

Notice of Preparation

Notice of Preparation

To: _____ From: _____

(Address)

(Address)

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report

_____ will be the Lead Agency and will prepare an environmental impact report for the project identified below. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project.

The project description, location, and the potential environmental effects are contained in the attached materials. A copy of the Initial Study (☐ is ☐ is not) attached.

Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to _____ at the address shown above. We will need the name for a contact person in your agency.

Project Title: _____

Project Applicant, if any: _____

Date _____

Signature Brittany Bendip

Title _____

Telephone _____

Reference: California Code of Regulations, Title 14, (CEQA Guidelines) Sections 15082(a), 15103, 15375.



City of Petaluma

Notice of Preparation – Environmental Impact Report for the Scannell Mixed-Use Development Project

Date: September 3, 2020

To: State Clearinghouse
State Responsible Agencies
State Trustee Agencies
Other Public Agencies
Interested Organizations

From: Brittany Bendix, Deputy Planning Manager
City of Petaluma

Planning Division
11 English Street
Petaluma, CA 94952

Subject: Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Scannell Mixed-Use Development Project

Lead Agency: City of Petaluma Planning Division

Project Title: Scannell Development Project

Project Location: City of Petaluma (see Figure 1 – Regional and Vicinity Map)

Notice is hereby given that the City of Petaluma (City) will be the Lead Agency and will prepare a project-level EIR for the Scannell Mixed-Use Development Project (proposed project) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15060(d)). The EIR is being prepared by the City in accordance with applicable law, in particular, CEQA and the State of California CEQA Guidelines.

As shown on Figure 1, the proposed project is a mixed-use development on a 39.2-acre site at 500 Hopper Street and 500 Lakeville Street, less than 1 mile southeast of downtown Petaluma, County of Sonoma, California. As proposed, the project would develop commercial and residential uses. The proposed commercial component of the project would include office space in a two-story building to be occupied by Amy's Kitchen as its corporate headquarters, with full build out to approximately 147,305 gross square feet of office use. The proposed project would also include two additional two-story buildings containing approximately 46,440 gross square feet of additional commercial space and a three-story structured parking garage accommodating up to 330 off-street parking spaces, with a portion of the ground floor dedicated to retail space. An additional 65 parking spaces would be provided on-street. The residential component of the site will include up to approximately 275 dwellings unit including 80 apartments, 95 single-family motor court homes and 100 townhomes, and up to 250 off-street parking spaces.

The project site is comprised of Assessor's Parcel Numbers 136-010-024 and 007-171-023. The property is an irregularly shaped lot, bordered to the south and west by the Petaluma River and McNear Channel. On the east, the property borders the proposed Riverfront Mixed Use Project, which was approved in 2014 for mixed-use development and has initiated construction but is not yet occupied. The site is bounded by the City Corporation yard to the north.

The current General Plan land use designation for the property is River Dependent Industrial (RDI). The project site is located within the Central Petaluma Specific Plan (CPSP) and the current CPSP designations are River-Dependent Industrial (D3) and Civic Space. The project includes a General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan Amendment to change the land use designation on the property from RDI to Mixed Use, and a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the property from the D3 District to a mix of T4 (General Urban) and T5 (Urban Center). The portion of the property designated Civic Space would be developed with a multi-use trail and does not require a Specific Plan or Zoning Amendment. This area will be redeveloped in coordination with the California State Lands Commission. The project will also require a General Plan Amendment to provide additional below market-rate housing in lieu of a required 3.5-acre active park.

The EIR will evaluate the project for potential impacts on the environment and determine the potential environmental consequences of future change. The proposed project could potentially affect the following environmental factors, each of which will be addressed in the EIR: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, parks and recreation, transportation and circulation, and utilities and service systems. Cumulative impacts will consider impacts of relevant projects in and around the project area combined with those of the project. An evaluation of project alternatives that could reduce significant impacts will also be evaluated in the EIR.

September 3, 2020

To ensure that the EIR for this proposed project is thorough and adequate and ensure that the issues of concern to the public and public agencies are addressed, the City is requesting comments and guidance on the scope and content of the EIR from interested public agencies, organizations, and individuals. Public comments on the scope of issues to be evaluated in the EIR are encouraged. With respect to the views of Responsible and Trustee Agencies as to significant environmental issues, the City needs to know the reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures that are germane to each agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the project.

