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## OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Maria Drive Apartment Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lead agency name and address: | City of Petaluma  
11 English Street  
Petaluma, CA 94952 |
| Contact person and phone number: | Alicia Giudice, Senior Planner  
(707) 778-4401 |
| Project Location: | 35 Maria Drive  
APN: 007-280-078 & 077 |
| Project sponsor's name and address: | Marty Brill  
JDA West, LLC  
505 Montgomery Street, 11th  
San Francisco, CA 94111 |
| General plan designation: | Mixed Use |
| Zoning: | Planned Unit District  
Greenbriar Medical and Office PUD |
| Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.) | The applicant has applied to the City of Petaluma for a 144 unit apartment complex on 5.85 acres. The site is currently developed with an existing 16,000 square foot medical/office complex that will be demolished. The proposed development is for 144 apartment units consisting of, 54 one-bedroom units (800 sq. ft.), 72 two-bedroom units (1,000 sq. ft.) and 18 3-bedroom units (1,275 sq. ft.). The project requires the following:  
1. General Plan Amendment;  
2. Rezoning;  
3. Site Plan & Architectural Review; and  
4. Lot line adjustment to merge the two existing parcels (007-280-078 & 077) into one parcel (condition of project approval). |
| Surrounding land uses and setting; briefly describe the project's surroundings: | The site is currently developed with an existing medical/office complex and other site improvements such as landscaping and a paved parking area. East of the subject property is an existing multi-family apartment complex. West and southwest of the subject property are commercial uses and directly to the north is a public path which runs along Washington Creek and abuts to an existing single family residential neighborhood. South of the subject property is an existing little league baseball field and an existing elementary school. |
| Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financial approval, or participation agreements): | N/A |
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1. OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

**General Plan:** The Petaluma General Plan 2025, adopted in 2008, serves the following purposes:

- Reflects a commitment on the part of the City Council and their appointed representatives and staff to carry out the Plan;
- Outlines a vision for Petaluma’s long-range physical and economic development and resource conservation; enhances the true quality of life for all residents and visitors; recognizes that all human activity takes place within the limits of the natural environment; and reflects the aspirations of the community;
- Provides strategies and specific implementing policies and programs that will allow this vision to be accomplished;
- Establishes a basis for judging whether specific development proposals and public projects are in harmony with Plan policies and standards;
- Allows City departments, other public agencies, and private developers to design projects that will enhance the character of the community, preserve and enhance critical environmental resources, and minimize impacts and hazards; and
- Provides the basis for establishing and setting priorities for detailed plans and implementing programs, such as Development Codes, the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), facilities and Master Plans, redevelopment projects, and the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

**General Plan EIR:** Because CEQA discourages “repetitive discussions of the same issues” (CEQA Guidelines section 15152(b)) and allows limiting discussion of a later project that is consistent with a prior plan to impacts which were not examined as significant effects in a prior EIR or significant effects which could be reduced by revisions in the later project. (CEQA Guidelines section 15152(d)) No additional benefit to the environment or public purpose would be served by preparing an EIR merely to restate the analysis and significant and unavoidable effects found to remain after adoption of all General Plan policies/mitigation measures. All General Plan policies adopted as mitigation apply to the subject Project.

The impacts identified as significant and unavoidable in the General Plan are:

- Increased motor vehicle traffic which would result in unacceptable level of service (LOS) at six intersections:
  - McDowell Boulevard North/Corona Road, Lakeville Street/Caulfield Lane, Lakeville Street/East D Street, Petaluma Boulevard South/D Street, Sonoma Mt. Parkway/Ely Boulevard South/East Washington Street, and McDowell Boulevard North/Rainier Avenue
- Traffic related noise at General Plan buildout, which would result in a substantial increase in existing exterior noise levels that are currently above City standards.
- Cumulative noise from proposed resumption of freight and passenger rail operations and possible resumption of intra-city trolley service, which would increase noise impacts.
- Air quality impacts resulting from General Plan buildout to population levels that could conflict with the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy. (This regional air quality plan has since been replaced by the 2010 Clean Air Plan, discussed in the Initial Study Air Quality evaluation, Section 3.3.)
- A possible cumulatively considerable incremental contribution from General Plan development to the significant impact of global climate change.

The EIR reviewed all potentially significant environmental impacts and developed measures and policies to mitigate impacts. Nonetheless, significant and unavoidable impacts were determined to occur under the General Plan. Therefore, the City prepared and adopted a statement of overriding considerations, which provides the rationale on the ultimate balancing of the merits of approving the project despite the potential environmental impacts. This environmental document tiers off of the GP EIR and holds that all potentially significant environmental impacts identified under the GP EIR are “acceptable” and are hereby incorporated by reference.
1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Maria Drive Apartments Project consists of a General Plan Amendment, Rezone and Site Plan and Architectural Review. The General Plan Amendment would change the current land use designation from Mixed Use, which allows a maximum density of 30 units per acre, to High Density Residential which allows a range of 18.1 – 30.0 units per acre; Rezoning the subject property would change the zone from Planned Unit District (Greenbriar Medical & Office PUD) to R5. In addition, a Lot line adjustment would be required to merge the two existing parcels (007-280-077 & 078) into one parcel to allow for the development of an 144 unit apartment complex on the 5.85 acre site, which would result in a density 24.6 units per acre. The proposed development includes six buildings containing a mix of unit types as follows:

- 54 one-bedroom units (800 sq. ft.),
- 72 two-bedroom units (1,000 sq. ft.) and
- 18 3-bedroom units (1,275 sq. ft.).
- 8 accessible units (all ground floor units will be adaptable)
- 3 units to accommodate those who are sensory impaired

The apartment buildings will be three stories in height with an average building height of 35 feet (approximately 42’ to the peak of the roof). The project includes two points of access from Maria Drive and internal circulation via a center drive aisle. A total of 252 vehicle parking spaces and 144 bicycle parking spaces are proposed throughout the site. A proposed courtyard provides common areas such as a 3,517 square foot community building, swimming pool/hot tub, accessible picnic area, and playground area. Existing concrete wall along the westerly property line will remain. The chain link fence along the northerly property boundary would be removed and replaced with a combination wrought iron fence with concrete columns. A similar wrought iron fence will be placed along the property frontage.

The site is currently developed with an existing medical/office complex, which will be demolished to accommodate the proposed development.

Pedestrian and bicycle facilities include sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signal phases, bike racks and project connectivity to the adjacent Class I multi-use path along the Washington Trail.
1.2. PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The project site is located at 35 Maria Drive in the incorporated City of Petaluma, within Sonoma County. The assessor parcel numbers are 007-280-078 and 007-280-077.

The 5.85-acre project site is located on the northeast side of Petaluma, east of East Washington and North of South McDowell Boulevard. The site is currently developed with an existing 16,000 square foot medical/office complex that was constructed in the mid 1970’s. The existing buildings would be demolished as part of the project proposal.

Across the street, east of the subject property is an existing 224 unit apartment complex, Addison Ranch (a.k.a.: Greenbriar Apartments) on approximately 17.2 9.76 acres (General Plan designation - Medium Density Residential 8.1-18.0 hu/ac and zoned PUD). To the west and south, is the Washington Square Shopping Center (zoned Community Commercial). Directly to the north is a public path adjacent to Washington Creek. Beyond the path/creek is a single family residential neighborhood (zoned R2 with a General Plan land use designation of Low Density residential 2.6-8.0 hu/ac). Southwest of the subject property is an existing little league baseball field and an existing elementary school (McDowell Elementary School). The East Side Transit Center, located approximately 1,000 feet southwest of the project site, provides nearby access to a transit hub. The map below shows an aerial view of the subject property and its surrounding uses.

Figure 2: Maria Drive Apartments Site Aerial

1.3. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Petaluma is located in southwestern Sonoma County along the 101 corridor approximately 15 miles south of Santa Rosa and 20 miles north of San Rafael. It is situated at the northernmost navigable end of the Petaluma River, a tidal estuary that snakes southward to San Pablo Bay. The City originated along the banks of the Petaluma River, spreading outward over the floor of the Petaluma River Valley as the City developed. The Valley itself is defined by Sonoma Mountain on the northeast and by the hills extending northward from Burdell Mountain on the west. To the south are the Petaluma Marshlands and the San Francisco Bay beyond.
Petaluma’s Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) defines the limits within which urban development may occur and encompasses approximately 9,911 acres. The UGB was implemented in 1998 and extends through 2025. The General Plan and EIR evaluated potential impacts associated with existing and proposed development within the UGB.

The subject property currently has a General Plan land use designation of Mixed Use and is zoned Planned Unit District (Greenbrier Medical & Office PUD). The map below shows General Plan and zoning of the subject property and the surrounding properties. The applicant is requesting to amend the General Plan from the current land use designation of Mixed Use (maximum density allowed in Mixed-Use land use is 30 hu/ac) to High Density Residential (18.1 – 30.0 hu/ac). The High Density Residential classification would permit a full range of housing types, and is intended for multi-family housing in specific areas where higher density is considered appropriate.

Figure 3: Existing GP and Zoning Designations

The subject project site is located between commercial retail and residential land uses, in the northeastern most portion of the Washington Core Planning Area. The project site is currently developed with an existing medical/office complex. The complex includes four existing one-story buildings, parking and landscaping (turf and perimeter trees), which are proposed for demolition as part of the project. The site was developed in the mid 1970’s and the buildings are in need of maintenance and repair. In addition, many of the office spaces are vacant.

The subject property is currently zoned Planned Unit District and is part of the Greenbrier Medical & Office PUD. The project proposal includes a zoning ordinance amendment from PUD to R5. The R-5 zone is consistent with and implements the proposed High Density Residential General Plan land use classification. The R5 zoning district is applied to areas intended for the most urban housing types at densities ranging from 18.1 to 30.0 units per acre, but where lower density housing is considered conforming.

The subject project is consistent with the Land Use designations set forth and evaluated in the Petaluma General Plan 2025 ("General Plan") and its EIR, which was certified on April 7, 2008. The General Plan and
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation is Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

|---------------|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|

**DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.  

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.  

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.  

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.  

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.
A Notice of Intent to adopt the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration, which consists of this Declaration, the attached Initial Study and all mitigation measures contained herein, will be prepared, distributed and posted for the public comment period of June 27, 2013 through July 17, 2013.

Signature: Alicia Guidice, Senior Planner

Applicant Signature:

3. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The following section addresses the potential level of impact relating to each aspect of the environment.

3.1. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Considered</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2025 GP and EIR.

Aesthetics Setting:

The 5.85 acre site is located east of Washington Street and North of Highway 101, in the central portion of the City of Petaluma. The general characteristics of the properties surrounding the project area include a mixture of residential (single family and multi-family residential) and commercial uses. A little league baseball field and elementary school are located to the southeast of the subject property. The project site is currently developed with an existing medical/office complex constructed in the mid 70's, associated landscaping and parking, all of which would be demolished and replaced with the proposed development.

The project proposes the development of 6 new apartment buildings containing a total of 144 units including, 54 one-bedroom units (800 sq. ft.), 72 two-bedroom units (1,000 sq. ft.) and 18 three-bedroom units (1,275 sq. ft.). Two different yet complimentary building types, Type A and B are proposed. The apartment buildings will have three stories in height (approximately 42' to the peak of the roof). The project includes on-site parking (252 parking spaces both uncovered and covered - garages and carports) associated common areas such as a courtyard, community building (approximately 3,500 sq. ft.), swimming pool/hot tub, picnic area, and playground area (refer to Figure 1 above.)

The design focus of the project is the centrally located courtyard. The courtyard has been designed with a multi-age playground and tot lot, fully fenced in pool and patio area as well as a trellised picnic and BBQ area. The landscape has been configured to provide open space and grassed turf areas adjacent to the courtyard and the associated amenities. The landscaping provides a mix of public, semi-public and private spaces for residents.
Maria Drive Architectural Design
The overall design theme is a blend of residential and California Craftsmen architectural styles, complete with batten and board siding, shiplap and manufactured wood. The two-building types, A & B, have similar design features to create both a “front door” and a “back of house” composition but distinct enough on their own merits. The consistent design feature at the entry for both building types is a gabled portico which will have a base of cultured stone and vertical banding of the batten & board siding. The gabled roof will be supported with Craftsmen styled outriggers.

The architectural materials utilize three (3) primary siding materials for both A & B; the design is a contemporary palette. There are three (3) primary siding types composed of cementitious siding materials; the batten & board siding, and two different heights of shiplap or horizontal siding (3” and 6”). The third exterior material introduced is stucco, which will be limited to the corners of each building type. Stucco will also be utilized for exterior balcony half-walls and vertical column elements supporting the patios and will have a belly band to separate it from the shiplap siding. Additional design elements include painted wood plank shutters, painted wood outriggers, and powder coated metal railings at patio and deck half walls. Below is a contextual drawing (Figure 4) illustrating the proposed project along Maria Drive at the main entrance to the project site.

Figure 4: Maria Drive Apartments Rendering

MARIA DRIVE APARTMENTS

Aesthetics Impact Discussion:

3.1(a). No Impact: The site is not located in an area that has expansive views or valuable scenic vistas. It is located within a central urban area of the City of Petaluma. Views of hillsides, ridgelines and open space are not readily visible from the project site and would not change with the project. Therefore, the Project will not impact scenic vistas.

3.1(b). No Impact: The site is not located in an area designated as a scenic resource, is not on a state highway and contains no scenic resources. The project site is located within an urbanized area of the City. Views of the hills to the northwest are occasionally visible along Maria Drive. The proposed project will not
interfere with views along Maria Drive. Therefore, the Project will not impact scenic resources visible from a state scenic highway or locally scenic street.

3.1(c). Less Than Significant Impact: The project site serves as a transition area between a large retail commercial area and residential land uses. The proposed building massing and architectural concept are consistent with the existing visual character of the project area. The proposed development introduces a three-story residential development to the project area, which would be in conformance with the proposed R5 zone height limits. The proposed design is in keeping with the existing character of the neighborhood. The landscaping plan and orientation of proposed buildings towards the center courtyard buffer future residences from the adjacent commercial center, and provide existing residences in the project vicinity with a complimentary land use.

The project site is already developed with urban uses and there are no scenic or natural resources onsite. The existing complex would be replaced by a residential project that would serve as a transition to adjacent multifamily and single-family neighborhoods. The project architecture will complement existing development in the area and will be landscaped throughout the grounds and parking areas. The proposed project will not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact to the visual character of the neighborhood.

3.1(d). Less Than Significant with Mitigation: Exterior lights will be installed in conjunction with the proposed development, which will increase artificial light onsite somewhat, compared to the existing development. The project has the potential to result in new lighting associated with streetlights and exterior residential lighting that could affect nighttime view in the project area. In order to assure that new lighting introduced onsite does not constitute a significant affect, development is required to implement Mitigation Measures VIS-1 and VIS-2 below. These measure require that all exterior lighting be directed onto the project site and access ways, and shielded to prevent glare and intrusion onto adjacent properties. Only low-intensity light standards and/or wall mounted lights shall be used (no flood lights), and lights attached to buildings shall provide a "soft wash" of light against the wall and shall generate no direct glare. The project site is surrounded by existing urban uses with existing site and street lighting. With mitigation, the proposed project will not substantially increase light and glare onsite or in the project vicinity. Therefore, the Project will have a less than significant effect on the environment due to increased light and glare.

