an inundation area associated with a levee or dam. Therefore, the project would have no impacts associated with risk of flood hazard due to a levee or dam failure and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

j. Tsunami or Seiche Hazard. The project site is not located within an area that could be affected by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Seiche and tsunamis are short duration earthquake-generated water waves in enclosed bodies of water and the open ocean, respectively. The project geotechnical investigation indicated that the site is located 12 miles north of San Pablo Bay. Additionally, the site is at an elevation of at least 15+ feet and located sufficiently inland so that the potential for a seiche or tsunami to damage the development area is considered to be low (Miller Pacific Engineering, March 2006). Therefore, the project would have no impacts associated with exposure to tsunami or seiche hazards. The site and area are relatively flat and not subject to mudflows. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

7. Biological Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	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 Wildlife (formerly Fish and Game) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	✓			
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (formerly Fish and Game) or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				✓
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?	✓			
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?	✓			
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				✓

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?				✓
---	--	--	--	---

A biological resources assessment was prepared for the proposed project (WRA, March 2012), which included the project site and the adjacent state-owned river park property. The project’s biological resources report identified eight vegetation communities, 56 plant species and 19 wildlife species on the project site, and indicated that the project site has been significantly altered from its native state. Non-sensitive vegetation communities within the project site include disturbed land, ruderal herbaceous stands, and non-native annual grassland. Gravel roads, concrete slabs, and gravel piles occupy approximately 11.2 acres, while approximately 26.9 acres of the site are dominated by non-native species. A portion of the site is being used for construction lay-down site in conjunction with the current Highway 101 HOV project. and prior to that the site was used for placement of dredged materials. Therefore, the substrate throughout the site has been substantially altered with the construction of levees, gravel roads, gravel piles, and stockpiling of dredge material. (Although the biological resources report notes former construction of levees, there are no current formal levees along the Petaluma River adjacent to the project site.) Consequently, the majority of the site is characterized by invasive and non-native plant species adapted to extremely disturbed conditions (e.g. stinkwort, perennial pepperweed).

a. Special Status Species. The Petaluma General Plan 2025 EIR identifies potential habitat for special status plant species (Franciscan Onion, Alkali Milk Vetch, Point Reyes Checkerbloom, Petaluma Popcorn-flower, Sonoma Spineflower, and Round-leaved Filaree) on the project site and on lands to the west of the project area, as well as potential habitat for the San Pablo song sparrow on the project site and in areas to the north, east and southwest of the project site (Figure 3.8-1). Potential impacts to special status species and nesting birds due to development of the project site, the proposed Riverfront Park and a boat launch ramp will be evaluated in the EIR.

b. Riparian Habitat. The biological resources assessment did not identify riparian habitat on the project site or the adjacent Riverfront Park site where offsite improvements are proposed. No riparian habitat was identified in the project area in the Highway 101 MSN Project EIR/EIS (U.S. Department of Transportation, 2007). Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on riparian habitat; this will not be further discussed in the EIR.

c. Wetlands. The project biological assessment found that the site has been significantly altered from its native state and the majority of the site contains non-sensitive vegetation communities (disturbed land, ruderal herbaceous stands, and non-native grassland). However, four sensitive vegetation community types (all of which qualify as wetlands or drainages under federal and/or state regulations) cover a total of 0.58 acres of the project site. Direct and indirect impacts to wetlands and associated habitat will be evaluated in the EIR.

d. Wildlife Migration. There is no evidence of migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites on the project site. The project site is highly disturbed and surrounded by urban development, including former industrial uses. U.S. Highway 101 is located to the east, railroad tracks/Hopper Lane/commercial enterprises to the north, vacant industrial lands and the City of Petaluma water treatment facility to the west, and the

Petaluma River to the south. The disturbed nature of the site and the surrounding developed land uses makes the site relatively inaccessible to wildlife species, and the site does not appear to be functioning as a migratory wildlife corridor or native wildlife nursery site. Potential impacts to nesting bird species is addressed above in subsection 7a.

The Petaluma River may accommodate seasonally, migratory adult steelhead and may provide migration and rearing habitat for California Coast Chinook salmon, as well as potentially providing year-round juvenile rearing habitat for the green sturgeon. The installation and use of a future constructed small boat dock would not interfere with or impede migration or rearing of fish species. Potential impacts will be further discussed in the EIR.

e. Conflict with Local Tree Protection Ordinances. The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances regarding biological resources such as trees. The Biological Resources Assessment prepared by WRA identified Monterey pine and Monterey Cypress tree species located on the bank along the Petaluma River south of the project site. Monterey Pines are not native to Sonoma County and do not appear on the list of protected trees in the City of Petaluma Tree Preservation Ordinance.

There are no trees that are protected by the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance onsite. No trees are planned for removal as part of development of the proposed Riverfront Park. As shown on the conceptual park plan, existing trees along the Petaluma River will be retained. Trees that may be removed in the future would be subject to City regulations, i.e., Heritage and Landmark Tree Removal (Chapter 8.28) of the Petaluma Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project, including onsite and offsite improvements, would have no impacts due to conflict with the Petaluma Tree Protection Ordinance. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

f. Conflict with Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans. There is no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan for Petaluma, which would regulate the proposed development on the project parcel. The project is within the urban growth boundary and at a density consistent with and anticipated by the General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project including onsite and offsite improvement would have no impacts due to a conflict with a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

8. Noise

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	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?	✓			
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	✓			

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	✓			
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	✓			
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?				✓
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?				✓

a. Exposure to Noise. Petaluma’s General Plan, indicates that low density residential land uses are considered normally acceptable in noise environments of 60 dB CNEL/L_{dn} or less and conditionally acceptable to 70 dB CNEL/L_{dn}. Multi-family residential and hotels are considered normally acceptable in noise environments of 65 dB CNEL/L_{dn} or less and conditionally acceptable to 70 dB CNEL/L_{dn}. Office and commercial uses are considered normally acceptable in noise environments of 70 dB CNEL/L_{dn} or less and conditionally acceptable to about 77 dB CNEL/L_{dn}. General Plan policy 10-P-3B discourages new noise-sensitive uses, primarily homes, in areas with projected noise levels greater than 65 dB CNEL. Where such uses are permitted, incorporation of mitigation measures are required to ensure that interior noise levels do not exceed 45 dB CNEL.

According to the General Plan EIR, most of the project site is subject to noise levels between 65 and 70+ dB CNEL (Map 3.9-1). As a result, a noise assessment (Illingworth & Rodkin, 2013) was prepared in accordance with City policies. Additionally, Mitigation Measure 10-2 in the Central Petaluma Specific Plan EIR calls for preparation of an acoustical assessment for projects located adjacent to the rail corridor. Exposure to noise from vehicular and rail traffic will be evaluated in the EIR.

b. Exposure to Vibration. Rail operations are potential sources of substantial ground-borne vibration depending on distance, the type and the speed of trains, and the type of railroad track. Construction activities can cause vibration that varies in intensity depending on several factors. The use of pile driving and vibratory compaction equipment typically generates the highest construction related ground-borne vibration levels.