A public Scoping Meeting will be held via remote broadcast on Wednesday, September 23 2020 at 7:00 p.m. Public agencies, organizations, and interested members of the public are invited to participate in this meeting and provide verbal or written comments on the proposed project. Please find the meeting-specific link to the Zoom meeting included on the project webpage: <https://cityofpetaluma.org/scannell-mixed-use-development/>

If you wish to comment during the NOP comment period, or if you cannot participate in the scoping meeting, we will accept written comment beginning on September 3, 2020 until the close of the NOP comment period on October 2, 2020. **Comments on the NOP are due no later than the close of the 30-day review period at 5:00 p.m. on Friday, October 2, 2020.**

Please send all written comments to Brittany Bendix, Deputy City Manager, City of Petaluma, at the address shown above or email to bbendix@cityofpetaluma.org with "Scannell Mixed-Use Development Project EIR" as the subject. Public agencies providing comments are asked to include a contact person for the agency. Please direct questions about the proposed project description to Brittany Bendix, Deputy City Manager in the Planning Division at bbendix@cityofpetaluma.org, 707-778-4314.

NOTICE OF PREPARATION



- Project Site
- Railroad

Figure 1
Reginal Context and Local Vicinity

Attachment: Initial Study Checklist

This environmental checklist is intended to provide a summary of topics that will be analyzed in the EIR and a preliminary assessment of the potential significance of project impacts. This Initial Study also provides a brief description under each resource area summarizing the approach that the EIR will take in analyzing the project's impacts to that resource.

Definitions for the levels of significance in the checklist are provided below:

Potentially Significant Impact is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. These topics will be addressed in the EIR.

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures would reduce an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less-than-Significant Impact."

Less than Significant Impact applies when there is no substantial evidence that an effect may be significant.

No Impact applies when a project would not create an impact of any kind.

I. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099 (transit priority area/major transit stop), would the proposed project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The EIR analysis will identify and describe policies, regulations and guidelines relating to aesthetic resources, focusing on the Petaluma General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, Municipal Code, and other applicable City policy documents. The analysis will describe the existing visual quality and night time ambient lighting of the project site and its immediate surroundings. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant aesthetic impacts.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the proposed project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

Criteria a-e): The project site is currently zoned for industrial use, and was previously used as a pre-cast concrete plant, until 2006. The project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract,¹ and there are no agricultural land uses adjoining the site. In addition, there is no forest land and important farmland (i.e. Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance) on the project site or adjoining

¹ County of Sonoma, Williamson Act Land Contracts - County of Sonoma, <http://sonomacounty.ca.gov/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=2147565785>, accessed August 3, 2020.

area.² No impact would occur, and no mitigation would be required. Therefore, the EIR analysis will not include an analysis of agricultural resources.

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	■	□	□	□
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard?	■	□	□	□
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	■	□	□	□
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	■	□	□	□

DISCUSSION

The project is located near existing development that could be affected by project construction and operational emissions. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for planning, implementing, and enforcing air quality standards within the Bay Area Air Basin, including the City of Petaluma. BAAQMD standards will be used to assess the air quality impacts at both the regional and local level from the proposed project. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant air quality impacts.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plan, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	■	□	□	□

² California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, https://gis.conservation.ca.gov/server/rest/services/DLRP/CaliforniaImportantFarmland_mostrecent/MapServer, accessed August 3, 2020.

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

As reported in the 2025 General Plan EIR several special-status plant and animal species have been recorded or are suspected to occur within the Urban Growth Boundary of the City of Petaluma.³ The Petaluma River and McNear Channel provide valuable riparian habitat, marshland and wetlands for several special-status species and animal plants, including the western pond turtle and Central Coast steelhead ESU.⁴ The EIR analysis of biological resources will consist of a summary of local, regional, State, and federal regulations pertaining to sensitive biological and wetland resources, a summary of research methodology, a description of existing conditions, and the identification of environmental constraints, and opportunities for resource protection or enhancement. This analysis will identify existing vegetation types and wildlife habitat, wetlands, potential for occurrence of special-status species, and presence of any sensitive features on the project site. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant impacts.

³ City of Petaluma, 2006, Petaluma General Plan 2025 EIR, page 3.8-3.

⁴ City of Petaluma, 2006, Petaluma General Plan 2025 EIR, page 3.8-1-3.8-2.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	■	□	□	□
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	■	□	□	□
c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	■	□	□	□

DISCUSSION

Due to historic and existing uses on the project site, including heavy industry, there has been a high degree of past disturbance, including excavation, grading, and paving. As a result of these past disturbances, it is not expected that any sub-surface cultural resources would be discovered during the course of construction. Potential cultural resource impacts will be identified and assessed in the EIR and appropriate mitigation measures will be recommended.

