Section 2
Initial Study Checklist

Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form

1. **Project title:**
   Montini Open Space Preserve Management Plan

2. **Lead agency name and address:**
   Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District
   747 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 100
   Santa Rosa, CA 95401

3. **Contact person and phone number:**
   Leslie Lew
   Open Space Planner
   (707) 565-7360

4. **Project location:**
   Between 5th St. W, 1st St. W, the Vallejo Home State Historic Park, and the Montini Ranch.

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**
   Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District
   747 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 100
   Santa Rosa, CA 95401

6. **General plan designation:**
   City of Sonoma: Residential
   Sonoma County: Resources and Rural Development

7. **Zoning:**
   City of Sonoma: Park with an Open Space Overlay
   Sonoma County: Resources and Rural Development, 100-acre density with a Scenic Landscape Unit overlay.

8. **Description of project:**
   A management plan for an Open Space Preserve. Please see attached.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:**
   The project is bordered to the north by a cattle ranch; to the east by a recreational trail; to the south by city ball fields, a State Historic Park, and a subdivision; and to the west by a cattle ranch and residences.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:**
    California Department of Fish and Game
    US Army Corps of Engineers
    North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
    Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

None of the environmental factors below have been checked because the proposed plan did not impose any impacts that would be a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics	Agriculture Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology /Soils
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology / Water Quality	Land Use / Planning
Mineral Resources	Noise	Population / Housing
Public Services	Recreation	Transportation/Traffic
Utilities / Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance	

Determination:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

I find 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.

Bill Keene — 11/13/08

Bill Keene, Assistant General Manager — Date

Leslie Lew — 11/13/08

Leslie Lew, Open Space Planner — Date

Evaluation Of Environmental Impacts:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is

substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

I. Aesthetics - *Would the project:*

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

Discussion

a) Implementation of the proposed management plan is not anticipated to affect the viewshed. The proposed trail is not anticipated to be visible from offsite and is unlikely to have a significant effect on scenic vistas in the area.

b) Scenic resources would not be significantly affected by the implementation of the management plan. The biggest impact would result from the construction of a parking lot on the level portion of the property, which is not within the scenic vista.

c) The trail is not expected to be visible from off-site.

d) No lighting is proposed for this site. The proposed parking area along 5th St. West would be visible from surrounding properties. Sun reflecting off parked vehicles could create a new source of glare that could affect daytime views from the parking area to surrounding properties. However, the parking lot would include landscaping to provide shade and a visual buffer.

II. Agriculture Resources* - *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*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?				☑
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				☑

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? ☑

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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Discussion

e) The state Farmland map shows the property as "other lands," "farmland of local importance," and "urban or built up land." The soils mapping units on the preserve, Goulding-Toomes complex, 9 – 50 percent slopes, Red Hill clay loam, 2 – 15 percent slopes, and Clough gravelly loam 2 to 9 percent slopes. These soils do not meet the criteria for prime farmland as outlined in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's land inventory and monitoring project for the Sonoma county soil survey. Nor does the Preserve grazing fall under the "unique" category as defined by the United States Council on Environmental Quality in cooperation with the US Department of Agriculture as being is used for the poduction of specific high value food and fiber crops.

f) No conflicts with existing zoning are present, nor are any Williamson Act contracts in effect.

g) The preserve has not been farmed, although it has been and will continue to be grazed.

III. Air Quality - *Would the project:*

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

Discussion

a) Implementation of the Management Plan is not expected to conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan. The Preserve is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The BAAQMD does not meet Federal or State standards for ozone and has adopted an Ozone Attainment Plan and a Clean

Air Quality Plan in compliance with Federal and State Clean Air Acts. The BAAQMD has two applicable Air Quality Management Plans, which provide a strategy to achieve progress toward attaining Federal and State standards. These plans include measures to achieve compliance with ozone standards, dealing primarily with emissions of ozone precursors from stationary sources. The plans also recommend designing new development projects to reduce mobile source emissions and include various transportation control measures which may be incorporated. Implementation of the management plan is not a development project. It will not include any new stationary sources of emission and will generate only a small amount of mobile source emissions. Therefore, the plan will not conflict with BAAQMD's air quality plan to reduce emissions from new uses. Implementation of the management plan would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of these air quality plans because the proposed preserve use would not emit significant quantities of criteria pollutants and would not result in significant new traffic that would emit criteria pollutants.

b) No existing or projected air quality violations have been identified in the project area. State and Federal standards have been established for the following "criteria pollutants": ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, lead, and particulates (PM10 and PM2.5). The project will generate small amounts of criteria pollutants, primarily emissions from motor vehicles (carbon monoxide and ozone precursors) and particulates (PM10). Ozone is not emitted directly, but is formed in the atmosphere through chemical reactions between nitrogen oxides (NOx) and reactive organic gases (ROG) in the presence of sunlight. The principal sources of NOx and ROG, often termed ozone precursors, are various combustion processes (including motor vehicle engines). Of the PM10 emissions associated with motor vehicle use, some are tailpipe and tire wear emissions, but greater quantities are generated by resuspended road dust. PM10 emissions are also generated by construction activities which include grading and/or demolition.

Traffic: Vehicle emissions will increase in proportion to the increased vehicle trips per day. Existing annual average daily traffic on Norrbom Road is 748 vehicle trips per day. Plan implementation is expected to increase vehicle trips by 25 vehicle trips at peak use, for a total of 773 trips per day. Preserve use is expected to be less during the wet-season, during the summer, and during the week. Dust control on the 2-car, disabled-accessible vehicle only unpaved parking area is expected to be minimal. Any dust could be controlled using standard chip seal or application of dust control products which will reduce the amount of mobile emissions generated by limiting re-suspension of road dust. In addition, dust control measures, such as watering or application of dust palliatives, will be conducted periodically on unpaved surfaces (i.e., unpaved access road and parking areas) as part of long-term park maintenance.

According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, a detailed air quality analysis for projects generating less than 2,000 vehicle trips per day is not required, because this amount of additional traffic would not generate significant emissions under most conditions. Additional traffic resulting from the implementation of the management plan will not approach or exceed this number of trips, and therefore, project vehicle emissions are determined to be a less than significant impact.

Preserve Operations: Preserve maintenance and operations are not expected to produce significant amounts of criteria pollutants. However, the dust control measures will be implemented, as needed, during any maintenance/repair activities which involve excavation, grading and/or soil disturbance such as trail, road, and parking lot area.