Impact - Vibration. The construction of the project may generate perceptible vibration when heavy equipment or impact tools (e.g. jackhammers, hoe rams, pile drivers) are used. There are no residential or sensitive uses bordering the project site, except for the Homeless Shelter on city-owned property to the west of the project site. Vibration generated by construction activities near the common property

line would at times be perceptible, however, would not be of an expected magnitude sufficient to result in “architectural” damage to these buildings such as non-uniform displacement, cracking, and windows breaking. The nearest sensitive receptors are located in the McNear Landing residential development to the southwest and across the Petaluma River from the project site, more than 300 feet from where the nearest construction activities would occur. Potential exposure to vibration during construction will be further discussed in the EIR.

Trains on the tracks through Petaluma are proposed to travel at a maximum speed of 25 mph. The nearest buildings to the tracks would be the proposed office building, which is about 60 feet from the nearest track, and townhouses proposed in the northeast corner of the site at a distance of about 100 feet from the nearest track. There could be up to about 30 trains per day using the corridor. Given the low train speed of 25 mph or less proposed through Petaluma, the project noise study indicates that vibration levels would be below the identified vibration thresholds. Potential noise impacts to new sensitive receptors on the project site due to groundbourne vibration from future SMART rail operations will be further evaluated in the EIR.

c. Permanent Ambient Noise Increases. The project uses are generally not of the type to result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels, although increases in traffic can affect ambient noise levels.

Impact – Permanent Noise Increases. Potential increases in traffic noise levels on local streets due to project development and traffic were calculated by comparing existing traffic volumes to existing volumes with the project traffic added, and by comparing future cumulative traffic volumes to existing volumes. Traffic noise was calculated to increase about 1 dBA CNEL as a result of the addition of project trips, as well as with the addition of trips from other approved and under construction projects (as identified in the project traffic study). The City’s General Plan EIR establishes an increase of 4 dBA CNEL or greater as the significance threshold for determining whether a project would result in a substantial permanent noise increase. Project traffic would generate an ambient noise increase of about 1 dBA, the project’s impact to a permanent ambient noise increase would be less than significant.

Potential noise impacts to new sensitive receptors on the project site due to noise from future SMART rail operations and the nearby Highway 101 will be further evaluated in the EIR.

d. Temporary Ambient Noise Increases-Construction. Noise generated during construction would vary depending on the construction phase and the type and amount of equipment used at the construction site. Construction activities would include site grading and excavation, and subsequent foundation work, framing, and exterior & interior finishing as each development phase is constructed. The highest noise levels would be generated during grading of the site, with lower noise levels occurring during building construction and finishing. All project phases are estimated to be completed within approximately six years. Construction of the project would result in short-term increases in noise levels, but there are no residential or other sensitive uses adjacent to the site. The nearest residences are located across the Petaluma River from the project site, more than 300 feet from the nearest portion of the project site. However, later phases of the proposed project could be constructed after initial phases, including some residential uses, are completed and occupied, thus, subjecting onsite residents to construction noise, which will be evaluated in the EIR.

e-f. Exposure to Aircraft Noise. The Petaluma Municipal Airport is located approximately 1.75 miles northeast of the project site. Most aircraft activity is concentrated in the Airport’s immediate vicinity. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan. The noise exposure map for the Airport included in the 2025 General Plan shows the 55 dBA CNEL noise contour located east of S. Ely Boulevard, 1.5 miles north of the subject site. As such, the project site is not adversely affected by aircraft noise from the Petaluma Municipal Airport. The project site is not located within a 15-mile radius of any major airports. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, project residents, guests and employees would not be exposed to excessive noise levels associated with airports and airfields, and there would be no impact. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

9. Aesthetics

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			✓	
b. Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				✓
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			✓	
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓	

a. Scenic Vistas and Views. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a designated State scenic highway,¹⁰ nor is it within a widely-viewed scenic public view. Petaluma’s General Plan EIR identifies the hills to the west and south, vistas of Sonoma Mountain, and land along the Petaluma River, as notable as viewed from the three viewpoints / scenic vistas at the Washington Street overpass, McNear Peninsula, and Rocky memorial Dog Park. The Central Petaluma Specific Plan EIR indicates that the Lower Reach subarea in which the project site is located includes visually interesting short-range views of the river and views of Sonoma Mountain from vantage points within the subarea. The CPSP EIR also indicates that there are no sensitive receptors in the subarea, although once McNear Peninsula is developed with a planned park, it will become an important vantage point.

Impact – Scenic Vistas and Views. Project development would not substantially affect a scenic vista or view, and potential impacts to scenic views would be considered a less-than-significant impact. The CPSP EIR concludes that development facilitated by the Specific Plan within the Lower Reach subarea could adversely affect short-range views of the river and be visible from a future park site at McNear Peninsula. The City’s General Plan EIR indicates that areas throughout the City have views of the

¹⁰ Caltrans. “Eligible (E) and Officially Designated Routes (OD).” February 5, 2013. Online at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm>.

western ridgelines as well as Sonoma Mountain and that views from areas within developed neighborhoods would generally not change, with the potential exception of areas adjacent to infill sites. Overall, public scenic views would not be significantly altered or blocked as a result of the proposed project. The key viewpoint analysis in the General Plan EIR, which included the nearby McNear Peninsula, indicates that new development would not block scenic vistas or viewsheds in these areas. The project layout and designs would provide views of the river along public streets and pathways.

The project site is located east of McNear Peninsula which General Plan 2025 identifies as a future park. The general plan also plans the project site for development of the same type and density as proposed by the project. While the future development could be visible from the future park site, the project site is part of the general plan's overall urban view characterized by industrial and other development, as well as Highway 101, and would not disrupt qualities of an existing scenic view. Views of the river would remain intact, as a public street, path and park are planned adjacent to the river. Additionally, while Highway 101 is not a designated scenic highway, a full view of the site is available for a short duration along both northbound and southbound segments of the highway. The view from the highway is of short duration and is characterized by a large vacant site with stockpiles and weedy vegetation with different types of development generally surrounding the site, including homes across the river to the south. It is not considered to be a scenic vista given site disturbances and surrounding development. While future development would alter this view, development would not be inconsistent with other development in the area and as envisioned for the area in adopted City plans. Additionally, the proposed planting of trees would partially screen new structures. (See subsection 9d below for further discussion.) Thus, the project effect on scenic vistas and views is considered a less-than-significant impact. As discussed below in subsection 9c, each development phase will be subject to architectural review at which time further review of building designs would be provided. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR

b. Scenic Resources. The project site is flat with no prominent trees. The site has historically been used for disposal of dredge materials. There are no physical features of the project site that would be considered scenic resources. However, the Petaluma River is an important natural feature that will be protected and enhanced with improvements proposed with the Riverfront Park. Thus, the project would not result in impacts to scenic resources and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

c. Degradation of the Visual Character of the Surrounding Area. The project site is mostly a vacant, weedy lot; approximately one-third of the site includes gravel piles, cement slabs and other stockpiled materials. While undeveloped, the visual character of the site also reflects the bordering industrial uses. The visual quality of the surrounding area is characterized by the Petaluma River on the south as being the primary natural feature in the area, and Highway 101 on the east. The City's former wastewater treatment plant (currently a pump station) is located to the west, and the site is generally separated from other development by the rail corridor, the highway, the river and vacant industrial lands to the west.

