



Mitigated Negative Declaration

Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

Publication Date: April 13, 2012

Adoption Date:

State Clearinghouse: April 16, 2012

This statement and attachments constitute the **Mitigated Negative Declaration** as proposed for or adopted by the Sonoma County decision-making body for the project described below.

File No.: PLP11-0047

Planner: Blake Hillegas

Project Name: Black Point Sports Club

Project Description: The project involves the relocation of the existing Black Point Sports Club from 7711 Lakeville Highway to 5400 Sears Point Road (Highway 37; 4 mile east of existing club). The sports club is proposed as a licensed upland game bird club, including pheasant, quail, and chukar. The club includes the housing of upland game birds in an aviary and the release of the birds for hunt. The club includes the raising, breeding, boarding and training of hunting dogs with 50 separate kennels housed within a proposed 8,500 square foot club house building to replace an existing 4,200 square foot barn. The clubhouse/kennel building includes a service counter, a manager's office, an employee kitchen, a bathroom, and a gun room. The aviary consists of a 280 square foot bird house and a 5,000 square foot netted bird cage.

The project also includes a sporting clay shooting range with portable shooting stations. The applicant/operator has agreed to use biodegradable sporting clay targets and prohibit the use of led shot on the sporting clay range. The use of led shot for the sporting clay range would require an amendment to the use permit and a lead management plan would need to be implemented.

In addition, existing 1,064 square foot primary dwelling would be replaced with a 960 square foot primarily dwelling (modular home) to house a farm and club caretaker.

The sports club has a membership of approximately 300 members per year. Peak daily activity on the opening of hunting season and other peak days is approximately 40-45 vehicles a day with a peak hourly rate of 10 vehicles an hour. Staggered start times are implemented for hunter convenience and traffic management. Hours of operation of the facility are from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. six days a week (Tuesday through Sunday) year round, except that hunting will occur for 9 months a year (September

through May). The maximum number of employees will be 3 full time and 3 part time/seasonal employees during the hunting and sporting clay season, unless otherwise limited by conditions of approval.

Project Location: 5400 Sears Point Road
See Location Map - Attached

Environmental Finding:

The proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment, and the adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration is appropriate.

Based upon the information contained in the Initial Study included in the project file, it has been determined that there will be no significant environmental effect resulting from this project, provided that mitigation measures are incorporated into the project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed in compliance with CEQA State and County guidelines and the information contained therein has been reviewed and considered.

There (will not) be a significant impact on biotic habitat of concern to Fish & Game.

Initial Study: Attached

Other Attachments: Location Map and Site Plan

Decision-making Body: Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

Lead Agency: Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

COUNTY OF SONOMA
PERMIT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

FILE #: PLP11-0047

PLANNER: Blake Hillegas

PROJECT: Black Point Sports Club

DATE: 4/13/2012

LEAD AGENCY: Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

PROJECT LOCATION: 5400 Sears Point Road (Highway 37)

APPLICANT NAME: Mike Sutsos/Bill Hooper

APPLICANT ADDRESS: 7711 Lakeville Highway

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: LEA (Land Extensive Agriculture) 100 acres per dwelling

SPECIFIC/AREA PLAN:

ZONING: LEA (Land Extensive Agriculture) B6 100 (acres per dwelling) Z (Second Dwelling Exclusion) SR (Scenic Resource) F2 (Flood Plain)

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: The project involves the relocation of the existing Black Point Sports Club from 7711 Lakeville Highway to 5400 Sears Point Road (Highway 37; 4 mile east of existing club). The sports club is proposed as a licensed upland game bird club, including pheasant, quail, and chukar. The club includes the housing of upland game birds in an aviary and the release of the birds for hunt. The club includes the raising, breeding, boarding and training of hunting dogs with 50 separate kennels housed within a proposed 8,500 square foot club house building to replace an existing 4,200 square foot barn. The clubhouse/kennel building includes a service counter, a manager's office, an employee kitchen, a bathroom, and a gun room. The aviary consists of a 280 square foot bird house and a 5,000 square foot netted bird cage.

The project also includes a sporting clay shooting range with portable shooting stations. The applicant/operator has agreed to use biodegradable sporting clay targets and prohibit the use of led shot on the sporting clay range. The use of led shot for the sporting clay range would require an amendment to the use permit and a lead management plan would need to be implemented.

