



SONOMA DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER SPECIFIC PLAN



Supplement #3 to the
Final Environmental Impact Report

SCH # 2022020222 | 12/06/22

1 Introduction and Purpose

Sonoma County prepared and published Draft and Final Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) to evaluate the impacts of the Sonoma Developmental Center (SDC) Specific Plan (State Clearinghouse Number 2022020222). Following publication, the Sonoma County Planning Commission held public hearings on the SDC Specific Plan and Final EIR and provided recommended amendments to the Specific Plan. In accordance with SB 18 and AB 52, the County also conducted further consultation with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria.

Purpose of Supplement #3 to the Final EIR and Summary of Findings

Following publication of the Final EIR, the Planning Commission recommended the following summarized amendments to the Specific Plan:

Open space preservation

1. Expand riparian corridor setback from 50 to 100 feet top of bank, or the nearest existing roadway, for Sonoma Creek.
2. Amend the boundaries of the Core Campus and add and remove lands from the community separator (with no net loss) as follows:
 - a. Add the community separator designation to the approximately 19 acres of already-developed Core Campus land, including Paxton, Thompson, Bane, Residences 138 and 139.
 - b. Remove an equivalent acreage from the community separator of already-developed land east of Railroad adjacent to the southeast corner of the Core Campus. This expansion of the Core Campus shall be zoned as Buffer Open Space.
3. Retain the general plan land use designation of the open space as Public/Quasi-Public Facilities, allow for permitted uses identified in Specific Plan and any future park planning
 - a. Remove Buffer Open Space identified outside of the Core Campus.
 - b. Create a Preserved Parkland and Open Space Combining District that limits the allowed uses in the open space, but still allows all facilities owned and operated by the county.

Housing

4. Retain total number of housing units of 1,000 with a 25% inclusionary requirement with the following changes:

- a. reduce base number of housing units from 733 to 650 to help ensure total number of units does not exceed 1,000.
 - b. increase county-led number of 100% deed-restricted affordable units from 100 to 200.
 - c. limit at least 90% of the market rate units to no more than 1,800 s.f. (~80 units).
5. Table 4-2.1: Minimum and Maximum Unit Percentages by Housing Type (Market Rate Units)
- a. Single family (detached): 10-30%
 - b. Single family (attached): 20-40%
 - c. Multifamily: 40-60%
6. Dedicate no less than a total of 1 acre of land for the development of homes for individuals with developmental disabilities.

Mobility

7. A preferred alignment for the future Hwy 12 local road to run along the southern property line, if feasible.

Land use

8. Hotel as a permitted use
 - a. Extend policies and maps to extend the flex zone and hotel overlay to include the Porter Admin Building and its surface lot
9. Preservation of existing mature trees fronting Sonoma Ave by moving building setback line south of the Main Building to west of the existing grove of mature trees

Historic preservation

10. Prepare a historic preservation plan, prior to removal of any of the buildings based on desired development and suitability of buildings for adaptive reuse
11. Remove requirement to remove/demolish any buildings except the two individually significant structures – Main Building and the Sonoma House, prior to completion of a historic preservation plan

Additional Planning Commission recommendations

12. Modify Guiding Principle #9 to track with State legislation and to remove any implication that economic feasibility is guaranteed.
 - a. Pursue fiscal sustainability over the long-term using a combination of reduced costs and public and private funding for site work, infrastructure, services, and community benefits. (PROPOSED)
 - b. Ensure Long-Term Fiscal Sustainability. Ensure that the proposed plan is financially feasible and sustainable, as financial feasibility is essential to

- the long-term success of the project. Ensure that the proposed plan supports funding for necessary infrastructure improvements and historic preservation while supporting the Sonoma Valley community's needs and galvanizing regional economic growth. (EXISTING)
13. Extend Urban Service Area to include Core Campus west of Arnold Dr.
 14. Consideration of a community benefits agreement as part of a development agreement.
 15. If a developer and the County intend to enter into a development agreement in accordance with Sonoma County Code Chapter 26 Article 100, the developer must meaningfully and in good faith engage with the local community and the developer and the County must consider community benefits as part of the development agreement, including the provision of or support for the following: living wage and other worker protections, local and targeted hire policies, workforce housing, community gardens, public parks and recreation, local small business support/opportunities (e.g. allocate commercial storefronts for local small businesses, economic support for start-up costs, etc...), funding for job training, commitment to economic and educational opportunities for individuals with developmental and/or physical disabilities, local ad and outreach programs for affordable housing, application assistance programs, partnerships with local Affordable Housing organizations and land trusts, among other community benefits.