Construction: Primary construction activities will include trail construction, bench, sign and kiosk installation, and construction of an unpaved parking area for two disabled-accessible

vehicles only. Construction-related emissions, such as (vehicle and equipment exhaust and dust generation, will be short-term in duration and minor in extent, but could cause substantial increases in localized concentrations of PM10 during construction. The BAAQMD's approach to CEQA analyses of construction impacts is to emphasize implementation of effective and comprehensive dust control measures rather than conducting a detailed quantification of emissions. The mitigation measures presented below will reduce this impact to less than significant. The potentially significant impacts associated with use, operation and maintenance, and construction activities could be further reduced with implementation of the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures for III – b.

1. Trail construction will occur in spring while the soil still retains moisture. If necessary, the contractor will be required to spray water or dust palliative on unpaved construction and staging areas during construction a minimum of once a day and as directed by the County during construction of the proposed project. Water or dust palliative will be sprayed on unpaved areas a minimum of once a day as needed during maintenance activities.
2. The contractor will be required to cover loads of soil, sand, and other loose materials over public roads, keep the loads at least two feet below the level of the sides of the hauling container, and/or wet the load sufficiently to prevent dust emissions during construction of the proposed project. Loads of soil, sand, and other loose materials will be covered while being transported over public roads, loads will be kept at least two feet below the level of the sides of the hauling container, and loads wet sufficiently to prevent dust emissions as needed during maintenance activities.
3. The contractor will be required to cover, enclose, and/or apply water or other dust palliative to exposed stockpiles of wind-susceptible material, such as dirt, sand, etc., as needed to control dust during construction of the project. During maintenance activities, exposed stockpiles of wind-susceptible material, such as dirt, sand, etc., staff will be covered, enclosed, and/or water or other dust palliative applied as needed to control dust.
4. The contractor will be required to sweep paved roads as needed to remove soil that has been carried onto them from the project site during construction. Paved roads will be swept as needed to remove soil that has been carried onto them from the project site due to maintenance activities.
5. The contractor will be required to operate all construction vehicles and equipment with emission levels that meet current air quality standards and to minimize idling time to 15 minutes for all heavy equipment to reduce on-site emissions during construction. All construction vehicles and equipment will be required to operate with emission levels that meet current air quality standards and to minimize idling time to 15 minutes for all heavy equipment to reduce on-site emissions during maintenance activities.

c) Implementation of the plan is not expected to result in long-term objectionable odors. Construction equipment may produce odors during the construction period. However, these short-term, construction-related impacts would cease once construction is completed.

d) The primary effect of implementation of the management plan would be the addition of an annual average of 4 cars per day, with the anticipated maximum number of cars being 6 cars at any given time, with a daily total maximum of 25 cars. This effect is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).

e) The proposed project is not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial long-term pollutant concentrations. Sensitive receptors are facilities or land uses that include members

of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. Examples include schools, hospitals, and residential areas. Sensitive receptors are likely to visit the proposed project site and sensitive receptors exist within one-mile of the proposed project site. Vehicle use within the project area from visitor use, operation and maintenance activities, and construction activity may result in increased suspended dust and vehicle emissions that could temporarily affect sensitive receptors, although substantial pollutant concentrations are not expected to result. The mitigation proposed for III.b above would further minimize this less than significant impact. Vehicle emissions (carbon monoxide and ozone precursors) are not expected to be substantial and were determined to be less than significant above (< 2,000 trips added). Although not expected to result in substantial concentrations, mitigation measures proposed under III.b are proposed to reduce dust emissions during construction. Due to the limited amount of pollutants expected to be generated by the project, pollutant concentrations will not be substantial and this impact will be less than significant.

IV. Biological Resources -- *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications…				☑
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?		☑		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			☑	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				☑
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				☑
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				☑

Discussion

a) No adverse effects to species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS will occur as a result of implementation of this management plan. Early in the planning process, two California Native Plant Society 1B species, the Franciscan onion and the narrow-anthered brodiaea, were

identified within a 100-foot swath of the proposed trail alignment. The trail was realigned to provide a barrier and buffer for both plants from the trail.[1]

b) There are no year-round streams on the site. There are two ephemeral drainages and two ephemeral ditches on the site. There is no presence of typical riparian plants such as willow, cottonwood, wild rose, or box elder. Any riparian habitat associated with those drainages is not expected to be affected by the trail as the trail will cross using either existing rocks or boulders within the drainages or a small bridge with footings outside the drainage or ditch. Visitors will be expected to stay on the trail and hard rock surface. The District would obtain the necessary permits from Department of Fish and Game for any crossings of the ephemeral drainages.

Substantial oak woodlands and oak savanna exist throughout the site. Oak woodlands and savanna are sensitive natural communities that harbors the second highest species diversity in Sonoma County due to the shade, shelter, nesting and resting sites, cover, and food sources that they provide. Most activity in these habitats occurs at night, dawn, and dusk, and it is unlikely that substantial conflicts would occur with the use of the trail.

The use of heavy equipment is not anticipated. Trail construction is expected to be completed using hand tools and labor and possibly a Sweco or other trail dozer. As such, long-term impacts of the construction will be limited to the footprint of the trail and parking area.

c) There are scattered small areas on the Preserve that would be classified as federally protected wetlands. These areas typically consist of low, wet areas, ditches, or swales. The trail crosses a swale in one location for a combined affected area of less than 100 square feet. In this case rip rap would be constructed (see attached) and grade maintained. No hydrological interruption is anticipated as the topography will be maintained. Any fill of wetlands will be avoided where possible and mitigated when not.

Mitigation Measure for IV-c:
The District proposes to fence an existing wetland to protect it from the existing cattle grazing operation, allowing wetland vegetation to develop, to offset the above impacts to wetlands. To compensate for the minimal wetland losses associated with plan implementation, the District proposes to implement a wetland enhancement project in lieu of wetland creation. The enhancement project will include the planting of native trees along a drainage identified on the eastern boundary of the 9-acre field. The enhanced area would cover approximately 0.25 acres which represents a 2.5:1 replacement ratio of lost habitat. Tree plantings would include coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) along the top of bank. Emergent wetland plant species, including varieties of sedge and rushes (Juncus spp. and Eleocharis spp.) would be planted at the toe of slope of the channel banks to encourage establishment of these species. The creek corridor in this area would be fenced to preclude cattle use, thereby significantly contributing to improved functions and values of this system. The purpose of the proposed enhancement would be to improve wildlife habitat (in the form of nesting and cover) for species associated with wetland habitats. This mitigation measure would be conducted consistent with meeting the terms of a 404 permit.

d) The proposed trail would be routed through oak woodland areas that wildlife use to breed, nest and move. However, interference with wildlife movement or nesting is expected to be minimal because the trail would receive intermittent use; wildlife is expected to habituate to the trail and focus their activities elsewhere. Nesting surveys will be completed prior to construction and the trail routed away from nest sites.