Mitigation Measures:

VIS-1: In order to avoid light intrusion onto adjacent properties, all exterior lighting shall be directed onto the project site and access ways, and shielded to prevent glare and intrusion onto adjacent properties.

VIS-2: Only low-intensity light standards and/or wall mounted lights shall be used (no flood lights), and lights attached to buildings shall provide a "soft wash" of light against the wall and shall generate no direct glare.
### 3.2. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** General Plan Land Use and UGB.

### Agricultural Setting:

Agricultural lands are limited within the UGB and there are no identified forest lands within the City of Petaluma. Agricultural resources are prevalent outside of City limits and within the County of Sonoma. An impetus to the establishment of the UGB was to preserve natural resources, agricultural lands, and other open spaces.

### Agricultural Resources Impact Discussion:

**3.2(a-e). No Impact:** Agricultural lands are limited within the UGB and do not include the project site or area. There are no identified forest lands within the City of Petaluma. The project site will have no impact on prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. There are no Williamson act contracts onsite or in the project vicinity and the project would not interfere with any such contract. The proposed project would not conflict with any existing zoning for agricultural or forestry purposes. The project would have no impact to agricultural or forestry lands.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.
3.3. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Air Quality Setting:

The City of Petaluma is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, which is regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The Federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act establish national and state ambient air quality standards respectively. The BAAQMD is responsible for planning, implementing, and enforcing air quality standards within the Bay Area Air Basin, including the City of Petaluma.

The BAAQMD operates several air quality monitoring stations, the closest to the project site is located in downtown Santa Rosa at 5th Street, approximately 15 miles north of Petaluma. The Santa Rosa monitoring station records pollutant concentration levels for carbon monoxide (CO), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂), Ozone (O₃), and Particulate Matter (PM₂.₅). The BAAQMD Compliance and Enforcement Division routinely conducts inspections and audits of potential polluting sites to ensure compliance with applicable federal, State, and BAAQMD regulations.

The 2005 Bay Area Ozone Strategy and the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan contain district wide control measures to reduce ozone precursor and carbon monoxide emissions. The 2005 Ozone Strategy was based on the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) employment and populations projections for 2003. General plans that are consistent with ABAG projections are considered consistent with the growth projections of the adopted air quality plan. At the time of adoption, the City’s General Plan was not in conformance with the population projections of the 2005 Ozone Strategy.

BAAQMD adopted the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan (CAP) in September 2010. 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. As stated above, general plans that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts used in the CAP are considered consistent with the growth projections of the adopted air quality plan.
Air quality impacts resulting from the anticipated growth and development of the City were addressed in the EIR for the General Plan. No new or increased impact beyond what is already anticipated in the 2025 General Plan result of the proposed multi-family residential project.

The BAAQMD is charged with implementing regulations and programs to reduce air pollution and assist the Bay Area in reaching all outdoor air quality standards. The Bay Area Air Basin, including the project site, is designated as non-attainment for both the one-hour and eight-hour state ozone standards: 0.09 parts per million (ppm) and 0.070 ppm, respectively. The Bay Area is also in non-attainment for the PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ state standards, which require an annual arithmetic mean (AAM) of less than 20 μg/m$^3$ for PM$_{10}$ and less than 12 μg/m$^3$ for PM$_{2.5}$. In addition, the Bay Area Basin is designated as non-attainment for the national 24-hour fine particulate matter (PM2.5) standard and will be required to prepare a State Implementation Plan (SIP) for PM2.5. All other national ambient air quality standards within the Bay Area Air Basin are in attainment.¹

Air quality within the Bay Area Air Basin is a combination of natural geographical and meteorological conditions as well as human activities such as construction and development, operation of vehicles, industry and manufacturing, and other anthropogenic emission sources.

General Plan
According to the Petaluma General Plan EIR (Air Quality – Greenhouse Gas Emissions Section), vehicle emissions were the greatest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions (59 percent), which is discussed further under Section 3.7 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions). All General Plan policies adopted as mitigation apply to the proposed multi-family residential project, including the following:

Community Design
4-P-6 Improve air quality through required planting of trees along streets.
4-P-15D Reduce emissions from residential and commercial uses by requiring the following:
  - Use of high efficiency heating and other appliances, such as cooking equipment, refrigerators, and furnaces, and low NOx water heaters in new and existing residential units;
  - Compliance with or exceed requirements of CCR Title 24 for new residential and commercial buildings;
  - Incorporation of passive solar building design and landscaping conducive to passive solar energy use for both residential and commercial uses, i.e., building orientation in a south to southeast direction, encourage planting of deciduous trees on west sides of structures, landscaping with drought-resistant species, and use of groundcovers rather than pavement to reduce heat reflection;
  - Encourage the use of battery-powered, electric, or other similar equipment that does not impact local air quality for nonresidential maintenance activities;

4-P-16 To reduce combustion emissions during construction and demolition phases, the contractor of future individual projects shall encourage the inclusion in construction contracts of the following requirements or measures shown to be equally effective:
  - Maintain construction equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specification for the duration of construction;
  - Minimize idling time of construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment;
  - Use alternative fuel construction equipment (i.e., compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, and unleaded gasoline);
  - Use add-on control devices such as diesel oxidation catalysts or particulate filters;
  - Use diesel equipment that meets the ARB's 2000 or newer certification standard for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines;
  - Phase construction of the project, and
  - Limit the hours of operation of heavy-duty equipment.

¹ "2010 Clean Air Plan," prepared by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, September 2010.
Air Quality Impact Discussion:

3.3(a-c). Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed multi-family residential project does not propose any additional development not anticipated by the 2025 General Plan. The current General Plan land use designation onsite is Mixed-Use, which allows for a residential density of up to 30 dwelling units per acre. The Maria Drive Apartments proposed 24.6 dwelling units per acre. As such, the proposed multi-family residential project is consistent with the impacts evaluated in the General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project will not by itself violate any air quality standard or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Impacts to air quality resulting from project implementation will be less than significant.

Construction Emissions Significance Criteria

Air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would occur over the short term in association with construction activities such as demolition, grading and vehicle/equipment use. Major sources of emissions during grading and site preparation include (1) exhaust emissions from construction vehicles; (2) equipment and fugitive dust generated by construction vehicles and equipment traveling over exposed surfaces; and (3) soil disturbances from grading and backfilling. Air quality emissions generated during construction of the proposed project will be temporary and cease once construction is complete.

Emissions impacts from construction relating to ozone precursors (ROG and NOx), particulate matter, (PM) and air toxics are evaluated for the purposes of this Initial Study using the 2010 CAP and BAAQMD's 2010 CEQA significance thresholds. Average daily construction emissions in pounds per day (lbs/day), of 54/ROG, 54/NOx, 82/PM10 (exhaust) and 54/PM2.5 (exhaust) or less are considered less than significant under the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA thresholds. There is no carbon monoxide (CO) emissions threshold applicable to construction emissions. Also see the air quality screening level discussion below.

Operational Emissions Significance Criteria

The BAAQMD CEQA significance thresholds for average daily maximum (lbs/day) ROG, NOx, PM10 (exhaust) and PM2.5 (exhaust) are the same for the project long-term (operational) emissions as for construction emissions. The annual maximum tons per year (tpy) are specified in the significance threshold for operational emissions as follows: 10 tpy/ROG, 10 tpy/NOx, 15 tpy/PM10 (exhaust) and 10 tpy PM2.5 (exhaust). For carbon monoxide (CO), the operational significance threshold is 9.0 particles per minute (8-hour average) and 20.0 ppm (1-hour average). Also see the air quality screening level discussion below.

The proposed project will result in both stationary and mobile sources of operational emissions. Although there are no new stationary "point sources" created (large emitters such as manufacturing plants), the project will include small individual "area sources" such as residential furnaces and water heaters and consumer products such as solvents, cleaners and paints. Most stationary source emissions from residential use would come from the consumption of natural gas. Long-term mobile source emissions will result from vehicle trips associated with the residential use of the project site, and to a small extent, off-road sources such as landscaping equipment. The project will generate a net average of 393 new vehicle trips per day (see Section 3.16).

New Source Risk and Hazards Significance Criteria

If emissions of TAC's or PM2.5 exceed any of the thresholds of significance listed below, the proposed project would result in a significant impact and mitigation would be required:

- An excess cancer risk level of more than 10 in 1 million, or a non-cancer (chronic or acute) hazard index greater than 1.0.
- An incremental increase of more than 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter annual average PM2.5.

A project would have a cumulatively considerable impact if the aggregate total of all past, present, and foreseeable future sources within a 1,000 foot radius of the fence line of a source or from the location of a receptor, plus the contribution from the project, exceeds the following thresholds:

- An excess cancer risk levels of more than 100 in one million or a chronic non-cancer hazard index (from all local sources) greater than 10.0.
- 0.8 micrograms per cubic meter average PM2.5.
Maria Drive Apartments Air Quality Screening

In addition to the significance thresholds outlined above, the 2010 BAAQMD Guidelines provide "screening criteria" which were developed to establish a conservative estimate of whether a proposed project could result in significant impacts to air quality. If all the screening criteria are met, the local agency is not required to perform a detailed quantitative analysis of a project because the criteria were developed by BAAQMD using the Urban Land Use Emissions Model (URBEMIS), which contains default emissions assumptions for certain types of land uses. The proposed project does not have any characteristics that would create emissions from stationary source engines or industrial sources subject to BAAQMD rules and regulations.

The screening criteria assume a "greenfield" development without consideration of any mitigation measures and do not assume sustainable design elements or an infill location close to public transit and services. The project is located in close proximity to the East Side Transit Center and provides convenient access to public transportation opportunities. The proposed project will exceed the minimum requirements of Title 24 since development is required to achieve CalGreen Building Code standard, which generally exceed Title 24 by 15% through the incorporation of sustainable design features and resource- and energy conservation measures. It is an infill project, located close to public transportation and public services, and replacing existing development. All of these factors further reduce its air quality emissions impacts and place it well below the BAAQMD screening criteria.

Because the project is below the screening size criteria in BAAQMD Guidelines Table 3-1, it will not result in the generation of operational-related criteria air pollutants and/or precursors that exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance. Operation of the project would therefore result in less than significant project and cumulative impacts to air quality from criteria air pollutants and precursor emissions.

The project is well below the screening level size for apartments, which is 451 units for operation and 240 unit for construction, as shown in BAAQMD Guidelines Table 3-1. In addition, the proposed construction does not include the simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases, and will not involve more intensive construction activities than the default assumptions used by URBEMIS for demolition, grading, cut/fill, earth movement and truck haul material transport. Therefore air quality emissions generated by construction would have a less than significant impact and would not violate any air quality standards.

At operation, air quality emissions will be limited to typical residential sources including the operation of vehicles and the occupancy of residential units. The proposed development is required to adhere to all Title 24 standards and the CalGreen Building specifications. These requirements assure that buildings are energy efficient and conserve resources. In addition, efficiencies are gained due to the infill nature of the project, proximity to nearby shopping, access to transit, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities proposed onsite and connectivity to existing facilities in the project vicinity. As mentioned above, as a 144-unit apartment complex, the subject project is below the operational screening level of 451 units and therefore would have less than significant impacts to air quality at operation.

3.3(d). Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation: In order to evaluate the potential air quality impacts to sensitive receptors, including existing residences in the project vicinity and the new residences to be developed onsite, a Health Risk Analysis was conducted by Illingworth & Rodkin (dated October 22, 2012) for the Maria Drive Apartment Complex. The following discussion is based on finding of that analysis. Operation of the proposed project is not expected to cause any localized emissions that could expose sensitive receptors to unhealthy air pollutant levels. However, construction of the proposed Maria Drive Apartments Project has the potential to impact existing sensitive receptors in the project vicinity due to short-term exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Existing Sensitive Receptors

Construction activity would include demolition of existing buildings, excavation, grading, building construction, paving and application of architectural coatings. During demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities, substantial amounts of fugitive dust could be generated. The amount of dust generated would be highly variable and would be dependent on the size of the area disturbed at any given time, amount of activity, soil conditions and meteorological conditions. To address fugitive dust emissions that lead to elevated PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ levels near construction sites the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines identify best control measures such as water exposed surfaces,
limiting the area of disturbance, covering haul trucks, and paving driveways. These are set forth under mitigation Measure AQ-1 below. With implementation of best control measures during construction activities and specifically during site grading, when the majority of fugitive dust is generated, air quality impacts to nearby sensitive receptors can be reduced to levels below significance.

In addition to fugitive dust, construction equipment and associated heavy-duty truck traffic generates diesel exhaust, which is a toxic air contaminant (TAC). BAAQMD has developed screening tables for evaluating potential impacts from TACs associated with construction projects. These screening tables indicate that construction activities similar to this project could have significant impacts within 1,000 feet of nearby residences, with the primary impact being excess cancer risk. As such, the project specific health risk assessment was conducted to evaluate increased cancer risk due to demolition, excavation, grading and building construction occurring over a fifteen-month construction period.

The U.S. EPA ISCST3 dispersion model was used to predict concentrations of diesel particulate matter (DPM) at existing residences near the project site. The ISCST3 dispersion model is a BAAQMD recommended model for use in refined modeling analysis of CEQA projects. The ISCST3 modeling of construction activities used a single area source with a release height-of-6 meters to represent the project construction area. The elevated source height reflects the height of the construction equipment's exhaust pipes and buoyancy of the exhaust plume. Emissions from trucks traveling near the project site were assumed to travel along Maria Drive and were modeled as a line source.

The dispersion modeling incorporated construction emissions projections generated by the California Emissions Estimator Model Version 2011.1.1 (CalEEMod), which assumed that construction activities would occur 5 days per week between 8 am - 5 pm. The CalEEMod model provided annual PM$_{2.5}$ exhaust emissions (assumed to be DPM) for the off road construction equipment used for construction of the project of 0.13 and 0.055 tons per year for 2013 and 2014 construction years, respectively. On-road PM$_{2.5}$ exhaust emissions were calculated by CalEEMod as 0.01 and 0.005 tons per year for 2013 and 2014, respectively. On-road emissions are a result of on-road haul trucks travel during demolition activities and vendor deliveries. Since only a portion of the total on-road vehicle exhaust emissions would affect local residents near the project site, emissions from vehicles traveling on Maria Drive near the project site were calculated based on the length of roadway travelled relative to the total travel distance used by CalEEMod to calculate total emissions.

The ISCST3 model used a 5-year data set (1990 - 1994) of hourly meteorological data from the Petaluma Airport, located about 0.85 miles northwest of the project site. Period average concentrations from construction activities were predicted for 2013 and 2014, with the concentrations for each construction year based on the 5-year average concentrations from modeling 5 years of meteorological data. DPM concentrations were calculated at receptors placed at nearby residences for two receptor heights, 5.9 feet (1.8 meters) and 15.9 feet (4.8 meters), representative of the first and second floor levels of apartments and multi-level homes east of Maria Drive.

Increased cancer risks were calculated using the maximum modeled annual concentration and BAAQMD recommended risk assessment methods using age sensitivity factors for child exposure (3rd trimester through 2 years of age) and for an adult exposure. Since the modeling was conducted assuming emissions occurred 365 days per year, the default OEHHA exposure period of 365 days per year was used. Infant and child exposures were assumed to occur at residences through the entire construction period.