The site is designated for mixed-use development in the Central Petaluma Specific Plan and General Plan 2025. According the Central Petaluma Specific Plan, Central Petaluma's physical features—including the Petaluma River and estuary, McNear Peninsula, Petaluma Depot, and architecturally significant buildings—will serve as focuses and amenities for new development. Design renderings are included in

the CPSP, which are intended to “hint” at the type of development that is possible as a result of the policy recommendations and regulatory language in the Specific Plan. The rendering of the of the Lower Reach subarea (Figure 4.4 of the CPSP) presents a view looking north up the river with the southern portion of the Pomeroy property to the right and a portion of the existing McNear Landing development to the left, and which depicts a river park separated by landscaping from a developed area with multi-story buildings on the project site.

The CPSP Design Guidelines identify the project site as “Area 12- Lower: Lower Reach Area.” The Design Guidelines states the recommended design approach for this area as follows:

“The Specific Plan envisions the creation of a new street grid developing between Hopper Street and the Petaluma River and extending from the Middle Reach area into the Lower Reach and the highest densities in the Specific Plan Area. Buildings from two to six stories are possible in the Lower Reach. This area, in combination with the Middle Reach, offers the developer and designer the greatest latitude and opportunity for the creation of new architectural forms and patterns and the use of new materials and technologies. Developers are encouraged to go beyond the historical character and patterns that predominate in other parts of the Specific Plan area to create a character unique to this area.”

The City’s General Plan EIR addressed the potential for future development to potentially degrade the existing visual quality of the city through incompatibilities with existing development in scale and/or character. In areas along the Petaluma River, the General Plan EIR indicates that new development could result in buildings and structures that are larger in height and mass than existing development and that the aesthetic resources of the City, including Petaluma River could potentially be impacted by new development unless it is thoughtfully designed. The General Plan EIR identified potential impacts as less than significant based on implementation of policies for preservation of significant scenic views with new development that would help retain the character of existing areas as set forth in the General Plan’s policies to minimize adverse aesthetic impacts. Policies in the General Plan ensure that any new development along the river incorporate design approaches consistent with the Petaluma River Access and Enhancement Plan.

Impact – Degradation of Visual Character of Site and Area. The proposed project will result in a new mixed-use development that is consistent with land use and zoning designations and the vision for the site as set forth in the Central Petaluma Specific Plan and General Plan. The site is vacant, and thus, any development would change the character of the site from undeveloped to a developed site. However, based on the characteristics of the site, development of the site will not result in a substantial degradation of the visual character of the site or area as envisioned in existing City plans.

The project would convert the site from vacant to developed uses, which would change the character of the site, but such development has been identified in City plans and evaluated in the related CPSP and General Plan 2025 EIRs. Furthermore, the river is a prominent feature of the site plan, and development in the southern portion of the site is oriented toward this natural scenic resource. The project will develop a passive Riverfront Park with trail and sitting areas in the state-owned land

adjacent to the project site. General Plan policies call for appropriate setbacks, improving connections to the river, and fronting development along the river, with which the proposed project is consistent .

Site-specific development plans for each development phase have not been prepared. Conceptual renderings depicting what future development may look like have been provided by the Applicant and are shown on Figure 7, which are for illustrative purposes only to depict how the site may develop, but are not intended to show exactly how development will occur within Riverfront property. This is similar to renderings included in the Central Petaluma Specific Plan and latest Smart Code documents. Buildings in the T-6 zone, which includes the mixed-use area around the central green and part of the planned hotel-office areas could be four to six stories in height. However, as described above, this type and intensity of development is envisioned in the CPSP. The site's envisioned development is consistent with the land use designations and vision of the area as depicted and described in the Central Petaluma Specific Plan and the CPSP Design Guidelines. Furthermore, future development phases will be subject to Planning Commission Site Plan & Architectural Review to ensure that future development will be implemented in accordance with applicable design policies and guidelines.

The CPSP EIR indicates that future development and intensification in the Lower Reach subarea could affect the visual character at a future proposed park on the McNear Peninsula, resulting in potentially significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation 9-5 that calls for architectural review of development projects and CPSP policies that require a band of open space along the waterfront, would mitigate the impact to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation 9-1 calls for site and architectural review of development projects, and setbacks of new buildings along the waterfront. Proposed buildings would be set back approximately 150+ feet from the river, which is consistent with the recommended design approach in the City's adopted River Access and Enhancement Plan (for Area 2) as referenced in the CPSP EIR. The project will result in a new mixed-use development with some 4-6 story buildings. The nearest development is located south of the site across the Petaluma River. No other development is in the proposed project area. As proposed, the project would not substantially degrade the visual character of the site or surrounding area. The required site plan and architectural review of each development phase will ensure internal design continuity between the various project uses. Thus, the project would not result in a substantial degradation of the visual character of the site or surrounding area. This is considered a less-than-significant impact. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR

D. Creation of Light or Glare. The project is currently undeveloped and surrounding by existing sources of light and glare including Highway 101 to the east and Lakeville Boulevard to the North. Existing lights from street lamps, traffic signals, and headlights from vehicles traveling along project area roadways contribute to the light levels in project vicinity.

Impact – Light and Glare. Buildout of the project site would include street lighting, exterior building lighting, and potential lighting along pathways, all of which are is expected to be typical of an urbanized setting. Additionally, future development will be required with comply with the Zoning Ordinance performance standards, specifically section 21-040 Article D of the IZO, which would minimize light and glare associated with the project such that day or nighttime views would not be substantially affected in the area. Section 21-040-D requires the following.

No such direct glare shall be permitted with the exception that parking areas and walkways may be illuminated by luminaries so hooded or shielded that the maximum angle of the cone of direct illumination shall be sixty (60) degrees if the luminary is not less than six (6) feet above the ground. Such luminary shall be placed no higher than the principal structure on the site if attached to said structure and, if not attached to the principal structure, no higher than twenty (20) feet unless the Zoning Administrator determines that special operational circumstances of the subject property require higher light standards. The maximum illumination at ground level shall not be in excess of three (3) foot candles.