In addition, existing 1,064 square foot primary dwelling would be replaced with a 960 square foot primarily dwelling (modular home) to house a farm and club caretaker.

The sports club has a membership of approximately 300 members per year. Peak daily activity on the opening of hunting season and other peak days is approximately 40-45 vehicles a day with a peak hourly rate of 10 vehicles an hour. Staggered start times are implemented for hunter convenience and traffic management. Hours of operation of the facility are from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. six days a week (Tuesday through Sunday) year round, except that hunting will occur for 9 months a year (September through May). The maximum number of employees will be 3 full time and 3 part time/seasonal employees during the hunting and sporting clay season, unless otherwise limited by conditions of approval.

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

The site abuts the north side of Highway 37 and contains agricultural land with a tidal slough meandering through the property. The surrounding area is characterized by agricultural lands to the north and south and is surrounded by nearby tidal marsh and wetlands. Marshlands and the 2nd Napa Slough border the site to the east. Additional marsh and hunting lands are situated to the west, along with the Northwest Pacific Railroad, Highway 121 and Infineon Raceway. The San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge is located to the south and across Highway 37.

Other Public Agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): California Department of Fish and Game and Sonoma County Animal Control Regulation Division

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 "Less than Significant with Mitigation" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agricultural & Forest Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emission	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise
<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	
<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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED 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 "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact 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. 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, all potentially significant effects were previously analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable standards and potential impacts 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. There are no changes in the project, no new information related to potential impacts, and no changes in circumstances that would require further analysis pursuant to Section 15162 of CEQA Guidelines, therefore no further environmental review is required.

Incorporated Source Documents

Environmental Checklist

Page 5

File# PLP11-0047

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.
- Other technical reports: W-trans traffic report; March 20, 2012 and Rosen Goldberg Der & Lewitz, Inc. noise report; Revised April 4, 2012

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 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) 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 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). 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 significance.

1. **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?

_____	_____ <u>X</u> _____	_____	_____
-------	----------------------	-------	-------

Comment: The site is located within a scenic corridor and within a scenic landscape unit. The compatibility of new development is important to the overall scenic character of the area. Based on the location of the proposed buildings within the developed farming complex, scale of proposed buildings, setbacks from existing roads (1600 feet), existing landscaping, and building materials and colors, the project will not result in significant visual impacts.

Mitigation: Building materials and colors shall be submitted for staff review and approval prior to building permit issuance. Building materials and colors shall be dark earth and wood tone colors.

Mitigation Monitoring: PRMD Project Review will not sign off the building permit until materials and colors are submitted for review and approval.

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

_____	_____	_____ <u>X</u> _____	_____
-------	-------	----------------------	-------

Comment: Three eucalyptus trees will be removed, but this will not substantially change the scenic character of the site. No historically significant structures or other scenic natural features will be affected.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

_____	_____	_____ <u>X</u> _____	_____
-------	-------	----------------------	-------

Comment: See comments in 1. b) above.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

_____	_____	_____ <u>X</u> _____	_____
-------	-------	----------------------	-------

Comment: A minimal amount of pedestrian lighting will be necessary at the pedestrian entrances to the building and at the caretakers unit. Standard conditions of approval will restrict nighttime lighting and require all lighting to be shown on the plans for review and approval.

2. **AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES**

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment

section 51104(g))? _____ X

Comment: The site is not designated as forest or timberland.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? _____ X

Comment: The site is not designated as forest or timberland.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? _____ X

Comment: Impacts to Farmland are less than significant as noted above.

3. **AIR QUALITY** Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? _____ X

Comment: The limited amount of demolition, grading, new construction, and operation of the use will not obstruct implementation of adopted air quality plans.

Mitigation: See construction mitigation as noted below.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? _____ X

Comment: The BAAQMD has established project-level screening criteria to predetermine when in-depth air-quality analysis is appropriate. Due to the limited intensity in use (40-45) vehicles per day during peak periods, air quality impacts would be below the screening criteria and would not exceed Bay Area air quality standards for criteria air pollutants, precursors, and Greenhouse gas emissions, including ozone.

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)? _____ X

Comment: Due to the limited intensity in use (40-45) vehicles per day during peak periods, air quality impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. This level of traffic is below the screening criteria for criteria air pollutants, precursors, and Greenhouse gas emissions, including ozone. Nonetheless, it is important to minimize the project's incremental

contribution to cumulative air quality impacts by controlling dust during construction as follows:

Mitigation: The following dust control measures shall be included on the plans and implemented during construction:

A. Water or other dust palliative shall be applied to unpaved portions of the construction site, unpaved roads, parking areas, staging areas and stockpiles of soil daily as needed to control dust. Increased watering frequency during windy conditions.

B. Trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials over public roads will cover the loads, or will keep the loads at least two feet below the level of the sides of the container, or will wet the load sufficiently to prevent dust emissions.

C. Paved roads will be swept as needed to remove any visible soil that has been carried onto them from the project site.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? _____ X _____

Comment: The project would not result in the concentration of pollutants in proximity to sensitive receptors.

- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? _____ X _____

Comment: The use is not situated in proximity to a substantial number of people. The odor from the dog kennels would be controlled through regular maintenance. No other odors of concern have been identified.

Mitigation:

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |

Comment: The project has been referred to the Department of Fish and Game, Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for comment. No comments have been received. Three eucalyptus trees would be removed with the project.

Based on a thorough site inspection, staff has concluded that project construction, including placement of a new modular dwelling (in the location of a dilapidated dwelling) construction of the new kennel (in the location of an existing barn) and installation of a bird pen within the existing developed area of the site, would not affect sensitive habitat (except for potential nesting trees) or adversely affect sensitive animal or wetland plant species. The area of development is within the existing disturbed area of the site. The project would not disturb any pickle weed or other marshland habitat and no burrows were observed. In addition, the barn to be removed did not show any sign of bat activity and did not contain any bird nests. The three eucalyptus trees proposed for removal did not contain any bird nests and there did not appear to be any cavities that would provide bat habitat. However, trees in close proximity to construction could provide habitat for nesting birds and should be evaluated by a qualified

biologist within 14 days of construction to confirm whether there are any nesting birds in the area and prescribe appropriate mitigation as noted below.

A review of the California Natural Diversity (CNDDDB) Data Base shows occurrences of the endangered California clapper rail occurring along Sonoma Creek which runs along the east and north sides of the 18 acre sporting clay field. The California clapper rail is known to nest low amongst marshland plants. The breeding season near the San Pablo Bay is typically from mid-march through July. In addition, a large grove of eucalyptus trees exist west of the proposed sporting clay range. While no colonial breeding birds were observed at the time of site inspection, the trees represent potential habitat for nesting birds of prey and colonial breeding birds. The breeding season for colonial breeding birds and raptors is typically February through August. These habitats would not be adversely impacted by construction due to distance from construction areas and the limited scope of construction.

The hunting of planted upland game birds and the sporting clay range would occur on hay fields. Hunting on the hayfields would be spread out over hundreds of acres and would be periodic and intermittent. Due to the intermittent and relatively infrequent and dispersed nature of noise associated with hunting, and due to distances from habitat areas, noise impacts to potential nesting birds is considered less than significant.

The sporting clay range is also periodic, but shooting can occur for longer durations and be more intense. As proposed, the sporting clay shooting area includes a 300 foot setback from the potential roosting trees and clapper rail habitat. The sporting clay area and clapper rail habitat are separated and partially protected from disturbance by a raised levy system. However, mitigation is recommended requiring that a buffer setback to the potential roosting trees and clapper rail habitat be increased to no less than 656 feet or 200 yards to reduce noise impacts on potential sensitive habitat areas to less than significant.

Mitigation:

A qualified biologist shall perform a pre-construction survey for nesting birds within 14 days prior to tree removal, demolition of the existing house, and/or ground breaking activities for the bird pen if these activities will take place between February 1 and August 31. If nesting birds are found, the qualified biologist shall establish suitable buffers prior to tree removal, demolition of the existing house, and/or ground breaking activities for the bird pen. To prevent encroachment, the established buffer(s) should be clearly marked by highly visible material. The buffer(s) should remain in effect until the young have fledged or the nest has been abandoned as confirmed by a qualified biologist.

Mitigation Monitoring:

PRMD Project review will not sign off on grading, demolition, or building permits as noted above until the above measures have been implemented.

Mitigation: Prior to project approval, the applicant shall revise the site plan to provide a minimum 200 meter buffer area between the sporting clay area and the potential roosting trees and clapper rail habitat unless otherwise recommended by a qualified biologist in agreement with resource agencies.

Mitigation Monitoring: Staff will ensure that the applicant revises the site plan to meet this requirement prior to holding a public hearing on the application.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Comment: The project would not impact any native riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. See 4. a) above for further comment.

