

I. AESTHETICS

Preface

The Proposed Project is located at 60 Sea Walk Drive, The Sea Ranch, California, on Assessor's Parcel Number 122-200-09. The site is an approximately 52 acre parcel located on the northern Sonoma County Coast. The southern portion of the site currently houses the existing Sea Ranch Lodge complex including the Sea Ranch General Store and Post Office, a restaurant and bar, as well as the current hotel's operation and related back of house facilities. The site is surrounded by multi-family residential units to the south (the historically significant Condominium One) and single family hedgerow houses to the north. The Pacific Ocean forms the site's western boundary. The eastern boundary is formed by Highway 1 and additional single family units in the hills above the highway. Highway 1 serves as the site's primary access.

The parcel's topography ranges from relatively level to gently sloped. The site is an uplifted coastal marine terrace that slopes gently toward the ocean from east to west and in some instances toward the northwest. Native vegetation on-site includes introduced perennial grasslands and Coastal Terrace Prairie. Scattered shrubs include coyote bush and coffee berry. The grasslands support a rich variety of plant species. Wetland areas have been identified and are located outside of the proposed development area as documented further in the Site Sensitivity section outlined below. Trees planted along the northwestern and southeastern boundaries of the site are Monterey pine and Monterey cypress. In many cases, these trees form traditional "hedgerows" characteristic of the Sea Ranch landscape.

The Proposed Project site is not part of The Sea Ranch residential development, but is surrounded by the Sea Ranch community. The site is designated Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial and the coastal zoning is also CT (Commercial Tourist). A development of up to 120 lodge units and related site amenities was anticipated by the Local Coastal Plan (LCP). The site is not contained in a scenic landscape unit as designated on the Open Space Plan Maps of the County's General Plan 2020. As the site is within an Urban Services Area designation, the scenic corridor designation's restriction of development within 200 feet of the centerline of Highway 1 does not apply.

The proposed development will replace the existing Sea Ranch Lodge buildings with the exception of the original General Store and Post Office building designed by Joseph Esherick and Associates. The structure will be fully renovated and contain the Sea Ranch community's Post Office, a gift shop, administrative offices and various back of the house functions for the Lodge. There will be a new main lodge building that will contain the reception area; a kitchen, restaurant and bar; restrooms, a small spa or wellness center, staff areas and three hotel units. A separate "Fireside Room" building will be connected to the lodge via a covered, outdoor arcade. This building will contain a Fireside Room as a quiet space for guests to gather and relax. The building includes several smaller spaces that also will be used for small conferences,

weddings and other gatherings. The three commercial buildings, the Post Office and General Store, Lodge and Fireside Room building, will be situated in the same area as the existing buildings on the project site and clustered in what is already Sea Ranch's unique "village area." Parking for the development will occupy an expanded parking area that is currently used by the existing lodge. The parking lot is located adjacent to the commercial buildings to the west and bound to the east by Highway 1. The new commercial buildings and parking lot will continue to be shielded from view (in the same manner as existing buildings are shielded from view) by existing trees and other vegetation. The back of house and service areas for the new facilities will also occupy similar areas used by the existing facility. These include two rebuilt service "corrals" that are enclosed with fencing and hidden from view.

There will be a total of 60 lodging units. Three lodging units will be located in the new main building. The remaining 57 lodging units will be located in other portions of the site. Thirteen units will be in a new building located west of the Post Office and General Store building. Its visibility will be screened by the existing Post Office building and a hedgerow located directly to the south. The remaining 44 lodging units will be located north of the lodge in four clusters of buildings. The clusters will be surrounded by open space. There will be an outdoor swimming pool within the boundaries of one of these clusters.

Existing trees, new plantings and fences will screen the designated parking area. Meadow lodging units will only be accessible via pedestrian trails and the hotel operation's electric carts or other vehicles.

The clustered lodging units to the north will face toward the ocean, minimizing nighttime visual impacts to the east. Their scale is residential. Those closest to the highway are set into the topography and existing landscape and incorporate sod roofs that extend the visual continuity of the adjacent meadow.

A large central open space area has been preserved in conjunction with the site's wetland areas. No new structures will be constructed west of the existing pedestrian pathway and sheep fence located between Highway 1 and the ocean front. This open space will provide habitat for indigenous species as well as rare local flora and fauna. A trail system will link the Lodge with Black and Bihler Points and extend through the project site.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vista?	_____	__X__	_____	_____

Comment 1.a.:

Site Visibility

Views from the North

The site is partially visible from Highway 1 as one travels on the highway south of the highway’s intersection with Moonraker Road. Some of the clustered lodging units will be visible from the highway. Under both existing and proposed conditions, the General Store, Lodge buildings and parking areas are screened by an east/west running hedgerow as well as additional vegetation fronting Highway 1.

Primary views to the site’s clustered meadow units will occur along an approximately 1,200 foot stretch of road immediately south of Highway 1’s intersection with Moonraker Road (the site’s proposed development area is not otherwise visible from Moonraker Road). As one travels south at 45 miles per hour, the site is visible for about 18 seconds. The meadow is one of the last unobstructed, undeveloped fields in The Sea Ranch. In the foreground is a large wetland with coffee berry and coyote bush. South of and adjacent to this wetland is the existing public access parking lot and public access walkway to bluff top trails and Black Point Beach (see the vignettes on Sheet R1.01 of the BSA plans dated March 24, 2009). This access point is considered a major view point in the Local Coastal Plan (LCP).

There is significant existing vegetation on this portion of the site and a change in elevation between the road and the new development. This change in grade ranges from 19 feet to 42 feet in vertical elevation. The nearest lodging unit is located 220 feet from Highway 1 and 115 feet from Black Point parking lot. The combination of the change in grade, vegetation, and distance from the highway minimizes visual impacts from the north and allows for blue water views from Highway 1 across the site, over the rooftops, toward the ocean (see Sheet R1.01 of the BSA plans dated March 24, 2009 (BSA 3/24/09)).

Views from the South

As one drives Highway 1 northbound, the vegetative scenery to the north of the existing entrance to the Lodge buildings blocks all views until one passes the east/west hedgerow and clears the bend. Views are primarily focused to the northwest to north. In order to see the Proposed Development when driving, one would have to look to the left to see the development area.

Due to topography and vegetation, the central commercial development area is not generally visible from the roadways east of Highway 1 and uphill of the Proposed Development. The views from this area, also known as Crow's Nest, are primarily out to the ocean and the bluffs beyond the property's no-build zone (see Sheets A1.41, A1.42, A1.43 of BSA 03-24-09). From Highway 1, the meadow is less of a view factor to the northbound traveler.

Views from the Black Point Beach Access Parking Lot

The Black Point Beach Access Parking lot is one of five coastal access points in The Sea Ranch developed with a parking lot, trail head, and restroom. According to staff of the Sonoma County Regional Parks Department, this trail head provides the best ocean views of the five. Under the Local Coastal Plan, Open Space maps, the view of the ocean from Highway 1 is designated as "Major View." The Local Coastal Plan defines major views as "long views of unique visual interest, focus, or variety. Major views are abundant along Sonoma County's coast and include islands, rock headlands, coves, lagoons, estuaries, riverways, expansive beaches, white water, and historic settings."

The Black Point Beach Access is not designated as a vista point on the old Open Space map, and appears to have been developed later. As currently developed, it fits the LCP definition of a Vista Point, which is defined as "roadside areas suitable for parking with exceptional views. Designated vista points should be developed with safe ingress and egress, parking areas, interpretive signs, and restrooms where appropriate. The view shed from a vista point is even more sensitive than a major view since the viewer is stopped and can take full advantage of the visual experience."

To evaluate the visual impacts of the project, the County's Visual Assessment Guidelines are considered as follows.

Site Sensitivity

Based upon the Site Sensitivity (Table 1) of the County’s Visual Assessment Guidelines, the site is rated as “High.”

**Table 1
 Site Sensitivity**

Sensitivity	Characteristics
Low	The site is within an urban land use designation and has no land use or zoning designations protecting scenic resources. The project vicinity is characterized by urban development or the site is surrounded by urban zoning designations and has no historic character and is not a gateway to a community. The project site terrain has visible slopes less than 20 percent and is not on a prominent ridgeline and has no significant natural vegetation of aesthetic value to the surrounding community.
Moderate	The site or portion thereof is within a rural land use designation or an urban designation that does not meet the criteria above for low sensitivity, but the site has no land use or zoning designations protecting scenic resources. The project vicinity is characterized by rural or urban development but may include historic resources or be considered a gateway to a community. This category includes building or construction sites with visible slopes less than 30 percent or where there is significant natural features of aesthetic value that is visible from public roads or public use areas (i.e. parks, trails etc.).
High	The site or any portion thereof is within a land use or zoning designation protecting scenic or natural resources, such as General Plan designated scenic landscape units, coastal zone, community separators, or scenic corridors. The site vicinity is generally characterized by the natural setting and forms a scenic backdrop for the community or scenic corridor. This category includes building and construction areas within the SR designation located on prominent hilltops, visible slopes less than 40 percent or where there are significant natural features of aesthetic value that are visible from public roads or public use areas (i.e. parks, trails etc.). This category also includes building or construction sites on prominent ridgelines that may not be designated as scenic resources but are visible from a designated scenic corridor.

Maximum	<p>The site or any portion thereof is within a land use or zoning designation protecting scenic resources, such as General Plan designated scenic landscape units, coastal zone, community separators, or scenic corridors. The site vicinity is generally characterized by the natural setting and forms a scenic backdrop for a designated scenic corridor. This category includes building or construction sites within the scenic resource designation on or near prominent ridgelines, visible slopes greater than 40 percent or where there are significant natural features of aesthetic value that are visible from a designated scenic corridor.</p>
---------	---

The basis for this determination is that the site is within the Coastal Zone, is designated as a “Major View” on the LCP Open Space maps, and is designated as within a scenic corridor. However, as the site is also within an Urban Service Area, the 200 foot setback does not apply to the scenic corridor designation. However, all new lodging units have been located more than 200 feet from Highway 1; the closest meadow unit is approximately 215 feet from the roadway and 115 feet from the Black Point parking lot. The project structure closest to the highway is the wastewater treatment building, which is located near a hedgerow and is 110 feet from the highway. While the overall site has scenic backdrop qualities, the visitor serving zoning anticipates a commercial level of development for the site. Supporting this zoning and anticipated land use is the property’s location in an Urban Service Area. The most visible feature in the central portion of the site, moreover, is a public parking area for coastal access. All of these factors support a visual sensibility rating of high versus maximum.

The central portion of the site has the greatest amount of visibility from Highway 1. This large meadow area is characterized by wetlands, coastal scrub and grassland. As previously noted, the Proposed Development in this area is clustered, residentially scaled and is set back from the highway. Within the developable area, centralized open space between the individual clusters is also maximized. The buildings are organized around the open meadow as it slopes down toward the ocean.

Slopes from Highway 1 are gradual ranging from approximately 5 to 7 percent. Between Highway 1 and the Proposed Development, there is a drop that ranges from 19 feet in vertical distance to the nearest unit to a drop of 42 feet from the farthest. The units are also low profile and buried into the ground. The unit closest to the highway (Building 19) has a finish floor elevation of 112 feet versus the highway’s elevation of 131 feet. The difference is 19 feet whereas the unit, including its proposed sod roof, is 20’-5” tall, according to Sheet A1.33 dated March 24, 2009. A driver from Highway 1 will be able to look over the top of the nearest unit toward the ocean. Due to the combination of the sloping topography, existing vegetation, construction style, finish floor elevations and overall building heights, the developed areas will be only marginally visible.

Visual Dominance

Based upon the mitigative design features of the project, including the height of the Meadow Cluster roofs relative to Highway 1, the sod roof design of the Meadow Cluster, and the inclusion of a view corridor from the Black Point Beach parking lot, the meadow development’s visual dominance can be considered to be “subordinate” according to Table 2 of the Visual Guidelines).

**Table 2
 Visual Dominance**

Dominance	Characteristics
Dominant	Project elements are strong – they stand out against the setting and attract attention away from the surrounding landscape. Form, line, color, texture, and night lighting contrast with existing elements in the surrounding landscape.
Co-Dominant	Project elements are moderate – they can be prominent within the setting, but attract attention equally with other landscape features. Form, line, color, texture, and night lighting are compatible with their surroundings.
Subordinate	Project is minimally visible from public view. Element contrasts are weak – they can be seen but do not attract attention. Project generally repeats the form, line, color, texture, and night lighting of its surroundings.
Inevident	Project is generally not visible from public view because of intervening natural land forms or vegetation.

The balance of the project is not substantially visible from public view because of:

- The intervening topography
 - Slopes drop off from Highway 1 (elevation 131) to elevations ranging from 100 to 112 in the cluster of meadow units closest to the highway and fronting the communal open space
- The natural vegetation at:
 - the north end of the site;
 - between the existing Moonraker development to the north and the project site;
 - between the site and Sea Walk (to the south); and,

- vegetation along Highway 1.

Within the visible portion of the site, 44 clustered units will be visible at a distance between 215 feet and 504 feet from Highway 1. The 14 units closest to the road (the Meadow Cluster) are sited down slope side of a natural ridge, are constructed into the slopes and have sod roofs generally slanted toward the highway and the northeast views. Within the tradition of the Sea Ranch and its other residential developments, all of the buildings sit low to the ground and incorporate a palette of materials and colors drawn from the site. The plan mitigates night sky issues by minimizing east facing glazing and minimizing night lighting. All light sources will be shielded and directed downward. The lines, form, texture and lighting are such that the development will blend into the site. The sod roofs will be sufficient in depth to support native grasses and other indigenous plant materials. Other roof slopes are limited to a maximum of 4 ½ to 12 feet in order to maintain a low profile and an architectural form consistent with the Sea Ranch. The buildings will be sided in vertical cedar or its cement-board equivalent. Eaves are minimized. Surfaces are non-reflective and naturally finished, including proposed west facing solar thermal panels. The architecture will be integrated into the natural landscape, incorporating native planting and communal open space.

The building heights for the Main Lodge and Great Room have been calculated based upon the County's building height calculations ¹. The Main Lodge is 46'-5" (9.86 feet taller than the existing building) and the Fireside Room is 48'-8" (12.10 feet taller than the existing structure).

A 24 foot building height is the maximum (for commercial uses) in the Coastal Design Guidelines Administrative Manual and the Coastal Zoning Ordinance. However, the Local Coastal Plan, at page 179, provides an exception: "Limit maximum height to 24 feet unless the greater height will not have an effect on coastal views and there are overriding considerations." This project may be found to be consistent with this standard because:

¹ **Main Lodge Building Height: 46'- 5"**

Lowest Topo Grade: 104.00'

Highest Topo Grade: 115.00'

Average: 109'-6"

Highest Roof Point: 39'-8" above Main Level which is 116'-3, or 155'-"11"

$$(39'-8" + 116'-3") - 109'-6" = 46'-5"$$

Fireside Building Height: 48'-8"

Lowest Topo Grade: 103.00'

Highest Topo Grade: 110.00'

Average: 106'-6"

Highest Roof Point: 38'-11" above Main Level which is 116'-3", or 155')

$$(38'-11" + 116'-3") - 106'-6" = 48'-8"$$

- Structures are screened from view by the existing tree hedgerows;
- The existing structures that are being demolished or renovated are already above 24 feet and any increase in height of the new buildings is relatively minor; and,
- The increased height of the main lodge building is necessary to accommodate three lodge units, which reduces unit density in areas that would be visible from Highway 1, and removes three units from their originally proposed location in the meadow.

**Table 3
 Thresholds of Significance
 for
 Visual Impact Analysis**

Sensitivity	Visual Dominance			
	<i>Dominant</i>	<i>Co-Dominant</i>	<i>Subordinate</i>	<i>Inevident</i>
<i>Maximum</i>	Significant	Significant	Significant	Less than significant
<i>High</i>	Significant	Significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<i>Moderate</i>	Significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<i>Low</i>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant

While the project as a whole will not have substantial impacts to the view of travelers in their cars along Highway 1, the buildings in the meadow could have a substantial impact to the view of hikers walking on the trail between the Black Point beach parking lot and the stairs to the beach. The following measure will mitigate this impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure I.a.: Prior to the issuance of building permits for the Meadow Cluster or North Cluster, the Applicant shall make an Offer of Dedication to the Sonoma County Regional Parks Department for a Black Point loop trail easement. The general location of the Black Point loop trail is conceptually depicted in Attachment “K” of this Initial Study. The Offer of Dedication shall be placed in escrow and released to Regional Parks simultaneously with the issuance of certificates of occupancy for the Meadow Cluster or North Cluster. Prior to occupancy of the North Cluster or Meadow Cluster, the Applicant shall cooperate with Regional Parks and the Kashia Pomo Tribe to make any needed field adjustments to the loop trail that provides safe access to the westernmost end of Black Point from the existing Black Point Trail Easement. A

representative of the Kashia Pomo Tribe shall be retained to monitor construction activities that involve disturbance of the earth, and a biologist shall be onsite to ensure the trail avoids any seabird nesting area.

Mitigation Monitoring. PRMD staff shall not clear issuance of building permits for construction of the North Cluster or the Meadow Cluster units until the easement has been offered for dedication for a new loop trail that provides safe access to the westernmost end of Black Point.