Results of this assessment indicate an incremental child cancer risk of 21.3 excess cancer cases in a million and the adult incremental cancer risk of 1.1 excess cancer cases in a million would occur at the location of the Maximum Exposed Individual (MEI). The location of the MEI is on the first floor of the multi-family residences on the east side of Maria Drive. The predicted excess child cancer risk of 21.3 in one million would exceed the significance threshold of 10 in one million and would be considered significant. The annual average PM$_{2.5}$ concentration at the MEI location was modeled as 0.17 µg/m$^3$, which is below the BAAQMD threshold of 0.3 µg/m$^3$. The maximum non-cancer risk evaluated using BAAQMD's hazard index would be 0.03, while the threshold is 1.0. Therefore, the project will be subject to mitigation measure to assure that potential impacts to sensitive receptors are reduced to level below significant due to an increased risk of cancer from exposure to fugitive dust and TACs.
In order to reduce DPM and fugitive dust and minimize the exposure of existing sensitive receptors to TACs “Best Management Practices” (BMP) will be implemented during all phases of construction in accordance with AQ-1 through AQ-4 below. BMPs include limiting idling time of construction equipment, assuring that all equipment is properly maintained to manufactured specification, and staging equipment away from sensitive receptors. The type of construction equipment used onsite as well as the construction schedule and operating time of equipment also contribute to the level of DPM generated. The mitigation measure below specify construction activity requirements that will reduce emissions and limit the exposure of nearby sensitive receptors. Specifically, Measures: AQ-1 through AQ-4 would reduce the computed maximum child cancer risk to 9.3 in one million and a maximum PM2.5 concentration of 0.07 μg/m³, as reported in the Health Risk Assessment Report. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-4, set forth below, air quality impacts to existing sensitive receptors will be reduced to levels below significance.

Sensitive Receptors Onsite
The subject project would site new residences, which are considered a sensitive receptor, in proximity to an existing Loading Dock (Safeway) and in the vicinity of an existing stationary source emitter (Chevron). Proximity to loading docks is associated with exposure to TAC's or PM 2.5, predominately from diesel emissions. The BAAQMD recommends using a 1,000-foot radius around a project site for purposes of identifying community health risks from siting a new sensitive receptor. As a new sensitive receptor would be located within 1,000 feet the health risk analysis was conducted to identify the potential risk of exposure to future sensitive receptors.

Impacts from Safeway Loading Dock
The U.S. EPA ISCST3 dispersion model was used to predict concentrations of diesel particulate matter (DPM) from future loading activities at new project residences. Modeling was conducted using 5 years (1990 - 1994) of hourly meteorological data from the Petaluma Airport obtained from BAAQMD. Truck emissions were modeled as a line source (a series of volume sources along a line) representing a travel route from Safeway to the north along Maria Drive (which is considered a conservative assumption since they may also travel to the south, but that would be away from new receptors). DPM concentrations were calculated at receptors within the project site at a height of 1.8 meters. Cancer risks were calculated for a 70-year exposure assuming constant emissions at 2015 levels over the entire 70 year period. A cancer risk adjustment factor of 1.7 was used for this analysis. The location of maximum risk is in the southern end of the proposed project as shown below in Figure 5.
As reported in the Health Risk Assessment Report, emissions were calculated using emission rates from EMFAC2011 for 2015 for trucks in Sonoma County. Five (5) diesel-fueled medium duty trucks (MHDs) and 5 diesel-fueled heavy duty trucks (HHDTs) were assumed to operate daily for 365 days per year between the hours of 8am to 5pm. Emissions were calculated assuming a travel speed of 25 mph on Maria Drive and 5 mph along the back of Safeway to the loading dock. Emissions for years beyond 2015 were assumed to be the same as those for 2015.

The maximum increased cancer risk for a new residential receptor at the project site from diesel particulate matter emitted by delivery trucks is 0.40 per million and PM$_{2.5}$ concentration of 0.0007 µg/m$^3$. This is well below the established annual average threshold of 0.8 µg/m$^3$ for PM$_{2.5}$. Therefore, new residences would not be subjected to substantial emission concentrations due to the Safeway loading dock and impacts to proposed sensitive receptors would be less than significant.
Impacts from Stationary Sources

The BAAQMD’s Google Earth Screening Tool also provides locations of stationary sources of TACs and screening level exposures that do not account for the distance from the source. This tool was used to identify sources within 1,000 feet of the site. This tool identified one source, Plant G4887, that is a Chevron gas station located at 1440 East Washington Street about 600 feet west of the project. Based on these data, the nearby gas station is predicted to have a cancer risk of 3.4 in one million, a hazard index of less than 0.1, and a PM$_{2.5}$ concentration of less than 0.1 $\mu$g/m$^3$ at the proposed project site. These are well below the established thresholds. Therefore, health impacts to new sensitive receptors on the project site due to exposure from the nearby stationary source would be less than significant.

Cumulative Community Risk Impacts

Based on screening data provided by BAAMQD, the combination of exposures from Safeway loading dock activity and the nearby stationary source would result in excess cancer risks of less than 4 per million, PM$_{2.5}$ exposures of less than 0.1 $\mu$g/m$^3$ and a Hazard Index well below 1.0. These exposures are well below the cumulative source thresholds identified by BAAQMD. Therefore, new residences on the project site would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentration and impacts would be less than significant.

3.3(e). No Impact: None of the project activities are anticipated to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. 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.

Mitigation Measures:

The following measures will minimize exposure of sensitive receptors to potentially substantial fugitive dust and exhaust emissions, and assures that temporary construction emissions do not exceed the BAAQMD significance thresholds for community risk and hazard impacts:

AQ-1. In order to assure that potential impact to existing near by sensitive receptors are reduced to levels below significance, the applicant shall incorporate the Best Management Practices for construction into the construction and improvement plans and clearly indicate these provisions in the specifications. In addition an erosion control program shall be prepared and submitted to the City of Petaluma prior to any construction activity. BMPs shall include but not be limited to the BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures as modified below:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
8. Equipment staging shall occur as far as possible from existing sensitive receptors.
9. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours.
The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

10. The Developer shall designate a person with authority to require increased watering to monitor the dust and erosion control program and provide name and phone number to the City prior to issuance of grading permits. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number of designated person and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

AQ-2. Diesel-powered off-road equipment larger than 50 horsepower and operating at the site more than two days that are used for demolition and mass grading/excavation shall meet U.S. EPA particulate matter emissions standards for Tier 4 engines or an equivalent measure such as the use of alternate powered equipment, alternate fuels, and added exhaust devices. The applicant shall provide the City with a list of measures to be used along with an updated Health Risk Study that demonstrates effectiveness of such measures to reduce predicted cancer risks below thresholds of significance.

AQ-3. The contractor shall prepare a project schedule that minimizes the number of hours that equipment will operate and includes the provision of idling restrictions.

AQ-4. Line power shall be installed at the site as soon as possible after construction start and shall be used to power equipment to avoid use of diesel-powered generator engines.
3.4. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Holland's Preliminary Descriptions of Terrestrial Natural Communities of California (Holland, 1986); 2025 General Plan and EIR Figure 3.8-1: Habitat Areas and Special Status Species; Open Space Lands Map of the Petaluma General Plan; Figure 6-1.

**Biological Resources Setting:**

Biological resources are protected by statute including the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA), the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), and the Clean Water Act (CWA). The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) affords protection to migratory bird species including birds of prey. These regulations provide the legal protection for plant and animal species of concern and their habitat.

As reported in the 2025 General Plan EIR, several plant and animal species with special-status have been recorded or are suspected to occur within the Urban Growth Boundary of the City of Petaluma. A majority of these species are associated with the Petaluma River and its tributaries. The City of Petaluma Planning Area also contains species that are identified in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) due to rarity and threats, and are considered sensitive resources.
Within the Urban Growth Boundary, biological resources are largely limited to the Petaluma River and its tributaries, which contain aquatic and riparian resources as well as wetland. The National Wetland Inventory identifies fresh emergent wetlands in the southern portion of the Petaluma River and Northern coastal salt marsh wetland and brackish marsh wetland in the lower reaches of the Petaluma River. The Petaluma River Access and Enhancement Plan, prepared in 1996, contains policies and guidelines to protect these important biological resources.

The 5.65-acre site is located in the center of the urban core of the City of Petaluma and is already developed. The general characteristics of the properties surrounding area is a mixture of residential and commercial uses. A little league baseball field and elementary school are located to southeast of the subject property. The northwest edge of the project site is adjacent to the existing Washington Creek Trail. There are no biological resources onsite due to the existing development and surrounding urban environment.

**Biological Resources Impact Discussion:**

3.4(a). **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation:** The proposed project would not 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 or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as the property is currently developed with an existing medical/office complex and associated landscaping and parking lot improvements.

As described below, under discussion 4(a), the subject project contains 62 Eucalyptus Trees that would be removed. Onsite trees may provide perching and potentially nesting opportunities to bird species including migratory birds that are protected under the MBTA. Adherence to the General Plan policy 4-P-4, as well as California Department of Fish and Game Code Section 3503 and the MBTA will assure that potential impacts to migratory bird species are avoided. Should removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation occur within the breeding season (February 1st through August 31st), then a pre-construction bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist, see mitigation measure below. With implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 below, potential impacts to migratory birds will be less than significant.

3.4(b). **No Impact.** The proposed project would not 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 or US Fish and Wildlife Service. The subject property is currently developed with existing structures, landscaping and paved parking area. There is no known riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified on the site. The project site is located immediately south of East Washington Creek. The project design is consistent with the existing development onsite and provides for setbacks in buildings from the adjacent creek. The project will not adversely impact this nearby creek that may support biological resources; Therefore, there will be no impacts to natural communities due to development of the proposed Maria Drive project.

3.4(c). **No Impact.** There are no wetland or water of the state or US on the project site. The proposed project would not 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.

3.4(d). **No Impact.** The site is currently developed with existing buildings, landscaping and paved parking areas and is surrounded by other existing development including residential and commercial uses. There are no migratory corridors onsite or in the project vicinity that would be impacted due to the proposed development. The proposed project 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.

3.4(e). **No Impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. The site is currently developed with existing buildings, landscaping and paved parking areas and is surrounded by other existing development including residential and commercial uses.
The existing trees on the property were inspected by Robert W. Propos, a Board Certified Master Arborist. A tree report was prepared by Mr. Propos dated September 21, 2012, of Propos Tree & Landscape, Inc. The report prepared by Mr. Propos inventories the existing trees on-site for their type, size, overall health and species and evaluated if the trees would be required to be preserved under the City of Petaluma Tree Ordinance, Chapter 17 of the Implementing Zoning Ordinance. The trees predominately found on the site are Eucalyptus. There are some smaller ornamental trees and shrubs around the existing buildings that are associated with the existing landscaping. The tree report concludes that there are no native trees on the property nor are there any Landmark or Heritage trees. The report also notes that while the dominate species of tree on the property is Eucalyptus they are all less than 30 inches in diameter and appear to be in fair to poor overall health and are infested with an insect known as Lerp Psyllids. The trees also show drought symptoms with premature leaf drop and yellowing of the leaves and have not been properly maintained. There are a total of 62 Eucalyptus trees on the property all of which are recommended for removal, and none of which is a protected tree required to be preserved under Chapter 17. Therefore, the project will have no impacts to biological resources due to a conflict with the tree ordinance.

3.4(f). No Impact: The proposed project 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. There is no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan that exists for Petaluma, which would regulate the proposed development on this parcel. Review of the Open Space Lands Map of the Petaluma General Plan indicates that the site is not designated open space. The site is currently developed with existing buildings, landscaping and paved parking areas and is located surrounded by other existing development including residential and commercial uses.

Mitigation Measures:

BIO-1. To prevent impacts to nesting birds covered by State and federal law (California Department of Fish and Game Code and the MBTA), the applicant shall avoid the removal of trees, shrubs, or weedy vegetation between February 1 and August 31, during the bird nesting period. If no vegetation or tree removal is proposed during the nesting period, no surveys are required. If it is not feasible to avoid the nesting period, a pre-construction survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist no earlier than seven days prior to the removal of trees. Survey results shall be valid for the tree removals for 21 days following the survey. If the trees are not removed within the 21-day period, then a new survey shall be conducted. In the event that an active nest for a protected species of bird is discovered in the areas to be cleared, clearing and construction shall be postponed for at least two weeks or until the biologist has determined that the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts, whichever is later.
3.5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Petaluma General Plan/2025 Chapter 3: Historic Preservation; 2025 GP EIR; CEQA Guidelines §15064.5;

Cultural Resources Setting:

Historic resources are central to Petaluma culture and contribute greatly to the aesthetic quality and character of the City. During prehistoric times, drawn by the fertile soils and abundant wildlife, the Coast Miwok Indians settled in the Petaluma River Valley. European settlement began in the 1800s and increased after the discovery of gold. The California Historical Resources Information System identifies a number of Native American archaeological resource sites and historic era cultural resources within the UGB. Petaluma contains 3 Historic Districts (Oakhill-Brewster, Downtown, and A-Street Historic Districts) located in the southwest portion of the City’s UGB. The Historic Preservation Chapter of the General Plan includes policies and programs to protect the City’s historic and cultural resources throughout the City.

The project site is not located within any of the historic district nor does the site contain any historic or potentially historic resources. The site is currently occupied by an existing medical office building that was constructed in the 1970s. As proposed the existing buildings will be demolished and replaced with the Maria Drive Apartments. Development of the existing medical/office complex involved grading and ground disturbance. There were no prehistoric, archaeological, or paleontological resource or human remains identified on site during the previous ground disturbance conducted as part of the development for the existing medical/office complex. No cultural resources are expected to be present on the project site. As part of the General Plan Amendment process the City contacted the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria advising them of an opportunity to begin consultation in accordance with SB-18, which requires local agencies to make contact with local Native American Tribes wishing to participate in the General Plan Amendment process. The City has been working with the FIGR to address the potential for discovery of resources and/or remains.

Cultural Resources Impact Discussion:

3.5(a). No Impact. The site is currently developed but contains no identified historical structures. There is no evidence that the site is an otherwise historically significant site, area or place. The buildings on the site which are to be demolished were constructed in the mid 70's and are of no historical significance.

3.5(b). No Impact. No prehistoric, archaeological, or paleontological resource or human remains or cemeteries are known to exist or have been found on the site. Therefore, no impacts are expected in this
area. Nonetheless, there is always the potential for discovery of archaeological artifacts during grading and excavating activities. In the event that covered cultural resources are unburied, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 and CUL-2 below, would assure that potential impacts to cultural resources are avoided. Therefore, there would be a less than significant to cultural resources.

3.5(c). No Impact. There are no known paleontological or archeological resources on the site; therefore, there are no potential impacts. There are no unique geological features associated with the site.

3.5(d). Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. There are no known human remains that have been interred on the site. However, in order to ensure that potential impact are avoided in the event that human remains are discovered during excavation of the site or during construction, all requirements of state law shall be complied with, including requirements that the county Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission be contacted to arrange for Native American participation in determining the disposition of such remains should they be determined to be Native American. CUL-3 below sets forth these requirements. With CUL-3 below, potential impacts will be reduced to levels below significance.