Thus, based on the above, street, parking lot and pathway lighting will be required to be shrouded and directed downward and not result in offsite glare. Lighting will be reviewed as part of the subsequent Site Plan and Architectural Review by the Planning Commission to confirm compliance with the above standards. Therefore, because the project does not contain any design elements or features that would result in the introduction of a substantial new source of light or glare as compared to the surrounding developed areas, impacts are considered less than significant. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR

10. Hazards & Hazardous Materials

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	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?			✓	
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?	✓			
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or wastes within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				✓
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?				✓
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people				✓

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
residing or working in the project area				
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	✓			
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?				✓

a. Creation of Hazards. None of the project land uses or development activities, including offsite improvements, is expected to involve hazardous materials. No storage of chemical or hazardous materials is anticipated at this site. Except during construction where equipment may be used requiring various types of fuel, the project does not involve hazardous substances. During construction, the applicant will comply with all existing Federal and State safety regulations related to the transport, use, handling, storage, and/or disposal of potentially hazardous substances. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that will include specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) related to hazardous materials used during construction will be implemented during construction as required by the General Plan. Should any construction activities involve storage of chemicals or hazardous materials on-site, pursuant to city fire code ordinance, the applicant must file a declaration form with the Fire Marshal’s office and shall obtain a hazardous materials storage permit. Therefore impacts are expected to be less than significant. Nonetheless, this will be further discussed in the EIR.

b. Exposure to Hazards. A Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) were conducted for the project property in 2001 (Kleinfelder, January and May 2001). A Phase I ESA was completed for the currently proposed project in 2012 (IRIS Environmental, March 2012). The 2001 Phase I investigation found evidence of debris and waste at the site, river dredge disposal materials and diesel-impacted soil stockpiles. A soil and groundwater investigation was conducted that included onsite sampling and testing for petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls and metals. The 2012 ESA revealed no evidence of “Recognized Environmental Conditions” in connection with the project site. Hazardous materials that could cause a significant hazard to future residents and occupants of development at the site were not identified in environmental site assessments conducted for the project. However, the 2012 assessment indicated that because reuse of the majority of the stockpiled onsite soils was planned for use in the proposed development, assessment recommends that the quality of the soil be reaffirmed prior to its being used for residences, and the 2001 investigation also included a recommendation for construction activities in the event that construction workers encounter undiscovered soil contamination and petroleum hydrocarbons in the groundwater, which would result in limited exposure/duration. Exposure to hazardous materials will be evaluated in the EIR.

c. Hazardous Emissions. The project will result in a mix of residential and commercial land uses. There are no planned industrial uses or other anticipated stationary sources that could potentially result in hazardous emissions nor are there any anticipated other potential stationary sources. Therefore, the project would

have no impact to schools located within ¼ mile due to the release of hazardous materials. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

d. List of Hazardous Materials Sites. The project site and offsite improvements are not located on the State’s “Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List” that is maintained and updated by the California Department of Toxic Substance Control in accordance with requirements of Government Code section 65962.5 (online at: http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm). Therefore, development of the subject site and offsite improvements would have no impact in regards to creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

e-f. Airport/Air Strip Hazards. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan and would therefore not expose people residing or working in the project area to any safety hazard. The project is not within the vicinity of a private air strip. There would be no impacts associated with hazard due to an airport or airstrip and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

g. Interfere with Adopted Emergency Response Plan. Proposed offsite improvements include a 26 to 30-foot wide Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA) to connect D Street to Hopper Street. Old Lakeville Street will be widened from 14 to 20 feet to meet Fire Department access. The project’s potential to interfere with an adopted emergency response plan will be evaluated in the EIR. Further review of provision of emergency access to the project is provided in subsection 11(e) below.

H. Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard. The project site is located within a central portion of the City, within the Urban Growth Boundary, and is not located adjacent to wildlands. Therefore, the project has no impacts from hazards associated with risk of wildland fires. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

11. Transportation/Traffic

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the 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?				✓

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 risks?				✓
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	✓			
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	✓			
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?	✓			

a. Circulation and Transportation Modes. Access to the project site is provided from Hopper Street, primarily from its intersection with Caulfield Lane. Hopper Street, from Caulfield Lane to the project site, would be widened to 45 feet to accommodate two travel lanes, landscaping, and pedestrian/bicycle access from Caulfield Lane to the project site as proposed by the project. The project plans also provide an internal network of streets that consists of one primary north-south street and several minor north-south connections. Most onsite streets will provide onstreet parking. The primary north-south street through the project site will provide for the future extension of Caulfield Lane through the site to Petaluma Boulevard South to the south of the Petaluma River as set forth in the City’s General Plan.

A traffic impact study was prepared for the proposed project (Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, 2012), which did not identify any significant project traffic impacts. However, potential impacts will be further reviewed in the EIR.

b. Conflicts with Congestion Management Plans. There are no congestion management plans in the City of Petaluma. According to the City’s General Plan EIR, Sonoma County opted out of performing Congestion Management Plans in 1997. Thus, the proposed project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. No further analysis of this issue is required and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

c. Changes in Air Traffic Patterns. The proposed project would have no effect on air operations or traffic patterns. The site is located approximately 1.75 miles south of the Petaluma Municipal Airport and does not introduce any design features that would change air traffic patterns. Therefore, the subject project would have no impacts to air traffic patterns and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

d. Increase Hazards. The project traffic study found that the onsite vehicular circulation network is projected to operate acceptably into the future. All project streets have been designed in accordance with the street standards adopted by the Central Petaluma Specific Plan. Adequate intersection sight distances are provided. The one-way counterclockwise loop street located within the core of the proposed mixed-use area would be expected to function acceptably as long as stop controls are located on entering side streets (rather than on approaches within the circle itself). The traffic report recommends stop controls for some of the internal intersections. Potential conflicts due to an increased hazard will be further discussed in the EIR.

The project site is located adjacent to a rail corridor. Potential safety concerns including potential passenger-freight conflicts, pedestrian/cyclist safety and emergency response will be reviewed in the EIR.

e. Emergency Access. The proposed project has one access point through the Lakeville Street/Caulfield Lane intersection. An additional access point is planned in the future upon construction of a bridge over the Petaluma River and extension of Caulfield Lane to Petaluma Boulevard South as called for in the City’s General Plan. It is not known when this extension will occur.

The project proposes to construct and utilize an emergency vehicle access (EVA) that connects the current one-way southbound portion of Hopper Street to a point on D Street (via Old Lakeview Street) approximately 100 feet west of the railroad tracks. The EVA would be for use only during an emergency or evacuation. The traffic study and independent review did not identify any significant impacts related to the location and operation of the EVA, but potential impacts will be further reviewed in the EIR.

f. Conflict with Alternative Transportation Policies. The project’s potential to conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise impact the performance or safety of such facilities will be evaluated in the EIR.

12. 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 w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection?			✓	
b. Police protection?			✓	
c. Schools?			✓	
d. Parks?				✓
e. Other public facilities?				✓

a-b. Fire and Police Protection. Police service to the project area is provided by the City of Petaluma Police Department. The City of Petaluma Fire Department (PFD) provides fire protection, fire suppression, and emergency medical services to the City. The Petaluma General Plan Policy 7-P-19 requires a four minute travel time for a total of a 6-minute response time for emergencies within the City limits. The project area is located within 1.1 miles of Station 1 (Fire Administration), located at 198 D Street and within 1.0 miles of Station 3, located at 831 South McDowell Boulevard. The site is within the 4-minute travel time for both Stations 1 and 3 (Holmes Fire, 2011), and the project would comply with the 6-minute emergency response time.