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

_____ _X_____

Comment I.b.: Scenic Highways. Less Than Significant Impact. The site is visible from Highway 1, which is listed as an “Eligible State Scenic Highway” by Caltrans. Currently the site is visible primarily from southbound Highway 1. The change in “long term” views will not be as noticeable as the change in “short term views.” The affected view will last only a few seconds (for drivers traveling at 45 mph on Highway 1). In order to blend into the existing environment, the following measures are incorporated into the project:

- Existing and new primary commercial buildings are visually shielded behind existing and/or new trees and plantings.
- Parking areas are visually shielded behind existing and/or new trees and plantings.
- Lodging units are residential in scale and clustered together in groups in order to maximize the open space and view corridors through the site.
- Lodging units utilize vegetation to both screen buildings from view as well as help the buildings blend into the natural landscape.
- Some lodging unit roofs utilize natural vegetation as “green” roofs to help the buildings blend into the surrounding landscape.
- Building materials are to be natural wood and other materials of similar tone and coloring so as to blend into the surrounding landscape palette.

Mitigation Measure I.b.: None Required.

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

_____ _____

Comment I.c.: Visual Character. Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the site will result in a change to the views of the coast from Highway 1. The impact is not considered to be significant due to the level of development proposed. Although the views of the site will be altered, buildings are in scale with the existing and adjacent development and will have a low profile. See comments regarding 1.a. above.

Mitigation Measure I.c.: None Required.

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

_____ _____

Comment I.d.: Light and Glare. Less Than Significant. Expansion of the Sea Ranch Lodge will affect the amount of light and glare emanating from the site. The exterior lighting scheme is to be designed as an attractive feature and will not impact views of the night sky. Measures to reduce light and glare are described in the General Notes on Sheet L4.0 of the Landscape Plan (BSA 03/24/09). The note states: "All site lighting to be low level, directed to the ground and shielded on all other sides. Lighting to be constructed of wood timbers with fixture mounted on side and conduit enclosed within timber. Height of fixture to range from 24 to 36 inches tall. Light fixtures to be located as needed to define access, at pathway junctions, top and bottom of stairs and where pedestrian circulation requires some ambient light for safety. Lighting will be limited to the built areas and not installed on the Meadow Path or Barn Trail.

Solar panels (or solar film) may be used on some roofs and may create the possibility of daytime glare depending upon the design and configuration of the panels. The plans indicate that solar panels will typically be located on sloped roofs facing away from public roads and adjacent properties, thereby minimizing any potential impact.

Mitigation Measure I.d.: None required.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Preface

Soils on the project site are mapped by the Soil Conservation Services. There are five soil units mapped on the site: Baywood Loamy Sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes (BaC); Kneeland Loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes (KnD); Kneeland Loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes (KnE); Rohnerville Loam, 0 to 9 percent slopes (RrC); and, Rohnerville Loam, 9 to 15 percent slope (RrD).

Baywood Loamy Sand soil underlay at least 65% of the site. This soil is characterized as somewhat excessively drained loamy sand that formed in the wind-modified sandy coastal plain sediments and soft sandstone. This soil occurs on the Pacific Ocean terraces from Bodega Bay to the Gualala River. Slope is 2 to 9 percent and elevation is 20-499 feet above sea level. This soil is formed from eolian deposit parent material. This soil has a low water holding capacity as well a very low runoff rate. There is no water table with the soil profile. The Baywood soils are rated as capability units IIIe-4 and IXe-4.

Kneeland Loam soil is characterized as a well-drained upland soil found only 20-40 inches above bedrock. These soils comprise less than 5% of the site. The soil is derived from residuum weathered from sedimentary rock. There is no water table within the soil profile. Kneeland Loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes has a medium rate of runoff while Kneeland Loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes has a high runoff rate; both have a low water holding capacity. These soils have a capability unit of IVe-1.

The Rohnerville series which comprise approximately 30% of the site, consists of moderately well-drained loams that have a subsoil of mainly sandy clay. They formed in material weathered from soft sandstone. These soils are on marine and bench terraces. They are along the ocean coastal areas between the shoreline and 3 to 4 miles inland. There is no water table found within this soil profile. These soils have a capability unit of IVe-1.

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	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 Resource Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b. Conflict with existing zoning for Agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

_____ _____ _____ __X__

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

_____ _____ _____ __X__

Comment II.a., b., and c.: Agricultural Resources. No Impact. According to the Sonoma County Soils report, the site does not contain any soils designated as prime soils and as such these soils are not noted on any of the Farmland and Monitoring Program mapped soils. The soils are not prime agricultural soils. Development will neither conflict with any agricultural uses, nor result in the potential conversion of any prime or soils mapped by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program to non-agricultural uses. The site is surrounded by completely semi-rural residential uses and County facilities (trail head parking).

Mitigation Measures II.a., b., and c.: None Required.

III. AIR QUALITY

Preface

The Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District (NSCAPCD) is the regional agency responsible for overseeing compliance with State and Federal laws, regulations, and programs with Northern Sonoma County. The NSCAPCD has prepared and/or implements specific plans to meet the applicable laws, regulations, and programs.

Would the project:

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|----|--|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a. | Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality Plan? | | | |
| | _____ | _____ | _____ | __X__ |

Comment III.a.: Air Quality Plan. No Impact. In formulating compliance strategies, the NSCAPCD relies on planned land uses established by local general plans. When a project proposes to change planned uses, by requesting a general plan amendment, the project may depart from the assumptions used in such a way that the cumulative result of the incremental changes may hamper or prevent the Air District from achieving its goals. This is because land use patterns influence transportation needs, and motor vehicles are the primary source of air pollution. Projects which conform to those general plans would not have significant cumulative impacts. As the subject project is lower than the allowable and scope anticipated by the Sonoma General Plan and the local Coastal Plan, the project would not generate emissions, nor would it interfere with implementation of transportation control measures. Therefore, the project would have no impact on air quality plans.

Mitigation Measure III.a.: None Required.

- | | | | | |
|----|---|-------|-------|-------|
| b. | Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | |
| | _____ | _____ | __X__ | _____ |

Comment III.b.: Violate Air Quality Standards. **Less Than Significant.** Carbon monoxide is an air pollutant that is directly emitted from combustion sources (e.g., automobiles) that concentrations can be modeled and compared with ambient air

quality standards. At full occupancy, the project would result in a net increase of about 357 new vehicle trips per weekday and 420 trips per weekend day. The combination of indirect (e.g., mostly motor vehicle) and stationary or point sources of air pollution associated with the project would emit less than 150 pounds of carbon monoxide per day. A project such as this, especially as it is consistent with the growth projections of the County's General Plan, is generally considered to have a less than significant impact on carbon monoxide concentrations because it would:

- Result in daily carbon monoxide emissions of less than 550 pounds,
- Traffic impacts would not impact local intersections. The affected intersection currently operates at Level of Service B or better and most are predicted to operate at a B level or better in the long term cumulative scenario; and,
- Traffic on Highway 1 would increase by less than 15%. Since the project meets these criteria, dispersion modeling is not necessary to identify that impacts on off-site sensitive receptors are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure III.b.: None Required.

- 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)?

_____ _____

Comment III.c.: Cumulative Impacts. Less Than Significant. Northern Sonoma County is considered a non-attainment area for ground-level ozone under both the Federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act. The area is also considered non-attainment for respirable particulates or particulate matter with a diameter of less than 10 micrometers (PM₁₀) under the California Clean Air Act, but not the Federal Act. The area has attained both State and Federal ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide. The area is considered to be in attainment for all other regulated air pollutants (i.e., nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide and lead). Attainment means the region normally does not violate air quality standards. Thresholds are in place for ozone precursors (reactive organic gases and nitrogen oxides) and PM₁₀. The District is considered to have attained carbon monoxide standards.

As explained in Attachment B, the project incorporates many features which will conserve energy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, it has been determined that the project's contribution to cumulative greenhouse gas emissions and associated climate change impacts are not cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure III.c.: None Required.

- d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

_____ X _____

Comment III.d.1: Construction-Related Impacts. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. During demolition, grading and construction activities, dust would be generated. Most of the dust would result during grading activities. The amount of dust generated would be highly variable and is dependent on the size of the area disturbed, amount of activity, soil conditions and meteorological conditions. Typical winds during late spring through summer are from the west-northwest. Nearby residences could be adversely affected by dust generated during construction activities.

Although grading and construction activities would be temporary, they would have the potential to cause both nuisance and health air quality impacts. PM₁₀ is the pollutant of greatest concern associated with dust. If uncontrolled, dust generated by demolition, grading and construction activities represents a potentially significant impact unless mitigated.

Mitigation Measure III.d.1: Include measures to control dust emissions.

Implementation of the measures listed below would reduce the air quality impacts associated with grading and new construction to a less than significant level:

- a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods as necessary. Construction areas adjacent to residences should be kept damp enough to prevent blowing dust at all times.
- b. Cover all hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard as necessary. Dust-proof chutes shall be used as appropriate to load debris onto trucks during demolition as necessary.
- c. Sweep, as necessary, all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas and sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads as necessary.
- d. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles as necessary.
- e. Limit traffic speeds on any unpaved roads to 15 mph as necessary.
- f. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible as necessary.
- g. Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site as necessary.

h. Provide a monthly Construction Report.

Mitigation Monitoring: PRMD shall review and approve the plans for inclusion of the measures prior to approval of Grading Plans. The County shall review the monthly construction report.

Comment III.d.2.: Toxic Air Contaminants. Less Than Significant With Mitigation.

Exhaust from construction equipment and associated heavy-duty truck traffic emits diesel particulate matter, which is a known Toxic Air Contaminant. The NSCAPCD has not developed any procedures or guidelines for identifying these impacts from temporary construction activities where emissions are transient. They are typically evaluated for stationary sources (e.g., large compression ignition engines such as generators) in health risk assessments that evaluate lifetime exposures (i.e., 24 hours per day over 70 years). Although temporary, diesel exhaust from construction equipment poses both a health and nuisance impact to nearby receptors. These construction activities are expected to occur during a relatively short time but are considered potentially significant unless mitigated.

Mitigation Measure III.d.2.: Include measures to reduce diesel particulate matter exhaust from construction equipment.

- a. Opacity is an indicator of exhaust particulate emissions from off-road diesel powered equipment. The project shall ensure that emissions from all construction diesel powered equipment used on the project site do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately.
- b. The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors).
- c. Diesel equipment standing idle for more than two minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate, or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were onsite and away from residences.
- d. Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.
- e. The Project Applicant shall designate a Disturbance Coordinator responsible for ensuring that mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts to nearby residences from construction are properly implemented. The Disturbance Coordinator shall be responsible for notifying adjacent land uses of construction activities and schedule, and shall provide a written list of the aforementioned dust control measures. The list shall identify a contact person that will respond to any complaints. A log shall be kept of all complaints and the actions taken to remedy any valid complaint as well as the response period.

Mitigation Monitoring: PRMD shall review and approve the Development Plans for inclusion of the measures prior to approval of Grading Plans. The County shall review the monthly Construction Report.

- e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

_____ _____ _____ x

Comment III.e.: **Odors. No Impact.** The project as a visitor-serving (primarily hotel) use, will not generate objectionable odors that would affect the general public and therefore will not result in any impacts.

Mitigation Measure III.e.: None Required.

IV. BIOLOGY

Preface

A comprehensive Biological Report, prepared by Monk and Associates (M&A), provides details that support this section of the Initial Study.

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

_____ X _____ _____

Comment IV.a.1.: Leaved Evax. Less Than Significant With Mitigation.

Short-leaved evax is a California Native Plant Society (CNPS) List 1.B2 species, indicating that it is “fairly endangered” in California, but more common elsewhere. It has no state or federal status. Short-leaved evax occurs in shallow soils on the project site. This plant occurs in an area of compacted soil located within an abandoned parking lot that was graded and used many years ago on the northwestern side of the project site. The Proposed Project would impact short-leaved evax at this location. Without mitigation, this impact is regarded as a significant adverse impact. Mitigation is prescribed below that would reduce impacts to this plant to a level considered less than significant pursuant to CEQA (see Mitigation Measures described below).

Mitigation Measure IV.a.1.: In order to compensate for impacts to short-leaved evax from the Proposed Project, an approximately 7.08 acre preserve (“Black Point and Bihler Point Preserve Areas”) will be established on the west side of the project site. This preserve supports several colonies of short-leaved evax which would remain protected within the preserve. The Black Point and Bihler Point Preserve Areas will be established and preserved through a recorded document on the title of the property. The recorded document for the preserve area shall run with the land.

Prior to grading the northwestern portion of the project site where this plant species has been found, a qualified botanist shall collect the top soils and seeds of the short-leaved evax at the appropriate time of the year from areas supporting short-leaved evax that are proposed to be disturbed. The seeds and topsoil shall be scattered for re-seeding at a suitable location within the Black Point and Bihler Point Preserve Areas. Orange construction fencing will be installed around all non-impacted short-

leaved evax plants within the site development plan to protect this species. The Project Applicant shall conduct annual monitoring surveys of the transplanted short-leaved evax population for a five year period, and shall prepare annual monitoring reports. These reports shall be submitted to Sonoma County and to CDFG no later than December 1st each monitoring year. The establishment of these preserve areas and subsequent seeding would reduce impacts to short-leaved evax to a level considered less than significant pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation Monitoring: Prior to issuance of building or grading permits, the applicant shall prepare and submit a covenant or easement, in a form satisfactory to County Counsel, to create the preserve for species that could be impacted by development. The document shall be recorded prior to occupancy of any of the Meadow Cluster units. PRMD shall not permit issuance of grading or building permits until the biologist who prepared the report for this project confirms in writing that the impacted species have been protected as described in this mitigation measure.

Comment IV.a.2.: Swamp Bellflower. No Impact. Swamp bellflower is a CNPS List 1B.2 species, indicating that it is “fairly endangered” in California. It has no state or federal status. On the project site, two populations of swamp bellflower have been identified in the most mesic parts of the freshwater marshes. The eastern population had been previously identified by biologist G. Snyder in 1998 and was recorded by CNDDDB as Occurrence No. 60. Swamp bellflower will not be impacted by the Proposed Project. It is found in wetlands mapped on the project site and the Proposed Project will not impact any wetlands. To ensure that there are no impacts to wetlands and to species living in wetlands, a buffer 100 feet in width will be established along the periphery of all wetlands. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are expected to occur to this species.

Mitigation IV.a.2.: None Required.

Comment IV.a.3.: Coastal Bluff Morning Glory. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. Coastal bluff morning glory is a CNPS List 1B.2 species, indicating that it is “fairly endangered” in California. It has no state or federal status. On the project site, this species is widespread and common throughout the coastal scrub. As such, there would be impacts to this species from implementation of the Proposed Project. These impacts are regarded as significant adverse impacts. Mitigation is prescribed below that would reduce impacts to this plant to a level considered less than significant pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation Measure IV.a.3.: In order to compensate for impacts to coastal bluff morning glory from the Proposed Project, the 7.08 acre Black Point and Bihler Preserve Areas will be established as part of the Proposed Project on the west side of the project site. Coastal bluff morning glory is common in the preserve. The Black Point and Bihler Point Preserve Areas will be established and preserved through a recorded document on the title of the property. The recorded document for these preserve areas shall run with the land. The establishment of this preserve area would reduce impacts to

coastal bluff morning glory to a level considered less than significant pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation Monitoring: Prior to issuance of building or grading permits, the applicant shall prepare and submit a covenant or easement, in a form satisfactory to County Counsel, to create the preserve for species that could be impacted by development. The document shall be recorded prior to occupancy of any of the Meadow Cluster units. PRMD shall not permit issuance of grading or building permits until the biologist who prepared the report for this project confirms in writing that the impacted species have been protected as described in this mitigation measure.

Comment IV.a.4.: Point Reyes Checkerbloom. No Impact. Point Reyes checkerbloom is a CNPS List 1B.2 species, indicating that it is “fairly endangered” in California. It has no state or federal status. Two populations of Point Reyes checkerbloom have been identified in the freshwater marshes on the project site. The eastern population of this plant had been previously identified by biologist G. Snyder in 1998 and was recorded by CNDDDB as Occurrence No. 30. Point Reyes checkerbloom will not be impacted by the Proposed Project. It is only found in wetlands mapped on the project site and the Proposed Project will not impact any wetlands. To ensure that there are no impacts to wetlands and to species living in wetlands, a buffer 100 feet in width will be established along the periphery of all wetlands. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are expected to occur to this species.

Mitigation Measure IV.a.4: None Required.

Comment IV.a.5.: Little Green Sedge. No Impacts. Little green sedge is a CNPS 2.3 species, indicating that it is “not very endangered.” It has no state or federal status. Little green sedge will not be impacted by the Proposed Project. It is found within the area of the project site that will be preserved as the 7.08 acre Black Point and Bihler Point Preserve Areas. Therefore no significant adverse impacts are expected to occur to this species.

Mitigation Measure IV.a.5.: None Required.

Comment IV.a.6.: Monarch Butterfly. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. In California, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) treats the migration/overwintering habitats of monarch butterflies as sensitive. Impacts to occupied roost habitat for this species would be regarded as a potentially significant adverse impact. This impact could be mitigated to a level considered less than significant pursuant to CEQA.