- 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? _____ X _____

Comment: See 4. a) above.

- 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? _____ X _____

Comment: Operation of the hunting club, including the sporting clay range, will not substantially interfere with the habitat or movement of native animal species See 4. a) above for further comment.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance? _____ X _____

Comment: The project would not result in conflict with the General Plan or other policies calling for the protection of biological resources.

- 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? _____ X _____

Comment: There are no adopted habitat conservation plans for the property and the hunting club will not substantially jeopardize the habitat value of the property or adjacent properties.

5. **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? _____ X _____

Comment: The barn to be demolished is not historically significant.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? _____ X _____

Comment: Native Americans are known to have lived in the area. The project was referred to the Northwest Information System for comments regarding archaeological resources and no comments were received. Site development would primarily occur within the footprint of or adjacent to existing buildings and within developed areas of the farm building complex. Therefore, there is limited potential that grading associated with foundation improvements could result in the discovery of archaeological resources. Nonetheless, if archaeological resources are discovered during grading, the following mitigation shall be implemented.

Mitigation: The following notes shall be included on building or grading plans for ground disturbing activities:

"If archaeological materials such as pottery, arrowheads or midden are found, all work shall cease and PRMD staff shall be notified so that the find can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist (i.e., an archaeologist registered with the Society of Professional Archaeologists). Artifacts associated with prehistoric sites include humanly modified stone, shell, bone or other cultural materials such as charcoal, ash and burned rock indicative of food procurement or processing activities. Prehistoric domestic features include hearths, firepits, or house floor depressions whereas typical mortuary features are represented by human skeletal remains. Historic artifacts potentially include all by-products of human land use greater than 50 years of age including trash pits older than fifty years of age. The developer shall designate a Project Manager with authority to implement the mitigation prior to issuance of a building/grading permit. When contacted, a member of PRMD Project Review staff and the archaeologist shall visit the site to determine the extent of the resources and to develop proper procedures required for the discovery. No work shall commence until a protection plan is completed and implemented subject to the review and approval of the archaeologist and Project Review staff. Mitigation may include avoidance, removal, preservation and/or recordation in accordance with accepted professional archaeological practice.

"If human remains are encountered, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovered remains and PRMD staff, County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist must be notified immediately so that an evaluation can be performed. If the remains are deemed to be Native American and prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted by the Coroner so that a "Most Likely Descendant" can be designated."

Mitigation Monitoring: Building/grading permits for ground disturbing activities shall not be approved for issuance by Project Review staff until the above notes are printed on the building, grading and improvement plans. The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about the requirement to cease construction if archaeological materials are found during ground disturbing activities. The project planner shall work with the applicant in reviewing and revising construction plans if archaeological materials are found. (Ongoing during construction)

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? _____ X _____

Comment: No paleontological resources are known to exist in the area. Site grading would not disrupt potential paleontological resources.

- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? _____ X _____

Comment: No burial sites are known in the vicinity of the project, and most of the project site has been affected by farming and agricultural activities. In the event that human remains are unearthed during construction, state law requires that the County Coroner be notified to investigate the nature and circumstances of the discovery. At the time of discovery, work in the immediate vicinity would cease until the Coroner permitted work to proceed. If the remains were determined to be prehistoric, the find would be treated as an archaeological site and the mitigation measure described in item 5. (b) above would apply.

- 6. **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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

_____ X _____

Comment: The proposed buildings are not located within the Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

_____ X _____

Comment: The area is subject to seismic ground shaking due to earthquake. The buildings and foundations are subject to permit approval and are required to utilize code complying construction techniques based on seismic risk.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

_____ X _____

Comment: The soils in the area are subject to liquefaction. However, the foundation design are subject to permit approval and are required to utilize code complying construction measures based on soil constraints.

Mitigation:

iv) Landslides?

_____ X _____

Comment:

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

_____ X _____

Comment: The construction of the new clubhouse/kennel, bird pen and caretakers unit will not result in an unusual amount of cut and fill because the site is level. However, wind or water erosion is possible once the ground is disturbed. Therefore the following mitigation is applicable.

Mitigation: Prior to issuance of grading permit, the grading and drainage plans shall include erosion and sediment control Best Management Practices in accordance with Grading and Stormwater forms GRD-004 (Grading Permit Required) and NPD-007 (Dry Season BMP's for Construction Sites). The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about the requirements for soil, construction-debris and concrete waste-water control measures to be implemented during construction.