Impact – Fire and Police Protection. The residential, commercial, and hotel development proposed for the project would result in additional calls for fire and police protection service, but would not result in the need for new or expanded facilities. The proposed project would result in less development than the level of development envisioned for this area as evaluated in the Central Petaluma Specific Plan and General Plan. The City's *General Plan 2025* EIR concluded that additional fire and police department staff would be needed in the future to serve development accommodated by the General Plan and to maintain staff ratios established in the Plan. However, the EIR did not identify the need for construction of new or physically altered fire department facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or response times. General Plan Policy 7-P-34 calls for expanding or replacing the police station in order to continue to provide adequate levels of police protection service. The project will have less-than-significant impacts on existing fire or police protection services in that the incremental increase in demand will not require construction of new or expanded fire or police department facilities to serve the project. New development onsite will be required to install automatic fire sprinklers and alarms in accordance with City standards and comply with other Fire Department recommendations regarding access. Additionally, the project will be subject to the payment of the City Facilities Development Impact Fee that will provide funding for a variety of public facilities, including fire and police facility improvements. Thus, the proposed project's impacts to fire and police protection services would be less than significant and potential contribution to cumulative impacts would be offset via the payment of City Facility Development Impact Fees.

c. Schools. The City of Petaluma is served by four elementary school districts: Cinnabar, Old Adobe (OASD), Petaluma City (PCESD), and Waugh, which operate a total of 17 elementary schools (K-6). All of the City's 10 secondary schools belong to the Petaluma Joint Union High School District (PJUHS), which serves populations both within and outside of the city limits. PJUHS and PCESD operate under one umbrella agency called Petaluma City Schools (PCS). Within the city limits, PCS runs eight elementary schools, including two charter schools and one alternative school, two junior high schools (7-8), one community day school for grades seven and eight, six high schools (9-12), including three small continuation schools and one alternative school (City of Petaluma September 2006).

The project site is located within the Old Adobe Union Elementary School District (City of Petaluma, General Plan Figure 7.2). All of the elementary school sites within the Old Adobe Union District are located on the other side of Highway 101 from the project site. According to the General Plan EIR, the overall 2004-2005 enrollment within the elementary school district was at 88% capacity, while the enrollment at the elementary school closest to the site, Miwok Valley, was 96% of capacity. According to information from the State of California, enrollments within the Old Adobe Union District have declined by approximately 235 students since the 2004-05 school year¹¹. Bond Measure G was approved in the General Election held November 6, 2012 will provide funding for construction projects to benefit all schools in the District.

All of the City's secondary schools are in the PJUHS. There are two junior high schools within the PJUHS, which were at 99% and 92% capacity in 2004-2005. The district has two high schools, Petaluma High School and Casa Grande High School, which were at 101% and 99% capacity respectively in 2004-

¹¹ California Department of educational Demographics Unit. March 3013. Enrollments by School District. From "DataQuest – online at: <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>.

2005. The General Plan EIR notes the capacity was increased with provision of rented portable classrooms and that the School District planned to replace the temporary structures with new facilities in the near future. According to information from the State of California, enrollments within the PJUHSD have declined by approximately 572 students since the 2004-05 school year.¹⁵

According to the General Plan, projected elementary and secondary enrollment is expected to decline, with the result that no new schools are anticipated to be needed during the life of this General Plan. However, elementary enrollment at the Petaluma City Unified School District is projected to exceed current capacity by a small number (175 students). The General Plan 2025 EIR notes that an overall increased enrollment is expected among elementary schools, although the projected enrollment would not exceed the existing capacity of all schools within the City limits. Secondary schools within the PJUSD are projected to experience a drop in total enrollment over the course of the General Plan buildout. The General Plan EIR further notes schools located in areas where growth is anticipated may experience capacity limitations, and that these limitations could be mitigated through redistribution of enrollment among elementary schools throughout the City.

Updated student enrollment as of 2013 and school capacities for the Petaluma School Districts are provided in the Table below.

Estimated Public Elementary and Secondary School Enrollment 2013/2014		
District	Enrollment(1)	Capacity (2)
Cinnabar School District (a)	220	325
Old Adobe Union School District (b)	1,675	2,165
Petaluma City (c)	2,101	2,414*
Waugh School District (d)	925	950
Wilmar Union Elementary (e)	245	310
Total	5,166	6,164
Petaluma Joint (f)	4,908	5,893*
1. Direct correspondence with schools August – September 2013: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Personal communication with Marissa Leon, Secretary to Superintendent, August 7, 2013. Personal communication with Dawn Walker (Secretary to the Superintendent) and Pete Tillett (Maintenance and Transportation Director) of the Old Adobe School District, week of August 1st, 2013.) Personal communication with Claire Chrisco of the Petaluma City/Joint School District, September 12, 2013. Personal communication with Anna Lisa Manning of the Waugh School District, August 6th, 2013. Personal communication with Joline Hale, Business Manager of the Waugh School District, August 6th, 2013. Personal communication with Claire Chrisco of the Petaluma City/Joint School District, September 12th, 2013. 		
2. Table 7.2-1 City General Plan. *Latest Capacity figures provided by Claire Chrisco August 6 th , 2013.		

As seen in the table above and consistent with the expected trend for declining enrollment as described in the General Plan, student enrollment for elementary schools within Petaluma have declined. Based on the

latest enrollment figures for the 2013/2014 school year the schools districts are at 84% of their total capacity.

Impact - Schools. The proposed project includes 134 single-family dwellings, 39 townhomes, including 4 live-work townhome units, and 100 apartments. The different types of onsite housing will result in various rates of new student enrollments. Student generation and impacts to school capacities were analyzed in the General Plan EIR, and the amount of development proposed by the project is less than the level of development proposed for this area in the Central Petaluma Specific Plan and General Plan EIR.

The General Plan 2025 indicates that the population growth that is expected under the proposed General Plan would include a small increase in enrollment within the Old Adobe School District (OASD) and the Petaluma City Unified School District (PCUSD). While the increased enrollment would exceed existing capacity within these school districts, this would not result in the need for new school facilities because enrollment projections for the other elementary school districts within Petaluma's Urban Growth Boundary would decline, and elementary students could be redistributed to alleviate enrollment limitations within the OASD and PCUSD. Enrollment projections for Petaluma's secondary school system, the Petaluma Joint Unified High School District, are expected to decline substantially through General Plan buildout. Furthermore, the project will be subject to the payment of school impact fee to local school districts. Therefore, impacts from the project to district schools would be less than significant and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

d. Parks. Petaluma's 2005 parks-to-population ratio was 5.1 acres/1,000 residents, and the Citywide standard is 5.0 acres/1,000 residents. Although the citywide parks ratio was met as of 2005, the Central Petaluma Specific Plan EIR states that total park provisions on the west side of the City, the area within which the project site is located, are below the General Plan specified parkland per capita objective. The *General Plan 2025 Parks and Open Space Map* (Figure 6-1) identifies future proposed park sites. One of the proposed community park sites is the Pomeroy/Riverfront site (P3), which is conceptually depicted on the western boundary of the project site. The proposed Pomeroy/Riverfront Community Park would include active recreation and is estimated at 7 acres. Community parks serve a citywide population and typically include active sports facilities. No existing or proposed neighborhood parks are identified in the vicinity of the project site in the General Plan 2025.