[1] 2006. J. Ruygt. Rare Plant Survey of Montini Open Space Preserve. Unpublished report.

e) The management plan, including the proposed trail and interpretive signs, is intended to increase the knowledge of the oak woodlands and other natural habitats of the preserve and promote environmental education. Therefore, implementation of the management plan would be consistent with local policies, including the Sonoma County Subregion Issues and Policies as identified by ABAG and the County's General Plan.

f) There are no such plans that cover the Preserve.

V. Cultural Resources - *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?		☑		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		☑		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		☑		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		☑		

Discussion

a) Implementation of the management plan is not expected to result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. A cultural resources survey was conducted of the entire Preserve in 2006.[2] Two historical resources were found, a stone fence and the remains of a basalt quarry.

The dry-laid stone fence extends about 900 feet with a 300-foot break. The stone fence will remain in its current condition. A buffer between the wall and public use will be in effect and there are no plans whose execution would alter its integrity.

A historic basalt quarry was found that extended over much of the Preserve. Remains of activity include pits, trenches, roads, ramps, a powder house, and other remains. The quarry is a good example of quarrying activity in Sonoma County. Although the trail is proposed through the quarry, no ill effects are anticipated. In fact, the quarry's juxtaposition with the trail provides a rich interpretive opportunity to tell the story of basalt quarrying and its importance to the early economy of Sonoma County. Any movable surface artifacts will be recovered prior to trail opening, possibly for display purposes (Steen and Origer 2006).

Historic resources could be uncovered during construction. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will minimize this potential impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure for V–a

[2] Steen, E. and T. M. Origer. 2006. A Cultural Resources Survey of the Montini Open Space Preserve, near Sonoma, Sonoma County, California. August 31, 2006.

The District will consult with a qualified historic resources expert regarding incidental historic resources discovered during management plan implementation and will implement recommendations that result from the consultation.

b) The 2006 cultural resources survey[3] discovered one recorded archeological resource, a midden. The midden, previously recorded, contains obsidian, chert and basalt lithics (stone tools or projectiles), fire-affected rock, and historic era ceramics. This site was also located during the 2006 survey. This site will be retained *in situ* (in its original place of deposition). The trail will avoid this site.

Additional archeological resources could be discovered during management plan implementation. The District's standard mitigation measure regarding impacts to cultural resources is included in checklist item 5(a) and would generally apply to archeological resources.

Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce the significance of potential impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measures for V–b.
The District will complete the following actions in the event that cultural resources are discovered during management plan implementation:

1. Immediately cease activity in the immediate vicinity of the discovery.
2. Contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to identify the representative tribe for the preserve so that the tribe can determine the significance of the find to the tribe and recommend appropriate treatment of the find.

c) Paleontological resources and/or unique geologic features could be discovered during the management plan implementation phase. The District's standard mitigation measure regarding impacts to cultural resources is included in checklist item 5(a) and would generally apply to paleontological resources.

Following is the District's standard mitigation measure regarding impacts to unique geologic features:

Mitigation Measure for V-c:
If paleontological resources and/or unique geologic features are discovered during project construction, construction will cease in the immediate vicinity of the find until a qualified geologist is consulted to determine the significance of the feature, has recommended appropriate measures

d) No evidence of human remains was found in the 2006 cultural resources survey. Although unlikely, there is the potential for buried or otherwise obscured resources. The prehistoric indicators of prior cultural occupation by Native Americans include artifacts and human bone, as well as soil discoloration, shell, animal bone, cobbles, ashy areas, and baked or vitrified clays.

Following is the District's standard mitigation measure regarding the discovery of human remains features:

Mitigation Measures for V-d:

[3] Steen, E. and T. M. Origer. 2006. A Cultural Resources Survey of the Montini Open Space Preserve, near Sonoma, Sonoma County, California. August 31, 2006.

1. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, activity at the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains will cease until the coroner of the county is contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and the coroner determines whether the remains are Native American.
2. If the remains are Native American the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours.
3. The NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of (with appropriate dignity) the human remains and any associated grave.
4. The District will complete necessary documentation associated with the discovery, compliance with this protocol, and any required follow-up.

VI. Geology And Soils - *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Expose people or structures to 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 in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				☑
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				☑

Discussion

a)

i According to the 1997 Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, the Preserve is 5 miles from the nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault and is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and does not appear on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning map for the area; the project is not anticipated to engender the rupture of any faults.[4] In any event, the only structures involved in the proposed project would be two small pedestrian bridges over two ditches. Any additional risk of injury due to surface fault rupture created by two small trail bridges would be low.

ii The proposed project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area, a region of intense seismic activity. Recent studies by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) indicate there is a 62 percent likelihood of a Richter magnitude 6.7 or higher earthquake occurring in the Bay Area in the next 30 years. As discussed in Item VI.a.i, above, the project is about 5 miles east of the nearest fault, and the project site could be subject to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. However, as discussed in Item VI.a.i, above, the only structures involved in the proposed project would be two small trail bridges spanning ditches. Additional risk of injury due to ground shaking created by these bridges is less than significant.

iii Seismic shaking can also trigger ground-failures caused by liquefaction. In general, the relative hazard, or "susceptibility," of soils and sediments to liquefaction is considered to be higher on gently sloping and nearly level alluvial landforms than in steeper uplands. The project site is not in an area with moderate or high potential for liquefaction.235 Furthermore, as discussed in Item VI.a.i above, the only structures involved in the proposed project would be two small footbridges which would not result in a substantial hazard due to seismic-related ground failure.