Mitigation Monitoring: The Permit and Resource Management Department will not issue a grading or building permit until evidence is submitted and approved by PRMD that the erosion/sediment control plan has been included in the project grading plans in accordance with the Grading Permit Application Contents (GRD-004) handout. If complaints are received concerning the tracking of soil or other construction debris or release of concrete waste-water into the public right-of-way, PRMD staff shall conduct an on-site investigation. If it is determined by PRMD staff that complaints are warranted, the permit holder shall implement additional measures as determined by PRMD or PRMD may issue a stop work order. (Ongoing during construction)

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? _____ X _____

Comment: Soil or geological constraints, other than those mentioned above are not known to exist.

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? _____ X _____

Comment: A soils report is required to address soil constraints and foundation design.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? _____ X _____

Comment: The project site currently contains a septic system to accommodate the existing single family dwelling and farming operations. This system has a capacity of 480 gallons a day. The applicant has applied to reutilize and upgrade the existing system to accommodate new employees, hunters and sporting clay shooters. The septic permit is currently under review, including the capacity of the system as it relates to the proposed use. The maximum permitted intensity of the use will be tied to the approved capacity of the system through conditions of approval.

7. **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION** Would the project: Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less than Significant Impact No Impact

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? _____ X _____

Comment: The limited amount of traffic and construction associated with the project is well below the Bay Area Air Quality Control Boards Screening criteria for Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors and GHG emissions. Nonetheless, it is important to minimize the projects contribution to cumulative greenhouse gas emissions to comply with General Plan policy.

Mitigation: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a greenhouse gas reduction plan to reduce emissions beyond prescriptive standards.

Mitigation Monitoring: PRMD will not issue any building permits, until the applicant indicates how the project will reduce emissions beyond prescriptive standards.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? _____ X _____

Comment: The project does not reach the CEQA screening thresholds for potential significance, but still needs to comply with General Plan policy to reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Therefore the project is conditioned to implement measures which exceed adopted Green Building Tier 1 standards.

8. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** Would the project: Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Mitigation
Incorporation

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? _____ X _____

Comment: The project does not involve the transport or use of hazardous materials. No lead shot will be utilized in the sporting clay shooting area and the sporting clays will be non-toxic and biodegradable. The use of lead shot in the hunting area will be dispersed such that lead would not concentrate to a point of adversely impacting the environment. The use of lead shot for hunting upland game birds is consistent with federal, state and local laws.

Mitigation:

- 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? _____ X _____

Comment: The applicant has agreed not to use lead shot in the sporting clay shooting range, therefore a lead management plan is not required. The applicant also proposes to use biodegradable sporting clay targets.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? _____ X _____

Comment: See a) above.

- 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? _____ X _____

Comment: The site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites inventory prepared in accordance with Government Code Section 65962.5.

- 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? _____ X _____

Comment: The site is located over three miles from a public use airport in Schellville.

- f) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? _____ X _____

Comment: The project would not result in a safety hazard due to proximity to an airport. Shooting areas setbacks from roads, structures, and habitat areas comply with Fish and Game requirements.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? _____ X _____

Comment: The project would not interfere with any emergency response or evacuation plans.

- 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? _____ X _____

Comment: The project is not located in an area subject to wild land fire. All buildings would be constructed to meet County Fire Safe Standards and the Uniform Fire Code.

9. **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? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |

Comment: The site contains various drainage sloughs, but none are near the proposed improvements. The project will increase impervious surfaces due to the foot print of the club house/dog kennel (8,500 square feet) which is larger than the existing 4,200 square foot barn. The aviary does not require impervious surfaces, except for the 250 square foot bird house. The new primary dwelling will be smaller than the demolished dwelling. The increase in run-off associated with these new structures is not expected to substantially change existing sheet flow conditions. Site preparation will result in the leveling of existing surface areas to accommodate building slab and pier foundations. This scope of work will require a building permit and a grading and drainage permit may be required. If a grading permit is triggered, the project is required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements and must obtain coverage under the State Water Resource Control Board's General Construction Permit (General Permit).