Impact. The project will result in an estimated population increase of approximately 710 residents (see discussion under subsection 2a above). This population increase would generate a demand of approximately 3.5 acres of parkland. The proposed project includes a 2.27 acre active park, an approximately 0.4 acre "Central Green" passive park space, and a multi-use trail along the perimeter of the project area on approximately 1.16 acres. The project provides 3.81 acres of onsite parkland, including trails, which is greater than the estimated generated demand of 3.5 acres. The proposed park acreage and proposed park uses are consistent with neighborhood parks. Proposed neighborhood parks range between 2 to 3 acres (General Plan 2025 Table 6.1-8) and are typically designed for non-organized and unsupervised activities. Play equipment, ball fields and open turn areas, and picnic tables may be provided within a neighborhood park.

The proposed project will fulfill the performance objectives for parks in terms of the overall citywide parks-to-population ratios. General Plan Policy 2-P-13 calls for development of a community park in the Lower Reach of the CPSP area, identified as the Pomeroy/Riverfront Community Park on a location that includes a portion of the project site and the adjacent property to the west. The proposed project will provide a combined total of 7.5 acres of new parkland, including the onsite park, green and trails and the proposed development of an approximate 3.5-acre passive offsite Riverfront Park on the adjacent state-owned land bordering the Petaluma River. Discussions with City staff indicate that taken together, adequate provision of parkland will be provided by the project, consistent with General Plan policies. Thus, the project would not result in the need for additional parkland. Potential impacts associated with the development of the proposed park areas are summarized in subsection 13b below.

e. Other Public Facilities. The project will be subject to the payment of the City Facilities Development Impact Fee that will provide funding for a variety of public facilities, including libraries, aquatic facility, and community center. The project includes the development of the boat dock that will be constructed at future date, which would implement GP 6-P-1 K. No facilities would be adversely impacted, rather the proposed project would enhance availability of other recreational opportunities by providing for increased access and use of the Petaluma River. Therefore, the project would have no impact to other public facilities and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

13. Recreation

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			✓	
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?		✓		

a. Increase Use of Existing Parks. The project site is presently vacant and does not feature any existing parks or recreational facilities. Existing neighborhood parks and community parks most accessible to the project site include Steamer Landing Community Park, Kennilworth Community Park, Rocky Memorial Community Park, Walnut Neighborhood Park, and Wickersham Neighborhood Park (*General Plan 2025* Figure 6-1).

Impact - Parks. The project includes approximately 3.8 acres of onsite parks and paths and development of an approximate 3.6-acre offsite Riverfront Park for a total of about 7.5 acres of parks and trails as discussed in subsection 12d above. Project generated residents and employees are expected to preferentially utilize these facilities rather than other existing neighborhood park facilities within the general area. The population generated by the project is less than the amount that would occur with development envisioned under the Central Petaluma Specific Plan area as explained in subsection 2a above. Thus, any increase in use of existing nearby regional parks, community parks and other recreational facilities would be less than-significant. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

b. Impacts of Construction of Project Recreational Facilities. The project includes construction of new park and recreational facilities, including a 2.27 acre active park, an approximately 0.4 acre “Central Green” passive park, and a 1.16-acre multi-use trail along the perimeter of the project area for a total of 3.8 acres. The project also includes development of an offsite “Riverfront Park” as a passive park with trail along the Petaluma River on approximately 3.5 acres. A drainage ditch, which has been delineated as a federally protected wetland, transects the proposed active park site, and seasonal wetlands are found in the park site adjacent to the Petaluma River.

Impact – Construction of Recreational Facilities. The project includes approximately 3.8 acres of onsite parks and paths and development of an approximate 3.6-acre offsite Riverfront Park for a total of about 7.5 acres of parks and trails as discussed in subsection 12d above. Development of onsite parks , as well as development of the adjacent proposed Riverfront Park, offsite trail and small boat dock could result in potential impacts related to erosion and inadvertent transport of sediments, and to special status

species and wetlands. These are potentially significant impacts as discussed above in subsections 6f, 7a and 7c, respectively. These potential impacts will be analyzed in the EIR.

The conceptual plan for the multi-use path shows the pathway as being located outside, though in close proximity, to the wetlands along the southern boundary of the project site. There are no wetlands within the area proposed for the "Central Green." Construction of the park and recreational facilities may have the potential to result in impacts to special status bird species;. As described above, special status bird species were identified at the site during a site inspection and four additional special status species have a moderate potential to occur within the project site improvement area. Direct impacts to nesting bird species could occur during removal or modification of vegetation for construction of the parks and recreational facilities. Indirect impacts to nesting and special status bird species may also occur during construction. Potential impacts to birds will be described in the EIR.

Future development of a small boat dock could also result in potential impacts to special status species if present at the time of construction, small wetland areas, and erosion/sedimentation into Petaluma River if project construction activities are not properly controlled. Potential impacts to these resources will be analyzed in the EIR.

14. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				✓
b. Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓
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?		✓		
d. Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements needed?			✓	
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			✓	
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			✓	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and				✓

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
regulations related to solid waste?				

a. Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements. Estimated wastewater generation of the proposed project is within capacities of sanitary sewer lines and the City’s wastewater treatment plant as discussed in subsections 14b and e below. There are no industrial or other proposed uses that would result in generation of wastewater that would require special treatment or which would have constituents that would exceed applicable standards. Therefore, the project will not result in impacts that exceed wastewater treatment requirements. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

b, e. Need for Expanded or New Wastewater Treatment Facilities & Wastewater Treatment Capacity. The City completed construction of a new wastewater treatment plant in 2010. The Ellis Creek Water Recycling Facility (WRF) east of the Oakmead/North bay Business Park and adjacent to Lakeville Highway, is currently operating and produces tertiary recycled water in accordance with California Department of Health Services (DHS) Title 22 requirements for unrestricted use. Allowable irrigation uses for tertiary recycled water include parks and playgrounds, schoolyards, residential landscaping, unrestricted access golf courses, food crops, and other uses permitted by the DHS through the California Code of Regulations.