iv The project site includes hilly terrain with steep slopes. In the Sonoma County General Plan, the upper 25% of the Preserve site is rated as having high or moderate potential for landslides.[6] The trail design width is four feet, with the exception of occasional pullouts that would be up to six feet in width. Trail treads would be at a three to eight percent outslope to allow for water drainage. The upslope would be sloped back to prevent cracking and erosion from uphill surface water, and the downslope would be raked out to allow accelerated revegetation. Small retaining walls would be constructed to protect tree root balls along the trail tread. These walls would not exceed four feet in height. The trail grade would be between one and ten percent along most of its alignment, with a maximum grade of ten percent. These project design features would facilitate sheet flow across the trail to prevent buildup of water-saturated soil in sloped areas of the trail that could increase risk of landslides. The bridges and parking area and related trailhead and overlook facilities, would be primarily constructed in relatively flat areas where the risk of landslide is low. In sloped areas where there is some risk of landslide, the potential impact on safety and property would be negligible because of the low intensity of use and improvement. Due to these design features, as well as the limited grading necessary to build the proposed trail and access facilities, the project would not contribute significantly to the existing risk of

[4] http://www.consrv.ca.gov/CGS/rghm/ap/obtain_maps.htm)

[5] County of Sonoma, *Sonoma County General Plan,* Adopted: March 23, 1989, First Revision to Reflect Amendments and Corrections as of April 9, 1991, Second Revision to Reflect Amendments and Corrections as of March 1, 1994, Third Revision to Reflect Amendments and Corrections as of December 31, 1998, PS-1i, viewed on http://www.sonoma-county.org/prmd/docs/gp/fig-ps-1i.htm, 3 September 2008.

[6] County of Sonoma, *Sonoma County General Plan,* Adopted: March 23, 1989, First Revision to Reflect Amendments and Corrections as of April 9, 1991, Second Revision to Reflect Amendments and Corrections as of March 1, 1994, Third Revision to Reflect Amendments and Corrections as of December 31, 1998, PS-1i, viewed on http://www.sonoma-county.org/prmd/docs/gp/fig-ps-1i.htm, 3 September 2008.

landslides, nor would use of the trail expose users to a significant additional risk of injury due to landslide.

b) The strategies described in the management plan are designed to decrease erosion overall. The trail alignment has been sited so that it would never exceed the maximum sustainable for this location and would therefore not collect drainwater. Rather, the trail would follow the contours of the slope to allow water to sheetflow over the trail tread rather than be collected on the tread, increase in velocity, gather sediment, and deposit the sediment and drainwater elsewhere. Since water will sheet flow over the trail tread, the Preserve's natural drainage pattern is preserved. Sediment will largely be captured by vegetation as it had been prior to trail construction; no additional erosion is anticipated as a result of the implementation of the trail or other elements of the management plan. This method of trail alignment is described in further detail in DPR 1991.

Other measures will also be implemented to reduce erosion. For example, construction would be conducted while the soil still retains moisture, but is not muddy. Constructing with soil that has retained moisture decreases the amount of dust and sediment produced in construction. In addition, silt fences would be installed prior to construction work on the ephemeral drainage crossings. A silt fence is a temporary structure constructed along the contour. The fence prevents sediment from leaving the construction site and entering the ephemeral drainage. Another example of erosion control measures is using a geotextile fabric apron under bridge structures to capture any debris that might enter the drainage from the assembly of the bridge.

The management plan also prescribes managing livestock using fencing, a strategy designed to disburse cattle to decrease erosion. [7]

Erosion and loss of topsoil could occur at the site during construction of the trail, and access facilities including the disabled-only parking and trailheads. During construction of the trail and staging area organic material would be stockpiled on the downhill side of the trail to catch loose debris and protect the trail from erosion and mudflows. The organic material would remain in place. Slope cuts would be sloped back to prevent cracking, or erosion from uphill surface water. To prevent slipping and cracking during the rainy season and allow for accelerated native plant growth, trail crews would rake down and spread the "overburden" (the fill that is created by the digging of the trail machine.) Trail workers would physically remove earth in the steep slideslope areas and deposit the fill in safe areas. Down-slope fills would be raked out to allow accelerated native re-vegetation growth. The trail would be outsloped to allow surface water to sheetflow over the trail and continue on its trajectory. Construction would occur during spring, while the soil still retains moisture and the potential for erosion from unfinished surfaces would be low. The construction timing and procedures discussed above would reduce the potential for erosion during construction. In addition, the District would be required by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board to create a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) that incorporates best management practices during construction activities to minimize soil erosion hazard during construction activities, as discussed in VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality, item VIII.a, Mitigation Measure VIII-1. The project may also be required to obtain a grading permit from the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. Soil erosion and/or loss of topsoil during construction and grading activities would be a potentially significant impact which would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the following mitigation measure, which stipulates development and implementation of a SWPPP containing, among other

[7] 1991. California State Parks. Trails Handbook with updates.

elements, erosion and sedimentation control practices, including soils stabilization, revegetation, and runoff control to limit increases in sediment in storm water runoff, such as detention basins, straw bales, silt fences, check dams, geotextile, and drainage swales.

Mitigation Measure for VI-b

1. Implement Mitigation Measure for VIII-a.

During the first rainy season after construction, the trail may be closed during the rainy season to allow the trail to cure. After curing, the trail tread would consolidate and have a lower erosion potential than a newly constructed surface. In addition, the full bench construction will also contribute to the trails lower erosion potential.

Turnpike construction would be used in unavoidable wet areas. Two bridges would be constructed to span ditches. At the 3 stream crossings where the topography of the stream corridors allow a gentle approach and exit into the stream channel, crossings of native rock, including rock-lined inlets and energy dissipaters also made with rock, would be installed. After one winter season, the trail contractor would be asked to return and do a one-time maintenance performance along the entire route to repair any underperforming trail structures.

The two-vehicle parking area to be constructed along 5th St. West would be graded and surfaced with compacted base rock. The potential for erosion from operation of the trail and access facilities would be a potentially significant impact. The project design and maintenance procedures described above, which would leave no large unvegetated or unsurfaced areas that would be susceptible to substantial erosion, in combination with implementation of the following mitigation measure, would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure for VI-b:

Trail management of the Preserve trail system shall contain the following management procedures:

1. Annual trail maintenance shall include brushing the trail corridor each fall to reduce vegetation growth into the trail travelway.
2. The trail tread and drainage structures shall be maintained each fall to prepare the trail for the winter. After the winter storms, the trail shall be checked as soon as feasible to make any repairs needed.
3. During operation, the District or facility manager may enact temporary closure to public use due to weather, mud flows, high fire hazard, or other safety concerns or adverse conditions.

c) The geology of the area is fairly stable. However some soils on the site are rocky and fairly shallow. The trail has been designed to avoid landslides, erosion and other impacts to the hillside slopes. The trail has been designed to avoid the areas near the toe of the hillside where water collects and stays primarily on the side slopes. In addition, existing rock outcroppings are incorporated into the trail design when possible since bedrock provides a stable, non-erodible trail substrate. Trail construction will be full bench (100 percent cut – which provides the most highly compacted soils) and will not exceed maximum sustainable grade and so is not anticipated to exacerbate erosion on the Preserve.

d) The soils on Preserve are not expansive soils. Most of the soil on the preserve is Goulding-Toomes complex, 9 – 50 percent slopes. The trail is not expected to cause impacts resulting in substantial risk to life or property.

e) There are no septic facilities proposed as part of this project.