Mitigation Measure IV.a.6.: To date, no overwintering monarch butterflies are known to use the project site for roosting. Some groves of trees, especially those on the northern portion of the project site, constitute suitable roosting habitat. As this butterfly is a mobile species that changes its roosts from year to year, it could move onto the project site in the future. In order to avoid impacting roosting monarch

butterflies, a preconstruction survey shall be conducted prior to any tree removal in the fall and/or winter months to ensure that this butterfly remains unaffected by the Proposed Project. If any roost is found, it shall be preserved within a 300-foot protection buffer through the end of the spring of the year the site is developed. Construction after this period would not affect this butterfly as it would have left the roosting site in the late winter and early spring. The Mitigation Measures prescribed above, when implemented, would reduce project impacts to potentially occupied roost habitat for the monarch butterfly to a level considered less than significant.

Mitigation Monitoring: Prior to the overwintering period, the biologist for the applicant shall survey the site and submit a letter to the PRMD project planner certifying that no Monarch butterflies are present at the site. If butterflies are present, work shall be diverted to areas where butterflies are not present and shall not resume until the biologist certifies that the butterflies have moved on.

Comment IV.a.7.: Nesting Raptors. Less than Significant With Mitigation.

Suitable nesting habitats for red-tailed hawk, red-shouldered hawk, white-tailed kite, and osprey occur on the project site. All four of these raptors (that is, birds of prey) are protected pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (50 CFR 10.13). In addition, their nests, eggs, and young are protected pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, 3800, and 3513. Finally, the white-tailed kite is also a fully protected species under California Fish and Game Code (Section 3511), and CDFG regards the osprey as a California species of special concern. Any substantial project-related impacts to these species would be considered a significant adverse impact. No nesting raptors (birds of prey) have been identified on the Proposed Project site during raptor nesting surveys that were conducted in March and May of 2007; however, these raptors have been observed foraging over the site. As such, impacts to nesting raptors are regarded as potentially significant. This impact could be mitigated to a level considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure IV.a.7.: Since raptor nests, eggs and young are protected pursuant to Fish and Game Code, nesting surveys will be conducted 30 days prior to commencing any earth-moving activity or tree removal if this work would commence between February 15th and August 31st. The raptor nesting surveys shall include examination of all trees on the project site and within 500 feet of the entire project site, if possible, and not just trees slated for removal. All stick nests shall be examined and all tree cavities shall be examined for evidence of nesting raptors.

If nesting raptors are identified during the surveys, the dripline of the nest tree will be fenced with orange construction fencing (provided the tree is on the project site), and a 300-foot radius around the nest tree must be staked with bright orange lath or other suitable staking. If the tree is adjacent to the project site then the buffer shall be demarcated per above where the buffer occurs on the project site. The size of the buffer may be altered if a qualified raptor biologist conducts behavioral observations and determines the nesting raptors are well acclimated to disturbance. If this occurs, the raptor biologist shall prescribe a modified buffer that allows sufficient room to prevent undue disturbance/harassment to the nesting raptors. No construction or

earth-moving activity shall occur within the established buffer until it is determined by a qualified raptor biologist that the young have fledged (that is, left the nest) and have attained sufficient flight skills to avoid project construction zones. This typically occurs by August 1. This date may be earlier than August 1, or later, and would have to be determined by a qualified raptor biologist. This mitigation would reduce impacts to nesting raptors to a level considered less than significant.

Mitigation Monitoring: Prior to the raptor nesting period, the biologist for the applicant shall survey the site and submit a letter to the PRMD project planner certifying that no raptor nests are present at the site's affected construction areas. If such bird nesting areas are present, work shall be diverted to areas where the birds are not nesting and shall not resume until the biologist certifies that the birds have moved on.

Comment IV.a.8.: Nesting Passerine Birds. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. Nesting passerine birds (that is, perching birds) could be affected by the Proposed Project. Birds and their nests are protected under California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503, 3503.5), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Impacts to nesting birds, their eggs, and/or young from the Proposed Project would be *potentially significant*. This impact could be mitigated to a level considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure IV.a.8.: In order to avoid impacts to common nesting birds, a nesting survey shall be conducted 15 days prior to commencing with construction work if this work would commence between March 1 and September 1. If common (that is, not special-status) passerine birds (that is, perching birds such as Steller's jays, chestnut-backed chickadees, and dark-eyed junco) are identified nesting on the project site, tree removal/grading activities within 75 feet of the nest site shall be postponed until it is determined by a qualified ornithologist that the young have fledged and have attained sufficient flight skills to leave the area. Typically, most passerine birds can be expected to complete nesting by July 1st, with young attaining sufficient flight skills by early July. This Mitigation Measure would reduce impacts to common nesting and special-status bird species to a level considered less than significant.

Mitigation Monitoring: Prior to the nesting period, the biologist for the applicant shall survey the site and submit a letter to the PRMD project planner certifying that no active nests are present at the site's affected construction areas. If such bird nesting areas are present, work shall be diverted to areas where the birds are not nesting and shall not resume until the biologist certifies that the birds have moved on.

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

_____ X _____

Comment IV.b.: Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Communities. No Impacts.

There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive habitats present on site that would be impacted by the Proposed Project. There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive habitats present on site that would be impacted by the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure IV.b.: None Required.

- 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 IV.c.: Waters of the United States/State. No Impact. M&A conducted a wetland delineation on the project site mapping all potential waters of the United States that would be regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Similarly, M&A mapped all wetlands on the project site that meet the California Coastal Commission definition of wetlands under the California Coastal Act. The Corps confirmed their jurisdiction over 2.23 acres of wetlands and 0.08 acres of "other waters of the U.S." on the project site. No isolated wetlands were mapped by the Corps. The Proposed Project establishes 100 foot protective buffers from the outside edge of all wetlands. As such, the Proposed Project will not impact waters of the U.S., waters of the State, or wetlands that meet the California Coastal Commission definition of wetlands.

Pursuant to the Clean Water Act, authorization for the Proposed Project will not be required from the Corps and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board. As there is a Local Coastal Plan, which was amended to be consistent with the Sonoma County General Plan and was certified by the California Coastal Commission on December 12, 2001, jurisdiction over mapped California Coastal Commission wetlands falls to the Sonoma County Permit Resource Management Department (PRMD). M&A's map of wetlands on the project that meet the California Coastal Commission definition of wetlands is attached as exhibit to this application. As there will be no impacts to California Coastal Commission jurisdictional wetlands, a permit is not required from the Sonoma County PRMD for impacts to wetlands that would be regulated pursuant to the California Coastal Act.

Mitigation Measure IV.c.: None Required.

- 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 IV.d.: Migratory Wildlife Corridors. Less Than Significant. The project site does not support a significant regional or local wildlife corridor. While there is an abundance of local common wildlife that moves freely on and through the project site, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to their movement corridors. The project design incorporates wildlife-friendly design standards that will continue to allow wildlife movement through the project site. Small clusters of building units will be constructed with large open spaces between each cluster. Wildlife friendly fencing, without cross fencing, will be used in all natural areas of the development allowing. These measures will ensure that the project site continues to provide minor local wildlife corridors.

Mitigation Measure IV.d.: None Required.

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

_____ _____ _____ X

Comment IV.e.: County General Plan and Ordinances: No Impact. The Proposed Project will not conflict with policies of the Sonoma County General Plan or the Sonoma County Ordinances that protect trees. Policy OSRC-7I of the General Plan requires the identification, preservation and protection of native trees and woodlands in the design of discretionary projects. No native trees or woodlands will be removed by the Proposed Project. Several Monterey cypresses and Monterey pine trees along the southern project site boundary and in the parking lot will be removed. These trees are not native to Sonoma County. The Sonoma County Heritage or Landmark Tree Ordinance (Chapter 26D, Sonoma County Code) protects trees that have been designated as heritage or landmark trees by the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors. No heritage or landmark trees occur on the project site. Thus, the Proposed Project will not impact trees protected by Sonoma County policies or ordinances.

Mitigation Measure IV.e.: None Required.

- 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 IV.f.: Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plan or Other Conservation Plan. No Impacts. The project site is not located within a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or other conservation plans. Implementation of the Proposed Project would therefore not be in conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plan or other conservation plans. Pursuant to CEQA, there would be no impact.

Mitigation Measure IV.f.: None Required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Preface

A Cultural Resource Study was completed in August 2008 by Tom Origer & Associates (“Origer 2008”). Previous on-site surveys identified several prehistoric archaeological sites and two historic barns in the project area. Three of the archaeological sites are in the developable portion of the property. Three previously recorded prehistoric archaeological sites mapped within the northeast portion of the property could not be relocated. Three previously recorded archaeological sites are CA-SON-876, CA-SON-877 and CA-SON-2258.

Site CA-SON-2258, which is situated at the Sea Ranch Lodge on the northern Sonoma County coast, was first recorded in 1998 by Holman and Associates. Following its discovery, it was determined that the site was vulnerable to alteration from proposed development. Consequently, a portion of the site area was investigated as reported by Bieling (1999).

Bieling found that the investigated portion of CA-SON-2258 was marked by darkened site matrix that extended from the ground surface down approximately 100 centimeters; however, archaeological materials extended even deeper to approximately 150 centimeters in non-midden soils. Archaeological materials at the site included projectile points, bifacial tools, core and core tools, flake tools, a grinding slab, a pitted stone, chert and obsidian debitage, and other stones that may have been tools, but they generally lacked definite attributes of use. Hydration band analysis indicated that the site was occupied from approximately 160 to 6,650 years before present. Bieling (1999:68) suggested that the site occupants subsistence relied on terrestrial game, and that the use of marine and plant resources was inferred. The site occupants had connections with interior groups as suggested by the presence of non-local obsidian specimens at the site. From a management perspective, Bieling (1999:51, 68) discussed past alterations to the site area. From the early historic period use of Black Point (Bihler Landing) to load and unload schooners through development of the Sea Ranch Lodge, near surface soils have been disturbed. Evidence was found that at least some portions of the site area down to approximately 40 centimeters had been disturbed (Bieling 1999:38).

Recent plans for improvements at the Sea Ranch Lodge indicate that portions of site CA-SON-2258 not previously investigated by Bieling (1999) are now within places where construction will take place, which required further investigation of a broader portion of CA-SON-2258. The Origer 2008 investigation resulted in findings similar to those reported by Bieling (1999). The site area is marked by darkened soils nearest the existing lodge while away from the lodge the soils are lighter brown in color. Archaeological materials extended down to approximately 150 centimeters; however, careful examination of the site matrix demonstrated that downward movement of archaeological materials took place due to displacement by burrowing animals (e.g., gophers). Primary site deposit extend from the ground surface down to approximately

100 centimeters. Below that depth archaeological specimens were present only in krotovina (i.e., gopher burrows filled with the site matrix). A similar set of archaeological specimens was recovered, and they date to the same approximate time range as reported by Bieling (1999).

The extensive subsurface investigations at CA-SON-2258 also revealed evidence of disturbance to the cultural deposit. Historical maps show structures situated within or adjacent to the site boundaries and trails or roads criss-crossing the site. Construction of the Sea Ranch Lodge in the mid-1960s may have resulted in greater subsurface disturbance than impacts caused during the Historic Period.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in 15064.5?	_____	_____	__X__	_____

Comment V.a.: Historic Resources. Less Than Significant. The archaeologist completed a literature search, historical evaluation and surveyed the Project Site. The historic activities document a sequence of changes in land use over a period of 150 years.

Review of mapping shows no boundaries at the current location of the lodge until 1978 (as stated by the NWIC); therefore, no further study is recommended by the archaeologist and there is no potential for impacts to historical structures.

Mitigation Measure V.a.: None Required.

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	_____	__X__	_____	_____
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	_____	__X__	_____	_____

Comment V.b. and d.: Subsurface Cultural Resources. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. The Origer 2008 investigations found that use of the site spanned over 5,000 years approximately 7,500 to 200 years ago. CA-SON-2258 appears to be

a site used for a limited set of activities, primary of which was the manufacture and/or repair of chipped stone tools such as projectile points and knives.

Mitigation Measure V. d.: The Origer 2008 report concludes that further investigation of the site would likely yield redundant information; therefore, impacts from reconstruction of the Sea Ranch Lodge renovation will be mitigated with the provision that a representative of the Kashia tribe and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to monitor construction activities that involve disturbance of the earth. Examples of soil disturbing actions include grading, trenching, landscaping. Notify PRMD if potentially important archaeological discoveries are made during monitoring, those discoveries shall be protected, evaluated and impacts mitigated prior to construction resuming at the place of discovery.

Mitigation Monitoring: Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall furnish evidence of a contract with a qualified archaeologist and a representative of the Kashia Pomo tribe for construction monitoring services. PRMD staff shall not issue grading permits until such contracts are provided.

- c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

_____ _____ X _____

Comment V.c.: Paleontological. Less Than Significant. The geotechnical engineer evaluated the site and determined that it is unlikely that any significant/unique fossil types will be found in the terrace deposits or underlying conglomerate and altered basalt. However, as a qualified archaeologist will be onsite during construction (per Mitigation Measure V.d. and d.), should a paleontological resource be uncovered the resource would be protected.

Mitigation Measure V.c.: None

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Preface

The project proposes units in the South Cluster 85 feet from the bluff top.

The applicant's geology and soils report, prepared by Cleary Consultants, Inc., includes materials from the January 2006 "Site Assessment for Onsite Wastewater System, Sea Ranch Lodge Expansion System Plan," prepared by Fall Creek Engineering, Inc. (FCE) and available published geological references for this area.

Several site visits were conducted during the interval from April to June, 2007, by the consultants. Stereographic aerial photographs of the site vicinity covering the period from 1965 to 1996 were also reviewed.

Existing Conditions

The subject property consists of approximately 52 acres along the northern California coast in Sonoma County. The property lies within the California Coastal Range Geomorphic Province, which is characterized by a series of northwest trending mountain ranges and valleys running nearly parallel to the San Andreas Fault system. The Sonoma coastline in this portion of the geomorphic province typically has an uplifted, wave-cut marine terrace bench of Quaternary age overlying much older and more resistant marine sedimentary and altered igneous rocks.

The bedrock unit found beneath the marine terrace deposits over a majority of the project site is the Stewarts Point Member of the Late Cretaceous age Gualala Formation, with the portion of the property north of Black Point underlain by the Jurassic age Black Point Spilite (an altered basaltic rock). A steep south dipping inactive fault separates the two rock units at the southern terminus of Black Point Beach. The Gualala Formation consists of marine conglomerate, sandstone and mudstone sedimentary rock types; as discussed further in this report, conglomerate is the primary rock unit exposed along the shoreline portion of the property.

The sandstone, mudstone and conglomerate strata of the Stewarts Point Member, which also forms the hills to the east of Highway 1, has northwest trending bedding and dips 25 to 70 degrees to the southwest, as shown on published geologic maps covering the site vicinity.

Thickly bedded, moderately fractured blocky sandstone conglomerate capped by terrace deposits forms the 70-80 foot high near-vertical cliffs above the ocean on the west side of the lodge. Conglomerate bedrock also forms the two seaward projecting peninsulas to the west of the project where the overlying terrace materials have been eroded away. Conglomerate outcrops were observed on the hill slope located above the Lodge about 30-feet east of Highway 1. North of Black Point, closely fractured altered basalt bedrock forms the 50-60 foot high cliffs above Black Point Beach, which

extends for about one mile to the north. The basalt exposed in the bluff face is closely fractured, and steeply inclined shallow wedge and tabular block failures have developed along intersecting joint planes which daylight out of the slope.

The conglomerate and basalt are overlain on the bluff face by variable thicknesses (approximately 5-20) feet of terrace deposits consisting of horizontally stratified, cross-bedded fine to coarse silty sand with thin pebbly gravel layers. A several foot thick dark gray silty sand topsoil layer overlies the terrace deposit materials on the bluff top exposures. The marine terrace is a wave-cut platform that is a product of regional tectonic uplift and sea level changes.

Erosional shoreline features of marine terraces including sea caves, sea stacks and arches can be found to the west of the subject property within the conglomerate rocks. The amount of erosion is controlled by external forces such as wave energy, tidal range, beach protection, climate, and storm events. The structural integrity, presence of groundwater and the strength of the rocks forming the cliffs are also important erosional constraints. Undercutting is common in less resistant materials underlying more resistant materials resulting in cave and arch features. In general, the altered basalt forms a continuous steeply inclined face under sea attack due to its high degree of fracturing, i.e., such as Black Point Beach, in comparison to the more blocky and durable conglomerate rock which erodes more slowly and forms seaward projections such as Black Point.

Intermittent seeps were observed at the base of the marine terrace during site visits, apparently resulting from lateral movement of seasonally perched groundwater on the wave-cut conglomerate and basalt bedrock surface, which is believed to slope gently westward. This water plays a role in the previously described shallow wedge and block failures observed on the slope face within the underlying bedrock. Seepage within the bedrock itself was not observed.

Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk or loss, injury, or death, involving:				
	a.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 the Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			_X_	
		___	___		___

Comment VI.a.i.: Faulting and Seismicity. Less Than Significant Impact. The site is located within a tectonically active area that is dominated by the San Andreas Fault system. The San Andreas Fault, the primary fault within this system, separates the northwest moving Pacific Plate (west of the fault) from the North American Plate which lies to the east. In Northern California, movement on the San Andreas fault system is distributed across a complex system of predominantly strike slip, right lateral, northwest trending active faults which in this region include the Maacama, Point Reyes, Rodgers Creek, Collayomi, and the San Andreas faults, among others.

The San Andreas fault is located approximately 1.2 miles to the east of the Sea Ranch Lodge. The Maacama, Point Reyes, Rodgers Creek, and Collayami faults are located approximately 26 miles northeast, 35 miles southwest, 37 miles southeast and 37 miles northeast, respectively, of the subject property.

Blake mapped a concealed fault trace beneath the terrace deposits in the northern portion of the property; the fault, which dips approximately 45 degrees southward and strikes roughly east-west, is visible on the cliffs below the property. This fault does not show evidence of displacement during Quaternary Time and is considered to be inactive.

No active faults are known to exist on or in close proximity to the site, and the site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone as defined by the State of California. The closest Earthquake Fault Zone boundary for the San Andreas fault is approximately 0.8 miles northeast of the lodge, encompassing a short discontinuous mapped fault segment which is located about 0.9 miles northeast of the lodge. The main trace of the San Andreas fault lies about 1.2 miles northeast of the lodge. Therefore, the potential for on-site surface fault rupture is considered very low. However, similar to other locations along the Sonoma County coastline, the property is likely to be subjected to strong ground shaking during the design life of the project from an earthquake originating on the San Andreas or another active fault in the Northern California region, a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure VI.a.i.: None required.

	a.ii.	Strong seismic ground shaking?				
			___	__X__	___	___

Comment VI.a.ii.: Seismic Shaking. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. USGS Open-File Report 03-214 predicts a 62 percent chance of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake during the 30 year period from 2002 to 2031 on one of the active faults which exist within the greater San Francisco Bay Area. The study estimates a 21 percent chance of such an event occurring on the San Andreas Fault during this period. It is likely, therefore that the property would experience an earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater in the next 25 years; the intensity and duration of shaking of such an event would depend on the fault on which the earthquake originated and its distance from the

site. The maximum predicted earthquake on the 1906 trace of the San Andreas fault has a moment magnitude of 7.9 and estimated peak ground acceleration at the site of .71g.

Mitigation Measure VI.a.ii.: The project structures shall be designed to meet the most current California Building Code standards for earthquake resistant construction, and to mitigate any potential geologic hazards to less than significant, construction shall follow the recommendations contained on Pages 22 through 35 of the Geotechnical Investigation dated July 2008 prepared by Cleary Consultants, Inc.

Mitigation Monitoring: The applicant shall submit a copy of the Geotechnical Investigation dated July 2008 prepared by Cleary Consultants, Inc., and any applicable site specific addenda to the PRMD plan check section with the construction drawings for the project. PRMD staff shall not approve the building permit for issuance until all of the applicable recommendations are included on the construction drawings.

	a.iii.	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefactions?			
			___	__X__	___

Comment VI.a.iii.: **Liquefaction and Other Seismically-Induced Ground Failures. Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which saturated, cohesionless soils located close to the ground surface lose their strength during strong seismic shaking. Such soils can experience horizontal and vertical movements which exceed the range of movements which buildings can tolerate. Soils which are most susceptible to liquefaction are clean, loose, saturated, uniformly graded, fine-grained sands and silts which occur within roughly 50 feet of the ground surface.

The geotechnical investigation for the planned new construction prepared in July, 2008, determined that the loose to medium dense sand layers encountered below the groundwater table (10-12 foot depth) in the borings which were drilled in the general locations of the areas planned for development were potentially susceptible to liquefaction. As recommended in the Geotechnical Report, the new buildings will be supported on mat slab foundations as a means of mitigating the effects on the structures of possible differential settlement resulting from liquefaction.

Lateral spreading, lurching, ground cracking, and landsliding can occur in soils which are susceptible to liquefaction and seismically induced ground densification can occur in clean loose dry sands as a result of strong seismic shaking. The likelihood of lateral spreading, lurching, ground cracking and landsliding is considered to be low based on the gentle slope gradients at the site and the limited thickness and granular composition of the terrace deposits. The potential for seismically induced "dry soil" settlement of the clean sand layers encountered above the groundwater table was analyzed in the Geotechnical Study and determined to be one-half inch maximum; and reworking of the upper soils under the building foundations will be performed as discussed in the Geotechnical Report, which will further reduce

theoretical settlement. Accordingly, the likelihood of building distress resulting from earthquake induced soil densification is considered very low.

Mitigation Measure VI.a.iii.: See VI.a.ii above.

Mitigation Monitoring: See VI.a.ii above.

Structures shall be designed in strict adherence with current standards for earthquake resistant construction.

	a.iv.	Landslides?
		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Comment VI.a.iv.: Landsliding. Less Than Significant. Huffman and Armstrong mapped the property within an area where there is a decreased hazard of slope stability, or Zone Bf, described as "locally level areas within hilly terrain; may be underlain or bounded by unstable or potentially unstable rock materials. The likelihood of large scale seismically-induced landsliding is considered to be low based on the gentle slope gradients and the dense granular nature of the terrace deposits; however, shallow landsliding and local bluff failures could occur on the steeply inclined cliffs during a seismic event.

Mitigation Measure VI.a.iv.: No Mitigation Required.

b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

Comment VI.b.: Erosion. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. Slumping, erosion and shallow landsliding were observed on the upper portion of the bluff within the marine terrace; and the portion of the slope underlain by terrace deposits has an overall grade approaching 2:1(horizontal to vertical) on the bluff face. The largest slope failure extends about 80-feet back from the face in the vicinity of the stairwell at Black Point Beach, and is about 100 feet across. This 20-25 foot deep active slump appears to have resulted from the concentration of seepage in the terrace sands near the slope face. An older landslide scar, roughly 50 feet across by 75 feet in length, is located on the bluff several hundred feet below the lodge; the thick hedgerow bordering the south property line next to Sea Walk Drive hides this feature. A low, roughly 100-foot wide by 150-long swale area of potentially lower stability was observed 50-75 feet west of the lodge on the surface of the marine terrace; the 1967 aerial photographs suggests there was originally a drainage gully at this location which has been filled in.

The development has been adequately set back from the areas of shallow landsliding and erosion. However, the potential exists for some erosion unless mitigated by the following measures:

Mitigation Measure VI.b.: While the potential for erosion of the surface soils on the project site as described in the Sonoma County soil survey is generally slight to moderate, any permanent slopes resulting from grading shall be protected against erosion through the use of erosion resistant vegetation and jute netting. Slopes shall be graded so that water is directed away from the slope face and runoff from new impervious improvements shall be carried in closed pipes or lined conveyances to suitable non-erodible discharge locations.

Mitigation Monitoring: PRMD staff shall not release the building permit for issuance until the above erosion control measure, and others that may be specified by the Drainage Review section of PRMD, are shown on the grading plans for the project.

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 VI.c.: Other Geologic Considerations. Less Than Significant.

Regional Uplift

The Gualala Block, which forms the northernmost segment of the Pacific Plate west of the San Andreas fault, is undergoing long term uplift as well as right lateral transform movement. Tectonic uplift rates in the project vicinity have been estimated to range from 0.24 meters per thousand years at Fort Ross to 0.58 meters per thousand years, or approximately two inches per 100 years, at Sea Ranch.

Bluff Erosion

Review of stereographic aerial photographs of the Sea Ranch property covering the period from 1967 to 1996 indicate the rate of bluff retreat from attack by the ocean is slow, and it is difficult to discern changes in the shoreline over this time period on the large-scale contact prints. Griggs, 2003, notes that the sedimentary and volcanic rocks forming the cliffs on the interval of coast line between Point Arena and Fort Ross (where the San Andreas Fault goes inland) are less extensively faulted and folded than Franciscan Formation rocks which lie north and south of this interval; and *"although information is limited, apparently few erosion problems exist along this rugged, undeveloped coast, and many of the rocky points have shown insignificant change over the past century."*

An engineering geologic report of erosion rates and repair measures for ten bluff top locations experiencing erosion at Sea Ranch suggests an erosion rate of 2-3 inches per year ranging up to 5-6 inches per year is occurring along the bluffs. The conglomeratic rocks (Ks) forming the Black Point and Bihler Point seaward projections on the west end of the property are more resistant to wave activity than the more fractured basaltic rocks (Ksb) which begin immediately north of Black Point and underlie Black Point Beach. Occasional joint-controlled wedge and translational failures, ranging from

blocks a few feet across up to 10-15 feet across, within the well-jointed and highly fractured basalt were observed on the steep rock face above Black Point Beach at the northerly end of the property (vicinity of the stairwell). Long term weathering and the recession of the steep rock portion of the bluff appears to be controlled by jointing.

According to the Fall Creek Engineering Water Balance Report (Appendix I-2, and Cleary Consultants Inc letter dated August 12, 2008), the increased hydraulic gradient resulting from the planned leachfield system during the seasonal period when it is receiving treated wastewater "will not result in significant increased groundwater flows to the bluff based on the minor (two foot) mounding of the water table resulting from the new installation and the distance to the bluffs (700 feet or more). Therefore, we further conclude that the new wastewater disposal system will not cause increased slumping or erosion of the bluffs".

Sea Level Rise

Another geological consideration over the life of the project is the rise of ocean levels and the corollary impact on bluff erosion. Studies prepared by the Pacific Institute for the California Coastal Commission show limited effect from a one meter sea level rise because of the height and geology of the bluffs, as discussed above. See maps at http://www.pacinst.org/reports/sea_level_rise/maps/

Mitigation Measure VI.c.: None Required.

d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creative substantial risks to life or property?
----	---

	___	___	__X__	___
--	-----	-----	-------	-----

Comment VI.d.: Expansive Soils. Less Than Significant. The USDA Soil Conservation Service (SCS) Soil Survey for Sonoma County (1972) primarily maps two soil types on the property; the Baywood loamy sand (BaC), 2-9 percent slopes, and the Rohnerville loam (RrC), 0-9 percent slopes. The Baywood loamy sand (BaC) forms in wind-modified sandy coastal plain sediments and soft sandstone and consists of somewhat excessively drained loamy sand. Permeability on this soil type is rapid, runoff is very slow to slow and the hazard of soil blowing is moderate. The Rohnerville loam (RrC) is found along coastal terraces. Permeability on this soil type is moderately slow, runoff is slow to medium and the hazard of erosion is slight to moderate.

The Baywood loamy sand, which is mapped over the portion of the property to the south of the seasonal wetland, is classified (SCS, 1972) as a non-plastic silty sand with a low shrink-swell potential. The Rohnerville loam, which is mapped on the northeast portion of the property in the area of the seasonal wetlands, and northward, is similarly classified as a lean sandy clay or sandy silt with a moderate shrink-swell potential. The descriptive information provided in the FCE report for the upper soils encountered in their investigation is consistent with the Baywood sandy loam classification provided in

the SCS report. Based on the above information and on-site observations, the risk to foundations, slabs, pavements and other project improvements from the standpoint of expansive soil shrink-swell movement is considered to be low at this time, a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure VI.d.: None Required.

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

	___	___	__X__	___
--	-----	-----	-------	-----

Comment VI.e.: **Support of Septic Tank and Leachfield Disposal System. Less Than Significant.** The limitations (SCS, 1972) of the Baywood sandy loam for septic tank leachfields are classified as slight to moderate and the series is classified within Hydrologic Group A defined by the SCS as "*Soils which have a high infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted. These soils have a high rate of water transmission and low runoff potential. They are deep, are well drained or excessively drained, and consist chiefly of sand, gravel, or both.*" The FCE wastewater treatment process includes a new multi-stage advance wastewater treatment system (or package plant) with treated effluent to be disposed into shallow (four foot deep) leachfield trenches (27 total) within the primary field which will be installed on the west side of Highway One. An expansion field will be located immediately west of the primary field. During the non-rainy season, treated effluent will be reused as landscape irrigation around the buildings by means of a shallow drip dispersal system. FCE estimates that groundwater mounding on the order of two feet due to the leachfield operation will result during the winter due to continuous full Lodge occupancy over a 150-day period.

The proposed new primary and expansion leachfield trenches will be located at least 700 feet from the bluff, which is a significantly greater setback from the bluff frontage above Black Point Beach than the existing disposal system below the lodge. The existing leachfield, currently located below the existing lodge, will be abandoned. The proposed on-site waste water disposal system is unlikely to result in landsliding or surfacing of the treated effluent on the terrace landform based on the existing gentle slope gradients, the anticipated uniform west-sloping wave-cut terrace basal contact with the bedrock, and the granular nature and high relative density of the horizontally stratified marine terrace silty sand and fine gravelly materials. The bluff down slope of the leachfield could experience increased seepage along the contact with the bedrock at the base of the terrace materials. However the slumping and local failures observed on the upper slope face are unlikely to change significantly from current conditions since the groundwater effects are expected to be minor. These are not potentially significant impacts because new leachfield development is set back at least 700 feet from the bluff face.

Mitigation Measure VI.e.: None Required.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Preface

Hazardous materials are substances which can harm people or the environment. These materials can impair human health if contacted, ingested, or inhaled. Contacts which expose people and wildlife to harm occur when such substances are encountered in soil, groundwater, surface water, or air, or when operations associated with specific land uses are deemed hazardous processes. Such processes are classified as hazardous because of materials they use or because of the potential for fires or explosions to occur at the facilities.

Would the Project:

- | | Potentially
Significant
Impact | Potentially
Significant
Unless
Mitigation
Incorporated | 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? | _____ | _____ | __X__ | _____ |

Comment VII.a.: Transport Hazardous Materials. Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction and operation of the Sea Ranch Lodge Expansion would not use the amounts of hazardous substances that would be considered hazardous to the public or environment. The project would include facilities that would house small amounts of materials considered hazardous (e.g., swimming pool, cleaning supplies, propane, etc.). Due to the small amounts of such materials and existing regulations which govern the use and handling of such materials, no significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measure VII.a.: None Required.

- | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 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 VII.b.: Upset. No Impact. Hazardous materials that could create significant environmental impacts would not be present on, or transported to and from, the Proposed Project. Operation of the facilities would not be expected to release such material either accidentally or in an emergency.

Mitigation Measure VII.b.: None Required.

- 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 VII.c.: **Proximity to Schools. No Impact.** There are no educational facilities located within four miles of the Proposed Project. As explained above, no acutely hazardous materials, substances or wastes would be emitted from the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure VII.c.: None Required.

- d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 56862.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

_____ _X_

Comment VII.d.: **Hazardous Materials Sites. No Impact.** Review of the State Department of Toxic Substances Control Hazardous Waste and Substances Site list compiled under Government Code Section 65962.5 (otherwise known as the Cortese list) and conversations with representatives from the County Hazardous Materials Division, indicate that the project site contains no hazardous materials with the exception of diesel storage (for the emergency generators). These facilities are relatively modern and are therefore not considered by Sonoma County's Hazardous Materials Division as a posing a significant hazard to the public on the environment.

Mitigation VII.d.: None Required.

- 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_

- 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?

_____ _X_

Comment VII.e. and f.: **Airport Safety Hazards. No Impact.** The Sea Ranch Airport is located over two miles from the project site on top of the main ridge between the

coastal shelf and the Gualala River basin; therefore, no impact will occur. Aircraft would not normally fly over the project site during take-offs and landings.

Mitigation Measure VII.e. and f.: None Required.

- g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan emergency excavation plan?

_____ _____ _____ __X__

- h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas of where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

_____ _____ _____ __X__

Comment VII.g. and h.: Emergency Evacuation or Wildland Fires. No Impact.

The site will not interfere with any emergency evacuation plans nor is it near any wildland area that would be subject to fires; therefore, no impact is expected.

Mitigation Measure VII.g. and h.: None Required.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

A comprehensive Hydrology and Water Quality report, prepared by Fall Creek Engineering (FCE) provides details that support this section of the Initial Study.

The project site is dominated by grassland, with a 2.23 acre wetland located in its central portion and a small spring/wetland on the southwest portion of the site near the old barn. Trees have been planted along the boundaries of the site to provide wind-breaks. Drainage of the site is referable to five drainage areas, which are shown in Figure 3 of the Attachment C-2. The drainage area surrounding the wetland swale (Drainage I) is 14.5 acres. The swale also receives runoff through two culverts from a 17.1 acre off-site area. Runoff here passes to the ocean through a channel with a floor eroded about 10 feet into the surrounding terrain. The drainage area surrounding the smaller wetland near the old barn (Drainage IV) is 6.5 acres. Here the runoff flows over the ocean bluff through a small erosion scar. Drainages II (7.4 acres), III (6.0 acres), and V (8.0 acres) do not focus runoff into clearly defined streams; any runoff generated on them moves as sheet flow or shallow concentrated flow to the ocean bluffs and into the ocean.