According to the City’s General Plan EIR, the Ellis Creek Recycling Facility will serve all wastewater treatment needs of the City of Petaluma to 2025 and beyond. The amount of wastewater expected to be generated by the project is consistent with the service needs anticipated by the Petaluma General Plan and will not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Development of the site at the proposed density and intensity is well within what was anticipated by the General Plan. As such, the proposed project will not generate wastewater that exceeds the capacity of the City’s existing wastewater treatment plant, when added to existing and projected commitments through General Plan buildout. Additionally, project studies concluded that wastewater line capacity is sufficient to serve the project (Steven J. Lafranchi & Associates, June 2012). A condition of approval will require that the project pay the City Wastewater Capacity impact fees applicable to the residential and non-residential portions of the project to fund its share for existing facilities and planned improvements. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

c. Storm Water Drainage Improvements. Existing stormwater facilities in the project vicinity will not be impacted by the proposed development. The project will be required to ensure that onsite stormwater improvements are sufficient to accommodate any increased flows emanating from the project site. As indicated in subsection 6c-e above, stormwater drainage impacts, including adequacy of existing and planned drainage facilities will be evaluated in the EIR.

b, d. Need for Expanded or New Water Facilities and Availability of Water Supplies. The Petaluma Department of Public Works and Utilities is the water purveyor for the City of Petaluma. The City purchases wholesale water from the Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA). SCWA’s primary source of

water is the Russian River water, and groundwater from the Santa Rosa Plain also provides a portion of the SCWA's water supply. The SCWA supplies water to Petaluma and other water contractors under the Restructured Agreement for Water Supply (Restructured Agreement) in 2006, which states that SCWA is not obligated to provide the City of Petaluma more than 13,400 acre-feet per year or more than 21.8 million gallons per day as an average daily rate during any one month (City of Petaluma, June 2011).

The City's *General Plan 2025* indicates that that buildout through 2025 would result in a projected water demand of approximately 5,139 million gallons annually (15,775 acre-feet), and Petaluma's 2006 contract entitlement of 4,366 million gallons (13,400 acre-feet) per year from SCWA alone will not be sufficient to meet the growth projected through 2025. The General Plan indicates that by 2025, there would be an annual demand shortfall of 773 million gallons (2,371 acre-feet) per year and an average day maximum month (ADMM) demand shortfall of 5 mgd. The General Plan EIR that was certified in May 2008 further reviewed water demand and supplies and concluded that sufficient water supplies will be available to serve the City through General Plan buildout in 2025 with offsets provided by increased use of recycled water and groundwater, as well as conservation. Expanding the City's recycled water system would result in annual reduction of potable water demands by 464 million gallons and reduces peak day demands by 3.57 mgd that would reduce the annual demand and ADMM shortfalls to 309 million gallons and 1.43 mgd, respectively.

Since certification of the General Plan EIR and the adoption of *General Plan 2025*, several events have occurred relating to the portion of the City's water supply that comes from SCWA. In 2008, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) released its "Biological Opinion for Water Supply, Flood Control Operations, and Channel Maintenance conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Sonoma County Water Agency and the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District in the Russian River Watershed". The Biological Opinion requires the SCWA and the USACOE to implement a series of actions to modify existing water supply and flood control activities that, in concert with habitat enhancement, are intended to minimize impacts to listed salmon species and enhance their habitats within the Russian River and its tributaries. In return, the Biological Opinion contains an "incidental take statement" that allows the Water Agency to "take" listed salmonid species (within limits specified in the Biological Opinion) while operating its water transmission system and flood control activities, without violating the federal Endangered Species Act. The Biological Opinion is in effect until September 2023. According to the SCWA's updated UWMP (as discussed below), the Agency has met requirements of the Biological Opinion since its issuance.

On May 12, 2009, SCWA adopted Resolution No. 09-074, declaring that the water production capacity of SCWA's system was temporarily impaired, ostensibly because SCWA did not have sufficient budget funding to operate the existing transmission system. The resolution limited SCWA's capacity to deliver water to its contractors to 53 million gallons per day (average day peak month) for the Fiscal Year 2009-2010, but this temporary impairment has now expired. In September 2009, SCWA decided to stop pursuing a water project that sought additional diversion rights and transmission system expansion, the Water Supply and Transmission System Project ("WSTSP"), but to continue to develop other new water supply projects, plans and strategies.

The City's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) updated information from General Plan 2025 background and environmental documents and extended the term of water demand analysis to 2035.

Based on increased use of recycled water in combination with conservation efforts to meet the City's state-mandated per capita water target, the UWMP estimates a water demand of 10,112 acre-feet of water per year in the year 2025. The 2010 UWMP's updated analysis found that sufficient water (14,070 acre-feet year with recycled water offsets) is available for long-range development through 2035 based on estimated future water demand, the City's existing water supply contract with the Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA), and planned City water recycling and water conservation programs.

Additionally, the Sonoma County Water Agency adopted its 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (Brown & Caldwell June 2011) on June 21, 2011. The SCWA Plan confirms the conclusion that neither the 2008 National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinion nor reasonably anticipated changes to it will affect the Water Agency's ability to deliver the quantities of water from its transmission system projected in its Plan. The overall conclusion is that the Water Agency has adequate water supply through the 2035 planning horizon of this Plan, except for single-dry years, starting in 2015, which will require demand curtailment for some portion of the year. In these circumstances, the Water Agency will work with its customers to reduce water demands, utilize additional local sources, or both. Based on efforts over the last five years during dry conditions, the Water Agency does not anticipate any difficulty in maintaining an adequate water supply during the single-dry year.¹² This conclusion is partially based on the assumption that the Agency will obtain water rights approvals from the State to increase its Russian River diversions by 2035 based on Agency reviews and evidence including the Agency's existing rights to divert and store water in Lake Sonoma and Lake Mendocino.

In evaluating the reasonable likelihood that sufficient water supply is available for this project, the City has compared General Plan 2025 projected demand to actual use through December 2012. General Plan 2025 Policy 8-P-4 provides that the City routinely assess its ability to meet demand for potable water. The 2010 Urban Water Management Plan updated the General Plan 2025 water analysis and further refined a water supply program that relies upon water from SCWA, recycled water (potable offset) and conservation. As noted in General Plan 2025 Policies 8-P-5-C and 8-P-19, the City also anticipated continuing use of groundwater to meet emergency needs and to offset peak demands. Per Policy 8-P-4 of the *General Plan 2025*, city staff is required to monitor actual demand for potable water in comparison to the supply and demand projections in the 2006 Water Supply and Demand Analysis Report.

City Staff has compared actual demand for potable water to an annual SCWA supply limit for Petaluma of 4,366 million gallons per year (13,400 acre-feet) and a peak supply limit of 21.8 million gallons per day. In both instances, potable demand is well within available SCWA supply capacity. Tiered water rates, conservation efforts, and the conversion of Rooster Run Golf Course to recycled water have kept annual and peak demands within the available SCWA supply at approximately 2,972 million gallons per year and an average day maximum month peak demand of 11.5 million gallons per day, respectively, in 2012.

Staff has also reviewed the projected demand of entitled projects and proposed projects compared to available supply as of December 31, 2012. Entitled projects are defined as approved projects that are either under construction or yet to be constructed. Proposed projects are those projects that are undergoing discretionary review as of December 31, 2012, and include the subject proposed project. When all proposed

¹² Sonoma County Water Agency. June 2011. "2010 Urban Water Management Plan." Prepared by Brown and Caldwell.

projects are added to the actual demand for 2012, the resulting aggregate demand of 3,190 million gallons per year and average day maximum month peak demand of 12.42 million gallons per day remains well within the available SCWA supply of 4,366 million gallons per year and peak supply of 21.8 million gallons per day evaluated in the General Plan 2025 and the 2010 UWMP.