Mitigation Measures:

CUL-1 Prior to excavation for the swimming pool, the applicant shall conduct test drilling to the depths expected for the pool. A City-approved archaeologist shall be present during test drilling and excavation for the swimming pool or for any work involving depths of more than 5 feet.

CUL-2 In the event that any cultural resources are uncovered during earthmoving activities, all construction excavation activities shall be suspended for a period to be determined by a City-approved archaeologist to allow for adequate inspection, recommendation and retrieval, if appropriate.

CUL-3 In the event that human remains are uncovered during earthmoving activities, all construction excavation activities shall be suspended and the following measures shall be undertaken:

1. The Sonoma County Coroner shall be contacted.
2. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.
3. The project sponsor shall retain a City-approved qualified archaeologist to provide adequate inspection, recommendations and retrieval, if appropriate.
4. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American, and shall contact such descendant in accordance with state law.
5. The project sponsor shall be responsible for ensuring that human remains and associated grave goods are reburied with appropriate dignity at a place and process suitable to the most likely descendent.
3.6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong Seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Petaluma General Plan 2026; Chapter 10.1 Natural Hazards, and Figures 3.7-2 (Local Geology), 3.7-4 (Ground Shaking Intensity), 3.7-5 (Geological Hazards); and Geotechnical Evaluation, prepared by Neil O. Anderson & Associates, October 5, 2012.

Geology and Soils Setting

The City of Petaluma lies within a seismically active region. It is in California Building Code (CBC) Seismic Zone 4, and as such new development is required to meet the most stringent CBC standards. Geologic hazards within the City of Petaluma are largely related to seismic ground shaking and associated effects such as liquefaction, ground failure, and seismically induced landslides. Principal faults in the vicinity of Petaluma are capable of generating large earthquakes that could produce strong to violent ground shaking. The Rodgers Creek Fault is located less than 5 miles to the northeast. Although branches of the Rodgers Creek closest to the City are not historically active (within the last 200 years), they do show evidence of activity during the last 11,000 years, which is a relatively short time in terms of geologic activity. Expansive soils and soil erosion are also of concern within the City of Petaluma.
Expansive soil materials occur in the substrates of the clays and clayey loams in the City and represent a potential geologic hazard. Without proper geotechnical considerations, buildings, utilities and roads can be damaged by expansive soils due to the gradual cracking, settling, and weakening of older buildings. These effects create safety concerns and risk of financial loss. To reduce the risks associated with expansive soils, the City’s Building Code, Chapter 18, requires that each construction site, intended for human occupancy, that is suspected of containing expansive soils be investigated and the soils be treated to eliminate the hazard. As such, Neil O. Anderson & Associates prepared a site-specific Geotechnical Evaluation on October 5, 2012. Findings and recommendations from the site-specific geotechnical report are further discussed below.

**Geology and Soils Impact Discussion:**

3.6(a, i). No Impact. 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 proposed project will have no impacts resulting from hazards associated with an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.

3.6(a, ii). Less Than Significant Impact. As is the case throughout the City’s UGB, development of the subject project has the potential to expose people and structures to substantial adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking. The project site is located within zone IX-Violent of the Mercalli Intensity Shaking Severity Level. In the event of a magnitude 7.1 earthquake, the site and the City of Petaluma could experience severe ground shaking that could damage buildings, structures, infrastructure and result in the risk of loss of life or property. The closest active fault with a Maximum Moment magnitude of 7.0 and a slip rate of 9 millimeters per year is the Rodgers Creek Fault, which is located a distance of 6.6 kilometers from the project site.

Conformance with standards set forth in the Building Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2 (the California Building Code 3.7-20 Chapter 3: Setting Impacts, and Mitigation Measures [CBC]) and the California Public Resources Code, Division 2, Chapter 7.8 (the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act) will assure that potential impacts from seismic shaking are less than significant. Based on review of the project site and Section 1813, "Earthquake Load," the CBC parameters for a Site Class D shall be utilized to assure that potential impacts from ground shaking are less than significant. In accordance with Section 1803.5.12.2 of the CBC, a ground acceleration of 0.414g (S10%/2.5) should be anticipated. Adherence to these design standards will assure that the Maria Drive Apartments would not expose a substantial number of people or structures to adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death resulting from strong seismic ground shaking. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact due to hazards resulting from seismic activity.

3.6(a, iii). Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. According to the Geotechnical report prepared by Neil O. Anderson and Associates, and dated October 5, 2012, the project site and surrounding area have a moderate to high level of liquefaction hazards. This is in part due to presence of groundwater as shallow as 8.5 feet below the surface as well as the type of soil present on the project site. The soils encountered during the field investigation consisted of highly plastic fine clays that extended to a depth of 4 to 5.5 feet below the existing ground surface. The upper soils were generally underlain by 3 to 4 feet of slightly cemented, sandy lean clays, which in turn was underlain by stiff sandy lean clay to the maximum depth explored. The project will require building permit review and, through that process, implementation of design elements necessary to address design to accommodate seismic hazards will be incorporated. Such improvement will be specified in construction level geotechnical analysis are likely to include removal and/or re-compaction of foundation soils, dewatering of subsurface soils, and seismic design requirements for structures as specified in the CBC. Conformance with CBC standards and GEO-1 below, will assure that hazards associated with are reduced to less than significant levels. Therefore, with mitigation potential impacts to onsite residences due to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction will be reduced to less than significant.

3.6(a, iv). No Impact: The project site is located on a relatively flat portion of the City. There are no hillsides onsite or in the project vicinity. There will be no impacts to onsite residences due to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.
3.6(b). Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. As reported in the Geotechnical Report, a geologic map of the area indicates that the surface soils are described as Holocene Age, Alluvium Deposits consisting of poorly sorted stream and basin deposits, clay to boulder size. The subject property is currently developed with existing structures (which will be demolished) and other associated site improvements such as paved parking and landscaping. Accordingly, the project site has been previously graded and topsoils removed or substantially altered. The site would be developed with new buildings, paving, walkways, and landscaping. The project will not result in a substantial loss of topsoil beyond what has already occurred onsite. Construction activities have the potential to result in erosion, if not properly controlled. Soil erosion will be controlled during construction activities through best management practices and adherence to the SWPPP as described below under the Hydrology discussion. With implementation of mitigation measure GEO-6 below, which requires an Erosion Control Plan, impacts due to erosion and sedimentation would be reduced to levels below significance. Therefore, the project will not generate substantial erosion or loss of topsoil and impacts due to geology and soils will be less than significant.

3.6(c). Less than Significant. The project site is general flat with no slopes or apparent soil migration onsite. There are no signs of soil creep or lateral spreading onsite or in the project vicinity. The subject project is not located in an area that is particularly susceptible to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. Lateral spreading can be induced by vibration of near-horizontal alluvial soil layers adjacent to an exposed face. Lurching is an action, which produces cracks or fissures parallel to streams or banks when the earth movement is at right angles to them. The potential for lateral spreading and lurching at the site is low. Other than liquefaction, as described above, the project site does not contain a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project. Therefore the project would have less than significant impacts due to soils and geology of the project site.

3.6(d). Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The soil investigation found that the near surface soils contain a high clay content and may exhibit high expansion potential. The actual amount of shrink and swell potential is dependent on a number of factors including the moisture content, percentage of clay in onsite soils, and drainage pattern. The primary geotechnical concern is the presence of expansive clay soils and the secondary concern is demolition of the existing structures. The report concludes that the site is suitable for construction of the proposed apartment complex; however, all of the recommendations presented in the Geotechnical Investigation should be incorporated into the design and construction to mitigate the potential for soils and foundation problems. The recommendations shall be implemented through mitigation measures GEO-1 through GEO-8 below.

The Geotechnical Investigation recommends that demolition remove building slabs, foundations, and flatwork. Loose soils should be removed, the resulting excavation scarified to a depth of 12 inches, and moisture conditioned and compacted to at least 90 percent of maximum density pursuant to ASTM D1557, modifier protector density. Utilities greater than 2 inches in diameter should also be removed.

While there are several options to mitigate expansive soils, the Geotechnical Investigation recommends that proposed buildings be founded on spread footings. Moisture conditioning and 18 inches of non-expansive fill and/or lime treatment may be necessary to account for the expansive potential of onsite soils. In addition, over excavation may be required. Adequate draining of onsite soils will be provided via site grading and/or drainage inlets. The City Engineer will require grading, slab and foundation design to adhere to the report specifications.

Potential impacts associated with expansive soils will be reduced to less than significant levels through standard building code compliance and adherence to the required mitigation measures set forth below. These measures will assure that new development will not create a substantial risk to life or property. With implementation of the mitigation measures set forth below potential impacts to risk of life and property due to expansive soils will be reduced to less than significant levels.

3.6(e). No impact. The proposed project would connect to the existing sanitary sewer system that would convey effluent to the Ellis Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant for treatment. There are no onsite septic tanks proposed as part of the Maria Drive Apartment Project. Therefore, there would be no impacts due to the disposal of wastewater.

Mitigation Measures:
GEO-1. Prior to Submittal of Improvement Plans, the applicant shall submit an updated geotechnical report that identifies performance of supplemental exploration, defines the amount of expansive or weak soils to be removed from the amount and make up of engineered fill to be replaced, and specific recommendations for private and public improvements.

GEO-2. The design of all earthwork, cuts and fills, drainage, pavements, utilities, foundations, and structural components shall conform with the specifications and criteria contained in the geotechnical report (as updated to comply with GEO-1), as approved by the City Engineer and/or Chief Building Official. Foundation and structural design for buildings shall meet the Uniform Building Code regulations for seismic safety (i.e., reinforcing perimeter and/or load bearing walls, bracing parapets, etc.).

GEO-3. The applicant shall obtain a geotechnical engineer to review the final project plans and specifications to determine if they are consistent with the recommendations as outlined in the report and observe grading, compaction, and foundation excavations to verify that conditions are as anticipated and to modify recommendations if warranted. A qualified geotechnical engineer shall sign the improvement plans and certify the design as conforming to geotechnical report specifications. A qualified geotechnical engineer shall inspect the construction work and shall certify to the City, prior to acceptance of the improvements or issuance of a certificate of occupancy that the improvements have been constructed in accordance with geotechnical report specifications.

GEO-4. Construction and improvement plans shall be reviewed for conformance with the geotechnical report specifications (as updated by GEO-1 above) by the Public Works Department and the Chief Building Official prior to issuance of grading or building permits. Additional soils information may be required by the Chief Building Inspector during the plan check of building plans in accordance with the Code.

GEO-5. All earthwork, grading, trenching, backfilling, and compaction operations shall be conducted in accordance with the City of Petaluma's Subdivision Ordinance (#1048, Title 20, Chapter 20.04 of the Petaluma Municipal Code) and Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance #1576, Title 17, Chapter 17.31 of the Petaluma Municipal Code).

GEO-6. The applicant shall submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan prepared by a registered professional engineer as an integral part of the grading plan. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning Division and Public Works Department, prior to issuance of a grading permit. The Plan shall include temporary erosion control measures to be used during excavation for foundations, and other grading operations at the site to prevent discharge of sediment and contaminants into the drainage system. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan shall include that the material and equipment for implementation of erosion control measures shall be on-site by October 1st.

GEO-7. All construction activities shall meet the Uniform Building Code regulations for seismic safety. Foundation and structural design for buildings shall conform to the requirements of the Uniform Building Code, as well as state and local laws/ordinances. Construction plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Building Division prior to the issuance of a building permit. All work shall be subject to inspection by the Building Division and must conform to all applicable code requirements and approved improvement plans prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

GEO-8. All public and private improvements shall be subject to inspection by City staff for compliance with the approved improvement plans, prior to their acceptance by the City.
3.7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: BAAQMD 2010 Clean Air Plan.

**Greenhouse Gas Setting:** Greenhouse gas emissions are a cumulative issue in that project-level greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions do not directly produce local or regional impacts, but may contribute cumulatively to an impact on global climate change. Individual projects contribute relatively small amounts of GHGs associated with construction activities and operation. GHG emissions are typically a result of the combustion of fossil fuels and/or industrial and agricultural processes.

To address GHG's at the State level, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill 32 in 2006, which requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. Senate Bill 375 has also been adopted, which seeks to curb GHGs by reducing urban sprawl and vehicle miles traveled.

The City of Petaluma has also taken steps to address GHG emissions within City limits. The City adopted Resolutions 2002-117 and 2005-118 (both incorporated herein by reference), which calls for the City's participation in the Cities for Climate Project effort and established GHG-emission reduction targets of 25% below 1990 level by 2015 for community emissions and 20% below 2000 levels by 2010 for municipal operations, respectively. In addition, the City of Petaluma is currently preparing a Climate Action Plan in partnership with the County and other local jurisdictions. This effort will implement General Plan Policy 4-P-27. General Plan Policy 2-P-90, which calls for the City to "work with regional and other agencies to create a new rail transit station near Corona Road with high-intensity, transit-oriented development..." is also being pursued. The light rail effort is estimated to take more than 1.4 million car trips off Highway 101 annually and reduce greenhouse gases, which contribute to global warming, by at least 124,000 pounds per day.

2-P-2 Use land efficiently by promoting infill development, at equal or higher density and intensity than surrounding uses.

In November 2010, the City adopted an update to the California Building Standards Code, which contains the mandatory California Green Building Code (CalGreen). All new development within the City of Petaluma must comply with these standards. As such, new development is expected to be more energy efficient, use less resources and emit fewer GHGs.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Discussion:**

3.7(a). Less Than Significant Impact: Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions impacts are evaluated for this project using the 2010 CAP and BAAQMD's 2010 CEQA significance thresholds. In addition, the following discussion also evaluates compliance of the proposed project with AB 32 GHG reduction measures, and General Plan 2025 measures designed to reduce GHG emissions.

The BAAQMD Guidelines use a three-tiered approach for setting a significance threshold for the project-level contributions to cumulative GHG impacts. Based on the BAAQMD Guidelines, a project is considered less-than-significant if it either:

Page 32 of 62
June 27, 2013

4-32
a) Complies with a legislatively adopted GHG Reduction Strategy which meets or exceeds one of the following three options:
   i. Reduces emissions to 1990 levels by 2020,
   ii. Reduces emissions 15% below baseline (2008 or earlier) emission level by 2020, or
   iii. Meets the plan efficiency threshold of 6.6 MT CO\textsubscript{2}e/service population/year;

b) Emits a total of less than 1,100 metric tons (MT) CO\textsubscript{2}e per year; or

c) Emits less than 4.6 MT/service population/year. Metric tons per capita for service population per year; service population includes residents and any employees.

The 2010 BAAQMD guidelines define a qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy as one that has followed an approved protocol, has been adopted through the CEQA process by the local jurisdiction (or similar adopted policies, equivalent), and includes enforceable measures to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, or 15% below a 2006 or earlier baseline with a plan efficiency threshold of 6.6 MT CO2d/service/population/year. These reductions are designed to meet AB 32 goals. The plan can be set out in one adopted document such as a Climate Action Plan, or consist of a compilation of the jurisdiction’s planning documents, adopted ordinances and other measures which together will result in GHG reductions to the required levels. As noted in the General Plan 2025, Revised Draft EIR, Vol. 5.A, Appendix G-1, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the combination of state and local measures which could be quantitatively evaluated as of November 2007 provided an estimated 8% reduction from the 2005 General Plan GHG baseline. Additional work would be needed to identify and adopt other measures to achieve additional reductions before the General Plan 2025 (plus added measures) would be considered a “qualified” GHG reduction strategy by BAAQMD.