Five soil types were mapped on the site. All elements of the Proposed Project will occur on the Baywood loamy sand soil type (BaC). This soil type is assigned to hydrologic group A, which designates soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These are typically well- to excessively-well-drained sands having a high rate of water transmission. The erosion hazard on this soil is slight. The runoff coefficient for grass-covered terrain on this soil and appropriate to the 10-year storm is 0.19; for the 25-year storm it is 0.23; and for the 100-year storm it is 0.30. Portions of the BaC terrain covered by trees are assigned runoff coefficients of 0.09, 0.18, and 0.28 for 10-, 25-, and 100-year storms respectively.

The 14.5 acre on-site portion of drainage Area I embraces four soil types: RrC (59%), BaC (25%), KnD (8%), and KnE (8%). This drainage area also receives runoff from 17.1 acres off site, which flows into the on-site portion through two 18-inch culverts beneath State Highway 1. The off-site acreage is entirely on soil type KnE. The appropriate runoff coefficients for grass-covered soil type RrC are 0.24, 0.28 and 0.35. For grass covered KnD, runoff coefficients of 0.27, 0.31, and 0.38. The corresponding coefficients for grass-covered KnE are 0.31, 0.35, and 0.42 were used.

Drainage areas II, III, and IV are all entirely on site and are situated on soil type BaC. Drainage area V has 8 on-site acres on soil type BaC and also receives runoff through a culvert under State Highway 1 from 10.9 off-site acres on soil type KnE.

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

_____ X _____ _____

Comment VIII.a.1. and f.1.: Water Quality. Less Than Significant With Mitigation.

Construction Period Water Quality Impacts

Site grading will render soils susceptible to the erosional forces of runoff. The eroded sediments could be deposited in the Drainage Area IV designated wetland. This would be a short-term significant impact, if not mitigated.

The preliminary project plans show that site grading will be required in Drainage Area IV at locations from which runoff will reach the designated wetland area. The grading referred to is for the new paved road as well as for building pad construction. The project would present a significant threat of soil erosion from soil disturbance because:

- Some of the proposed grading would occur on moderately steep (5 to 10%) slopes.
- Extensive grading will be required to construct the proposed roadways and building pads, thus exposing surface and sub-surface soils to the erosional forces of runoff.

Soil erosion can cause numerous types of environmental impacts. Eroded soil contains nitrogen, phosphorous, and other nutrients. When these nutrients are transported to water bodies, they can trigger algal blooms that reduce water clarity, deplete oxygen, and create odors. Excessive deposition of the sediment in streams may blanket fauna. The increased turbidity from the erosion may also reduce the photosynthesis that produces the food supply in natural aquatic habitats. Deposition of sediments from project-induced erosion could interfere with the natural flow of storm water, cause flooding where it would not otherwise occur, aggravate downstream flooding conditions, or accelerate channel erosion. The sum of soil erosion effects during project construction could be a significant water quality impact, if not mitigated.

In addition to soil erosion, the improper use or accidental spillage of fuel, hydraulic fluid, or other construction-related fluids could contaminate on-site wetlands. This would be a significant impact, if not mitigated.

Mitigation Measure VIII.a. and f.: The following Mitigation Measures would reduce project construction-related water quality impacts to less-than-significant levels:

1. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall file with California Regional Water Quality Control Board North Coast Region a Notice of Intent (NOI) to comply with the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (General Permit). This is a feature of the NPDES regulations. The Project Applicant must also comply with the requirements of the permit to minimize pollution to storm water discharge during construction activities. The General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP must meet the following objectives related to construction activities:
 - All pollutant sources, including sources of sediment that may affect storm water quality associated with construction activity shall be identified;
 - Non-stormwater discharges related to construction activity shall be identified;
 - Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be identified, constructed, implemented, and maintained in accordance with a time schedule. The maintenance schedule shall also provide for maintenance of post-construction BMPs.

The BMPs shall include a variety of “housekeeping” measures to prevent pollution from building materials, chemicals and maintenance during construction of the development and infrastructure. Examples of typical “housekeeping” measures to be included in the SWPPP include the following:

- Performing major vehicle maintenance, repair jobs, and equipment washing at appropriate off-site locations;
- Maintaining all vehicles and heavy equipment and frequently inspecting for leaks;
- Designating one area of the construction site, well away from streams or storm drain inlets, for auto and equipment parking and routine vehicle and equipment maintenance. This site shall be illustrated on the Grading Plans;
- Cleaning-up spilled dry materials immediately. Spills are not to be “washed away” with water or buried;
- Using the minimum amount of water necessary for dust control;

- Cleaning-up liquid spills on paved or impermeable surfaces using “dry” clean-up methods (e.g. absorbent materials such as cat litter, and/or rags);
- Cleaning-up spills on dirt areas by removing and properly disposing of the contaminated soil;
- Reporting significant spills to the appropriate spill response agencies;
- Storing stockpiled materials, wastes, containers and dumpsters under a temporary roof or secured plastic sheeting;
- Properly storing containers of paints, chemicals, solvents, and other hazardous materials in garages or sheds with double containment during rainy periods;
- Placing trash receptacles under roofs or covering them with plastic sheeting at the end of each workday and during rainy weather;
- Washing-out concrete mixers only in designated on-site wash-out areas where the water will flow into settling ponds or onto stockpiles of aggregate or sand. Whenever possible, the wash-out water will be recycled by pumping back into mixers for reuse. The wash-out water is not to be disposed of into the street, storm drains, drainage ditches, or streams;
- Applying concrete, asphalt, and seal coat during dry weather. Keeping contaminants from fresh concrete and asphalt out of the storm drains and creeks by scheduling paving jobs during periods of dry weather and allowing new pavement to cure before storm water flows across it;
- Covering catch basins and manholes when applying seal coat, slurry seal and fog seal; and,
- Parking construction equipment over drip pans or absorbent materials, to capture dripping oil and/or other possible pollutants.

Also required under the General Permit is the development and implementation of a Monitoring Program. The Monitoring Program shall include inspections of the construction site prior to anticipated storms and after actual storms. During long-lasting storms inspections shall be made during each 24-hour period. The inspections are used to identify areas contributing to storm water discharge to evaluate the effectiveness of BMPs and to determine whether additional BMPs or corrective maintenance are needed. All corrective maintenance and BMPs shall be made as soon as possible (provided working conditions are safe), and all necessary equipment, materials, and workers shall be available for rapid

response. The SWPPP shall also include post-construction storm water management practices. Post-construction water quality impacts are mitigated under Mitigation Measure VIII.e.

2. The Project Applicant shall obtain a County General Grading Permit for all components of the project from the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. The Grading Plan shall adhere to Uniform Building Code and County of Sonoma requirements and shall employ sound construction practices. The total amount of grading on the project site shall be minimized, and the amount of development and grading for sloping areas of the project site shall be reduced. Pier foundations shall be used for structures where this could substantially reduce construction grading.

3. The Project Applicant's Drainage Plan shall include a County-approved Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to minimize the impacts from erosion and sedimentation during construction of all elements of the project. This plan should conform to all standards adopted by the County. Many elements of the Drainage Plan would overlap with the SWPPP. This plan should include application of BMPs, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - Site construction practices including restricting grading to the dry season, specifying construction measures that minimize exposure of bare soil to rainfall, winterization, traffic control, and dust control;
 - Existing wetlands and the riparian setback shall be delineated on the final map as well as on the construction plans;
 - Designing the access roads to use the minimum amount of grading necessary. Road grading and construction within 100 feet of all streams, wetlands, and major drainages shall be completed by October 15 during the year(s) of construction, and erosion control measures shall be installed by that date;
 - Using soil stabilization techniques such as straw mulching, hill slope benching, erosion control matting, hydroseeding, revegetation, and preservation of existing vegetation to protect all finished graded slopes from erosion;
 - Weed-free straw or mulch shall be used to cover bare soils during and after construction, and areas shall be landscaped and revegetated as soon as possible after disturbance. Straw or straw bales used for erosion control shall be certified weed free prior to use on the site, in order to prevent invasive weeds from entering the site;
 - Protecting downstream receiving drainage channels and storm drains from sedimentation and retaining sediment on the project site by using silt

fencing, straw bale sediment barriers, and drop inlet sediment barriers, diversion dikes and swales, sediment basins, and sediment traps; and

- After each phase of construction is completed, all drainage culverts and the downstream receiving channels shall be inspected for accumulated sediment. Where sediment has accumulated, these drainage structures shall be cleared of debris and sediment.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure VIII.a./VIII.f. would reduce both short-term construction impacts to water quality and permanent impacts to water quality to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Monitoring: The Project Applicant would be responsible for obtaining coverage under the NPDES General Permit prior to commencement of construction. To obtain coverage, the Project Applicant must file a NOI with the NCRWQCB. In addition, coverage under this permit shall not occur until the Project Applicant develops an adequate SWPPP for the project. The Project Applicant would also be responsible for obtaining County permits. The Project Applicant shall submit a copy of the NOI, SWPPP, and Erosion Control Plan to the County with the grading permit applications. PRMD shall not issue grading permits until the NOI, SWPPP, and Erosion Control Plan are presented and confirmed to be adequate.

- b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with ground water recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (i.e., 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 VIII.b.: Groundwater Supply. No Impact. The Proposed Project will rely upon municipal supply from the Sea Ranch Water Company, and not alter the quantity of water stored in any aquifer on- or off-site. Neither will it substantially alter the quantity of water discharging from an aquifer on- or off-site.

Mitigation Measure VIII.b.: None Required.

- c. Substantially alter the existing drainage patterns 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 offsite?

_____ _X_____

Comment VIII.c.: Erosion. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. The project will cause an increase in amount of impermeable cover as a result of roofs, roadways, paths and parking. Increased impermeable cover will potentially increase runoff from these

site improvements potentially causing localized erosion and sedimentation. Although the development is clustered, the majority of runoff will not be collected in a centralized storm water collection system. Runoff will be managed in small landscaped based drainage systems that will be designed to dissipate the runoff rates, so that runoff will not be erosive.

Impermeable and Semipermeable Surfaces. Existing structures and paved roads, paths, and parking lots are counted as impermeable surfaces and are assigned a runoff coefficient of 0.95 (for all storms). Gravel and dirt paths and patios for the new guest units are counted as semipermeable surfaces and are assigned a runoff coefficient of 0.65. The percentages of impermeable and semipermeable surfaces in the different drainage areas, both pre-project and post-project, are shown in Table VIII-1 from the Fall Creek Engineering study (Attachment D to this Initial Study).

**TABLE VIII - 1
 Pre-Project and Post-Project Percentages of Area Covered by
 Impermeable and Semipermeable Surfaces, by Drainage Area**

Drainage Area		I	II	III	IV	V
Existing Impermeable		%	%	%	%	%
Structures		0.00	0.00	0.00	2.93	2.58
Parking (paved)		0.83	0.00	0.00	1.44	9.82
Paths (paved)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	1.45
Existing Semipermeable						
Paths (gravel/dirt)		1.79	3.21	3.82	2.06	1.80
Existing Runoff Coefficient		0.222	0.205	0.209	0.227	0.274
Proposed Impermeable						
Structures		0.30	4.60	0.59	5.38	4.93
Parking (paved)		0.83	0.00	0.00	3.30	13.67
Path (paved)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.58
Proposed Semipermeable						
Patios & Pathways (gravel/dirt)		0.47	1.56	0.27	6.08	1.33
Proposed Runoff Coefficient		0.218	0.233	0.197	0.278	0.312
Percentage Change in Runoff Coefficient						
		-1.80	13.65	-5.74	22.47	13.87

Stormwater discharge through the various drainages may be expected to change in direct proportion to the change in runoff coefficient if mitigations are not implemented. Increased stormwater discharge would be attended by increased erosion.

Mitigation Measure VIII.c.: The potential impacts associated with increases in impermeable surfaces and stormwater runoff can be mitigated by incorporating and implementing drainage controls engineered to reduce the velocity of runoff, retain, and/or detain stormwater runoff. The Project Applicant shall prepare for the review and approval by the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, a drainage plan (including appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic information), which minimizes changes in post-development runoff volume, peak flows, and velocities, as compared with pre-development conditions. The design calculations shall demonstrate that the post-development ten-year runoff would not exceed pre-development runoff levels. Examples of applicable BMPs include the following:

- Use of permeable pavements and/of green roofs to promote infiltration and minimize runoff;
- Cisterns, infiltration trenches and basins to infiltrate roof runoff and/or parking areas; and,
- Small bioretention swales or stormwater detention facilities to capture and regulate off-site runoff.

The Drainage Plan shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and in conformance with the Sonoma County Water Agency's Flood Control Design Criteria. All on-site drainage facilities shall be constructed according to the Sonoma County Water Agency's Flood Control Design Criteria and the County of Sonoma Permit and Resource Management Department's standards and requirements.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure VIII.c, would reduce project impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Monitoring: Prior to Building or Grading Plan issuance the Project Applicant shall submit evidence of approval of the Drainage Plan by the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. County staff shall not issue grading or building permits until ensuring that the recommendations of the Drainage Plan have been incorporated into the Construction Drawings.

- 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 VIII.d.: Increased Runoff and Flooding. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. See VII.c.

Mitigation Measure VIII.d.: The mitigations achieved with Mitigation Measure VIII.c. will reduce project impacts from increased runoff and potential flooding to less than significant.

Mitigation Monitoring: Prior to Building or Grading Plan issuance the Project Applicant shall submit evidence of approval of the Drainage Plan by the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. County staff shall not issue grading or building permits until ensuring that the recommendations of the Drainage Plan have been incorporated into the Construction Drawings.

- e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

_____ X _____

Comment VIII.e.: Runoff and Water Quality. Less Than Significant With Mitigation.

The project will result in increased runoff and may contribute to water quality degradation, if Mitigation Measures are not incorporated.

Mitigation Measures VIII.e.: Mitigation Measures VIII.a. and VIII.c. will reduce project impacts from increased runoff to less than significant. Non-point source water quality impacts from the project will be mitigated with an overall Storm Water Runoff Control Program. Under the General Construction Permit the Project Applicant must develop and implement a SWPPP. The SWPPP includes BMPs for storm water management during and following the construction phase of the project. Mitigation Measure VIII.a, discusses the management practices applicable to construction. The SWPPP shall also include the following in its discussion of post-construction pollution control measures:

- Identify specific types and sources of storm water pollutants associated with the Proposed Project development and land use activities;
- Identify the location and nature of potentially significant water quality impacts; and,
- Specify appropriate permanent control measures to be incorporated into overall site development and design/management guidelines to eliminate any potentially significant impacts to receiving water quality from storm water runoff.

Control measures should incorporate such things as vegetated buffer strips, vegetated swales, water quality detention basins, site development restrictions, and other design or source control management practices, as appropriate, to mitigate potential adverse

seiche, or mudflow, as the site is not located in a flood zone, near a levee, or dam, or near locations that would expose it to a seiche, or mudflow.

Tsunamis, or sea waves, which are generated by submarine volcanic, landslide or earthquake activity, can travel long distances at speeds up to 500 miles per hour. As tsunamis reach shallow water, they slow down and grow in wave height. Tsunami concerns are considered minor as Armstrong and Huffman (1980) indicates a tsunami wave run-up of 20 feet while the bluffs in the project vicinity area a minimum of 50 feet high.

Mitigation Measure VIII.i. and j.: None Required.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	_____	_____	_____	__X__

Preface

Sonoma County General Plan designation for this site is R&VSC (Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial) and the Coastal Plan designation is Visitor Serving Commercial, both of which allow lodging. The Coastal Plan zoning is CT-CC (Commercial Tourist-Coastal Combining) for the entire property.

Comment IX.a.: Division of Community. No Impact. The Proposed Project is located on a site that already has a similar use and this project would only expand that use from 20 to 60 units and add some visitor serving amenities (spas, pool, etc.). As a result, expansion construction of the Sea Ranch Lodge would not physically divide an established community.

Mitigation Measure IX.a.: None Required.

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?	_____	_____	__X__	_____
---	-------	-------	-------	-------

Comment IX.b.: Consistency With Local Plans. Less Than Significant .

The project is subject to the recently updated County General Plan (GP2020, adopted September 23, 2008, and applicable to discretionary projects submitted after September 23, 2007.) The lodge property is designated as RVSC-Recreation and Visitor Serving Commercial. The Proposed Project is consistent with the purpose of this designation to provide a site for outdoor recreation and the commercial service needs of visitors and travelers. The Permitted Development Intensities and Criteria provide that structures and parking are not to cover more than 50 percent of the site, and the proposed project uses approximately 10 percent of the total site. While several proposed structures exceed in the 24-foot commercial height limit of the

Coastal Zoning Ordinance, the LCP provides that additional height may be considered if a reduction in coverage is provided that results in no overall increase in building intensity. Design Review is required for commercial and recreational development.

The Sea Ranch is part of the Sonoma Coast/Gualala Basin Planning Area. General Plan 2020 observes that residences, “originally planned as second homes, including Sea Ranch and Bodega Harbor, are now increasingly occupied by permanent residents....The Land Use Plan projects 3,283 new residents for this area, resulting in a population of 11,700. The greatest gains in employment are associated with the recreation and tourism industries....Increased tourism may result in an imbalance between local and tourist oriented commercial growth. Visitor serving uses, particularly lodgings, are often located near scenic resources. Too many facilities in sensitive scenic areas may harm the unique qualities of the coast that are protected in the Coastal Act and Local Coastal Plan.”