If a grading and drainage permit are required, the grading and drainage plans shall include an erosion prevention/sediment control plan utilizing Best Management Practices in accordance with Grading and Storm water forms GRD-004 (Grading Permit Required and NPD-007 (Dry Season BMP's for Construction Sites). The plans shall clearly show best management practices (BMP's) to be implemented, limits of disturbed areas, vegetated areas to be preserved, pertinent details, notes, and specifications to prevent damages and minimize adverse impacts to the environment. The notes shall include but are not limited to "tracking of soil or construction debris into the public right-of-way shall be prohibited. Runoff containing concrete waste or by-products shall not be allowed to drain to the storm drain system, waterway(s), or adjacent lands." The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about the requirements for soil, construction-debris and concrete waste-water control measures to be implemented during construction.

- 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? _____ X _____

Comment: The existing well is an older substandard well with limited production and no standard seal. A new well has been drilled to provide a more reliable potable water source for the primary dwelling and the proposed sports club. The site is within a Groundwater Availability Area 1. The recharge occurring on the site is substantially more than the demand created from the sports club and residence. The hayfields are not irrigated pasture.

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? _____ X _____

Comment: The project will not alter existing natural drainage flows on the property (See grading and erosion control requirements/mitigations above).

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? _____ X _____

Comment: The project will have a minor increase in runoff associated with approximately 4,550 square feet of new impervious surface. The increase in runoff will not be substantial and will sheet flow and likely infiltrate the ground before entering existing drainage ways.

Drainage improvements shall maintain off-site natural drainage patterns, limit post-development storm water levels and pollutant discharges in compliance with PRMD's NPDES permit, and abide by the standards and provisions of Chapters 11 & 11A of the Sonoma County Code and all other relevant laws and regulations.

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? _____ X _____

Comment: See comment under d) above.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? _____ X _____

Comment: See comments under a) and d) above.

g) Place housing within a 100-year hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? _____ X _____

Comment: The project would replace an existing residence and construct a new sports club within a flood plain. The property is protected from floods by an existing levy and pump system. The property could experience inundation if the levy system were to fail. Therefore, the residence and club house shall comply with building standards a noted below.

Mitigation: The residence and clubhouse shall be elevated above the 100 year flood plain, unless the building division determines that the engineered levy system and pump system provide adequate safeguards from inundation..

11. 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?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____

Comment: The site is not designated as containing mineral resources.

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?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____
---	-------	-------	-------------	-------

Comment: See 11. a) above.

12. NOISE Would the project result in:	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?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____

Comment: Noise sources from the operation include noise associated with dogs barking and shot gun blasts. Because shot gun blasts associated with the shooting range and hunting represent the worst case noise scenario, the project noise analysis (Rosen Goldberg Der and Lewitz, Inc., Revised April 4, 2012) addresses those noise sources. The noise report analyzed impacts to nearby receptors, including Ramsgate Winery located approximately 3,500 feet from the closest hunting field and a residence situated across Highway 37, approximately 1,300 feet from the hunting area. The sporting clay shooting range is located over 1.5 miles away from the nearest residence

The report concludes that noise impacts to the winery and closest residence would comply with General Plan standards. This is primarily due to distance between the noise sources and receptors and the periodic and short duration of noise from the hunting fields. Therefore, no noise mitigation is required except the setbacks to protect wildlife habitat as noted in 4. a) above.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____
--	-------	-------	-------------	-------

Comment: Groundborne vibration associated with the use would not be significant.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____
--	-------	-------	-------------	-------

Comment: Existing noise sources in the area include periodic car and truck noise from Highway 37 running the entire length of the property from east to west and Highway 121 running north to south. The operation of the hunting club, dog boarding, and the sporting clay shooting range would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise in the area due to the periodic nature of the noise sources and distance to receptors.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? _____ X _____

Comment: Existing noise sources in the area include periodic car and truck noise from Highway 37 running the entire length of the property from east to west and Highway 121 running north to south. The operation of the hunting club, dog boarding, and the sporting clay shooting range would periodically increase noise levels in the immediate vicinity of the project throughout the year and more so during the hunting season. The noise sources would be concentrated in proximity to the dog kennel and clay shooting range. The clay shooting range and dog kennel are located over 1.5 miles from the nearest residence. Hunting in the fields would be 1,300 feet away from the nearest residence and across Highway 37. The project noise study indicates that periodic increases in noise associated with hunters would be noticeable, but would not be substantial or significant in respect to existing ambient noise levels and General Plan standards.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife and the CA. Dept. of Fish and Game have not identified noise as an issue in regard to wildlife conservation efforts in the area. In fact wildlife conservation and hunting in approved areas are compatible uses regulated by these agencies. Fish and Game manages the adjacent westerly property which is open to hunting.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such 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? _____ X _____

Comment: The site is not located within two miles of an airport.