Projects proposed in areas where a qualified BAAQMD GHG Reduction Strategy has not been adopted should be reviewed against a screening threshold of 1,100 MT carbon dioxide equivalents per year (CO2e/yr). This threshold generally corresponds to the project sizes set out in Table 3-1 of the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, as discussed above. Residential projects that are over the screening threshold are not considered significant if their overall GHG efficiency is less than 6.7 MT CO2e/yr/capita.

The screening size for GHG emissions is 78 dwelling units for an apartment complex. The proposed project size is above the screening threshold since 144 unit are proposed. As such, a GHG analysis was conducted by Illingworth & Rockin (dated October 22, 2012) for the Maria Drive Apartment Complex. The California Emissions Estimator Model Version 2011.1.1 was used to predict net GHG emissions from construction and operation of the site assuming full-build-out of the project. CalEEMOD provides emissions for transportation, areas sources, electricity consumption, natural gas combustion, electricity usage associated with water usage and wastewater discharge, and solid waste land filling and transport.

**Construction Emissions**
GHG emissions associated with construction were estimated to be 488 MT CO\textsubscript{2}. These are the emissions from on-site operation of construction equipment, hauling truck trips, vendor truck trips, and worker trips. The BAAQMD does not have an adopted Threshold of Significance for construction-related GHG emissions. Rather, BAAQMD encourages the incorporation of best management practices to reduce GHG emissions during construction. Best management practices are specific under AQ-1 above.

**Operational Emissions**
The CalEEMod model, along with the project vehicle trip generation rates, was used to predict annual emissions associated with operation of the fully-developed site under the proposed project. In 2015, net annual emissions resulting from the proposed project are predicted to be 639 MT of CO\textsubscript{2}e. These emissions would be below the BAAQMD threshold of 1,100 MT of CO\textsubscript{2}e/yr. Table 1 shows the project’s annual GHG emissions at operation.
Table 1
Annual Project GHG Emissions in Metric Tons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Category</th>
<th>Unmitigated Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Generation</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Usage</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                      639

BAAQMD Threshold                           1,100

MT CO₂e/year

The project's operational emissions of GHG are below the BAAQMD established threshold of significance. Therefore, impacts to air quality resulting from GHG emission would be less than significant.

Consistency with GHG Regulation and General Plan 2025 Measures

Petaluma's General Plan 2025 and its EIR contain a quantified estimate of emissions within the City through General Plan build-out, evaluate state and local programs designed to reduce emissions and include an extensive series of policies, programs and implementation measures designed to reduce GHG emissions. The applicant is required to comply with the CalGreen Building standards, which is beyond the energy efficiency requirements set forth under Title 24. Therefore, potential impacts due to the generation and emission of greenhouse gases would be less than significant under project implementation.

Mitigation Measures: None required.
3.8. HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine: transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site that 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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 of public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2025 General Plan and EIR.

Hazardous Material Setting:

Regulations related to hazardous materials and waste are implemented by a number of governmental agencies that have established regulations regarding the proper transportation, handling, management, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials for specific operations and activities. Pursuant to the Planning and Zoning Law, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a hazardous-waste and substances sites list (Cortese List). There are no Cortese sites within the City of Petaluma, including the project site. Hazardous waste management in Petaluma is administered by the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency through the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan.
Hazards/Hazardous Materials Impact Discussion:

3.8(a-c). Less Significant. None of the project activities are expected to involve significant 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. Pursuant to GP 8-P-38 and as set forth in HYDRO-1 below, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that will include specific Best Management Practice’s (BMP’s) related to hazardous materials will be implemented during construction. For construction activities involving storage of chemicals or hazardous materials on-site, pursuant to city fire code ordinances, the applicant must file a declaration form with the Fire Marshal’s office and shall obtain a hazardous materials storage permit. These standard requirements will assure that impacts related to the use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials and waste are less than significant.

3.8(d). No Impact. The project-site is not located within an area that is identified on a hazardous materials list of sites. There are no signs of spills or leaks on the project site and no indication that hazardous materials or substances are present on site soils or in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impacts due to the development of a site included on a list of known hazardous materials.

3.8(e-f). No Impact: 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 in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest airport is the Petaluma Municipal Airport located approximately one mile north of the project site. There would be no impacts to construction workers or new residents due to hazard associated with an airport or private airstrip.

3.8(g). No Impact. None of the propose site improvements are expected to impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Project development will retain emergency vehicle access to the site during all phases of construction. At project buildout, the site provides two points of access and accommodates emergency vehicle turning radius. The project will not affect the existing emergency access on project area streets. Therefore, the project will have no impacts due to conflict with an emergency response plan.

3.8(h). No Impact. The project site is in the city center in a suburban area and not adjacent to wild lands. The project site is surrounded by existing urban development in the core of the City of Petaluma. There are no wildlands onsite or in the project vicinity. Therefore, the project will have no impacts due to the risk of hazards associated with wildland fires.

Mitigation Measures: None required.
3.9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or sitation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: "Preliminary Storm Water Mitigation Plan," prepared by Civil Design Consultants, Inc., October 2012; and 2025 General Plan and EIR.

**Hydrology and Water Quality Setting:**

The Petaluma River is the primary watercourse within the City of Petaluma and the Petaluma watershed (an area of approximately 46 square miles). The Petaluma River is tidally influenced and flows in a southeast direction into San Pablo Bay. The Petaluma River is used for recreational boating and water sports as well as long-standing river-dependent industrial operations. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) dredges the river on a four-year cycle to maintain navigability for commercial shipping. In order to ensure...
continued dredging services from the USACE; there must be an "economically justifiable" tonnage of commercial products moved on the river, as determined by the USACE.

The Project is not in the immediate proximity to the Petaluma River, but is adjacent to Washington Creek Capri Creek, which is a small tributary stream that drains to the Petaluma River. Capri Creek Washington Creek runs from the northeast to southwest immediately east north of the proposed project site. The creek bisects suburban residential development and serves as public open space in conjunction with Sunrise Park. The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) does not consider Capri Creek a major surface water.

Section 402 of the Clean Water Act regulates the discharge of pollutants to waters of the US. The National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit Requirements apply to grading, grubbing, and other ground disturbance activities. Construction activities on more than one acre are subject to NPDES permitting requirements including, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

Low Impact Development (LID) requirements establish limitations on the storm water runoff emanating from development sites. New development, including the subject Project, is required to mimic pre-developed conditions, protect water quality, and retain runoff from impervious surfaces onsite. Achieving these conditions generally avoids the need for upsizing of storm drain systems. As further described below, the subject project proposed to retain all excess runoff onsite and incorporates design measures to limit impervious sources and allow for filtration, thereby reducing runoff and pollutants.

**Hydrology and Water Quality Impact Discussion:**

3.9(a). **Less Than Significant With Mitigation:** The project is immediately adjacent the East Washington Creek. Development of the project site will include demolition and ground disturbance, which could result in soil erosion and runoff if not properly developed. Civil Design Consultants, Inc. prepared a Preliminary Storm Water Mitigation Plan (PSWMP) for the Maria Drive Apartments Project in October 2012. The SWMP identified Best Management Practices to be implemented onsite in order to mitigate pollutants and provide onsite retention. As set forth therein, the subject project will implement Bio-Filters, Tree Pods and provide retention for the 85th percentile 24-hour storm. Stormwater retention onsite is addressed through a robust tree-planting plan, the use of pervious material along pedestrian paths, and downspouts from roof gutters that drains to landscaped areas. The project will collect overland flow and route it to a series of proposed bio-filters before entering the underground drainage system. This pre-treatment design feature not only removes pollutants, but also limits channel-forming discharges by capturing and slowly releasing storm flows from the project site. The bio-filters are proposed at various locations throughout the project site, providing treatment for each of the site tributaries. These onsite improvements have been designed to capture sediment, reduce runoff, and limit potential impacts to water quality associated with site development. At operation the project’s impacts to water quality will be less than significant.

However, construction activities have the potential to result in soil erosion and runoff during site grading, which could result in impacts to water quality. Best Management Practices implemented during construction can substantially reduce runoff and impacts to water quality and storm water discharge. In order to assure that standards for stormwater runoff are achieved and in accordance with the NPDES MS4 permit, the City requires that sites greater than one acre prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) throughout all construction activities. Any sediments or pollutants generated by construction activities will be contained through mitigation measure HYDRO-1 listed below. In addition, as further described below under 3.9(e), HYDRO-2 through HYDRO-6 will provide mitigation to assure compliance with water quality standards. Implementation of the mitigation measures below will assure that potential impacts to water quality and waste discharge requirements are reduced to levels below significance.

3.9(b). **No Impact:** The City has adequate water supply resources to accommodate development of the Maria Drive Apartments Project without depleting, degrading or altering groundwater supplies or interfering substantially with groundwater recharge. The subject project would not result in the lowering of the aquifer or the local groundwater table. The project’s water demands are consistent with water demands evaluated in the 2010 UWMP, which found sufficient water supplies are available to meet existing and planned future development within the UGB. The project will not use groundwater, as all domestic water supplies will be obtain via surface water provided by Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA). Nor will the project interfere substantially
with groundwater recharge. As described herein, the project will retain the existing drainage pattern onsite and will facilitate percolation through the use of Tree Pods and pervious surfaces, and downspouts that drain to landscaping. Therefore, groundwater reserves will not be impacted by the proposed development.

3.9(c-d). Less Than Significant Impact: The project would not alter the course of a stream or river or result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. In accordance with LID, the existing drainage pattern of the site will not be substantially altered. No alteration of a drainage swale, stream, or river will occur. During construction the contractor will be required to adhere to City of Petaluma standards and regulation regarding storm water management and erosion controls measures. A storm water detention basin/bio swale is proposed within Lot 4 to detain a 10-year storm event as well as treat runoff. The basin/swale will be designed to control runoff such that downstream erosion and siltation is less than significant.

The north portion of the site is tributary to an existing creek outfall to Washington Creek. The remainder of the site is tributary to an existing catch basin located at the most southerly point of the site at Maria Drive. From there the storm drain system consist of a series of pipes that flow in a southwesterly direction to Washington Creek. The proposed project will not change the existing drainage patterns. Below is a plan of the "Tributary Area" which shows the proposed grading pattern for the project along with the drainage tributary areas.

The proposed grading for the site will control all onsite storm water runoff and convey the runoff into a piped storm drain system and detention basin/bio-swatch system. No lot-to-lot drainage is proposed. Surface runoff shall be collected, detained and treated within the project, and then conveyed to an existing public storm drain system. There would be little change in drainage patterns, and with the proposed drainage controls, no potentially significant sources of pollution would be generated by the project site. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on the drainage pattern.

3.9(e). Less Than Significant with Mitigation: The project will result in an increase of impervious surfaces relative to the existing condition, which has a potential to impact storm drain facilities. Currently 38.5% of the subject site is pervious. As proposed, 25% of the site would be pervious. Thus, relative to the existing condition the proposed project will increase the amount of impervious surfaces, which has the potential to result in increased runoff that could impact storm drain facilities. In order to ensure that potential impacts associated with increased runoff are reduced to levels below significance, the applicant shall implement mitigation measures HYDRO-2 through HYDRO-6, which require onsite stormwater detention consistent with the existing condition (i.e. no increased run-off relative to the pre-project condition), a mechanism to ensure that long term maintenance and funding for onsite storm water facilities, requires that all inlets and catch basins be labeled with text and graphics noting that storm water facilities drain to ocean, and reinforces the requirement to pay
development impacts fees for Storm Drainage. (These fund are dedicated to the maintenance and expansion of the regional Storm Drain system.) With implementation of mitigation measures HYDRO-2 through HYDRO-6 below, potential impacts to drainage facilities and additional sources of pollution will be reduced to less than significant levels.

3.9(f). No Impact. No other water quality degradations are expected to occur from the project development. As mentioned above, implementation of the required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will assure that there are no other impacts to water quality due to the subject project.

3.9(g-h). No Impact: The project is not located in a Flood Zone. According to FEMA Flood Panel Map 06079C1001E (effective date December 2, 2008) as well as the draft updated Flood Map Panels dated June 3, 2013, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. The project site is located in Zone X - other flood areas. These are areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain. As such, the project would not place structures within a zone subject to a flooding hazard. Thus, no structures developed as part of the subject project would impede or redirect flows. Therefore, the Maria Drive Apartments Project would have no impacts due to the hazards associated with flooding.

3.9(i). Less Than Significant. The project site is located adjacent to East Washington Creek, which is contained by levees on either side. Flows within this creek are low volume and unlikely to result in a levee failure that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. The nearest unit is set back approximately 100 feet from East Washington Creek, and 60 feet from the northerly property line, which is consistent with the setback requirements established in IZO. Building set backs from the adjacent creek and existing and proposed storm drain facilities will assure that any potential impacts from flooding due to levee failures are less than significant. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts from flooding, including inundation areas associated with the failure of a levee or dam.

3.9(j). No Impact. The project site is not located within an area that could be affected by seiche, tsunami, or mudflows. There are no substantial water bodies in the immediate vicinity of the project site. There will be no impact from inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow resulting from project implementation.

Mitigation Measures:

HYDRO-1. The project shall prepare a SWPPP prior to the issuance of grading permits. The SWPPP shall be prepared pursuant to the requirements set by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), and implemented throughout project construction and operation. The Applicant shall complete and submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) and appropriate filing fee to the SWRCB. The applicant shall file a Notice of Termination (NOT) with the SWRCB upon project completion. The SWPPP shall be submitted for review and approval by Public Works prior to approval of improvement plans or issuance of grading or building permits. City inspectors shall inspect the improvements and verify compliance prior to acceptance of improvements. The SWPPP shall comply with San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements.

HYDRO-2. In accordance with City of Petaluma General Plan 2025 Policy 8-P-36, the project shall include an on-site storm water detention system to limit post-construction storm water peak flows leaving the site to not exceed pre-project peak flows by detaining peak storm water runoff from the 100-year, 24 hour storm event. Final storm water calculations shall be designed in accordance with City of Petaluma and Sonoma County Water Agency requirements and shall be provided with the project construction drawings, subject to the review and approval by the City Engineer.

HYDRO-3. The developer shall be responsible for funding, through the project cost recovery account, all City required storm water quality inspections. The project conditions, covenants and restrictions shall establish and fund a mechanism to ensure long term maintenance, inspection and repair as needed of the storm water detention system and post construction storm water treatment measures and best management practices. The systems shall be inspected at least annually, prior to the onset of the rainy season, by a Civil Engineer licensed to practice in the State of California, to ensure the drainage systems are performing as designed and required in project approvals. The Civil Engineer shall prepare a signed and sealed report of the inspection including findings regarding the condition of the storm water detention and treatment systems.
photo documentation, any necessary proposed modifications and a statement indicating that the system is operating as designed and required by project approvals. The annual report shall be submitted to the City of Petaluma Planning Department and Department of Public Works and Utilities no later than October 15th of each year.

HYDRO-4. The project shall comply with the City of Petaluma Phase II Storm Water Management Plan requirements.