VI. ENERGY

Would the proposed project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	■	□	□	□
b)	Conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	■	□	□	□

DISCUSSION

The EIR analysis will describe and identify the projected energy consumption that would result through the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project. The analysis will include a discussion of existing energy resources, as well as local efforts to conserve energy. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant impacts to energy conservation.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the proposed project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	■	□	□	□
ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?	■	□	□	□
iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	■	□	□	□
iv)	Landslides?	■	□	□	□
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	■	□	□	□
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?	■	□	□	□
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	■	□	□	□
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 wastewater?	□	□	□	■
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	■	□	□	□

DISCUSSION

The EIR analysis will evaluate geologic conditions at the site based on available literature covering the site and vicinity, including maps and reports published by the US Geological Survey, and a geotechnical report prepared for the proposed project. The EIR analysis will examine the potential for liquefaction, ground shaking, bank stability and settlement hazards. The analysis will also evaluate potential impacts related to fault rupture and other potentially significant geologic or geotechnical concerns, including expansive soils. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant geologic impacts.

The following criterion would not be further analyzed in the EIR for the reasons specified:

Criterion (e): The proposed project would be served by the City of Petaluma wastewater treatment system and would not employ septic tanks or alternative waste disposal facilities. No impact would occur, and no mitigation would be required.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the proposed project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	■	□	□	□
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	■	□	□	□

DISCUSSION

The proposed project would result in greenhouse gas emissions during construction and operation. The EIR will summarize statewide planning efforts relative to climate change and the generation of greenhouse gas emissions. Project features that would result in lower greenhouse gas emissions will be described and included in the modeling assumptions for emission estimates. Mitigation measures will be identified, if required.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the proposed project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	■	□	□	□
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	■	□	□	□
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	■	□	□	□
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	■	□	□	□
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	□	□	□	■
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	■	□	□	□

Would the proposed project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The EIR analysis will examine historical use of hazardous materials on or near the project site, hazardous materials associated with the historical dry dock usage, the historical use of fill on the subject property, and the presence of soil and other contamination. The analysis will also address potential impacts associated with remediation actions (soil excavation, grading, and off-hauling) including impacts to air quality, noise and traffic. The Valley Oaks High School and Crossroads Alternative School sit approximately one quarter mile northwest of the project site, therefore the EIR analysis will also examine and address hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous materials, substances or waste on the proposed project site. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant impacts.

The following criteria would not be further analyzed in the EIR for the reasons specified.

Criterion e): The proposed project is not located within the Petaluma Municipal Airport Land Use Plan, and there are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site. Thus, no impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Criterion g): The project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) or within a State Responsibility Area (SRA) and therefore is categorized as having a low wildland fire risk.^{5,6} This is partially due to the surrounding terrain and vegetation as well as project site's location adjacent to the Petaluma River and a developed industrial area. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required. The impact of the project on fire services, and the extent to which the project is consistent with City policies on fire services, will be discussed in the "Public Services" section of the EIR.

⁵ City of Petaluma Fire Department, 2019, Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map, <https://storage.googleapis.com/proudcity/petalumaca/uploads/2019/05/Fire-Hazard-Severity-Zone-Map.pdf>, accessed August 6, 2020.

⁶ California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2020, Fire Hazard Viewer, <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>, accessed August 6, 2020.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the proposed project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	■	□	□	□
b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	■	□	□	□
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
	i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				
	ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	■	□	□	□
	iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or				
	iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?				
d)	In a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	■	□	□	□
e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	■	□	□	□

DISCUSSION

The proposed project would include the placement of clean fill on the majority of the site, raising the elevation of most areas within the project site. The project would also include extensive exterior hardscape/flatwork and asphalt paving, new underground utilities, new site drainage, landscaping, lighting, and other improvements “typical” of such developments. The EIR analysis will include an assessment of potential water quality and flooding impacts. The analysis will also include discussion of finished grades and design of storm drain systems that could be an issue during flooding events, and flooding risks associated with projected sea level rise which may occur due to global warming. Flooding risks both on and off site will be addressed, as well as water quality issues related to stormwater and wastewater disposal. The EIR will also analyze potential long term impacts on groundwater recharge and aquifer volumes. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant impacts.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the proposed project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Physically divide an established community?	■	□	□	□
b)	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	■	□	□	□