Following publication of the Final EIR, the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria recommended the following amendments to the Specific Plan. Note that revisions by Sonoma County Staff based on feedback during the public comment period of the Draft EIR are shown in ~~strikeout~~/additions below and revisions made based on consultation with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria are shown underlined in red.

Chapter 2: Open Space and Resources, and Hazards

Section 2.4, page 2-8

“The first known inhabitants of the Planning Area were Native American members of the Coast Miwok, ~~and Pomo, and Winton~~ tribes, who intermingled lived in Sonoma Valley.”

~~2J Native People~~ **Tribal Cultural Preservation:** ~~Preserve the heritage and legacy of the native people in the area through land stewardship and preservation of cultural resources~~

~~on the site.~~ Work in consultation with the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria and other local tribes culturally and geographically associated with the planning area to protect and preserve cultural resources and Tribal Cultural Resources, both within the core campus and for activities within the open space, and support nomination to the National and/or State Registers, as appropriate.

2-48 Provide resources and learning opportunities for residents and visitors about all phases of the history of the site. Materials should be accessible to all ages and abilities and could include posted signs, fliers, or informational sessions, among other things. Materials must be developed in ~~coordination~~ consultation with local tribes culturally and geographically associated with the planning area.

2-52 Develop a Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) ~~plan~~, in consultation with Graton Rancheria and other local tribes culturally and geographically associated with the planning area, to identify and manage cultural and tribal cultural resources. ~~Plan~~The CRMP shall include, but not limited to the following, (e.g. Cultural Resources Management Plan, cultural resource survey, and a treatment testing plan, etc.). Require any unanticipated discovery of archeological or paleontological resources to be evaluated by a qualified archeologist or paleontologist, in ~~coordination~~ consultation with local tribes culturally and geographically associated with the planning area, particularly the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria. A treatment testing plan must be completed and incorporated prior to completion of any final drawings. The testing plan shall include the following: test, demolition, test again, then finalize drawings.

2-53 Ensure that the eventual owner and operator of the preserved parkland and open space preserves protects and maintains, in perpetuity, public access to the SDC cemetery, and maintains and enhances existing signage and seating, as feasible.

Chapter 4: Land use

4-21 Preserve and enhance the landscape elements that contribute to the significance and character of the Sonoma State Home Historic District, including the formal tree grid at the Central Green, the baseball field, Sonoma Bridge, the front entrance gate, ~~and the Eldridge~~

~~Cemetery~~, as well as primary circulation routes. All non-functional turf areas where no recreational purpose is provided and existing should be eliminated and replaced with

drought-tolerant planting. Require the Eldridge Cemetery to be protected, preserved, and accessible to the public, in perpetuity.

Chapter 7: Implementation

7.2 Additional Project Review

As described in Policy 4-13, Sonoma County staff will review all proposed development to ensure consistency with the Specific Plan and all of its policies, conditions, and requirements prior to approval. This would include consistency checks for all Specific Plan policies such as number of preserved historic contributing resources, consistency with the overall development program, and provisions of wildlife corridor buffers and creekside setbacks. To assist in this effort, the County will prepare a checklist to be used for all proposed projects at the SDC site to ensure consistency with Plan policies and Supplemental Standard Conditions of Approval, as detailed in Appendix A. The Supplemental Standard Conditions of Approval will be updated by County staff over time to reflect changing conditions, new information, and compliance with changing local and State laws and guidelines.

Appendix A: SDC Specific Plan Supplemental Conditions of Approval

GEO-4 Halt Work if Cultural Resources or Human Remains are Encountered and

Evaluate Resource. Developers of projects in the Planning Area shall halt all work if cultural resources are encountered during excavation or construction of a project and retain a qualified archaeologist to evaluate and make recommendations for conservation and mitigation. The developer shall notify the Director of Permit Sonoma, and said Director shall notify and provide an opportunity to consult to all tribes culturally and geographically associated with the planning area, particularly the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, to aid in the evaluation, protection, and proper disposition of the resource. If human remains or suspected human remains are discovered,

all such recommendations related to the discovery of human remains shall be in accordance with section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, and section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, as applicable, to ensure proper disposition of the human remains or suspected human remains, including those identified to be Native American remains.