HYDRO-5. All storm drain inlets and catch basins will be stenciled with prohibitive language (such as: "NO DUMPING-DRAINS TO OCEAN") and/or graphical icons to discourage illegal dumping.

HYDRO-6. The applicant shall pay the applicable City's Storm Drainage Impact Fees calculated at the time of building permit issuance; and a fair share portion shall be paid for each residential unit prior to final inspection of issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

3.10. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat-conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2025 General Plan Land Use and EIR. Figure 3.1-2 Planning Subareas.

Land Use and Planning Setting:

The City’s land uses within the Urban Growth Boundary include residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, open space and public lands. Approximately 44% of the UGB lands are designated for residential development.

Petaluma’s General Plan 2025

Policies contained in the Petaluma General Plan that have been adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and those that apply to this project include the following:

Land Use, Growth Management, & the Built Environment
1-P-1 Promote a range of land uses at densities and intensities to serve the community needs within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).
1-P-2 Use land efficiently by promoting infill development, at equal or higher density and intensity than surrounding uses.

The subject project is located within the eastern portion of the Washington Core subarea, which is dominated by Community Commercial development and surrounded by residential land uses.
Land Use and Planning Impact Discussion:

3.10(a). No Impact: The project will not divide an established community. The project site is currently developed with an existing medical/office complex (constructed in the mid 70’s) and associated site improvements such as landscaping and parking lot improvements, which will be demolished. Across Maria Drive to the east of the subject property is an existing 224 unit apartment complex, Addison Ranch (a.k.a; Greenbriar Apartments) on approximately 9.76 acres (General Plan designation - Medium Density Residential 8.1-18.0 hu/ac and zoned PUD). To the west and south, is the Washington Square Shopping Center (zoned Community Commercial). To the north is a public path that follows along East Washington Creek and beyond is a single-family residential neighborhood (zoned R1 with a General Plan land use designation of Low Density residential 2.6-8.0 hu/ac). Southeast of the subject property is an existing little league baseball field and an existing elementary school (McDowell Elementary School).

The project proposes a residential development on a currently under utilized lot that is situated between an existing commercial retail center and an established neighborhood. The project will not divide the community, rather as an infill project it will provide an appropriate transition of land uses between the high traffic commercial center and the residential neighborhoods beyond. The project will have no impact in regards to dividing an established community.

3.10(b). Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project includes requests for amendments to both the 2025 General Plan and Implementing Zoning Ordinance. With these changes to land use and zoning, the proposed density and design of the Maria Drive Apartment project would be in conformance with the applicable land use plan, policy, and regulations.

The applicant is requesting an amendment to the General Plan from the current land use designation of Mixed Use (maximum density allowed 30 hu/ac) to High Density Residential (18.1 – 30.0 hu/ac). The project would allow for the development of high density residential at approximately 24.6 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the proposed High Density Residential land use that allows 18.1 – 30.0 hu/ac. The High Density Residential classification would permit a full range of housing types, but is intended for multi-family housing in specific areas where higher density is considered appropriate. The applicant is also requesting a zoning map amendment to rezone the property to R-5, which is consistent with and implements the proposed High Density Residential land use classification of the General Plan. The R5 zoning district is applied to areas intended for the most urban housing types at densities ranging from 18.1 to 30.0 units per acre, but where lower density housing is considered conforming.

The project is consistent with the General Plan land use policies as it is an infill (redevelopment of an underutilized parcel), transit-oriented project at urban densities. Street trees and a thorough landscape plan are also proposed. Compliance with the emission reduction measures specified by items 4-P-15D and 4-P-16 will be achieved as these are standard conditions of project approval. The proposed project as conditioned will conform to the requirements of the City of Petaluma Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The project has been designed as a sustainable community with many resource and energy conservation measures. Examples of some of the measures include, low water landscaping, an on-site drainage system which includes the filtering of storm water prior to release of the water into the public storm drain system, etc. Therefore, the subject project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation and impacts to land use and planning would be less than significant.

3.10(c). No Impact. There is neither habitat conservation nor a natural community conservation plan that apply to the project site. Therefore, the project will have no impact to any conservation plan or natural community plan.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.11. MINERAL RESOURCES
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2025 General Plan and EIR.

Mineral Resources Impact Discussion:

3.11(a-b). No Impact: The subject property is currently developed with an existing medical/office complex, landscaping and paved parking areas all of which will be demolished for the proposed new apartment complex.

Soil studies conducted as part of the geotechnical investigation did not reveal any valuable mineral resources. There are no known mineral resources on site or in the project vicinity that would be impacted by project development.

The project site has not been delineated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site on any plans. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource. The project would have no impacts to mineral resources.

Mitigation Measures: None required.
3.12. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Noise Setting:

Noise sources within the City’s Urban Growth Boundary include vehicular traffic, trains, and industrial activities such as mechanical equipment and refrigeration units. Freight train service through Petaluma is currently irregular, and thus does not constitute a significant noise source. In the future, the addition of SMART service will contribute to noise levels within the UGB.

Petaluma General Plan indicates that multi-family residential land uses are considered normally acceptable in noise environments of 65 dB CNEL/L_{eq} or less, conditional acceptable (fresh air supply systems or air conditioning normally suffice) up to 70 dB CNEL/L_{eq}, and normally unacceptable between 70+ dB CNEL/L_{eq} and 75 dB CNEL/L_{eq}. The General Plan states that noise environments over 75 dB CNEL/L_{eq} are clearly unacceptable. Multi-family housing in California is subject to the environmental noise limits set forth in the State Building Code (Chapter 12). The noise limit is a maximum interior noise level of 45 dBA CNEL/L_{eq}. Where exterior noise levels exceed 60 dBA CNEL/L_{eq}, a report must be submitted with the building plans describing the noise control measures that have been incorporated into the design to meet the noise limits.
Per Section 21.040 A.3.a of the City’s Implementing Zoning Ordinance, noise generating construction activities are limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. on weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. For daily operational noise, the Implementing Zoning Ordinance (Section 21.040 A) generally establishes an hourly average level of 60 dBA as the maximum that may be generated on one land use that would be affecting another land use, and the allowable levels are adjusted to account for the ambient noise levels and in no case shall the maximum allowed threshold exceed 75dB after adjustments are made.

The project site is bounded by residential land use to the north and east, beyond Maria Drive, and the Washington Square Shopping Center to the south and west. The shopping center buildings are oriented so that the rear of the buildings face the project site and the customer parking lot is on the other side of the buildings from the project site. The project site is nearest to the loading and service areas of the shopping center. The site is situated approximately 0.5 miles north of the US 101 and is within the 60 dBA CNEL noise contour generated by the highway. The site is also located approximately one mile south of the Petaluma Municipal Airport and is outside of the noise contour lines associated with air traffic.

Noise Impact Discussion:

3.12(a). Less Than Significant with Mitigation: To assess noise levels onsite and determine potential impacts to future residences, a project specific noise impact study was prepared by Rosen Goldberg Der & Lewitz, Inc., on October 23, 2012. The existing noise environment was measured at two locations for long-term noise levels (LT-1 and LT-2) and at two locations (ST-1 and ST-2) for short-term (15 minute) noise levels. The noise locations were chosen to represent the noise exposure at the setback of the proposed residential uses nearest to the major noise sources. Figure 6 below shows the location of noise measurements.

![Figure 6: Noise Monitoring Locations](image)

The noise level evaluation determined that the greatest contributor to the ambient noise levels onsite were due to the noise generated by the distant highway 101. The shopping center loading and service activities occurred intermittently and generated noise levels of 60 dBA at Location LT-1 and 61 dBA at Location LT-2, respectively. The Murphy Little League Field, located about 215 feet southeast of the project site, also contributes to the noise environment onsite.
Although noise measurements were not conducted during the little league season, another field (Garfield Park, in Napa) was used as a proxy to simulate noise and is assumed to generate similar noise levels during use. Based on noise measurements associated with ball field use, the average noise level generated would be 60 dBA and 62 dBA at ST-1 and ST-2 respectively. The noise levels emanating from Murphy Field during use would be audible at the nearest residences with a calculated increase of less than 1 dBA. Therefore the existing noise environment in the project vicinity would not expose future residences to excessive noise level beyond established standards.

The Petaluma General plan EIR shows existing and future (year 2025) noise levels for US 101. According to this data, it is calculated that noise levels at the project site could increase by up to 2 dBA due to increased noise from distant traffic. With these future increases in traffic volumes, the CNEL onsite could increase to 62 to 64 dBA.

The existing and future CNEL dBA noise levels onsite are projected to be below the normally acceptable exterior noise standard of 65 dBA CNEL/Ldn, or less for multi-family residential as established by the Petaluma General Plan. The proposed project would not expose new residences to excessive exterior noise standards due to the current or future ambient noise environment. Therefore, impacts from excessive exterior noise levels on new residents would be less than significant.

As mentioned above, the interior noise limit is a maximum level of 45 dBA CNEL/Ldn. Where exterior noise levels exceed 60 dBA CNEL/Ldn, a report must be submitted with the building plans describing the noise control measures that have been incorporated into the design to meet the noise limits. Since the exterior CNEL is up to 64 dBA, the required exterior-to-interior noise reduction is up to 19 dBA. This can normally be accomplished with conventional construction, but with closed windows. In order to assure that the interior noise standard of 45 dBA is achieved a detailed acoustical analysis shall be conducted to identify required window sound ratings, if any. The analysis shall also identify which units will require an alternative ventilation system because the windows need to be in the closed position to meet the indoor noise standard. Therefore, the project shall be required to adhere to this requirement and incorporate necessary control measures to reduce the interior noise levels to level below 45 dBA. With implementation of mitigation measure NOI-2 set forth below, the projects interior noise standard will be reduced to levels below significance.

3.12(b). Less than Significant with Mitigation. The project has the potential to generate excessive noise levels during construction including groundborne vibration. Noise levels associated with construction are temporarily intrusive during certain types of construction activities such as demolition and the operation of construction equipment. Due to the proximity of the project to existing residences construction noises generated by project development may occasionally result in temporary impacts to the noise environment. These excessive noise levels will occur only during active construction activities and will end once the project is operational. In order to reduce potential impacts to level below significant construction activities shall be restricted to certain times of the day. Project specific requirements on when construction can occur are more restrictive than those identified in the IZO and are intended to mitigate construction noise impacts on nearby residences. With implementation of the mitigation measure set forth in NOI-1 below, excessive noise levels generated during construction activities will be reduced to levels below significance.

At project operation the onsite land use and associated noise environment will be typical of multi-family residential development and subject to the City's noise exposure standards. Operation of the Maria Drive Apartment Project will have less than significant impacts to the existing noise environment.

3.12(c). Less than Significant. The Maria Drive Apartments Project will not introduce a substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise environment. The project will increase traffic trips along Maria Drive due to the intensification of the subject property. As reported in the Noise Study, this level of increase will not have a substantial impact on the ambient noise environment and changes in noise level would be barely perceptible. Onsite activities at operation of the subject project would be typical of a multi-family residential development and would include noise generated by children at play, operation of HVAC equipment, and car door/garage doors opening and closing. These new noises do not constitute a substantial increase in the noise environment and impacts to existing residences in the project vicinity would be less than significant.
3.12(d). Less than Significant with Mitigation: Project construction activities following demolition, anticipated to be ongoing or occasional (as the units are constructed) over one to two or more years, would include some grading, paving of the driveways and parking areas, construction of utilities, and construction of the multi-family homes, garages/carports, community room and pool, etc. Construction noises are temporary and can be occasionally intrusive. As described herein, mitigation measures in NOI-1 restrict the hours of construction to 7:00 to 6:00 Monday through Friday and interior-only work on Saturdays from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Construction is prohibited on Sundays and all federal, state, and local holidays. These hours are more restrictive than the City standard, due to the existing residential land uses in the project vicinity. Implementation of the mitigation measures in NOI-1 set forth below would reduce the temporary and periodic noise impact from construction activities to less than significant levels.

3.12(e-f). Less than Significant. The project site is located approximately one mile south of the Petaluma Municipal Airport. In accordance to the Petaluma General Plan, annual operations (takeoffs and landings) at the airport were estimated at approximately 145 flights per day. The projected increase in airport operations can be expected to increase noise levels for those land uses adjacent to the airport to the levels indicated in Figure 10-1 of the Petaluma General Plan (Noise Contours). It is likely that the increase in air traffic will affect existing residences; however, all new residential developments within the 55 to 65 CNEL contour are subject to an outdoor-to-indoor noise level reduction of at least 25-30 decibels. Aviation easements and fair disclosure agreements are required of new dwellings between 55 and 65 CNEL. Figure 10-1 of the Petaluma General Plan (Noise Contours) indicates that the project site is outside of the noise contours generated by the Petaluma Municipal Airport. Therefore, new residences on the project site would not be exposed to excessive noise levels generated by the airport and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

NOI-1. Due to the surrounding residential development and potentially intrusive noise generated by construction activities, construction hours shall be restricted the hours of 7:00 am to 6:00pm Monday through Friday and interior-only work may be conducted on Saturdays from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Construction activities shall be prohibited on Sundays and all federal, state, and local holidays.

NOI-2. The project shall comply with interior noise standards of 45 dBA. To assure that interior noise standards are achieved plans submitted for development permit shall include a detailed acoustical analysis that identifies required window sound ratings, if any. The analysis shall also identify which units will require an alternative ventilation system because the windows need to be in the closed position to meet the indoor noise standard per the State of California and the City of Petaluma requirement that interior noise levels be reduced to a CNEL of 45 dBA or less in habitable rooms.
3.13. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial 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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2025 General Plan and EIR; City of Petaluma 2009-2014 Housing Element.

Population and Housing Setting

The 2025 General Plan proposes development of approximately 6,000 additional residential units and a buildout population of approximately 72,700. This represents an annual growth rate of nearly 1.2% per year. The project would add 144 market rate dwelling units.

General Plan Policies: Housing

11-P-1 Promote residential development within the Urban Growth Boundary.
11-P-1 Encourage the development of housing on underutilized land.
11-P-3 Encourage a mix of housing design types.
11-P-6 Make the maximum use of resources available for the provision of housing affordable to lower income households.
11-P-15 Promote the provisions of disabled-accessible units, and housing of mentally and physically disabled.
11-P-17 Discourage discriminatory housing practices.
11-P-20 Promote the use of energy conservation features in the design of residential development.

Population and Housing Impact Discussion:

3.13(a). Less than Significant. The project site is developed, in the City's urban core, and is served by existing infrastructure. Replacement of the existing medical office complex development with the project's 144 residential units is not considered to be substantial, resulting in a small increase in the population to the area. The applicant is requesting a General Plan Amendment from the Mixed Use land use designation to high Density Residential (18.1 -30.0uha/ac) however, the Mixed Use land use designation does allow up to a maximum 30 uha/ac. The proposed project at 144 units is at a density of 24.6 uha/ac; well within the density limit of the Mixed Use designation. The addition of 144 units was considered in the General Plan 2025 analysis and does not result in unforeseen impact to infrastructure. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

3.13(b-c). No Impact. The project site is currently an office complex, of which approximately 50% of the tenant spaces are currently vacant. There are no existing housing or residences on the project site. The proposed project will not displace any existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, there would be no impacts to population and housing due to displacing people or necessitating the construction of replacement housing.