The following Objectives from General Plan 2020 apply to this project:

Objective LU-12.3: “Designate Bodega Bay the major retail and service center for the Coast. Permit limited opportunities for new commercial activities in the Sea Ranch in keeping with their size and character.”

Objective LU-12.4: “In the Coastal Zone, limit the scale of any new visitor and tourist oriented uses and confine them to existing communities and locations that are designated for such uses. Assure that they are compatible with and protect the area’s natural, undeveloped scenic character. Avoid these uses outside of the Coastal Zone except in the RVSC and Agricultural designations.”

There are no Special Area Policies that apply to the Sea Ranch Lodge site, however, Policy LU-12g provides the following general requirement: “Design discretionary projects in any commercial or industrial categories in harmony with the natural and scenic qualities of the local area. Give natural landscapes precedence over man made features.”

COMMENT: As will be discussed below regarding the Local Coastal Plan conformance, and as previously discussed in the Aesthetics section above, the project substantially complies with these General Plan 2020 land use policies and objectives.

The application requests a Use Permit, Design Review approval, and a Coastal Permit, which is appealable to the California Coastal Commission. Design Review will be conducted by the County as provided by the County’s Local Coastal Plan (LCP). The project is consistent with the General Plan and Coastal Plan to include lodging for 40 new units and the associated uses, including renovation of the existing lodge. The County’s LCP provides, in part, at page 196, Section 17, for the addition of “up to 100 lodge units” (i.e., up to a total of 120 units) on the Sea Ranch Lodge property. Since the Coastal Plan was updated in 2001, this reference to 100 lodge units is in addition to the existing 20 lodge units.

Individual projects in the Coastal Zone are measured against the policies of the LCP. The Coastal Plan's Visual Resources section describes Sonoma County's coast as:

“beautiful, rugged and varied. A typical coastal cross-section west to east would show ocean with a rocky intertidal zone, steep vertical bluff, coastal terrace, hillside, and ridge. The landscape is divided by the Gualala and Russian Rivers, and by numerous creeks and gullies with riparian vegetation, and by coastal villages and independent subdivisions.

The beauty and accessibility of Sonoma County's coast have made it a heavily used tourist and recreational area. A survey of travelers prepared as part of the Highway 1 Capacity Study revealed that for the majority of travelers, sight-seeing is the primary purpose of the trip to the Sonoma Coast. **The goal of the Visual Resources section is to prevent blockage or degradation of scenic views and to assure that development is compatible with the existing natural and man-made landscape.”**

There are numerous policies in the LCP that apply to the project, and they are listed below. But in general, the standard is that set forth above: prevent blockage of scenic views and assure compatibility of development with the existing natural and man-made landscape. To that end, the project as currently configured substantially complies with the policies set forth below. The original February 2008 submittal did not, and the story poles placed in the fall of 2008 showed that from the Black Point beach access parking lot, the buildings in the meadow completely blocked any view of the water. The applicant reconfigured those units, set lower rooflines, and created a view corridor that allows a view of Black Point, the destination of the beach access. On the way, one walking the trail will still be looking at some sod roofs and lodging units.

Applicable text and policies of the published LCP follow with their 2001 LCP Part I document page numbers in parentheses. The entire document is available online at <http://www.sonoma-county.org/prmd/docs/lcp> .

Visual Resources (p. 167)

“Scenic Corridors. The primary impression of any area comes from what is seen while driving, cycling, or hiking along a roadway. One of the most effective methods of protecting visual resources is to protect scenic corridors along a system of scenic roads.

Designated scenic corridors in the General Plan are Highway 1,

Major Views. Major views are long views of unique visual interest, focus, or variety. Major views are abundant along Sonoma County's coast and include islands, rock headlands, coves, lagoons, estuaries, riverways, expansive beaches, white water, and historic settings.

Vista Points. Vista Points are roadside areas suitable for parking with exceptional views. Designated vista points should be developed with safe ingress and egress, parking areas, interpretive signs, and restrooms where appropriate. The view shed from a vista point is even more sensitive than a major view since the viewer is stopped and can take full advantage of the

visual experience.” [Although not formally designated as such, the Black Point beach access is considered a Vista Point for purposes of this analysis because it fits the definition of one.]

COMMENT: As noted in the discussion of Aesthetics above, the impact of the proposed development on the overall site is considered to be subordinate, although the impact on the scenic views from the Black Point parking lot and trail is considered to be less than significant with mitigation.

Landforms (p. 168)

“Terraces. Terraces are the broad, level areas between coastal hills and bluffs. They are generally covered with grasses and sometimes dotted with trees or divided by windbreaks. Lines are horizontal except where trees create a vertical influence and break up the open landscape. Terraces are particularly visually sensitive. Appropriate terrace uses are agriculture and recreation.”

COMMENT: A substantial portion of the terrace is left in open space to be used for passive recreation.

Structural and Community Features (p. 169)

“The Sea Ranch. For over 100 years this spectacular ten-mile stretch of the Coast was used by sheep ranchers who added to it only the cypress windbreaks on the lower meadows west of Highway 1. Oceanic Properties bought the 5,200 acre Del Mar Ranch in 1963, intending to create a low density residential community where development would have a minimum impact on the natural environment and would blend harmoniously with it. To some extent these goals have been achieved under the design guidance of The Sea Ranch Review Committee.

“Design Review Guidelines apply to all development at The Sea Ranch and include the following provisions:

1. Homes are sited to take advantage of natural landforms and vegetation while preserving views from neighboring lots.
2. Buildings are clustered in some areas to achieve screening and greater open space.
3. Landscaping is informal and utilizes indigenous plant materials.
4. Roof slopes are governed by a roof slope direction plan to achieve building to building unity.
5. Sea Ranch homes tend to be simple and dramatic with no roof eaves.
6. Natural wood exteriors and shake roofs or suitably colored asphalt shingles are strongly encouraged.

7. Property line fences are discouraged; fences are used primarily for screening parking areas, service yards and trash areas.

The overall effect is of subdued, modern structures at times very well integrated with the existing landforms and vegetation. The strict design approach will be even more important as The Sea Ranch builds out.”

COMMENT: The project has been reviewed by The Sea Ranch Design Committee, which has indicated its preliminary approval of the design location and height of buildings in a letter dated February 25, 2009. The project incorporates The Sea Ranch architectural vernacular and is therefore consistent with these policies.

VISUAL RESOURCE POLICIES

View Protections (p. 173)

- “1. Prevent development (including buildings, structures, fences, paved areas, signs, and landscaping) from obstructing views of the shoreline from coastal roads, vista points, recreation areas, and beaches.
2. Prohibit development which will significantly degrade the scenic qualities of major views and vista points.
3. Except in rural community and urban service areas, require a minimum setback of 100 feet from the right-of-way along scenic corridors and greater where possible. However, permit a 50-foot setback when sufficient screening exists to shield the structure from public view. Where the General Plan policies and standards are more restrictive than the above standards, development shall comply with the General Plan or Coastal Plan policies, whichever are more restrictive, provided that no development shall be approved which does not comply with Coastal Plan policies.” [Note: The Sea Ranch Lodge is located within an Urban Service Area.]

COMMENT: The project is designed to avoid fully obstructing views by keeping rooftops low enough that travelers along Highway 1 can see over them to the ocean and the horizon. The redesign of the project to open up a view corridor from the Black Point parking lot reduces the impact on that view to less than significant. Nevertheless, the impact on the Black Point trail is considered to be significant unless mitigated as set forth in Section 1a.

Landform Guidelines (p. 174)

6. Minimize the visual impacts of development on terraces by:

Prohibiting development in open fields in rural areas,

Minimizing the number of structures and clustering them near existing natural or man-made vertical features.

Designing structures to be in scale with the rural character of the region.

COMMENT: The lodge property is in an Urban Service Area, and therefore not considered “rural”. The project contains fewer units than allowed by the Local Coastal Plan, thereby minimizing the number of structures, which are grouped into clusters. The bulk and height of the structures in the meadow are in keeping with other residential units in The Sea Ranch, and the lodge/restaurant and Fireside Building are consistent with the height of neighboring structures and the original lodge itself, which is now non-conforming as to height.

Natural Landscape Compatibility (p. 175)

“9. Locate and design development to fit the setting and to be subordinate to the pre-existing character of the site.”

COMMENT: As discussed in the section on Aesthetics, the project’s buildings can be considered to be subordinate to the pre-existing character of the site because of the heights relative to Highway 1, the sod roofs of the Meadow Cluster, and the screening of the new lodge building by existing hedgerows.

Community Compatibility (p. 175)

“10. Design structures to be compatible with existing community characteristics.

11. Relate structures in size and scale to adjacent buildings.

12. Locate and design all development to minimize the impacts of noise, light, glare, and odors on adjacent properties and the community at large.”

COMMENT: As noted above, The Sea Ranch Association’s Design Committee has given its preliminary approval to the project, indicating consistency and compatibility with The Sea Ranch standards, which define the community.

Utilities (p. 175)

“13. Require that all new distribution line extensions be placed underground.”

COMMENT: All utilities are proposed to be underground, therefore the project is consistent with this policy.

Vegetation (p. 175)

“14. Discourage the removal of significant trees except through legitimate logging operations.

15. Locate and design new development to minimize tree removal.
16. Prohibit removal of windbreaks unless required because of the disease.
17. Prohibit the planting of vegetation west of Highway 1 which could block coastal views.
18. Encourage the use of appropriate native plants for landscaping. A Native Plant List for the Sonoma County Coast will be made available at Sonoma County PRMD.

COMMENT: The project incorporates native plants, retains and enhances the hedgerows, and does not include landscaping that would block coastal views except to reinforce existing hedgerows that screen the main lodge area.

Design Guidelines (p 178)

- “21. Require compliance with community design guidelines, when applicable, or the overall Coastal Zone Design Guidelines.
- “22. Apply Coastal Zone Design Guidelines to all new coastal zone development in areas described in 19. and 20. except Bodega Harbour subdivision and The Sea Ranch. The guidelines apply to Bodega Bay town with the amendments described in 26.”
- “25. Coastal Zone Design Guidelines

“General. Design and site structures to preserve unobstructed broad views of the ocean from Highway 1 and to minimize visual impacts. Cluster structures to the maximum extent feasible.

“Height. Limit residential building height to 16 feet west of Highway 1. However, an increase in height, to a maximum of 24 feet, is permissible if (1) the structure is no higher than 16 feet above the corridor route grade directly across from the building site, and (2) the structure will not affect views to the ocean or be out of character with surrounding structures.

“Limit building height to 24 feet east of Highway 1. However, an increase in height to a maximum of 35 feet is permissible if (1) the structure is no higher than 24 feet above the corridor route grade directly across from the building site, and (2) the structure will not affect water views, or be out of character with surrounding structures.

“Height for residential structures is measured as the vertical distance from the average level of the highest and lowest point of that portion of the lot covered by the building to the topmost point of the roof. (See Figure VII-11.) Where these requirements conflict with the height, site, and bulk criteria of Appendix B (Bane Bill), for those properties listed, the requirements of Appendix B shall be followed.

“Bulk. Keep buildings in scale with their natural and man-made setting.

“Siting. Utilize natural landforms and vegetation for screening. Minimize the alteration of natural landforms caused by grading, cutting, or filling. Prescribe building envelopes for lots west of Highway 1 in Timber Cove and other appropriate areas.

“Building Materials and Color. Use natural materials and earth colors which blend with the vegetative cover of the site unless the building is a historic reproduction, in which case colors should be in keeping with the historic style. Encourage use of non-reflective exterior surfaces. Encourage composition shingle and shake roofs in harmonizing colors with the building exterior. Dark colors are preferred. Discourage tar and gravel roofs. Discourage metal window frames unless they are bronze anodized aluminum or baked enamel. Encourage dark and non-reflective driveway materials. To maintain natural drainage flows, the use of impervious material should be minimized.

“Architectural Form. Encourage traditional architectural styles of the coast in older development areas and contemporary styles in newer subdivisions. Encourage pitched roofs and relate roof slopes to existing nearby buildings. Relate the architectural shape and style of new buildings to existing nearby structures and natural features. Design accessory buildings to be consistent with the main building architectural character, materials, and finishes.

“Landscaping. Use indigenous plant materials in areas visible from public roads. Protect existing vegetation where possible. Utilize plant materials to integrate the man-made and natural environments and to screen and soften the visual impact of new development. Use landscaping to screen parking areas from public view. Landscape, grade, and fill areas as soon as possible to minimize soil erosion.

“Fences. Discourage property line fences to minimize visual disruption of the natural terrain. Design fences as extensions of the main house. Materials should be the same as, or complimentary to, the building. Six-foot fences are intended to be used only for screening of service yards, etc., and for privacy purposes.

“Commercial. Design buildings which are compatible with the predominant design of existing buildings in the area and are of wood or shingle siding. Buildings should employ natural or earth colors, and use pitched, non-reflective roofs unless they are historic reproductions. Require that exterior lighting be functional, subtle, and architecturally integrated with the building style, materials, and colors. Limit maximum height to 24 feet unless the greater height will not have effect on coastal views and there are overriding considerations. Height for commercial structures is measured as the vertical distance between the average level of the highest and lowest point of that portion of the lot covered by the building to the topmost point of the roof. Screen parking areas from view through use of plantings, design, and siting.”

28. **The Sea Ranch.** Continue to enforce The Sea Ranch Design Guidelines, incorporating the specified Height, Site, and Bulk Criteria provided for in Section 30610.6 (d) of the Public Resources Code. If a proposed residence does not meet the Height, Site and Bulk Criteria, the County may issue a variance as allowed in the adopted Height, Site and Bulk Criteria.

COMMENT: The project has received preliminary approval from The Sea Ranch Design Committee, thus indicating conformance with The Sea Ranch design standards and community character. The policy noted above also indicates that height for commercial structures can exceed the 24-foot limit, and the applicant has applied for a Variance to do so.

“Traffic Constraints [p. 189] The Coastal Act required that coastal development not reduce the capacity of Highway 1 so that recreational travel is impaired. The Coastal Plan traffic study [January 1980, by JHK & Associates, of Emeryville, CA.] identifies projected highway capacity deficiencies at The Sea Ranch and it recommends intersection improvements along Highway 1 to increase highway capacity.”

COMMENT: The 1979-80 Coastal Plan Traffic Study projected an average daily trips (ADT) of The Sea Ranch at build-out at 5,103 to 6,318 ADT if it were predominately a retirement community and 7,400 to 9,160 ADT if it were predominately a resort community. The Sea Ranch is now substantially built out, with perhaps 500 of approximately 2,300 units to be constructed, many with problems finding septic system percolation. Current ADT per Caltrans website for the peak month in summer range from 4,300 to 5,200.

Policies

The Sea Ranch (p. 195)

“17. Allow Oceanic Properties, Inc. 300 additional residential units and up to 100 lodge units on the conditions that:

Fifteen percent of the total 300 are constructed affordable housing units.

Intersection improvements at Highway 1 and Halcyon, Deer Trail and the Lodge entrance are constructed as recommended in the Transportation section.

Two accessways in Units 34-A and 36 are improved as recommended in the Access section.

Sites which would accommodate 100 units for the purpose of transfer programs are designated.”

COMMENT: The 45 affordable housing units were constructed by Burbank Housing and are now occupied. While the improvements at Halcyon and Deer Trail have been constructed, the left turn lane at the lodge has not, however, the applicant is not proposing its full entitlement to additional 100 lodge units and the traffic study prepared for the project concludes that a left turn lane is not warranted at this time because traffic volumes have not approached those contemplated in the 1980 study. The accessways in Units 34-A and 36 have been constructed. The Transfer Site has been designated.

POLICIES FROM TRANSPORTATION SECTION

Highway 1 Safety, Capacity and Access Improvements (p. 164)

8. Provide turn lanes at the following Sea Ranch intersections:
Priority I (short range 0-5 years): The Stables and North Recreation Center entrance, Annapolis Road, Longmeadow Road, Moonraker and Whalebone Reach.

Priority II (Oceanic implementation if and when additional units are constructed in potential development areas and at the Lodge, when Lodge Road is relocated. Some of these roads are not yet constructed): Lodge entrance, Deer Trail and Halcyon:

Priority III (longer range 5-20 years): Leeward Spur, Deerfield Road, Breaker Reach, Vantage Road, Pine Meadow, Whitebluff Road, Headlands Reach, Navigators Reach, and Lodge Entrance and Halcyon if developer does not improve.

ACCESS PLAN DESCRIPTION AND POLICIES (p. 73)

9. Black Point Beach - Proposed

Discussion: The public is allowed to park at The Sea Ranch Lodge and walk to the Black Point blufftop across land owned by Oceanic Properties. Access includes a vehicular accessway from Highway 1 to a parking area for 10 cars, a 15-foot pedestrian easement from the parking area to Black Point Beach. The Black Point Beach access could be relocated within the "Lodge parcel" at the landowners option and expense. Use of the existing staircase is recommended. The current road access to the Lodge is considered temporary and a new entrance to the north is planned.

Policies:

County Parks shall negotiate to accept the offer of dedication or otherwise secure the designated accessway. If, within one year from the date of the offer, County Parks has not so acted, the offer shall be available to another appropriate public agency.