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				☑
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				☑
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or 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 materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				☑
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				☑
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				☑
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				☑
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				☑

Discussion

a) No hazardous materials will be used in the implementation of the management plan or were discovered on site in the Phase I site assessment. The project is not be expected to generate a need for routine transport, use, or disposal, thus reducing the potential risk to the public and/or environment in the event of an upset or accident to a less-than-significant level. Proposed trail construction may require use of oils and combustible motor fuels. There would not be on-site storage or disposal of substantial quantities of these materials. Normal operating practices and procedures would involve preventive and protective measures to reduce the risk of spills or accidents to a less-than- significant level. The District would comply with all applicable

Occupational Safety and Health Agency (OSHA) guidelines and regulations regarding worker safety.

b) Implementation of the management plan would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Proposed trail construction may require use of oils and combustible motor fuels. There would not be on-site storage or disposal of substantial quantities of these materials. Normal operating practices and procedures would involve preventive and protective measures to reduce the risk of spills or accidents to a less-than- significant level. The District would comply with all applicable Occupational Safety and Health Agency (OSHA) guidelines and regulations regarding worker safety.

c) There are no schools within a quarter mile of the project area.

d) The site is not included on any lists of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.21. There are no known contaminants present in soil or groundwater on the site and no known previous uses that routinely involved the use or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, no impact would occur.

e) There are no public or private airstrips on or within the vicinity of the project area.

f) See e) above.

g) The proposed project would not change the existing traffic circulation network in the vicinity, and therefore would not affect any emergency response plan or evacuation plan.

h) Implementation of the management plan is not expected to increase the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The project area is not mapped as having wildland fire potential.[8] Although the Preserve is nearly ½ in grassland which turns dry during the summer months and becoming more susceptible to fire, grazing will be continued at the property in part, to manage fire fuel. Human activity within the park, such as smoking or use of fire such as from a barbeque, could result in wildfire. Smoking, playing with fire, and campfires accounted for a relatively small percentage of all fires according to a study conducted regarding the causes of Sonoma County fires in 1996. The proposed project will include signs stating the park rules. The Lakeville Fire Protection District provides fire protection services, and the California Department of Forestry is responsible for fighting wildland fires. The following standard mitigation measure will further reduce the potential harm to humans from potential natural hazardous situations:

Mitigation Measure for V-h:
The District May close the facility when there are high fire danger periods or other situations could pose a threat to the health and safety of those using the facility.

8 Sonoma County General Plan. Figure PS-1h. 1989.

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality - *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				☑
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				☑
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			☑	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				☑
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				☑
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				☑
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				☑
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				☑
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				☑
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				☑

Discussion

a) Trail construction and use would not significantly alter water quality as long as necessary precautions are taken to ensure that soil erosion does not occur during or after construction. Good trail design, soil stabilization, mulching, and replanting where necessary and proper drainage across the trail shall be assured. Waste discharge will not be affected.

Clearing vegetation, exposing soil, grading, and moving soil during construction of the proposed trail and access facilities would increase erosion potential, which could result in increased sedimentation and turbidity in downstream surface waters. Fuels, lubricants, and other toxic materials used during construction, if spilled or disposed of improperly, also could enter and contaminate surface waters. Without mitigation, these impacts could be potentially significant. Because project construction would disturb more than one acre, storm water discharge originating from the project site during construction activities is subject to regulation under the United States Environmental Protection Agency's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. As required by NPDES regulations, the project applicant would apply for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board General Construction Permit, and subsequently prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), as described in the Mitigation Measure for VIII-a, below. The objectives of a SWPPP are to identify pollutant sources that may affect the quality of storm water discharge and implement best management practices (BMPs) to reduce and potentially eliminate pollutants carried by storm water runoff. The SWPPP therefore contains specific actions for handling and storage of construction materials and equipment, site grading activities, soil stabilization and post-construction runoff, monitoring, and reporting activities at the project site. SWPPP measures are especially important during construction phases requiring grading and during periods of heavy precipitation.

The project may also be required to obtain a grading permit from the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. The Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) has recently implemented regulations implementing section C.3 of the Regional Board's NPDES permit governing discharges from the municipal storm drain systems of Sonoma County and its cities and towns. These new requirements pertain to operational erosion and sediment control, and are separate from, and in addition to, the construction-related requirements described above. The C.3 program requires preparation of a Stormwater Control Plan to address operational (as opposed to construction) runoff from sites that create or replace over 10,000 square feet of impervious area. Because the proposed project would create less than 10,000 square feet of impervious area, the C.3 requirements are not applicable. As discussed in Item VI.b, above, construction when the soil is dry enough to avoid mud. The design of the project includes erosion control features and construction erosion control measures (discussed in Item VI.b, above), which, along with the control measures for fuel described in Item VII.b, above, and implementation of the SWPPP, as specified in Mitigation Measure VIII-1, would reduce potential water quality impacts associated with construction activities to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure for VIII-a

The project applicant shall develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for construction of the proposed project, as required by the State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Board. The SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

- Source identification;
- Preparation of a site map;
- Description of construction materials, practices, and equipment storage and maintenance;
- List of pollutants likely to contact storm water;
- Estimate of the construction site area and percent impervious area;
- Erosion and sedimentation control practices, including soils stabilization, revegetation, and runoff control to limit increases in sediment in storm water runoff, such as detention basins, straw bales, silt fences, check dams, geofabrics, drainage swales, and sandbag dikes;

- Proposed construction dewatering plans;
- List of provisions to eliminate or reduce discharge of materials to storm water;
- Description of waste management practices; and
- Maintenance and training practices.