DISCUSSION

The current General Plan land use designation for the property is River Dependent Industrial (RDI). The project site is located within the Central Petaluma Specific Plan (CPSP) and the current CPSP designations are River-Dependent Industrial (D3) and Civic Space. The project includes a General Plan Amendment from RDI to Mixed Use and Medium Density Residential, and a Specific Plan Amendment from D3 to a mix of T4 (General Urban) and T5 (Urban Center). The EIR analysis will describe the existing regulatory and physical land use setting and will also identify and describe the key City of Petaluma policy documents and regulations applicable to the proposed project that are intended to avoid environmental effects. The analysis will also identify and describe the existing land uses on the project site and in the project vicinity and assess impacts if an established community is identified as being divided. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant impacts.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	□	□	□	■
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	□	□	□	■

DISCUSSION

Criteria a-b): The project site is not identified in the Petaluma General Plan or EIR as containing known mineral resources.⁷ Therefore, the EIR analysis will not include a discussion of mineral resources located on the site. No impact would occur and no mitigation would be required.

⁷ City of Petaluma, 2006, Petaluma General Plan 2025 EIR, page 4-6.

XIII. NOISE

Would the proposed project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The EIR analysis will describe the existing noise environment in the project area and assess the potential noise and vibration impacts of construction and operation of the proposed project. If necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant impacts.

XIV. RECREATION

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The EIR analysis will focus on whether the future resident and employee populations at the project site would result in a significant impact on existing recreational facilities or necessitate the construction of new facilities. Where necessary, propose mitigation measures to address potentially significant impacts.

XV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The EIR analysis will evaluate existing population, employment, and housing conditions in the Scannell Mixed-Use Development project area. The analysis would determine whether the project would result in substantial, unplanned population growth in the City based on the City's most current population projections as set forth in the recently updated General Plan.

The following criterion would not be further analyzed in the EIR for the reasons specified.

Criterion b): The project would not displace any housing units, as it is vacant and unoccupied. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

XVI. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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:				
i) Fire protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The EIR analysis will identify public services serving the project site and evaluate the existing and proposed service levels, with particular emphasis on any services that are operating at or near capacity. Through coordination with service providers, the analysis will determine which public services, if any, would be significantly impacted as a result of the project. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant impacts.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	■	□	□	□
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	■	□	□	□
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	■	□	□	□
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	■	□	□	□

DISCUSSION

The EIR analysis will provide an overview of the existing transportation network serving the project site, including roadways, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian options. The impact analysis will focus on vehicle miles traveled that would be generated by the project, as well as project site access, emergency vehicle access, and potential hazards. If necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant impacts.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of	■	□	□	□

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance to a California Native American tribe.				

DISCUSSION

Due to historic and existing uses on the project site, including heavy industry, there has been a high degree of past disturbance, including excavation, grading, and paving. As a result of these past disturbances, it is not expected that any sub-surface tribal archaeological or paleontological resources would be discovered during the course of construction. The EIR analysis will include a discussion of any existing known tribal cultural resources in the project area and identify any potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. Mitigation measures will be proposed to address potentially significant impacts to tribal cultural resources.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	■	□	□	□
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	■	□	□	□
c) 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?	■	□	□	□
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	■	□	□	□
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	■	□	□	□

DISCUSSION

The project is proposed to utilize potable water and wastewater treatment services from the City of Petaluma. The proposed potable water system and proposed wastewater system would tie into existing water and wastewater mains, respectively. In addition, electricity and natural gas services would be provided by Pacific Gas and Electric and telephone and internet would be provided by AT&T.

The EIR analysis will identify existing utilities serving the project site and evaluate the existing conditions of these utilities, with particular emphasis on any known existing deficiencies. The EIR will also analyze potential impacts associated with proposed new utilities or expansions of existing facilities. Utilities that will be examined include those related to stormwater, sanitary wastewater, potable water, solid waste disposal, electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications. Mitigation measures will be identified if required.

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the proposed project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

Criteria a-d): The project site is not located within or near a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in a Local Responsibility Area or within a State Responsibility Area and therefore is categorized as having a low wildland fire risk.^{8,9} This is partially due to the surrounding terrain and vegetation as well as project site's

⁸ City of Petaluma Fire Department, 2019, Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map, <https://storage.googleapis.com/proudcity/petalumaca/uploads/2019/05/Fire-Hazard-Severity-Zone-Map.pdf>, accessed August 6, 2020.

⁹ California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2020, Fire Hazard Viewer, <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>, accessed August 6, 2020.

location adjacent to the Petaluma River and a developed industrial area. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

The impact of the project on fire services, and the extent to which the project is consistent with City policies on fire services, will be discussed in the “Public Services” section of the EIR.