The new entrance road to the Lodge shall be used for public vehicular access to the pedestrian accessway. Until the new road is constructed, the public shall continue to be allowed to park at the Lodge and use the Oceanic pathway. Such continued public use of present Oceanic facilities and public use of designated future public access facilities shall be a condition of any additional development by Oceanic, including but not limited to the development identified in Policy VII-17. [See above, p. 195]

A staircase to Black Point Beach shall be constructed.

COMMENT: These policies from the 2001 Local Coastal Plan update were carried over substantially verbatim from the 1980 LCP and fail to acknowledge that the Black Point access has been constructed with its own access to Highway 1 instead of shared access

with the Lodge. Inasmuch as the goals of these policies have been satisfied, they are inapplicable now. Furthermore, the Circulation and Transit element of General Plan 2020 discourages new driveways. Policy CT-3h regarding Rural Arterial roads, which is how Highway 1 is designated, states: "Design Principal and Minor Arterial Roads to discourage access from abutting parcels and to prohibit such access if reasonable access is available elsewhere, to encourage driveway consolidations...."

Mitigation Measure IX.b.: None Required.

- c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

_____ _X_____

Comment IX.c.: **Habitat Conservation Plans. No Impact.** The Proposed Project would not conflict with any local, regional, State, or Federal Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan (see Section IV.f.) as there are no such plans with proximity of the project site. Therefore, no impact is identified.

Mitigation Measure IX.c.: None Required.

X. MINERAL RIGHTS

Preface

The surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975 identifies specific areas of mineral resources in the North San Francisco Bay Region including Sonoma County.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	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__
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 X.a. and X.b.: Mineral Resources. No Impact. The project does not lie within one of the listed aggregate deposits in the SMARA report as shown on Stewarts Point Quadrangle (CDMG SR 146, 1983). The site is not designated as a mineral resource site on any local general or other land use plans.

Mitigation Measure X.a. and X.b.: None Required.

XI. NOISE

Preface

Land uses in the vicinity of the project site are primarily widely spaced multi-family and single family residential properties. The noise environment at the site results primarily from vehicular traffic along Highway 1 and waves at beach and bluff. The Noise Element of the County’s General Plan indicates that commercial buildings are considered “normally acceptable” in noise environments up to 70 dBA L_{dn} . In noise environments considered to be “normally acceptable,” the specified land use is satisfactory assuming that the building is of normal conventional construction, without any noise insulation features. The existing noise environment at the project site and at nearby noise sensitive receptors is very low. The existing L_{dn} at the project site is 62 to 63 dBA, according to readings taken by the applicant’s environmental consultant. Based on traffic volumes supplied by the traffic engineers, noise levels on the site are expected to increase by less than 1dB in the future. Noise levels increases of less than 3dB are not discernable to human hearing.

The noise environment at noise sensitive receivers in the vicinity of the project site (multi-family residences to the south and single family residences to the north of the project site) is expected to be approximately 63 to 64 dBA L_{dn} in the future. Noise sources associated with the operation of the project would include vehicular traffic accessing the site, parking lot activity, and the operation of rooftop mounted mechanical equipment.

Would the project result in:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	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 XI.a.: Exposure to Noise. Less Than Significant. The noise environment at the project site is expected to be approximately 64 dBA L_{dn} in the future. The Proposed Project would be considered “normally acceptable” by the Sonoma County’s noise and land use compatibility guidelines (Table NE 2) and does not trigger the need for further study by an acoustical engineer.

Mitigation Measure XI.a.: None Required.

- b. Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

_____ _____

Comment XI.b.: Vibration. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. Vibration levels associated with construction are expected to be very low. During excavation and other heavy construction periods minor vibration may be perceptible onsite but not likely to be felt by nearby residences. Nevertheless, project construction has the potential for significant impacts that can be reduced.

Mitigation Measure XI.b.: Perceptible vibration can be kept to a minimum by use of administrative controls including:

1. Notifying neighbors of scheduled construction activities;
2. Scheduling construction activities with the highest potential to produce perceptible vibration to hours with least potential to affect nearby residences (e.g., mid-day) in order to reduce noise impacts to less than significant levels; and,
3. Pile driving shall be prohibited.
4. Post prominently at the construction site and provide residents of Sea Walk Drive, Black Point Reach, and the streets uphill of the project with the phone number of a Noise Disturbance Coordinator to whom complaints may be directed.

Mitigation Monitoring: PRMD shall not clear issuance of grading or building permits unless the above-listed mitigation measures are listed on the construction drawings.

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

_____ _____

Comment XI.c.: Ambient Noise Levels. Less Than Significant. Traffic noise generated by the project is not projected to increase noise levels by more than 1dB above the existing noise environment. With the project, vehicular traffic would continue to access the project site from its entranceways off Highway 1. The project does not propose changes in traffic that are substantial enough to provide a noticeable increase in the noise environment at the nearby residential receivers (noise level increases of less than 1 dB are not noticeable to human hearing).

Mitigation Measure XI.c.: None Required.

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

_____ X _____

Comment XI.d.: Construction Noise. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. The construction of the Proposed Project would generate noise levels that could exceed ambient noise levels at noise sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site. Construction activities would include removal of existing pavement, buildings, grading and excavation of areas on the site, and construction of new buildings or structures. Noise impacts from these activities depend on noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and length of noise generating activities, and the distance between the noise generating construction activities and receptors that would be affected by the noise. The highest noise levels would be generated during razing of buildings and grading of the site, with lower noise levels occurring during building construction. Large pieces of earth-moving equipment, such as graders, scrapers, and bulldozers, generate maximum noise levels of 80 to 85 dBA at a distance of 100 feet. Typical hourly average construction-generated noise levels are about 75 to 80 dBA measured at a distance of 100 feet from the site during busy construction periods. These noise levels drop off at a rate of about 6 dBA per doubling of distance between the noise source and receptor. Intervening structures or terrain result in lower noise levels.

The closest existing noise-sensitive land is the residential area located south and north of the site. These residences are located more than 200 feet from the nearest area of construction. Existing ambient daytime noise levels at adjacent residences range from approximately 54 to 62 dBA Leq. Construction noise levels at these locations would intermittently exceed 60 dBA Leq and existing ambient levels by more than 5 dBA when hotel cottages construction occurs on the site near the residences. At times, noise levels produced by heavy equipment may interfere with normal residential activities.

Typically, small construction projects do not generate significant noise impacts when standard construction noise control measures are enforced at the project site and when the duration of the noise generating construction period is limited to one construction season (typically one year) or less. The impact is potentially significant unless mitigated.

Mitigation Measure XI.d.3.: The following construction noise control measures are recommended to limit the amount of noise generated during the construction period. These measures would mitigate the impact to a less than significant level:

1. Construction Period Development Activity Restrictions - Contractor and/or developer shall comply with the following construction noise, dust, litter, and traffic control requirements:

- a. All construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and shall be prohibited on state or federal holidays.
- 2. Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors, generators, and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
- 3. Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.
- 4. Equip all internal combustion engine driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- 5. Locate stationary noise generating equipment as far as possible from noise sensitive receptors.
- 6. Noise from jackhammers, chainsaws, and pavement breakers used on the parking area construction site shall be shielded from nearby residences.
- 7. Designate a noise disturbance coordinator who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site. During the construction period, provide a complaint log to the PRMD.
- 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?

_____ _____ _____ X
- 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 XI.e. and f.: Proximity to Airports. No Impact. The project is not located within two miles of a public or private airport. Therefore, this is not a potential impact.

Mitigation Measure XI.e. and f.: None Required.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	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 XII.a.: Growth Inducing. No Impact. Construction and expansion of the Sea Ranch Lodge could provide a small increase in related jobs in the area. The creation of new full-time jobs will potentially result in new workers moving to the area, with a secondary increase in the demand for more housing. The magnitude of these increases would not include substantial population growth in the area. While some of the full and part time employees will move from existing facilities, those facilities will then become available for other comparable uses. The increase in construction work would be short-term and not likely to result in new workers permanently moving into the area. The increase in demand for housing as a result of new permanent employment could likely be accommodated by the normal turnover in housing in the area. Construction on the project site will be served by existing facilities and expanded onsite facilities; and therefore would not induce or facilitate unplanned or premature population growth.

Mitigation Measure XII.a.: None Required.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	___	___	___	__X__
c. Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	___	___	___	__X__

Comment XII.b. and c.: **Displacement of Housing or People. No Impact.** No housing units exist on the project site, thus none would be displaced by the project. Neither would the Proposed Project displace any existing population.

Mitigation Measure XII.b. and c.: None Required.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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 would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?</p>			_X_	

1. Fire Protection

Comment XIII.a.1.a.: Fire Protection. Demand for Service. Less Than Significant. The Fire Services Division of the Sonoma County Department of Emergency Services, the Sea Ranch Volunteer Fire Department operates the North Fire Station, located on Highway 1 (approximately four miles from the site), although this station is not manned 24/7.

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) is two miles away and is manned year-round. The captain or engineer supervise and train the Sea Ranch Volunteer Fire Department and provide full fire crews during the fire season. Response time to the site varies but is no more than 10-12 minutes.

Currently fire flow to the Sea Ranch Lodge has been measured at 640-760 gpm, which exceeds the County's Fire Safety Standards (which is 250 gpm in rural situations, as is the case along this area of the coastline). Water supply (for fire suppression) will be supplemented with on-site water storage that will be provided via the swimming pool (which will have a capacity of approximately 25,000 to 35,000 gallons). The site is located on the west side of Highway 1, making it a lower fire risk than the east side, which is closer to dense vegetation.

All of the occupied additions would be Type II, Fire Resistive, and fully sprinklered buildings. The Sea Ranch Volunteer Fire Department has indicated that the increase in demand for services associated with construction of the project would not result in the need for additional staffing of firefighters. Current facilities, equipment, staffing and emergency vehicle response times are sufficient to accommodate the anticipated increase in annual calls associated with the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure XIII.a.1.a.: None required.

2. Police Protection

_____ _____

Comment XIII.a.2.: Police Protection. Less Than Significant. The project site is within the jurisdiction of the Sonoma County Sheriff. The Sheriff provides general police protection and the California Highway Patrol provides traffic patrol on Highway 1. The beat covers the area from the County line to Jenner.

According to the Sheriff's Department representative, expansion of the Sea Ranch Lodge would not require an increased demand for police staffing or equipment, nor would it affect police response time to the site due to the Sheriff's presence in the vicinity, and the presence of the Sea Ranch Association's private security team. The Proposed Project would not lead to the need for other new or physically altered County Sheriff's facilities.

Mitigation Measure XIII.a.2.: None Required.

3. Schools

_____ _____

Comment XIII.a.3.: Schools. No Impact. Expansion of the Sea Ranch Lodge would not result in the need for new school facilities. The project will contribute to funding of local schools as the project will be required to pay local school impact fees (at the commercial rate).

Mitigation Measure XIII.a.3.: None Required.

4. Parks

_____ _____

Comment XIII.a.4.: Parks. No Impact. The Proposed Project includes an area for both active and passive recreation; therefore, no impact to recreational facilities is anticipated, other than as discussed in the Aesthetics Section above.

Mitigation Measure XIII.a.4.: None Required.

5. Other Public Facilities

_____ _____

Comment XIII.a.5.: Other Public Facilities. No Impact. No other public facilities will be required by the project.

Mitigation Measure XIII.a.5.: None Required.

XIV. RECREATION

Preface

The Sea Ranch Lodge currently has an extensive system of trails and public viewing areas. The proposal includes on-site recreational facilities for the customers (spa, yoga studio, workout room and lap pool). The county maintains a public access trail and parking lot off Highway 1

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	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 XIV.a.: Deterioration of Recreational Facilities: Less Than Significant Impact. The project, because of its commercial/tourist-orientation and as it will provide on-site amenities, there will be no substantial increase in the use of neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities that would result in these facilities deteriorating at an accelerated rate.

Mitigation Measure XIV.a.: None Required.

- 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 XIV.b.: Recreational Facilities. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. The Lodge will provide passive onsite recreational opportunities for guests in the form of indoor exercise areas (as noted above) and trails across the site. The entire site was evaluated for its constraints and all such on-site project-related recreational uses will avoid the identified constrained (drainages, wetlands, trees, etc.). As noted in the Aesthetics Section, the units of the Meadow Cluster and North Cluster could affect views from the Black Point beach access and trail.

Mitigation Measure XIV.b.: Mitigation for impacts associated with the expansion of the Sea Ranch Lodge are addressed in other sections of this Initial Study and specifically in Aesthetics Section 1.a.

XV. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Preface

W-Trans prepared a Traffic Impact Study for the Sea Ranch Lodge Expansion in September 2008. The report is included as Attachment G.

Study Area Description

Existing Conditions

The project site is located in the coastal community of The Sea Ranch, directly west of Highway 1 and south of the community of Gualala in Mendocino County. Highway 1 is a State highway that parallels the Pacific Ocean coastline in this area. It has one lane in each direction with shoulders of one foot or less near the intersection of Sea Walk Drive. The posted speed limit is 45 mph at this location, but increases to 55 mph south of Sea Walk Drive and north of Moonraker. According to data provided by Caltrans District 4, Highway 1 carries an average of about 2,800 vehicles to the north and 4,300 vehicles to the south daily on the segment between the Stewarts Point/Skaggs Springs Road intersection and the Sonoma/Mendocino County Line.

Sea Walk Drive is a striped asphalt private roadway with one lane in each direction. The private road currently provides access to the Sea Ranch Lodge and restaurant, post office and condominium units.

Sea Walk Drive/Highway 1 is a tee intersection with stop signs at the terminating approach to Highway 1. There are two travel lanes on Highway 1 with no separate turn lanes.

The study intersection along with its lane configuration is shown in Figure 1 of the traffic study appended to this report.

Traffic counts were obtained at the study intersection specifically for this report on Friday, April 13, and Saturday, April 14, 2007, and are shown in Figure 1 of Attachment G of this report. These spring traffic volumes were modified by applying a factor of 1.23 to represent the peak summer traffic levels present along this corridor. Also, since there are currently nine condominiums being remodeled on Sea Walk Drive, these vacant units were assumed to be occupied and the traffic that they would normally generate added to the existing counts.

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact
 Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact
 No Impact

- a. Cause an increase in traffic which 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 intersection?

_____ _____ X _____

Comment XV.a.: Increased Traffic. Less Than Significant. According to W-Trans: “the vehicle trip generation for the Proposed Project was estimated using standard rates published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in *Trip Generation*, 7th Edition. The trip generation potential of the project as planned was developed using the rates for a hotel based on occupied rooms (Land Use #310) as this description most closely matches the Proposed Project.

Based on the applied rates for occupied hotel rooms, at full occupancy the 60 new hotel units would be expected to generate an average of 535 trips per day, including 42 weekday p.m. peak hour trips, and 620 daily trips on weekends, with 52 trips during the midday peak hour period. At full occupancy, the expansion would therefore generate an increase of 357 weekday trips and 420 weekend trips. These results are summarized below in Table XV-2.

Based on these volumes, the existing intersection at Highway 1/Sea Walk Drive is currently operating acceptably at LOS A. The eastbound approach is operating at LOS A during the weekday p.m. peak and at LOS B during the weekend midday peak period. The Level of Service calculations are summarized below in Table XV-1 and copies are provided in Appendix A of the Traffic Study (Attachment G).

TABLE XV-1								
Summary of Existing Peak Hour Level of Service Calculations								
Study Intersection	Existing Conditions				Existing Plus Project Conditions			
	PM Peak		Midday Peak		PM Peak		Midday Peak	
	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
<i>Highway 1/Sea Walk Drive</i>	1.6	A	2.0	A	2.2	A	2.7	A
<i>Eastbound Approach</i>	9.9	A	10.1	B	10.0	B	10.5	B
Notes: Delay is measured in average seconds per vehicle, LOS = Level of Service								

TABLE XV-2 Trip Generation Summary									
Land Use	Units	Weekday		PM Peak Hour		Weekend		Midday Peak Hour	
		Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips
Hotel, occupied rooms, (LU #310)	60 du	8.92	535	0.7	42	10.5	630	0.87	52
Existing Hotel	20 du	8.92	178	0.7	13	10.5	210	0.87	17
Net New Trips			357		29		420		35

Notes: du = dwelling units

Although the existing lodge generates traffic at the intersection of Highway 1/Sea Walk Drive, these trips were not subtracted from the existing volumes in order to present a more conservative analysis.

Trip Distribution

A review of existing turning movements at the study intersection indicates that traffic entering and exiting the site from Highway 1 is divided fairly evenly between those that are coming from or returning northbound to Gualala and origins or destinations southbound to the Skaggs Spring Road intersection at Stewart's Point.

Existing Plus Project Conditions

The Existing Plus Project scenario presents an evaluation of the potential traffic impacts that are expected to occur during the weekday p.m. and weekend midday peak hours with the addition of traffic from the Proposed Project to existing traffic levels. Under these projected conditions overall operations at the intersection at Sea Walk Drive are expected to remain unchanged at LOS A for both the weekday p.m. and weekend midday peak hours. The eastbound approach is expected to change from LOS A to B during the p.m. peak period and will continue to operate at LOS B during the midday period with a slight increase in average delay time. A summary of the Existing plus Project traffic conditions is provided in Table XV-1, and copies of the calculations are provided in Appendix A of the Traffic Study (see Attachment G). The project volumes are shown in Figure1 of Attachment G. Changes in LOS associated with the increase from 20 to 60 units will not result in significant impacts per either the County of Sonoma's or Caltrans' thresholds. Therefore, project impacts are deemed to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure XV.a.: None Required.