Mitigation Measures: None required.
3.14. PUBLIC SERVICES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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:

a) Fire protection?  
☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) Police protection?  
☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

c) Schools?  
☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

d) Parks?  
☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

e) Other public facilities?  
☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Sources: 2025 General Plan and EIR.

Public Services Setting:

The City charges one-time impact fees on new private development in order to offset the cost of improving or expanding City facilities. Impact fees are used to fund the construction or expansion of needed capital improvements. Petaluma collects impact fees for open space, parkland, and others. Development impact fees are necessary in order to finance required public facilities and service improvements and to pay for new development's fair share of the costs of the required public facilities and service improvements.

Public Services Impact Discussion:

3.14(a-b). Less than Significant. The project site is located within an existing neighborhood that is currently well served by public services. Additional fire and/or police service calls may occur as a result of the project. In order to accommodate this potential increase in service demand, the applicant shall pay all development impact fees applicable to a multi-family residential project, including fire suppression facilities and law enforcement facilities. The payment of these impact fees will assure that any impacts offset the increase in fire and police protection services. Therefore, impacts to fire and police protection services will be less than significant.

3.14(c). Less than Significant. The project will be subject to the payment of statutory school impact fees. The Maria Drive Apartment Project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with providing new or physically altered school facilities. The project site is located within Petaluma Elementary School District and is closest to the McDowell Elementary School. The General Plan projects that the Petaluma City School District (elementary) will exceed capacity by 175 students at General Plan buildout. The proposed project will contribute to the student enrollment at of the district. Payment of impact fees will help to offset potential impacts to elementary schools. The Petaluma Joint Union High School District (high school) will experience a decrease in enrollments by General Plan Buildout due to a shift in the population demographics. Based on current capacities it is expected that sufficient facilities are in place to accommodate any increased enrollment associated with development of the subject project. With payment of impact fees, the Maria Drive Apartment Project will have less than significant impacts to schools.
3.14(d). **Less than Significant.** As a standard condition of project approval, the applicant shall pay all development fees applicable to a multi-family residential project, including parkland acquisition, park land development and open space acquisition impact fees to mitigate impacts of the project on parks and open space. The City has adopted a citywide parks standard of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. In addition to onsite recreation, which will contain a courtyard, pool, tot-lot and picnic area, the existing Washington Creek Trail is located immediately adjacent to the project site. Furthermore, the City’s General Plan identifies sufficient space for future parks necessary to accommodate population growth. The subject project does not constitute a substantial growth in population and existing park facilities are expected to be sufficient to meet active and passive recreational demands of residents. A substantial adverse impact to park facilities is not expected to occur from implementation of the subject project. Therefore impacts to parks and recreational amenities will be less than significant.

3.14(e). **No Impact.** The Project will not result in substantial adverse impacts associated with any other public facilities. The proposed project area is located within a well-established neighborhood and is well served by existing public utilities. The project will not generate a substantial increase in demands that warrant the expansion or construction of new public facilities. Any additional public services will be acquired through use of impact fees that will be levied. As a standard condition of project approval, the applicant shall pay all development fees applicable to a multi-family residential project, including public facilities, library, community center and aquatic center development impact fees to mitigate impacts of the project on other community and public facilities.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

### 3.15. **RECREATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** 2025 General Plan: Figure 6-1 Parks and Open Space; and EIR.

**Recreation Setting:**

The public parks and recreational opportunities within the UGB accommodate a wide range of uses and encompass nearly 1,400 acres. Activities offered at parks and open spaces include both active and passive recreation. In addition to the proposed project amenities for the residents; there is the nearby bike/pedestrian trail along Washington Creek and the little league baseball field/park. Park land development and open space acquisition impact fees are required and help to mitigate any potential impacts of the project on parks and open space.

**Recreation Impact Discussion:**

3.15(a). **No Impact.** As a standard condition of project approval, the applicant shall pay all development impact fees applicable to a multi-family residential project, including parkland acquisition, park land development, open space acquisition impact fees.
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3.15(b). No Impact. The project does not create new recreational facilities which will have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The new development proposal will consist of 144 units and includes on-site amenities such as a community building (approximately 3,500 sq. ft.), swimming pool/hot tub, picnic area, and playground area.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.16. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2025 General Plan and EIR; GP Figure 5-1; “Traffic Impact Study For The Maria Drive Apartment Complex,” prepared by W-Trans, May 28, 2013.

Transportation and Circulation Setting:

The City of Petaluma is bisected by U.S. 101, which serves as the primary route between San Francisco and Marin and Sonoma Counties. U.S. 101 accommodates over 90,000 vehicles per day within Petaluma. The circulation system within the City of Petaluma consists of approximately 140 miles of streets including arterials, collectors, connectors, and local streets.

The major arterials serving the project site are South McDowell Boulevard and East Washington Street, which provide access to Maria Drive, from which the project site is accessed. The major intersection closest to the project site is the intersection of South McDowell and East Washington Street. This intersection experience Level of Services (LOS) D during the am and pm peak hour. Under general plan buildout condition LOS at these intersection will deteriorate to LOS D and E. Future LOS at this intersection is identified as significant and unavoidable in the City’s General Plan EIR.
The City's Traffic Impact Study Guidelines are based on industry standards and indicate that a traffic study is warranted if a project is anticipated to create either 500 trips per day or 50 trips per peak hour. If a project falls within 10% of these thresholds the City may exercise discretion in whether or not to require a project specific traffic study. The proposed Maria Drive Apartments Project is estimated to generate approximately 958 daily trips and remove 565 daily trips from demolition of the existing office complex. A traffic impact study was prepared by W-trans to evaluate traffic impacts associated with project development.

**General Plan Policies: Mobility**

5-P-10: Maintain an intersection level of service (LOS) standard for motor vehicle circulation that ensures efficient traffic flow and supports multi-modal mobility goals. LOS should be maintained at Level D or better for motor vehicles due to traffic from any development project.

5-P-19: All new and redesigned streets shall be bicycle and pedestrian friendly in design.

5-P-20: Ensure that new development provides connections to and does not interfere with existing and proposed bicycle facilities.

5-P-22: Preserve and enhance pedestrian connectivity in existing neighborhoods and require well connected pedestrian network linking new and existing development to adjacent land uses.

5-P-43: Support efforts for transit oriented development around the Petaluma Depot and along the Washington Street, Petaluma Boulevard, McDowell Boulevard, Lakeville Street, and other transit corridors.

**Transportation and Circulation Impact Discussion:**

16(a-b). Less Than Significant Impact. The Traffic Impact Study prepared by W-Trans for the Maria Drive Apartment Complex (updated June 14, 2013) reviewed onsite circulation and access and evaluated the project's traffic impacts on the surrounding circulation network including six intersections in the project vicinity; 1) East Washington Street/US 101 South Ramps; 2) East Washington Street/US 101 North Ramps; 3) East Washington Street/McDowell Boulevard; 4) East Washington Street/Maria Drive; 5) Main Project Driveway/Maria Drive; and 6) South McDowell Boulevard/Maria Drive.

The project-specific Traffic Impact Study reviewed collision rates, trip generation and evaluated the project's contribution to the existing, baseline, and future year traffic conditions. As described below, all project area intersections operate acceptably, and are expected to continue to do so under baseline and projected future conditions. The addition of project-generated traffic would not be substantial, nor would it adversely impact LOS or result in a conflict due to congestion. With the Maria Drive Apartments Project all study intersections will continue to operate acceptably during the near-term and long term modeling periods.

**Maria Drive Apartment Trip Generation**

The proposed project will remove trips generated by the existing office complex and introduce new trips generated by Maria Drive Apartment residences. The net daily traffic trips represent the project's contribution to project area roadways. As seen in Table 3 below, the existing land use generates 565 daily trips and the proposed project is expected to generate an average of 958 trips per day, including 73 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 89 trips during the p.m. peak hour. As seen in Table 3 below, the net trip generation is projected to be 393 new daily trips, including 51 during the morning peak hour and 63 during the evening peak hour. These new trips represent the increase in traffic due to the project relative to existing and baseline conditions.
Table 2
Trip Generation Summary – Existing & Baseline Conditions Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Units</th>
<th>Daily Rate Trips</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Rate Trips In</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Rate Trips In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Apartments Apartments 144 du</td>
<td>6.65 958</td>
<td>0.51 73 15 58</td>
<td>0.62 89 58 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolished Existing Use Surveyed Trip Generation</td>
<td>-565</td>
<td>-22 -12 -10</td>
<td>-26 -13 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>51 3 48</td>
<td>63 45 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 4 below, when the standard trip generation potential of the 16,000 square foot office is applied to account for the assumptions contained in the City’s traffic model, the daily trips would be 176, which is much less than the surveyed condition. As such, the proposed project would contribute a greater share of new trips, a net total 782 new daily trips, compared to the survey condition. These new trips represent the increase in traffic due to the project under future year conditions. The project’s impact to LOS at project area intersections, due to future year conditions are described below.

Table 3
Trip Generation Summary – Future Conditions Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Units</th>
<th>Daily Rate Trips</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Rate Trips In</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Rate Trips In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Apartments Apartments 144 du</td>
<td>6.65 958</td>
<td>0.51 73 15 58</td>
<td>0.62 89 58 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolished Existing Use Office Building</td>
<td>11.01 -176</td>
<td>1.55 -25 -22 -3</td>
<td>-24 -4 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>48 -7 55</td>
<td>65 54 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Traffic/Circulation

Other than the East Washington Street/McDowell Boulevard intersection, study area intersections currently operate at level of service (LOS) C or above during am and pm peak hour traffic. The intersection of East Washington Street/McDowell Boulevard currently operates at LOS D during am and pm peak hour traffic. Accordingly, all study area intersections currently operate at acceptable levels of service. While acceptable, LOS D results in noticeable congestion and queuing delays. In order to improve traffic flow and circulation, improvements are currently underway to modify the northbound onramp to highway 101 at East Washington Street. These improvements are expected to result in improved operations at two project area intersections: East Washington Street/US 101 North Ramps and East Washington Street/McDowell Boulevard.

The table below shows that the existing plus project condition would not increase level of service for any project area intersection beyond the existing condition without the project.

Table 4
Summary of Existing & Existing Plus Project Peak Hour Intersection LOS Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Intersection Approach</th>
<th>Existing Conditions AM Peak</th>
<th>Existing plus Project AM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E. Washington St/US101 SB</td>
<td>27.2 C 26.4 C</td>
<td>27.6 C 26.7 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. E. Washington St/US 101 NB</td>
<td>8.7 A 14.9 B</td>
<td>8.6 A 15.2 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. E. Washington St/McDowell Blvd</td>
<td>39.0 D 36.4 D</td>
<td>36.7 D 36.7 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. E. Washington St/Maria Dr</td>
<td>17.0 B 20.4 C</td>
<td>17.2 B 20.5 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maria Dr/Project Driveway</td>
<td>8.5 A 9.0 A</td>
<td>8.8 A 9.5 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. S. McDowell Blvd/Maria Dr</td>
<td>12.1 B 13.8 B</td>
<td>12.5 B 13.9 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the addition of project-related traffic, a.m. delay at the East Washington Street intersections with U.S. 101 Northbound and McDowell Boulevard decreases during the a.m. peak hour. While this is counterintuitive, this condition occurs when project adds trips to movements that are currently underutilized or have delays that are below the intersection average, resulting in a better balance between approaches and lower overall average delay. Thus, project trips are expected to make use of excess capacity at these intersections, so drivers will experience little, if any, change in conditions as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the with-project condition would have less than significant impacts to the existing level of service at project area intersections.

**Baseline Traffic/Circulation**

The Project’s effect on planning area intersections was evaluated to assess potential impacts to LOS and circulation on the roadway network. Baseline conditions include existing traffic in addition to the added traffic resulting from currently approved, but yet-to-be, constructed projects pursuant to the City’s Major Project List (updated August 2012). All study area intersections are projected to continue to operate at LOS D or above for the baseline condition.

The baseline and baseline plus project condition LOS at project area intersection are presented in the table below. Under the baseline plus project condition, all project area intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service D or greater, except for the intersection of East Washington and McDowell Boulevard. Staff has previously reviewed and considered LOS E at this intersection adopted overriding considerations to approve operations at LOS E for this intersection. The proposed Rainier connector is identified as a long-range solution to improve LOS along the Washington Street corridor. Furthermore, the project’s contribution to delays at this intersection are minimal, less than one-second per vehicle. Thus, the project’s effect on traffic and circulation would not result in a substantial impact to LOS and impacts would be less than significant.

### Table 5

**Summary of Baseline & Baseline plus Project Peak Hour Intersection LOS Calculations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Intersection</th>
<th>Baseline Conditions</th>
<th>Baseline plus Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak Delay LOS</td>
<td>PM Peak Delay LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E. Washington St/US101 SB</td>
<td>36.0 C 54.4 D</td>
<td>33.5 C 53.1 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. E. Washington St/US 101 NB</td>
<td>12.7 B 17.5 B</td>
<td>13.8 B 19.7 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. E. Washington St/McDowell Blvd</td>
<td>36.4 D 68.0 E</td>
<td>37.1 D 69.0 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. E. Washington St/Maria Dr</td>
<td>20.7 C 20.6 C</td>
<td>20.7 C 21.0 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maria Dr/Project Driveway</td>
<td>8.7 A 9.2 A</td>
<td>8.8 A 9.6 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. S. McDowell Blvd/Maria Dr</td>
<td>12.4 B 14.1 B</td>
<td>12.7 B 14.9 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Traffic/Circulation**

To assess traffic and circulation in future years, a horizon year analysis was also evaluated. The future year analysis included baseline conditions in addition to traffic generated by the East Washington Place and Deer Creek Village developments. Future year infrastructure improvement projects were also considered including, the Rainier Avenue Interchange and the proposed protected left turn phasing at East Washington Street/Maria Drive. Under the future traffic conditions all study area intersections are projected to operate at LOS D or above during a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic.

The future and future plus project condition LOS at project area intersections are presented in the table below. Under the future plus project condition, all project area intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service D or greater for both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact on long-term traffic and circulation through horizon year 2035.
Table 6
Summary of Future & Future Project Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Intersection Approach</th>
<th>Future Conditions AM Peak</th>
<th>Future plus Project AM Peak</th>
<th>Future Conditions PM Peak</th>
<th>Future plus Project PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E. Washington St/US101 SB</td>
<td>33:3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28:5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. E. Washington St/US 101 NB</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. E. Washington St/McDowell Blvd</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. E. Washington St/Maria Dr</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maria Dr/Project Driveway</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. S. McDowell Blvd/Maria Dr</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Impact Summary
The project will not cause traffic levels to exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard (D or below) established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. Project area intersections are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service under the project condition for both the near-term and long-term. Traffic volumes generated by the subject project will not have a significant impact on the existing intersection of Maria Drive and Park Lane nor warrant a traffic signal. Level of services for planning area intersections will not be noticeably affected by the proposed project. The project will not cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impacts to traffic and circulation.

The project’s circulation plan has been reviewed and approved by the Petaluma Public Works & Utilities Department (Engineering & Traffic Division) and the Fire Marshal. As a standard condition of project approval, the applicant shall pay all development impact fees. These fees will contribute to improvements to project area roadways and assure that the project’s fair share of increased traffic and use of the circulation system has been accounted for. Therefore, the project’s impact to traffic and circulation will be less than significant.