GEO-5 Inadvertent Discovery Protocol. In the event an archaeological resource is encountered during excavation or construction activities for projects within the Planning Area, the construction contractor shall halt construction within 50 feet of the find and immediately notify the City County. Construction activities shall be redirected and the project proponent shall, in consultation with the City County's Director of Permit Sonoma must notify and provide an opportunity to consult to all tribes, particularly the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, culturally and geographically associated with the planning area, retain a qualified professional archaeologist, in consultation with the Director of Permit Sonoma and the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, to 1) evaluate the archaeological resource to determine if it meets the CEQA definition of a historical or unique archaeological resource and 2) make recommendations about the treatment of the resource, as warranted. If the resource does meet the CEQA definition of a historical or unique archaeological resource, then it shall be avoided to the extent feasible by project construction activities. If avoidance is not feasible, then adverse effects to the deposit shall be mitigated as specified by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b) (for historic resources) or Section 21083.2 (for unique archaeological resources). This mitigation may include, but is not limited to, reburial, protection in place, and a thorough recording of the resource on Department of Parks and Recreation Form 523 records, or archaeological data recovery (b)(3)(C), which requires a data recovery plan prior to data recovery excavation, shall be followed. If the significant identified resources are unique archaeological resources, mitigation of these resources shall be subject to the limitations on mitigation measures for archaeological resources identified in CEQA Guidelines Sections 21083.2 (c) through 21083.2 (f).

GEO-6 Conduct Cultural Resources Awareness Training. Prior to the start of any ground disturbance or construction activities, developers of projects in the Planning Area shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist to conduct cultural resource awareness training for construction personnel. This training shall include an overview of what cultural resources are and why they are important, archaeological terms (such as site, feature, deposit), project site history, types of cultural resources likely to be uncovered during excavation, laws that protect cultural resources, and the unanticipated discovery protocol.

GEO-7 Tribal Monitor and Consultation. All local tribes culturally and geographically associated with the planning area, particularly the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, ~~contacted per SB 18 and AB 52 must~~ shall be given the opportunity to monitor ground disturbance activities, including demolition, and must be consulted throughout Plan implementation in accordance with SB 18 and AB 52 ~~of the Proposed Plan.~~

LU-3

d) Written History

i) A historical report shall be prepared, in consultation with local tribes culturally and geographically associated with the planning area, particularly the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria that provides a property description and summarizes the history of the SSHHD and its historical significance, and briefly describes each tribal cultural resource, contributing building and landscape feature, and shall document the true and accurate history of the Sonoma Developmental Center as a place where a diverse group of individuals resided. Documentation shall adhere to National Park Service standards for “short form” HABS/HALS documentation, and shall include the 2019 DPR forms as an appendix. The written historical report shall be prepared by a consultant meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for History or Architectural History and submitted for review and approval.

Final Environmental Impact Report reflects the following changes:

Cultural, Historic, and Tribal Cultural Resources

The last paragraph on page 281 is hereby amended as follows:

Chris Wright, Dry Creek Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians.

The last paragraph on page 281 is hereby amended as follows:

Greg Sarris, ~~The~~ Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria.

The last paragraph on page 281 is hereby amended as follows:

~~Dino W.~~ Reno Franklin, Kashia Pomos Stewarts Point Rancheria.

The last paragraph on page 281 is hereby amended as follows:

~~Michael Mirelez, Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians.~~

~~Michael Mirelez, Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians.~~

In summary, excluding the Planning Commission’s community separator boundary amendments which the County concludes would require further EIR analysis, the recommended changes to the Specific Plan would not change any of the significance of findings. No changes would be required for the already-published EIR.

2 Environmental Analysis

This section summarizes the nature and degree of change associated with recommended amendments to the Specific Plan, excluding the community separator boundary amendments, with respect to each of the environmental impact topics addressed in the Draft EIR.

Aesthetics

The recommended amendments noted above, including the expansion of riparian corridor setbacks, housing development requirements, and historic preservation plan requirements, would not change the findings of the impacts analyzed in this section. Impacts, as listed below, would remain unchanged, if not lessened due to more stringent historic preservation and tribal cultural preservation requirements.