After construction, the operation of the proposed project could result in an incremental increase in pollutants from parking-lot runoff, and the possible use of herbicides for control of nonnative invasive plants, but this is not anticipated to be substantial. As described in Item VI.b. above, project design and maintenance procedures, in combination with implementation Mitigation Measure VI-2, above, would reduce the potential for erosion from operation of the trail and access facilities to a less than significant level.

b) Implementation of the management plan and construction of the proposed trail is not expected to affect groundwater. The proposed trail and parking area would be unpaved and would not create additional impervious surfaces nor interfere with groundwater recharge. Neither construction nor operation of the trail and access facilities would use substantial amounts of groundwater, and this impact would be less than significant.

c) Implementation of the management plan and construction of the proposed trail would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, or increase the rate or amount of flow in a manner that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding. The trail will be designed to not alter drainage patterns and to result in minimal erosion. Substantial alterations in existing drainage patterns are not proposed in the management plan. The management plan will include minor storm water drainage improvements associated with the trail and road restoration work. Storm water drainage improvements may include structural drainage treatments such as bridges, puncheons, armored crossings, and drainage lenses to direct and control the flow of water across, under, through, and around the trails and internal roads. Improvements to the internal park roads may require additional culverts to convey water to a singular roadside drainage ditch and/or repair or replacement of existing culverts. Structural drainage treatments and culverts provide beneficial environmental effects to water quality by minimizing potential erosion of the trails. These minor alterations will result in beneficial effects to water quality by reducing erosion.

d) Implementation of the management plan and construction of the proposed trail is not expected to alter drainage patterns of the site. The trail was designed specifically to maintain existing hydrologic patterns. Please refer to checklist item VIII-c.

e) The property does not include a storm water drainage system. Implementation of the Interim Plan is not expected to create polluted runoff.

f) The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. It is mapped as being outside of the 500-year floodplain. There are no flood flows at this location.

g) The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. It is mapped as being outside of the 500-year floodplain. No new housing is proposed in the management plan implementation phase.

h) The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Furthermore, the proposed project does not include the placement of structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, no impact would occur.

i) Implementation of the management plan is not expected to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. The management plan does not include construction of new levees or dams.

j) The project site is not located within an area that is subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, no impact would occur.

IX. Land Use And Planning - *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Physically divide an established community?				☑
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				☑
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				☑

Discussion

a) The project is currently in open space and is surrounded on 3 sides by pasture, permanent open space, and park lands and is not located within an established community.

b) Proposed project development is consistent with the Sonoma County General Plan which designates the Preserve lands as Open Space and Scenic Landscape unit. The city of Sonoma General Plan identifies the Preserve as Sonoma Residential on the 26-acre parcel north of Montini Ranch and Hillside (1 DU per/10 acres maximum), Hillside Backdrop, and Open Space on the remainder of the Preserve within the Sonoma city limit.

c) The land comprising the Preserve is not under an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

X. Mineral Resources - *would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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?				☑
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

a) No known mineral resources that would be lost exist in the Preserve.

b) No known mineral resource exists on the site that has been delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

XI. Noise - *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				☑
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				☑
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			☑	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			☑	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				☑
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				☑

Discussion

a) Implementation of the plan is not expected to result in permanent, long-term exposure of people to noise levels in excess of established standards or of the level of noise without implementing the plan. No noise impacts are expected to result from this project, nor will implementation cause people to be exposed to noise levels in excess of General Plan or other standards either during construction, or during use of the path.

b) No significant groundborne vibrations or noise is expected to result from this project.

c) Implementation of the proposed plan is not expected to result in substantial increase in ambient noise above existing noise levels. A slight increase in use is anticipated. Visitors would drive to the preserve, and park their cars, which may result in occasional, temporary increase in ambient noise. This increase is not expected to be significant.

d) A temporary increase in ambient noise level may occur during construction resulting from digging and rock moving. However, these increases in noise are not expected to be substantial and they are short-term. The District will limit construction activities to the hours of 7 am to 7 pm on weekdays. Preserve hours will be from dawn to dusk.

e) This project is not located within an airport land use plan or near an airport.

f) This project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest privately-owned airstrip is located 3.5 miles from the Preserve.

XII. Population and Housing - *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				☑
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				☑
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				☑

Discussion

a) Implementation of the management plan would primarily involve habitat improvements in the form of weed control, road decommissioning, grazing management, and revegetation as well as recreational improvements including the construction of a trail and gravel parking lot. It is not expected to affect population growth or housing in any way.

b) Implementation of the management plan would not displace any housing and would not necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Please see discussion of a) above.

c) Implementation of the management plan would not displace any persons, and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Please see discussion of a) above.

XIII. Public Services - *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) 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				☑

XIII. Public Services - *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?				☑
Police protection?				☑
Schools?				☑
Parks?				☑
Other public facilities?				☑

Discussion

a) Implementation of the management plan would not necessitate any additional government facilities, nor would it require the physical alteration of any existing facility that would result in any significant environmental impacts. Implementation of the plan would result in some minor revisions to road striping and the construction of new trails segments on existing public park lands. These additions would not result in significant environmental impacts to public services.

XIV. Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				☑
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			☑	

Discussion

a) The management plan for the Preserve proposes a trail. The Preserve is adjacent to a local trail and a State Historic Park. It is not anticipated that the Preserve Management plan as implemented will increase use on existing facilities, however, it is anticipated that the Preserve will engender recreational use on Preserve lands, especially on the proposed trail.

b) The project includes the implementation of a recreational component which may have effects on the environment. Its effects have been identified throughout this Initial Study.

XV. Transportation/Traffic - *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			☑	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			☑	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				☑
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			☑	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			☑	
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			☑	
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			☑	

Discussion

The Project would result in the development of an open space preserve which will accommodate low-impact recreational uses such as walking and hiking. Project components include the development of an eastern and a western trailhead. The western, or "main trailhead" will be located at the Sonoma Field of Dreams/Police Station on 1st Street West. The eastern trailhead will be located at the intersection of 5th Street West and Verano Avenue, and will include the development of an access road and parking area for two handicap accessible vehicles. The project also includes the development of two mid-block pedestrian crossings on the east side of the Preserve within the Norrbom Road/1st Street West corridor. The northern crossing will be located on Norrbom Road and will connect proposed trails on the Montini Open Space Preserve to the Sonoma Overlook Trail. The southern crossing will be located on 1st Street West and will connect the project trailhead at the Sonoma Field of Dreams/Police Station to the Sonoma Overlook Trail.

Traffic analyses for the project were completed in phases to address traffic and circulation elements as they developed. These efforts were combined into the *Montini Open Space Preserve – Focused Traffic Impact Study*, Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc., dated August 11, 2008. The report provides the technical analysis used to complete this section of the impact evaluation and is referenced here as the Background Report.

a/b)Based on the CEQA Guidelines, the project's traffic impacts are considered significant if the project would result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips or the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, cause a substantial increase in congestion at affected intersections, or cause operation to drop below the adopted level of service standard. According to the Background Report, which was prepared using standard industry techniques, implementation of the project would result in a minor increase in traffic on the local/regional roadway system that is expected to result in an imperceptible change in traffic volumes and operation.

