

**COUNTY OF SONOMA  
PERMIT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT**

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
(707) 527-1900 FAX (707) 527-1103

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

**FILE #:** PLP 97-0002 **PLANNER:** Angus Latta

**PROJECT:** General Plan Amendment/Use Permit **DATE:**

**PROJECT LOCATION:** 6786 Lakeville Highway, Petaluma

**APPLICANT NAME:** Residuals Processing

**APPLICANT ADDRESS:** P.O. Box 793, Novato

**GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** LEA (Land Extensive Agriculture) 60 acre density

**SPECIFIC/AREA PLAN:** DA (Diverse Agriculture) 20 acre density

**ZONING:** LEA (Land Extensive Agriculture) B6/100 acre density; F2 (Secondary Flood Plain); BR (Biotic Resource); Z (Second Dwelling Unit Exclusion); DA (Diverse Agriculture) B6/20 acre density, 2 acre minimum; Z (Second Dwelling Unit Exclusion); BR (Biotic Resource)

**DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:** Request to continue the application of lime treated sludge on 2,500 acres for puproses of an agricultural enhancement.

**SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:** Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

Agriculutre

**Other Public Agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).**

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Land Use and Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Circulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Population and Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities and Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/>	Geological Problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy and Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Water	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hazards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

**DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- The proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed by 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

The environmental documents which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached or referenced herein, and hereby made a part of this document.

Incorporated Source Documents

In preparation of the Initial Study checklist, the following documents were referenced/developed, and are hereby incorporated as part of the Initial Study. All documents are available in the project file or for reference at the Permit and Resource Management Department.

- Project Application and Description
- Initial Data Sheet
- County Planning Department's Sources and Criteria Manual
- Sonoma County General Plan and Associated EIR Specific or Area Plan
- Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance
- Sonoma County Rare Plant Site Identification Study
- Project Referrals from Responsible Agencies
- State and Local Environmental Quality Acts (CEQA)
- Full record of previous hearings on project in File
- Correspondence received on project.
-

**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 cited in the comments 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 will 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) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Potentially Significant Unless 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 17 at the end of the checklist, "Earlier Analysis" 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). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 17 at the end of the checklist.
- 6) Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. Other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1. <b>LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____
b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
f) Require land acquisition or easements?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** General Plan policies require amendment to General Plan for the importation of sludge material. General Plan amendments are subject to complying with policies PF-2q and PF-2r of the General Plan application of sludge is subject to demonstrating that it will result in an improvement to agricultural productivity. Utilizing biosolids material generated outside the County is subject to demonstrating there is no alternative source of sludge in the County.

**Mitigation:** Priority shall be given to utilizing sludge material generated in the County.

2. **POPULATION AND HOUSING** Would the proposal:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** N/A

3. **GEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS** Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fault rupture?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
b) Seismic ground shaking?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
c) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
d) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
e) Landslides or mudflows?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
g) Subsidence of the land?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
h) Expansive soils?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
i) Unique geologic or physical features?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** N/A

4. **WATER** Would the proposal result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate amount of surface runoff?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____
c) Alteration of surface water quality through discharges or temperature, dissolved oxygen and/or turbidity?	_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____	_____
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
e) Changes in currents, course or direction of water movements?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
f) Change in quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
h) Impacts to groundwater quality?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** This site is shown to be located in the floodplain. Project has been reviewed by the Drainage Review division. There is determination that the project would not have an adverse impact. The Petaluma River is located adjacent to the project site. Environmental Health has reviewed project with respect to biosolid material leaching onto water way. It is their determination project would not effect water quality if following mitigation measures are implemented:

1. Require that a 100 foot setback be maintained with respect to spreading of biosolids be maintained.
2. That biosolids material shall only be spread during non-rainy season.
3. Biosolid material shall be disked into the soils when delivered to the site.

5. <b>AIR QUALITY</b> Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
d) Create objectionable odors?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____

**Comment/Mitigation:** N/A

6. <b>TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION</b> Would the proposal cause:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
b) Safety hazards from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	_____	_____X_____	_____	_____
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site, or change parking conditions?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
e) Hazards or barriers for vehicles, pedestrians or bicyclists?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____
h) Change in traffic circulation patterns?	_____	_____	_____	_____X_____

**Comment/Mitigation:** The biosolids material will be brought to site by truck deliveries. The truck trips will enter and exit Lakeville Highway because Lakeville Highway a high speed thoroughfare. Public Works has indicated there may be a safety concern regarding the entering and exiting onto Lakeville Highway.

**Mitigation:** To assure vehicles safely enter and exit the site, a left turn lane shall be provided.

**7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the proposal result in impacts to:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including plants, fish, insects, animals and birds)?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, serpentine, coastal habitat, etc.)?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** That application of biosolids material to existing agricultural lands would adversely effect the biotic resources.

**8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES** Would the proposal:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
b) Use non-renewable resources in an inefficient manner?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
c) Cause a known mineral resource to become unavailable for future use?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
d) Increase the demand for energy?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** N/A



9. **HAZARDS** Would the proposal involve:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evaluation plan?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____	_____
d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____	_____
e) Increased fire hazard in areas with brush, grass, or trees?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** The potential health concerns are that the application of biosolids could result in the build-up of metals which could effect production. There is also concern with increase in pathogens and vectors. To assure that health risks are minimized conditions of approval include submissions of monitoring data for review of Hazard Material Division/Environmental Health.

10. **NOISE** Would the proposal result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increases in existing noise levels?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
c) Violate or be inconsistent with Federal, State or local noise standards?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** N/A

11. **PUBLIC SERVICES** Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
b) Police protection?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
c) Schools?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
e) Other government services?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** N/A

12. **UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** Would the proposal cause a need for new or altered utility systems or supplies?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Power or natural gas?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
b) Communications systems?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
d) Sewer or septic tanks?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
e) Storm water drainage?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
f) Solid waste disposal?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
g) Local or regional water supplies?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** N/A

13. **AESTHETICS** Would the proposal:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
c) Create light or glare?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** N/A

14. **CULTURAL RESOURCES** Would the proposal:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Disturb paleontological resources?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
b) Disturb archaeological resources?	_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____	_____
c) Affect historical resources?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural resources?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

**Comment/Mitigation:** Archaeological report has been prepared. The conclusion of the report is that application of biosolids would not effect potential archaeological resources.

15. **RECREATION** Would the proposal:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?
- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?

**Comment/Mitigation:** N/A

16. **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>

- 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 pre-history?
- b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?
- c) 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, other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).
- d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

**Comment/Mitigation:** N/A

## 17. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

a) Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses 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 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.

**Discussion:** N/A