- Impact 3.1-1: Development under the Proposed Plan would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.1-2: Development under the Proposed Plan would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.1-3: Development under the Proposed Plan would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings in nonurbanized areas, or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality in urbanized areas. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.1-4: Development under the Proposed Plan would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. **(Less than Significant)**

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

Given that the recommended amendments pertain to the already developed Core Campus area, these changes would not affect the findings of the impacts analyzed in this section. Impacts would remain unchanged, as listed below.

- Impact 3.2-1: Development under the Proposed Plan would not Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. **(No Impact)**
- Impact 3.2-2: Development under the Proposed Plan would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.2-3: Development under the Proposed Plan would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g)). **(No Impact)**

- Impact 3.2-4: Development under the Proposed Plan would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.2-5: Development under the Proposed Plan would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use, or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. **(Less than Significant)**

Air Quality

Air quality emissions (modeled using CalEEMod version 2020.4.0) associated with the SDC Specific Plan are primarily a function of land uses throughout the entire Planning Area and secondarily of regional and citywide transportation (see Appendix B of the DEIR). Therefore, changes associated with the recommended Planning Commission amendments would be nominal given that the total number of 1,000 housing units would be retained. Impacts would remain unchanged, as listed below.

- Impact 3.3-1: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.3-2: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.3-3: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.3-4: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people. **(Less than Significant)**

Biological Resources

Expanding riparian corridor setbacks and providing additional housing development and historic preservation plan requirements would not change the findings of the impacts analyzed in this section. In addition, expanding the riparian corridor setbacks from 50 to 100 feet top of bank for both Sonoma and Hill Creeks may help reduce potential impacts to biological resources (although this is not a significant impact of the Project) by further limiting development near these resources. As such, impacts would remain unchanged, as listed below.

- Impact 3.4-1: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans,

policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. **(Less than Significant)**

- Impact 3.4-2: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.4-3: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.4-4: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not 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. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.4-5: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.4-6: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. **(Less than Significant)**

Cultural, Historic, and Tribal Cultural Resources

Recommended amendments to the Specific Plan pertain to the already developed Core Campus area and further restrict development along riparian areas. Therefore, the potential to impact existing cultural, historic, and tribal cultural resources would be null. Impacts, as listed below, would remain unchanged, if not lessened due to more stringent historic preservation and tribal cultural preservation requirements.

- Impact 3.5-1: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of individually significant historical resources pursuant to § 15064.5. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.5-2: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would cause a substantial adverse change to the significance of a historic district, as defined as physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the historic district or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historic district would be materially impaired pursuant to § 15064.5. **(Significant and Unavoidable)**
- Impact 3.5-3: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5. **(Less than Significant)**

- Impact 3.5-4: Development allowed by the Proposed Plan would not have the potential to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.5-5: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
 - i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or
 - ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. **(Less than Significant)**

Energy and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Expanding riparian corridor setbacks and providing additional housing development and historic preservation plan requirements would have minimal impacts on transportation and the configuration of land uses throughout the entire Planning Area. As a result, impacts on energy resources, greenhouse gas emissions, and use due to transportation sources would also be nominal, and the impacts listed below would remain unchanged.

- Impact 3.6-1: Implementation of the Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.6-2: Implementation of the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.6-3: Implementation of the Project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.6-4: Implementation of the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. **(Less than Significant)**

Geology and Soils

Expanding riparian corridor setbacks and providing additional housing development and historic preservation plan requirements would not change the significance levels of impacts related to geology and soils. These changes would in fact help reduce potential impacts to geology/soil by further limiting development along existing riparian corridors instead of introducing new infrastructure in areas that are more susceptible to liquefaction. As such, impacts would remain unchanged, as listed below.

- Impact 3.7-1: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not expose residents, visitors and employees, as well as public and private structures, to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismically related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.7-2: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.7-3: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would potentially locate structures on expansive soils or on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of new development under the Proposed Plan, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse, or create substantial risks to life or property. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.7-4: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not 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 wastewater. **(No Impact)**
- Impact 3.7-5: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.7-6: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or 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. **(Less than Significant)**

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Expanding riparian corridor setbacks and providing additional housing development, historic preservation plan, and tribal cultural preservation requirements would not change the significance levels of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. There would be no potential for exposure to hazards or hazardous materials not already analyzed in the EIR, so the impacts below would remain unchanged.