- 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? _____ X _____

Comment: No private airstrips are known to exist in the area. The project would not result in adverse noise impacts to people working Sonoma Valley Airport.

13. **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)? _____ X _____

Comment: The project would not induce housing or business development.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? _____ X _____

Comment: The project would not displace housing.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement

housing elsewhere? _____ X _____

Comment: The project would not displace residents.

14. **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 significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection? _____ X _____

Comment: The project would not result in an unusual demand for fire services. The area is currently served by the Schellville Fire District.

Police protection? _____ X _____

Comment: The project would not result in a demand for the County Sheriff serving the area.

Schools? _____ _____ X

Comment: The project does not impact schools.

Parks? _____ _____ X

Comment: The project does not affect the demand for park services.

Other public facilities? _____ X _____

Comment: The project would not affect the delivery of other public services.

15. **RECREATION** Would the project:

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?

_____ _____ X

Comment: The project would not result in the increase in demand for public park facilities

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?

_____ _____ X _____

Comment: The project is a private recreational hunting and shooting facility. It's physical impacts have been determined to be less than significant based on mitigation measures identified in this Initial Environmental Study.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____

Comment: Do to the limited intensity of the club (40 trips per day/10 peak hour trips), potential traffic impacts are limited and the scope of the traffic study has been narrowed to site access. The access analysis has been revised to address Caltrans comments in a letter dated March 9, 2012. The Access analysis concludes that left turns into the site would not exceed a maximum queue of 1 vehicle at a time. A sensitivity analysis was performed by assuming double the volumes on SR 37. The left turn lane was still determined adequate for the proposal and comparable to existing use of the turn lane.

The median break at the project driveway is 485 feet long and consists of a shared left turn pocket. However, because the turn pocket does not meet Caltrans standards, the safety record at this location was reviewed. In the past five years, there was only one collision at this location, consisting of a west bound rear end collision as a result of deceleration. The collision resulted in property damage only. Based on this data, the traffic engineer concludes there does not appear to be a safety problem associated with the projects use of the existing median opening. No mitigation measures were recommended. In addition, Caltrans has reviewed and agreed with the conclusions of the analysis.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____
--	-------	-------	-------------	-------

Comment: The project would not result in congestion.

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?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____
---	-------	-------	-------------	-------

Comment: The project does not include air traffic.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____
--	-------	-------	-------------	-------

Comment: See discussion under 16. a) above.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____
---	-------	-------	-------------	-------

Comment: The project would adversely impact emergency vehicle access.

- f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? _____ _____ X _____

Comment: The project does not conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation.

- g) Result in inadequate parking capacity? _____ _____ X _____

Comment: Parking for 30 cars are accommodated on the site plan and within the existing developed area of the site.

17. 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? _____ _____ X _____

Comment: The applicant has applied to improve the existing septic system under the County's re-utilization policy. The re-utilization policy requires a critical evaluation of the proposed land use, septic demand, existing septic conditions, soils, and percolation rates, and proposed improvements. One of the major requirements to permit re-utilization of the septic systems is to protect the quality of groundwater. All criteria of the Re-utilization Policy including compliance with water quality requirements shall be met.

- 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? _____ _____ X _____

Comment: See 17. a) above.

- 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? _____ X _____ _____

Comment: See #9. Hydrology and Water Quality above.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? _____ X _____ _____

Comment: The applicant has drilled a new well to provide potable water for the use. Prior to use of the well for domestic purposes, approval of a state drinking water permit is required. The well water will need to be treated with a reverse osmosis system as permitted by the state due to relatively low levels of salt found in the water.

Mitigation: Prior to final occupancy a state drinking water permit shall be obtained for use of the new well, including approval of a treatment system.

Mitigation Monitoring: PRMD will not sign off on final occupancy of any new habitable buildings until proof that a state drinking water permit has been obtained.

- 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? _____ X _____

Comment: The existing septic system will be upgraded to comply with the County's Re-utilization policy as noted under #17. a) above.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? _____ X _____

Comment: Local landfills have the capacity or are under disposal contracts with capacity to accommodate the proposed use.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? _____ X _____

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Yes No

- 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? _____ X
- 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)? _____ X
- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? _____ X