Long-term supply for buildout relies on the continued implementation of various phases of the City's recycled water program and water conservation programs to offset potable water use. Those programs are analyzed in the *General Plan 2025* and 2010 UWMP with estimated dates for implementation dependent upon demand. The General Plan monitoring policies outlined above will continue to track the contribution of these programs to the supply and demand balance. General Plan Policy 8-P-4.A is a further limitation on approval of development and requires an adequate water supply to be in place at the time of any future project entitlement.

Impact – Water Demand & Supply. The proposed project will result in increased water demand of approximately 32.7 million gallons per year. For analysis purposes, project buildout is estimated to occur within six years. As indicated above, when all proposed projects, including the proposed project, are added to the City's actual demand, the resulting demand of 3,190 million gallons per year and average day maximum month peak demand of 12.42 million gallons per day remains well within the available SCWA supply of 4,366 million gallons per year and peak supply of 21.8 million gallons per day evaluated in the General Plan 2025 and the 2010 UWMP. Therefore, sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project, and the project's water demand would result in a less-than-significant impact.

The proposed project plans include installation of recycled water lines that could ultimately connect to a the City's recycled water line system and be used for irrigation of the onsite park and green areas. Additionally, the project will be subject to Chapter 15.17 of the Petaluma Municipal Code, the Water Conservation Regulations Ordinance, which contains water efficiency standards for all installed water using fixtures, appliances, irrigation systems, and any other water using devices to ensure that water is used as efficiently as possible throughout new development projects. Chapter 15.17 also provides enforcement mechanisms and penalties for water waste, up to and including shut off of water service.

Additionally, project studies concluded that the project water line sizing and system is adequate to meet required fire flows (Steven J. Lafranchi & Associates, September 2011). A condition of approval will require that the project pay the City Water impact fees applicable to the residential and non-residential portions of the project to fund its share for existing facilities and planned improvements. Therefore, there are sufficient water supplies to serve the proposed project and impacts to water resources would be less than significant. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

f-g. Solid Waste Disposal. Starting in January 2006, Petaluma began contracting with the private hauler Green Waste Recovery for the city's solid waste pickup and disposal. Under various options for waste disposal, Petaluma's waste could go to landfills in Novato, Hollister, Suisun City, or Dixon. The General Plan EIR indicated that population and employment growth under the proposed General Plan would increase the generation of solid waste and could increase the demand on landfills. However, continued efforts towards waste diversion through recycling and composting programs, as well as compliance with the General Plan, will keep impacts from solid waste to less than significant levels. The amount of solid

waste expected to be generated by the project is consistent with the service needs anticipated by the Petaluma General Plan and evaluated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on solid waste disposal. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

15. Mineral Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in the loss or availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents or the state?				✓
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?				✓

a-b. Mineral Resources. The project site is a former marshland that has been used for stockpiled soils and dredges materials. The site is not identified in the City’s General Plan as being a known mineral resource of value to the region and the proposed project would not result in loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site on any such plans. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to mineral resources and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

16. Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				✓
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	✓			
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✓
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	✓			

a. Historical Resources. There are no structures on the project site or in the project vicinity. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to historical resources. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

b, d. Archaeological Resources and Human Remains. The Central Petaluma Specific Plan EIR indicates that the Specific Plan area appears to have a high potential for the discovery of archaeological materials, particularly prehistoric resources and in the vicinity of the Petaluma River (City of Petaluma, March 2003). Mitigation 7-1 requires further review of cultural resources during environmental review of development projects. As a result, a records search and review was conducted for the project (Archaeological Resource Service, 2013), and the following section is based on the conclusions in this report, which is on file for review at the City of Petaluma Community Development Department, Planning Division, located at 11 English Street in Petaluma.

The literature search and data review indicate that the project area has a low potential for the discovery of potentially significant historic or prehistoric cultural resources. The entire project area was a brackish marsh until at least the second quarter of the 20th century. This precludes the presence of Native American cultural resources in the area. The project area has been filled with soils from various construction projects, dredge spoils, and other materials from unknown sources. There is some potential that these fill soils contain remnants of cultural materials from their sources. However, these transported and badly disturbed soils do not constitute potentially significant cultural resources since they have lost all association with their original location and structure.

Impact – Archaeological Resources Discovered During Construction. The proposed project does not pose a threat to local cultural resources, and no further archaeological investigation or mitigation is necessary at this time. However, while unlikely, there is a slim chance that subsurface deposits could exist in subsurface soils. If artifacts are found in the project area it is most likely that they would be in fill soils that have been imported from other locations (such as dredged material). Such disturbed prehistoric sites are not generally considered scientifically or culturally significant. Nonetheless, disturbed human remains that might be in such imported deposits would be considered significant to the Native American community and would require notification of the County Coroner. The possibility of finding currently unknown cultural resources during project construction is a potentially significant impact and will be addressed in the EIR.

c. Paleontological Resources and Unique Geologic Features. The project site is a former marshland that has historically been used for storage of dredged materials. The site is flat without any significant natural features. There are no known, mapped or observed paleontological resources or unique geological features on the site. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to these resources or features. There will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

17. Agricultural and Forestry Resources

<p>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 (1977) 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 Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>				✓
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?</p>				✓
<p>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))?</p>				✓
<p>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>				✓
<p>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?</p>				✓

a-b, e. Agricultural Resources. The project site is not classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. According to maps in the General Plan 2025 EIR, the site is designated as “Other Land” (General Plan EIR Figure 3.7-3). The site is not in agricultural production, is not zoned for agriculture, and is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. The site is not adjacent to lands in agricultural production or designated for agricultural uses. Thus, the project not directly or indirectly convert or affect agricultural lands. Therefore, the subject project would have no impact on agricultural lands and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

c-e. Forestry Resources. The project site is not forest land nor is it zoned as such. The project site is within the City’s Urban Growth Boundary and is not contiguous to any forest land. Thus, the project would not directly or indirectly convert or affect forestry resources. Therefore, the subject project would have no impact on forest resources and there will be no further discussion of this topic in the EIR.

18. Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/ Mitigation Measures	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 fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		✓		
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)?		✓		
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		✓		

a. Degradation of Quality of Environment. Potential impacts to biological resources will be evaluated in the EIR. The project would not remove existing structures or features that would eliminate examples of major periods of California history.

b. Cumulative Impacts. The project is located within the City’s Urban Growth Boundary. Development and buildout in the City was evaluated in the General Plan 2025 EIR. The project will contribute to the cumulative impacts identified in the City’s GP EIR. However, cumulative impacts will be evaluated in the EIR.

c. Substantial Adverse Effects on Human Beings. There are no direct or indirect effects that would adversely impact human beings, except for potential exposure to traffic and future rail noise sources., which will be evaluated in the EIR.

VI. FIGURES

FIGURE 1: Regional & Vicinity Location



SOURCE:
WRA Environmental Consultants

RENDERING BELOW FROM PROJECT PLANS



FIGURE 2: Proposed Tentative Map



FIGURE 3: Proposed Land Uses



FIGURE 4: Riverfront Park Concept Design



FIGURE 5: Proposed, Existing and Planned Trails