- Impact 3.8-1: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.8-2: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not 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. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.8-3: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.8-4: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not result in development 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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.8-5: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not result in development 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 uses airport, and would result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Planning Area. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.8-6: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.8-7: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. **(Less than Significant)**

Hydrology and Water Quality

Expanding riparian corridor setbacks and providing additional housing development, historic preservation plan, and tribal cultural preservation requirements would still retain the existing land uses planned for the Core Campus area and not cause additional impacts to hydrology and water quality. Further, additional riparian corridor setbacks would in fact help reduce potential impacts to hydrology and water quality of Sonoma and Hill Creeks. As such, the impacts listed below would remain unchanged.

- Impact 3.9-1: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not violate any federal, state, or local water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. **(Less than Significant)**

- Impact 3.9-2: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.9-3: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; 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; or impede or redirect flood flows. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.9-4: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not 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, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, implementation of the Proposed Plan would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.9-5: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. **(Less than Significant)**

Land Use and Planning

Expanding riparian corridor setbacks and providing additional housing development, historic preservation plan, and tribal cultural preservation requirements would still retain the land uses planned for the Core Campus area, and conditions at this location would remain the same. Therefore, impacts would remain unchanged, as listed below.

- Impact 3.10-1: Development under the Proposed Plan would not physically divide an established community. **(Less than significant)**
- Impact 3.10-2: Development under the Proposed Plan would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. **(Less than significant)**

Noise

Expanding riparian corridor setbacks and providing additional housing development, historic preservation plan, and tribal cultural preservation requirements would not change the findings of the impacts analyzed in this section. There would be no additional noise

impacts from these recommended amendments. Thus, impact significance would remain unchanged.

- Impact 3.11-1: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not generate substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Planning Area in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.11-2: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.11-3: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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, implementation of the Proposed Plan would not expose people residing or working in the Planning Area to excessive noise levels. **(No Impact)**

Population and Housing

Recommended amendments to the Specific Plan would still retain the total number of housing units to 1,000. Thus, these amendments would therefore have no additional impact on population and housing, and the impacts below would remain unchanged.

- Impact 3.12-1: Development under the Proposed Plan would not 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). **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.12-2: Development under the Proposed Plan would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. **(No Impact)**

Public Services and Recreation

Recommended amendments to the Specific Plan would still retain the total number of housing units to 1,000 and would not increase demand for public services. Therefore, there impacts listed below would remain unchanged.

- Impact 3.13-1: Development under the Proposed Plan would not 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 fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. **(Less than Significant)**

- Impact 3.13-2: Development under the Proposed Plan would not 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. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.13-3: Development under the Proposed Plan would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. **(Less than Significant)**

Transportation

Changes associated with transportation and VMT from the recommended Planning Commission amendments would be nominal given that the overall land uses and the total number of 1,000 housing units would be retained. Therefore, the significance level of the impacts listed below would remain unchanged.

- Impact 3.14-1: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.14-2: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) pertaining to Vehicle Miles Traveled. **(Significant and Unavoidable)**
- Impact 3.14-3: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment). **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.14-4: Implementation of the Proposed Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access. **(Less than Significant)**

Utilities and Service Systems

Recommended amendments to the Specific Plan would still retain the total number of housing units to 1,000 and would not increase demand for utilities and service systems. These amendments would therefore have no impact on utilities and service systems, and the impacts below would remain unchanged.

- Impact 3.15-1: Full Buildout of the Proposed Project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater and stormwater drainage conveyance systems, and electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications distribution facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects. **(Less than Significant)**

- Impact 3.15-2: Development under the Proposed Plan would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Planning Area and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.15-3: Development under the Proposed Plan would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.15-4: Development under the Proposed Plan would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.15-5: Development under the Proposed Plan would not conflict with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. **(Less than Significant)**

Wildfire

Expanding riparian corridor setbacks and providing additional housing development, historic preservation plan, and tribal cultural preservation requirements would not change the findings of the impacts analyzed in this section. Such amendments would not further impact wildfire risk and emergency response and evacuation. Therefore, there impacts listed below would remain unchanged.

- Impact 3.16-1: Development under the Proposed Plan would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.16-2: Development under the Proposed Plan would not exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.16-3: Development under the Proposed Plan would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. **(Less than Significant)**
- Impact 3.16-4: Development under the Proposed Plan would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. **(Less than Significant)**