Based on visitor projections provided by the District, the project is expected to generate 50 trip ends on a peak weekend day, 14 trip ends on an average day, and an annual average of 16 trip ends per day. The addition of the estimated 16 trips on a weekday and/or 50 on a peak weekend day distributed over the course of a day to the surrounding local and regional street network would result in an imperceptible change in operating conditions and a less-than-significant impact on Levels of Service based on the County of Sonoma Traffic Impact Thresholds of Significance Criteria.

c) There would be no impact as the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

d) The proposed project would have a significant impact if it would create a traffic hazard as a result of a design feature, or if it would result in incompatible uses. Implementation of the project would result in the development of two mid-block pedestrian crossings along the Norrbom Road/1st Street West corridor on the east side of the Preserve. The crossings have been designed within the context of the corridor to maximize both pedestrian safety and motorist awareness. Given that recreational use and pedestrian crossing activity already exists within the corridor, the proposed crossing enhancements will help to improve safety conditions for all roadway users by channelizing pedestrian crossings to appropriate locations.

A historical review of collisions on the corridor was performed to determine any trends or patterns that may indicate safety issues. The collision analysis did not reveal a pattern of collisions or safety concerns and indicated that the roadway segment has a collision rate that is lower than the statewide average for similar roadways. Thus, the segment appears to be operating within acceptable safety standards.

e) The proposed project would have a significant impact if it would result in inadequate emergency access. The Preserve is relatively small compared to similar open space and recreation projects in the region. Given its proximity to urban services in the City of Sonoma and its shared access with the Sonoma Police Station, the project is relatively close to emergency services. Moreover, the project is accessible by public roads on its east and west sides, and a paved water agency service road provides internal access to the lower half of the site. While Norrbom Road is a winding rural road with horizontal and vertical curves, it would provide access to the upper reaches of the site. In addition, victims can be evacuated from the preserve by using a litter if necessary.

f) Parking for the project will be accommodated via a combination of on- and off-site parking at the project's eastern and western trailheads. It is anticipated that parking for the project would be distributed amongst the two trailheads. Parking for the eastern trailhead on 1st Street West will be accommodated in existing public parking lots adjacent to the site, with parking and primary access to the trailhead provided from Sonoma's Police Station and Field of Dreams Ball Park. Additional parking is available on 1st Street West south of the site and at nearby Arnold Field and Depot Park. At the western trailhead, disabled parking will be accommodated in a proposed disabled-accessible parking area which will be constructed on the Preserve property and will form the eastern leg of the 5th Street West and Verano Avenue

intersection. Additional parking will be accommodated via on-street spaces adjacent to the trailhead on Verano Avenue, 5th Street West, and the surrounding residential streets. Bicycle parking facilities will be provided at both trailheads. The combination of existing, proposed, and on-street parking in the vicinity of the project's trailheads is more than adequate to meet the anticipated parking demand.

g) Implementation of the proposed plan is not expected to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project will provide additional recreation opportunities in the region and bicycle parking will be provided at both trailheads, so supports policies for alternative modes by providing improved facilities.

XVI. Utilities And Service Systems -- *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				☑
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				☑
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				☑
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				☑
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?				☑
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				☑
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				☑

Discussion

a) Implementation of the proposed plan would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

b) Implementation of the proposed plan would not result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

c) Implementation of the proposed plan would not result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

d) The District has access to water supplies necessary to implement the management plan. A well located on the southeastern side of the property could supply irrigation water for restoration projects.

e) Implementation of the proposed plan would not result in the need for any wastewater treatment.

f) The local landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate trash created by visitors, which will be insignificant (less than one garbage can per week).

g) The District will comply with federal, state, and local regulations related to solid waster during implementation of the proposed plan.

XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		☑		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				☑
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				☑

Discussion

a) Implementation of the management plan is expected to benefit the quality of the environment. Impacts are expected from trail construction; however, these effects are expected to be short-term and temporary and are mitigated by various erosion control measures. In addition, impacts to wetlands will be mitigated by restoring wetland vegetation to a ditch.

b) Implementation of the management plan will result in low-intensity recreational use and low impact construction of about 1.7 miles of trail. The effects of the plan will be minimal, and with the incorporation of mitigation measures, less than significant both individually and cumulatively.

c) The environmental effects of the project on humans is expected be positive through better stewardship of the natural resources. Plan implementation will result in controlled public access to the preserve, weed control, and the rehabilitation of eroding ranch roads which will decrease the amount of erosion on the Preserve, and weed control, among other resource benefits.

Attachment A. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

This section presents the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project.

Overview

Pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the mitigation measures listed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) are to be implemented as part of the proposed project. The MMRP identifies the time at which each mitigation measure is to be implemented and the department or individual responsible for implementation. The initials of the designated responsible person will indicate completion of their portion of the mitigation measure. The District Project Manager's signature on the Certification of Compliance will indicate complete implementation of the MMRP.

The mitigation measures included in the MMRP are considered conditions of approval of the proposed project. The Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District agrees to implement the mitigation measures identified in the MMRP. Implementation of the mitigation measures included in the MMRP is expected to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or compensate potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Time of Implementation

Project Design

The mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project design and/or included in the project specifications and contract special provisions prior to awarding a construction project.

Pre-Construction

The mitigation measures will be implemented before construction activities begin.

Construction

The mitigation measures will be implemented during construction.

Post-Construction

The mitigation measures will be implemented after project construction.

Responsible Persons and Departments

The Project Manager will be responsible for the overall implementation of the MMRP. Generally, the Project Manager will sign off on the mitigation measures included in the MMRP. Periodically, staff of other County departments or regulatory agencies will be involved in the implementation of specific mitigation measures. In these instances, the staff, department, or agency will be identified in the MMRP.

Record Keeping

The Project Manager will maintain the records of the MMRP. When the MMRP is fully implemented, the original signed copy of the MMRP will be maintained in the project files.