3.16(c). No Impact. The project will not result in an increase in traffic in a manner that changes the air traffic pattern. Nor will the project introduce a safety concern related to air traffic pattern due to the location of facilities. The project is located over a mile south of the Petaluma Municipal Airport and does not contain any elements that would affect the air traffic pattern. Therefore, the project would have no circulation impact that affect air traffic.

3.16(d). Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. Access into the project site is provided from two places along Maria Drive, which is identified as a connector in the 2025 General Plan. The primary arteries used to access Maria Drive in the project vicinity are McDowell Boulevard and East Washington Street. The main entryway into the project site will be developed as the fourth leg to the current tee intersection at Maria Drive and Park Lane. Traffic at this intersection is currently controlled by a three-way stop and will be controlled by a four-way stop at project operation.

A turn lane warrant analysis was conducted to evaluate the need for turning pockets within Maria Drive at the proposed project driveways. Sufficient capacity was determined to be available along Maria Drive to provide safe access to the site without the need for dedicated turning pockets. Neither left-turn nor right-turn lanes are warranted at the Maria Drive Apartment driveways.

Site distance at the entrance to the proposed Maria Drive Apartments was evaluated based on criteria contained in the Highway Design Manual developed by Caltrans. Pursuant to design criteria set forth therein, a stopping sight distance of 150 feet is recommended for a 25 mile per hour speed limit. The available sight distance at the proposed primary and secondary site access points exceed 200 feet. Therefore clear lines of sight would be available at both of the project driveways.

The proposed project’s monument sign to be located south of the main project driveway would obstruct a driver’s view to the south. To provide clear sight lines, it is required that this monument sign be set back at least ten feet from the edge of the roadway. In order to assure that there are no conflict with visibility,
mitigation measure CIRC-1 shall be implemented, which requires that the monument sign be located south of the main project driveway in a position that does not obstruct a driver's view, to the south.

In order to ensure that any potential hazard associated with internal circulation are reduced to less than significant levels, mitigation measure CIRC-2 shall be implemented, which requires traffic calming measures.

New features introduced onsite including landscaping, signage, and parking locations will be developed in a manner that does not present a design hazard. Proposed landscaping will be developed in a manner that maintains visibility at site access points. Landscaping adjacent to the project driveways will be restricted to ground cover that does exceed one foot in height. The existing restrictions on parking on the west side of Maria Drive along the project frontage will remain unchanged. Red curbs will be repainted to clearly depict parking restrictions. Therefore, with implementation of CIRC-1 and CIRC-2 the proposed project will not increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or a dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) and impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels.

3.16(e). No Impact. The project's internal circulation plan has been reviewed and meets all standard conditions imposed by the Petaluma Public Works and Fire Departments. Site circulation was determined to be adequate, including sufficient internal street widths to allow for fire trucks to turn around. The project will have no impact to emergency access.

3.16(f). No Impact. For multi-family dwelling, the Implementing Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 11 - Table 11.1) requires 1 parking space, which may be covered or uncovered, for each bedroom, studio, or efficiency unit. In no case shall a project provide an overall parking ratio of less than 1.5 spaces per unit. The proposed multi-family residential project as proposed includes a total of 252 bedrooms therefore meeting the requirement of 252 parking spaces (1 per bedroom). The project as proposed provides 252 parking spaces including, 15 garage spaces, 134 covered carport spaces, 98 standard spaces and 5 handicap accessible spaces. Therefore the proposed project is consistent with the parking requirements established by the IZO and there would be no impacts due to parking.

3.16(g). Less Than Significant with Mitigation: As an infill project within the City's Urban Core, the project site is currently well served by pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit facilities. The project site is in proximity to an elementary school, parks, the Washington Creek Multi-use trail, and shopping. As proposed, the project will provide connectivity to these existing amenities. The project shall be required to comply with mitigation measures CIRC-3 and CIRC-4 below to assure consistency with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Implementation of CIRC-3 and CIRC-4 will reduce potential impacts to less than significance levels and avoid conflicts with the adopted Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

Pedestrian Facilities
Existing pedestrian facilities in the project vicinity include sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signals, and curb ramps. Adjacent to the project site, continuous sidewalks are provided along both sides of Maria Drive. Crosswalks with pedestrian signal phasing are provided at all nearby signalized intersections. Marked crosswalks at Maria Drive also exist approximately 150 feet north of the project driveway at the Washington Creek trail crossing and at the all-way stop-controlled intersection of Maria Drive and Park Lane.

Onsite pedestrian amenities will tie into the existing pedestrian network in the project vicinity. The project will retain the existing sidewalk along Maria Drive at the project frontage. In order to accommodate the increased pedestrian activity and assure the safety of school aged children crossing Maria Drive, yellow striped crosswalks are required to be added to the east and south leg of the Maria Drive and Park Lane intersection. With this mitigation measure, CIRC-3 set forth below, potential impacts to pedestrians and pedestrian facilities will be less than significant.

Bicycle Facilities
The project proposes onsite bicycle amenities including bicycle racks to accommodate 144 bike spaces located throughout the subject development. As proposed, the bicycle racks provide for safe, secure and convenient bike parking and storage.

In the project area, intermittent Class II bike lanes exist on Washington Street and McDowell Boulevard. There is an existing off-road, Class I multi-use path along the Washington Creek, which connects...
with Maria Drive near the proposed project site. Although Maria Drive does not currently contain dedicated bike lanes and bicyclists share the roadway and/or ride on sidewalks, Maria Drive is dedicated as a Class III Bike Route on the 2008 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. As a Class III bike route, signage informs motorists of the shared use roadway with cyclists. In accordance with BPP Policy 1 Program C, Policy 2, CIRC-3 required that the project shall install proper Class III bicycle route signage along the project’s frontage to Maria Drive. With implementation of CIRC-4 potential conflicts with signage along this Class III bike route will be reduced to levels below significance.

Existing bicycle facilities including dedicated bike lanes and shared roads provide adequate access for existing and future cyclists. The project would not alter Maria Drive along the site frontage and there would be no interference with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan’s long-term objective to dedicate Maria Drive as a Class III Bike Route. Therefore with implementation of CIRC-4 impacts to bicycle facilities would be less than significant.

Transit Facilities

Petaluma Transit provides public transportation throughout the City via dedicated bus stops and planned routes. Route 11 provides service along East Washington Street to downtown, including a stop along Maria Drive at the project frontage. The East Side Transit Center, located approximately 1,000 feet southwest of the project site, provides nearby access to a transit hub. The existing bus stop along the project’s frontage and the regional transit center are both within comfortable walking distance of the project site. Transit routes have adequate capacity to accommodate project-generated transit trips. Therefore, the project’s impacts to public transit will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

CIRC-1. The proposed monument sign at the extension of Park Lane and Maria Drive shall be set back from the access driveway approximately 10 feet to assure sufficient line of sight.

CIRC-2. Traffic calming measures shall be employed to encourage low traveling vehicles on internal circulation including, crosswalks at corners, speed bumps, and colored pavement to visually identify pedestrian crossings.

CIRC-3. The intersection of Maria Drive and Park Lane shall be improved with yellow stripping crosswalks to further enhance pedestrian safety at the project access driveway and assure safe crossing to the McDowell Elementary School to the southeast.

CIRC-4. The project applicant shall be responsible for the cost associated with the installation of signage along the frontage of the property at Maria Drive noting that Maria Drive is a Class III Bike route.
### 3.17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2025 GP and EIR; Water Resource and Conservation 2010 UWMP; and Sonoma County Water Agency 2010 UWMP.

### Utilities and Service Systems Settings:

The City charges one-time impact fees on new private development in order to offset the cost of improving or expanding City facilities to accommodate the project. Impact fees are used to help fund the construction or expansion of needed capital improvements. Petaluma collects impact fees for open space, park land, traffic impact, wastewater, water capacity, storm drain, and others. As an infill project, the subject site is well served by existing public utilities and will not require substantial infrastructure costs or enhancement to serve the proposed project.

### Water Service System

The City's water supply is sourced from the Russian River Water System and supplemented with local groundwater. Water from the Russian River Water System is obtained via the Petaluma Aqueduct through a contract with the Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA). The City's Water Resource and Conservation Department (WR&C) provides municipal water service to approximately 60,000 customers and is therefore must comply with the Urban Water Management Plan Act, which requires the preparation of an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) every five years. The most recent UWMP prepared for the WR&C was completed for the 2010 cycle and was adopted on June 6, 2011.
The City's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) updates information from the General Plan 2025 background and environmental documents and extended the term of water demand analysis through 2035. The 2010 UWMP was determined to be consistent with the General Plan 2025. The UWMP includes a water supply/demand analysis based on population trends and land uses set forth in the 2025 General Plan, the City's existing water supply contract with the Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA), and planned City water recycling and water conservation programs.

SCWA adopted its 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (Brown & Caldwell June 2011) on June 21, 2011. The SCWA holds water right permits for the diversion of surface water from the Russian River with a limit of 75,000 acre-feet per year. Instream flow requirements have also been established to protect fish and wildlife species (Decisions 1610) and recreation. Based on regional water supply availability, the SCWA expects to be able to increase annual water deliveries to Petaluma from approximately 7,200 acre-feet in 2010 to 11,400 acre-feet by 2035. SCWA

Based on the evaluation of future Russian River supply including, minimum instream flow requirements, SCWA expects to obtain water rights approvals necessary to increase its total diversions above 75,000 ac-ft/yr by 2027 and to 80,000 ac-ft/yr by 2035. This assumption is based on the most likely outcome of decisions by regulatory agencies and implementation of the Restructured Agreement (Executed in 2006) and proposed improvements to the water delivery system.

To assure that the City of Petaluma has sufficient water supplies to meet increased water demand, the General Plan requires routine monitoring of water supplies against actual use and evaluation for each new development project (GP Policy 8-P-4).

Wastewater Treatment
Ellis Creek Water Recycling Facility, treats all wastewater generated by the City of Petaluma and unincorporated Sonoma County community of Pengrove. The collection system is comprised of more than 190 miles of underground piping and nine (9) pump stations. The Facility's treatment capacity is about 6.7 million gallons per day (average dry weather flow). The facility treats approximately 5 million gallons per day. As such there is sufficient capacity to treat additional wastewater. During the summer, recycled water is introduced to the City's recycled water system and is used for irrigation of 800 acres of agricultural lands, two golf courses, and a vineyard. In the winter, secondary treated wastewater is conveyed to the Petaluma River.

Storm Drains
Within the City of Petaluma storm drains convey runoff from impervious surfaces such as streets, sidewalks, and buildings to gutters that drain to creeks and the Petaluma River and ultimately the San Pablo Bay. This water is untreated and carries with it any contaminants picked up along the way such as solvents, oils, fuels and sediment. The City has implemented a storm drain labeling program to provide a visual reminder that storm drains are for rainwater only. The City's Stormwater Management and Pollution Control Ordinance, set forth in Chapter 15.80 of the City's Municipal Code, establishes the standard requirements and controls on the storm drain system. All existing and proposed development must adhere to the City's Stormwater Management and Pollution Control Ordinance.

Utilities and Service Systems Impact Discussion:

3.17(a-b). No Impact: The Project will not cause or exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board or require the expansion of existing or construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.

3.17(c). No Impacts: The Project will not result in significant environmental impacts due to the expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities or construction of new facilities. Onsite grading will be conducted in a manner that mimics the storm flows of pre-developed conditions. As described above under the Hydrology and Water Quality discussion, the project's contribution of runoff to storm drains in the vicinity will be minimal and impacts to storm drain capacity less than significant.
3.17(d). **Less Than Significant Impacts:** In evaluating the sufficiency of water supplies to meet existing water demands in addition to water demand generated by the proposed project, the City has compared General Plan 2025 projected water demand to actual use through December 2012. The results of that comparison find that potable water demand is well within the available SCWA supply, both for this project, and for cumulative demand through 2035 as set forth in the 2010 UWMP.

3.17(e). **No Impact:** Under the current mixed-use land use designation onsite a maximum buildout density of up to 30 dwelling units per acre was evaluated under the General Plan. The Maria Drive Apartments project proposed a density of 24.6 dwelling units per acre. As such, the project’s contribution to wastewater flows were anticipated in the General Plan and have been considered for operating capacity of the water treatment plant. Therefore, the project will have no impacts related to the adequacy or capacity of wastewater treatment facilities.

3.17(f). **No Impact:** The Project will contribute to the generation of solid waste within the UGB. Solid waste disposal facilities are owned and operated by the Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works. The project’s level of contribution is minimal and considered as part of the GP EIR impact analysis. Therefore, the project will have no impact to the disposal of solid waste.

3.17(g). **No Impact:** The proposed project will adhere to all required regulations regarding the disposal of solid waste. Construction related waste will be minimized through the development of a construction waste management plan. Therefore, the project will have no impacts to solid waste. The proposed project will adhere to all required regulations regarding the disposal of solid waste. Policy 4-P-21 requires waste reduction in compliance with the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CoIWM). Construction related waste will be reduced through the development of a construction waste management plan.

The City is currently under contract with Petaluma Refuse and Recycling for solid waste disposal and recycling services. This company provides canisters for waste, green (plant-waste) materials, and recycling. Solid waste is picked up and trucked to the Sonoma County landfill sites. The project would be supplied with the same solid waste and recycling opportunities through the County’s existing waste management system via the City’s solid waste service provider. Although the project would generate additional solid waste, it is not expected to exceed landfill capacity and is not expected to result in violations of federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the project will have no impacts to solid waste.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.
Mandatory Findings Discussion:

3.18(a). Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation: The project is located within the UGB and is considered as part of the development plan set forth in the General Plan and analyzed in the EIR. The project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use and goals, policies, and programs. With implementation of mitigation measures set forth above in Sections 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.9, 3.12, and 3.16 the project's potential impacts would be reduced to levels below significance. As such, the project will not degrade the quality of the environment, reduce habitat, or affect cultural resources. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impacts due to degradation of the environment.

3.18(b). Less Than Significant: The project will contribute to the cumulative impacts identified in the City’s GP EIR. However, the project's contribution is limited and incorporates design features that reduce cumulative impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore the project's cumulative impacts will be less than significant.

3.18(c). No Impact: The project will have no substantial adverse impacts to environmental resources. There are no direct or indirect effects that would adversely impact human beings onsite or in the project vicinity. Therefore the project will have no impact due to substantial adverse environmental effects.
### 4. INFORMATION SOURCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan and Zoning Ordinance</th>
<th>Other Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Chapter 1. Land Use, Growth Management, &amp; the Built Environment</td>
<td>Published geological maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Chapter 2. Community Design, Character, &amp; Green Building</td>
<td>SCWA UWMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Chapter 3. Historic Preservation</td>
<td>General Plan: 2025 EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Chapter 4. The Natural Environment</td>
<td>FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Chapter 5. Mobility</td>
<td>General Plan Chapter 11. Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Chapter 6. Recreation, Music, Parks, &amp; the Arts</td>
<td>Implementing Zoning Ordinance/Maps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technical Appendices:** The following resources were prepared in order to further identify project specific parameters and all are incorporated herein by reference. Copies of these technical documents are available for review during normal business hours at the City of Petaluma, 11 English Street, in the Community Development Department.