Mitigation Measure	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
	Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
AIR QUALITY					
Mitigation Measures for III 1. Trail construction will occur in spring while the soil still retains moisture. If necessary, the contractor will be required to spray water or dust palliative on unpaved construction and staging areas during construction a minimum of once a day and as directed by the County during construction of the proposed project. Water or dust palliative will be sprayed on unpaved areas a minimum of once a day as needed during maintenance activities. 2. The contractor will be required to cover loads of soil, sand, and other loose materials over public roads, keep the loads at least two feet below the level of the sides of the hauling container, and/or wet the load sufficiently to prevent dust emissions during construction of the proposed project. Loads of soil, sand, and other loose materials will be covered while being transported over public roads, loads will be kept at least two feet below the level of the sides of the hauling container, and loads wet sufficiently to prevent dust emissions as needed during maintenance activities. 3. The contractor will be required to cover, enclose, and/or apply water or other dust palliative to exposed stockpiles of wind-susceptible material, such as dirt, sand, etc., as needed to control dust during construction of the project. During maintenance activities, exposed stockpiles of wind-susceptible material, such as dirt, sand, etc., staff will be covered, enclosed, and/or water or other dust palliative applied as needed to control dust. 4. The contractor will be required to sweep paved roads as needed to remove soil that has been carried onto them from the project site during construction. Paved roads will be swept as needed to remove soil that has been carried onto them from the project site due to maintenance activities. 5. The contractor will be required to operate all construction	Construction contractor	Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District	Implementation: Construction		

Mitigation Measure	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
	Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
vehicles and equipment with emission levels that meet current air quality standards and to minimize idling time to 15 minutes for all heavy equipment to reduce on-site emissions during construction. All construction vehicles and equipment will be required to operate with emission levels that meet current air quality standards and to minimize idling time to 15 minutes for all heavy equipment to reduce on-site emissions during maintenance activities.					
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
Mitigation Measure for IV-1 The District proposes to fence an existing wetland to protect it from the existing cattle grazing operation, allowing wetland vegetation to develop, to offset the above impacts to wetlands. To compensate for the minimal wetland losses associated with plan implementation, the District proposes to implement a wetland enhancement project in lieu of wetland creation. The enhancement project will include the planting of native trees along a drainage identified on the eastern boundary of the 9-acre field. The enhanced area would cover approximately 0.25 acres which represents a 2.5:1 replacement ratio of lost habitat. Tree plantings would include coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) along the top of bank. Emergent wetland plant species, including varieties of sedge and rushes (Juncus spp. and Eleocharis spp.) would be planted at the toe of slope of the channel banks to encourage establishment of these species. The creek corridor in this area would be fenced to preclude cattle use, thereby significantly contributing to improved functions and values of this system. The purpose of the proposed enhancement would be to improve wildlife habitat (in the form of nesting and cover) for species associated with wetland habitats. This mitigation measure would be conducted consistent with meeting the terms of a 404 permit.	Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District	California Department of Fish and Game	Pre-Construction: Within 14 days prior to the initiation of tree removal during February through April, and no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of these activities during May through August		

Mitigation Measure	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
	Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Mitigation Measure for V-a The District will consult with a qualified historic resources expert regarding incidental historic resources discovered during management plan implementation and will implement recommendations that result from the consultation. **Mitigation Measures for V-b** The District will complete the following actions in the event that cultural resources are discovered during management plan implementation: 3. Immediately cease activity in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. 4. Contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to identify the representative tribe for the preserve so that the tribe can determine the significance of the find to the tribe and recommend appropriate treatment of the find. **Mitigation Measure for V-c** If paleontological resources and/or unique geologic features are discovered during project construction, construction will cease in the immediate vicinity of the find until a qualified geologist is consulted to determine the significance of the feature, has recommended appropriate measures **Mitigation Measures for V-d** 1. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, activity at the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains will cease until the coroner of the county is contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and the coroner determines whether the remains are Native American. 2. If the remains are Native American the coroner shall contact	Construction contractor, Archaeological consultant	Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District	Restriction of Public Access and General Surface Inspection: Construction Re-Inspection of Resources Identified in General Surface Inspection: Post-Construction: Annually Protective Measures for Resources Identified in General Surface Inspection: Post-Construction: As specified by General Surface Inspection		

Mitigation Measure	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
	Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
the NAHC within 24 hours. 3. The NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of (with appropriate dignity) the human remains and any associated grave. 4. The District will complete necessary documentation associated with the discovery, compliance with this protocol, and any required follow-up.					
GEOLOGY AND SOILS					
Mitigation Measure for VI-b: Implement Mitigation Measure VIII-1.	See Mitigation Measure VIII-1	See Mitigation Measure VIII-1	See Mitigation Measure VIII-1		
Mitigation Measure for VI-b: Trail management of the North Slope Sonoma Mountain Ridge Trail shall contain the following management procedures: • Annual trail maintenance shall include brushing the trail corridor each fall to reduce vegetation growth into the trail travelway. • The trail tread and drainage structures shall be maintained each fall to prepare the trail for the winter. After the winter storms, the trail shall be checked as soon as feasible to make any repairs needed. • During operation, the District or facility manager may enact temporary closure to public use due to weather, mud flows, high fire hazard, or other safety concerns or adverse conditions.	Sonoma County Regional Parks Department	Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District	Trail Maintenance: Post-Construction: Annually each fall during project operation Inspection After Winter Storms: Post-Construction: After substantial storms during project operation Temporary Closure: Post-Construction: As required during project operation		

Mitigation Measure	MONITORING			VERIFICATION	
	Implementation Entity	Monitoring and Verification Entity	Timing Requirements	Signature	Date
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS					
Mitigation Measure for VII-h The District May close the facility when there are high fire danger periods or other situations could pose a threat to the health and safety of those using the facility.	See Mitigation Measure VIII-1	See Mitigation Measure VIII-1	See Mitigation Measure VIII-1		
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY					
Mitigation Measure for VIII-a The project applicant shall develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for construction of the proposed project, as required by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The SWPPP shall include, at a minimum, the following elements: • Source identification; • Preparation of a site map; • Description of construction materials, practices, and equipment storage and maintenance; • List of pollutants likely to contact storm water; • Estimate of the construction site area and percent impervious area; • Erosion and sedimentation control practices, including soils stabilization, revegetation, and runoff control to limit increases in sediment in storm water runoff, such as detention basins, straw bales, silt fences, check dams, geotextiles, drainage swales, and sandbag dikes; • Proposed construction dewatering plans; • List of provisions to eliminate or reduce discharge of materials to storm water; • Description of waste management practices; and • Maintenance and training practices.	Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District	Regional Water Quality Control Board	Preparation of SWPPP: Pre-Construction Implementation of SWPPP: Construction		