- b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

_____ _____ X _____

Comment XV.b.: Cumulative Contribution. Less Than Significant Impact. Future traffic volumes on Highway 1 were determined from an examination of traffic volume increases over the last 10 years. The expected increase in traffic over the next 20 years was applied to the existing traffic volumes in the form of growth factor. Under these projected future traffic volumes, the Sea Walk Drive intersection is expected to continue operating acceptably overall at LOS A during both weekday p.m. and weekend midday peak hours, with no significant increase in average vehicle delay. The eastbound approach is expected to operate at LOS B during both peak periods. These Level of Service results are summarized below in Table XV-3, with copies of the calculations provided in Appendix A of the Traffic Study found in Attachment G of this report.

TABLE XV-3 Summary of Future Peak Hour Level of Service Calculations								
Study Intersection	Future Conditions				Future plus Project Conditions			
	PM Peak		Midday Peak		PM Peak		Midday Peak	
	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. HIGHWAY 1/Sea Walk	1.6	A	2.1	A	2.3	A	2.8	A
<i>Eastbound Approach</i>	10.3	B	10.6	B	10.5	B	11.1	B

Notes: Delay is measured in average seconds per vehicle, LOS = Level of Service

Future Plus Project Conditions

Future volumes with project generated traffic added indicate that the Sea Walk Drive intersection continues to operate at LOS A during the a.m. and midday peak periods. Likewise the eastbound approach will continue operating at LOS B during both peak periods, with no significant increase in average vehicle delay. A less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure XV.b.: None Required.

- 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 XV.c.: Air Traffic. No Impact. The project will not affect air traffic as this is a residential project; therefore having no impact.

Mitigation Measure X.V.c.: None Required.

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

_____ _X_____

Comment XV.d.: Increased Hazards. Less Than Significant Impact. According to the W-Trans study, the need for left-turn channelization on Highway 1 at the project intersection was evaluated based on criteria contained in the *Intersection Channelization Design Guide*, National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report No. 279, Transportation Research Board, 1985, as well as a more recent update of the methodology developed by the Washington State Department of Transportation. The NCHRP report references a methodology developed by M. D. Harmelink that includes equations that can be applied to expected or actual traffic volumes in order to determine the need for a left-turn pocket based on safety issues. Based on the applicants research and discussions with Caltrans staff, this methodology is consistent with the "Guidelines for Reconstruction of Intersections," August 1985, which is referenced in Section 405.2, Left-turn Channelization, of the Caltrans *Highway Design Manual*.

As all vehicles will access the proposed lodge units via Sea Walk Drive, 17 northbound left-turning vehicles on Highway 1 at this intersection would be expected during the weekday p.m. peak hour and 22 left-turning vehicles during the weekend midday peak hour under Future conditions with the project (approximately one trip every three minutes). Based on the analysis of left turning traffic volumes, a left turn pocket on Highway 1 is not warranted for the project intersection. Copies of the worksheets used for the left-turn lane warrant analysis are enclosed in Appendix B of Attachment G; this is considered a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure XV.d.: None Required.

- e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

_____ _X_____

Comment XV.e.: Emergency Access. No Impact. Sea Walk Drive carries approximately 600 vehicles per day on weekdays and 1,200 vehicles per day on weekends. These volumes are expected to increase to approximately 870 and 1,520 vehicles, respectively. Sea Walk Drive has a paved width of 22 to 26 feet which exceeds minimum AASHTO road width standards for similar facilities. Given the low

traffic volumes and the road dimensions which exceed minimum standards, there will be no impacts to emergency services accessing these roads.

Mitigation Measure XV.e.: None Required.

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?

_____ X _____

Comment XV.f.: Parking Demand. Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.

For the entire development, the applicant proposes to provide 131 parking spaces with an additional 17 spaces to be provided by valet double-parking for a total of 148.

Applying the standards of the Coastal Zoning Ordinance, staff calculates the hotel's required parking spaces at 159 spaces, and this analysis assumes that use of the spa and health facility will be limited to hotel guests only, and not to the public-at-large. The calculation goes as follows:

Hotel = 1 space per unit, plus 1 for the manager, or 61 spaces for 60 rooms

Restaurant = 1 space per 60 SF. With 2,865 SF of restaurant floor space, approximately 300 SF of outdoor seating next to the coffee bar, and the indoor bar area of 1,024 SF, the total of 4,189 SF of space would require 70 spaces.

Meeting Rooms = 1 per 100 SF, or 28 spaces for 2,760 SF

If meeting room usage were limited to hotel guests, then the parking would be adequate for the lodging facility. However, staff assumes that in the event of weddings or community events that draw largely on local residents, then parking may not be sufficient. The applicant could use a Transportation Demand Management program to support a reduced parking requirement. Such a program, perhaps including free monthly bus passes for employees, would likely be successful given that there is public transit available along Highway 1. In addition to the lodging facilities, the project involves the general store and post office, with approximately 1,024 SF of retail floor space and counter area. At 1 space/200 SF for retail establishments, this standard would trigger the need for an additional 5 spaces, or a total of 164 for the project as a whole.

According to County of Sonoma parking requirements in the Coastal Zoning Ordinance, there will be insufficient parking capacity to accommodate the project's peak demand, especially when an event at the Fireside Room is coupled with full occupancy of the restaurant and lodge. Valet parking can be used for all lodging and restaurant patrons to allow for "stacking" or "double parking" vehicles to off-set the deficiency of parking spaces. Based on the project parking demand, the valet parking strategy would only need to stack parked vehicles during the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m. on weekends. Weekday parking demands are not expected to exceed 120, the supply of

130 spaces; therefore, stacked parking demands are not expected on weekdays. Post office and gift shop patrons will have non-valet parking spaces available.

Mitigation Measure XV.f.: The applicant shall provide valet parking for restaurant and lodge patrons during the weekend hours of 6:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. and during day time hours when the ledge is being used for conferences, weddings, events, etc.

Mitigation Monitoring: If complaints are received regarding lack of parking, PRMD staff shall investigate. If the investigation shows that the lodge did not provide sufficient valet parking to accommodate all authorized uses, PRMD shall take the matter to the Board of Zoning adjustments for consideration of revocation of the Use Permit or modification of the conditions to achieve compliance with the objective of providing parking for all users.

- g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (i.e., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

_____ _____ X _____

Comment XV.g.: Alternative Transportation/Plans. Less Than Significant.

Regional public transportation in the study area is provided by the Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA) fixed route bus service. The MTA Route 95 operates daily between Point Arena and downtown Santa Rosa, making one scheduled morning stop at the Sea Ranch Lodge on the southbound leg of its route, and one afternoon stop (by request) on the northbound leg. Therefore, given that the project as proposed is consistent with the County's General Plan and Local Coastal Plan, provides hiking trails onsite and incorporates a bus stop, the Proposed Project will have no impact modes of alternative transportation.

Bicycle and Pedestrian

There are no existing bicycle lanes or sidewalks within in the study area. Highway 1 has narrow shoulders and high travel speeds, generally leaving inadequate room for bicycle or pedestrian use. Sea Walk Drive, which serves as an entrance to the Sea Ranch Lodge, serves any bicycle or pedestrian needs within the existing pavement shared with vehicle traffic. This activity is acceptable given the rural setting, low traffic volumes and slow vehicle speeds. Within the study area there are hiking trails that provide access from the existing Sea Ranch Lodge entrance to the coastal headlands and beach area.

Mitigation Measures XV.g.: None Required.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	_____	_____	__x__	_____

Comment XVI.a.: Wastewater Treatment. Less Than Significant. The Sea Ranch Lodge presently operates a restaurant, bar, store and a hostelry with 20 guest rooms. Wastewater from these activities total about 7,200 gallons per day (gpd) during the summer months and less during the winter.

The Lodge expansion plans are projected to increase the daily average and peak wastewater flows to approximately 9,594 and 15,990 gpd. The increased wastewater flows will require a more advanced wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system. The following discussion is based upon an analysis by Fall Creek Engineering, included as Attachment D to this study, dated August 20, 2008.

In general, the proposed on-site wastewater system improvements will include the installation of a new collection system, a multi-stage biological wastewater treatment system (employing two-stage trickling filters, a vegetated treatment system, a filtration and UV disinfection unit). Treated effluent will be disposed in two separate systems a shallow pressure dosed leachfield system during the rainy season and into a subsurface drip dispersal system during the irrigation period. The proposed layout of the system is presented in Figure 11 of Attachment D-2.

The wastewater system improvements will include new pumping systems, and other electro-mechanical equipment. All pumping systems will include duplex pumps that will provide for system redundancy and reduced equipment run time. All electro-mechanical equipment will have a back up power supply to assure continued operation during power outages. The wastewater system will also include a system control and data acquisition (SCADA) system to allow for both local and remote operation, monitoring and alarm capabilities to inform the system operator of any potential problems.

The Proposed Project will include a multi-stage advance wastewater treatment system (or “package plant”). The proposed treatment system will be designed to meet tertiary level treatment standards to reduce the biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), total suspended solids, and total nitrogen to less than 10 mg/L for all three parameters. The

treatment system will also include a filtration and disinfection system to reduce the total fecal coliform levels below 23 MPN/100 ml.

The planned facility will utilize a multi-stage biological treatment system to reduce BOD, TSS, and total nitrogen and a physical unit processes (filtration and ultra violet disinfection unit) for reduction of total coliform bacteria.

The biological treatment system will utilize a combination of aerobic and anaerobic unit processes to reduce organic matter (BOD and TSS) and to nitrify, denitrify and remove the total nitrogen (TN) levels in the wastewater. The proposed treatment system will include a conventional two-stage trickling filter system to reduce BOD, TSS, and to reduce a portion of the TN. Effluent from the two-stage trickling filter will be filtered and discharged to a vegetated treatment system (FloraFilter) that will utilize both submerged and emergent aquatic plants to further reduce the BOD, TSS and TN levels in the water. Final effluent from the FloraFilter will be filtered and disinfected using a UV disinfection system prior to be discharged to either shallow pressure dosed leachfields and shallow drip dispersal system.

Two-Stage Trickling Filter

Two-stage trickling filters are recognized as advanced biological treatment system that are designed to reduce BOD, TSS and TN to a high level. The system uses a combination of aerobic and anaerobic treatment processes to treat the wastewater. Raw sewage (influent) enters a primary anaerobic dual chamber tank. A pump system is installed in the second chamber and a recirculation valve is installed in the first chamber. Settled effluent from the primary tank is pumped to the first-stage trickling filters (which would include two filter beds operating in parallel). The trickling filters are filled with plastic media substrate that allows for a fixed film of biological organism to grow and process the waste products in the influent. A single engineered high-capacity, non-clogging spray nozzle is installed above the filter bed to provide equal distribution of wastewater over the media. The pumps are controlled using a programmable logic controller (PLC) that turns the pumps on and off based on a prescribed time interval.

The proposed on-site wastewater system would include two subsurface disposal systems: a shallow pressure dosed leachfield system to accept treated effluent during the winter months; and a subsurface drip dispersal system to reuse treated effluent for landscape irrigation around the facility.

FloraFilter

Effluent from the two-stage trickling filter will be filtered through 120-micron disc type filters and discharged to a vegetated treatment system that will utilize both submerged and emergent plants to further reduce the BOD, TSS and total nitrogen in the wastewater. The design criteria of the FloraFilter are based on a free-surface constructed wetland, and this unit is expected to perform as a constructed wetland.

The major difference with the FloraFilter is that it is constructed in tanks, rather than in a pond. The use of the FloraFilter will reduce the average BOD, TSS and TN concentrations to below 10 mg/L for all three parameters.

Final Filtration and Disinfection

Effluent from the FloraFilter will be filtered through a multimedia sand filter and disinfected with a UV disinfection unit that will be sized to reduce the total coliform bacteria levels to 23 MPN/100 ml. A polymer feed system will be installed as part of the sand filtration system to assure a high level of filtration prior to disinfection.

Supplemental Treatment

During the winter period occupancy levels at the Lodge will be lower than the summer and the organic and nutrient load should be lower. The lower level of occupancy will correspond to a period when the vegetated treatment system performance will decline due to shorter days and less sunlight. During these periods additional treatment using a small ultra-filtration membrane treatment system may be required to polish and maintain nitrogen levels at a low level. Provisions in the design and layout of the treatment system have been made to allow for the future addition of a small membrane treatment process to assure that the treatment plant will meet effluent limitations established by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The proposed on-site wastewater system would include two subsurface disposal systems: a shallow pressure dosed leachfield system to accept treated effluent during the winter months; and a subsurface drip dispersal system to reuse treated effluent for landscape irrigation around the facility.

Figure 11 in Attachment D-2 shows the proposed layout of the leachfield and subsurface drip areas. The leachfield system is located in the area of the deepest soils and groundwater on the property. The subsurface drip dispersal system is shown in areas that will be landscaped and irrigated.

Shallow Pressure Dosed Leachfield

The proposed on-site wastewater system will utilize shallow pressure dosed leachfields. Based on the measured percolation rate of approximately 2.0 minutes per inch (MPI), a soil application rate of 1.20 gallons per square foot per day (gal/sf-day) was selected in accordance with design criteria established by the County of Sonoma and the RWQCB. Assuming an effective depth of three feet, the side wall area is calculated to be six-feet per lineal foot of trench. Based on the peak wastewater flow or 12,000 gpd approximately 1,800 lineal feet of trenches will be required as shown in Figure 11 of Attachment D-2. Assuming that the trenches will have a minimum cover or 12 inches, the total depth of trenches will be four feet.

Groundwater Separation

Based on groundwater monitoring data collected in 2005, a year of above normal rainfall, the highest measured groundwater levels in the area of the proposed leachfields occurred in April and ranged from 9.25 to 11.75 feet below ground surface. Using four feet deep trenches will maintain the leachfield trench bottom normally over five feet above the highest anticipated groundwater.

Groundwater Mounding

A groundwater mounding analysis was completed that indicated that based on continuous full occupancy of the Lodge over a 150 day period during the winter could potentially increase or raise groundwater levels by 1.99 feet, which would decrease the depth of groundwater from 12.5 feet to 10.5 feet. The groundwater mounding analysis indicates that the potential rise in groundwater water resulting from the continuous loading of wastewater under an average and peak load would maintain groundwater separation over the minimum groundwater clearance established by the RWQCB Basin Plan and the County of Sonoma's requirements for shallow pressure dosed leachfields, which sets a minimum clearance of 24-inches. The predicted minimum clearance would be over 48 inches in the vicinity of the proposed leachfield area.

Shallow Drip Dispersal System

The on-site wastewater system plan will reuse treated effluent for landscape irrigation around the new buildings. Treated effluent will be applied to over 26,100 square feet of dispersal area using a subsurface drip irrigation system. Based on the sandy soil conditions and using a soil application rate of 0.8 gpd/sf, the amount of subsurface drip disposal area required to manage 100% of the treated effluent on the site is approximately 20,000 square feet. Based on the Preliminary Irrigation Plan approximately 26,100 square feet of landscape irrigation will be installed. Therefore, the drip dispersal system will provide over an additional 130% of disposal area.

Groundwater Separation

The subsurface drip dispersal system will be installed six to 12 inches below ground surface. Based on the highest anticipated groundwater levels measured on the site in April 2005, the minimum separation between the driplines and the highest anticipated groundwater is over 24 inches. The subsurface drip dispersal system would normally only be used during the late spring and through the summer, when groundwater levels are typically lower than in early April.

Nitrate Loading

Groundwater quality and nitrate concentrations were measured in the vicinity of the proposed leachfield system. The nitrate-nitrogen concentration at these wells was

measured twice. On February 22 the average concentration in two monitoring wells was 3.5 mg/l, and on May 14 it was 1.0 mg/l.

It was shown in an earlier section that during wet weather the natural discharge of groundwater beneath the proposed leachfield exceeds the average rate of application of treated wastewater (13,100 gpd of groundwater flow versus 9,594 gpd of wastewater). Assuming the wastewater nitrate-nitrogen concentration is 10 mg/l and the background groundwater concentration is 3.5 mg/l, the resultant groundwater concentration would be 6.3 mg/l.

During dry weather the treated wastewater will be dispersed through subsurface drip irrigation lines. Although the groundwater discharge beneath the 26,100 square feet of irrigated landscaping will be lower, a significant volume of the wastewater will be lost to evapotranspiration and the landscape plants will up take available nitrate-nitrogen.

Performance Goals

The performance goal for the wastewater treatment system is to reduce the biochemical oxygen demand, total suspended solids, and total concentration of all forms of nitrogen to below 10 mg/l. Given the treatment method, virtually all the nitrogen in the treated wastewater will be in the nitrate form. Thus, an upper limit on the nitrate-nitrogen concentration in the receiving groundwater will be 6.5 mg/l. This is safely below the established drinking water level. The wastewater treatment system will include a UV disinfection system that will be sized to maintain total coliform bacteria levels below 23 MPN/100 ml, which protect shallow groundwater from impacts from pathogens.

Mitigation Measure XVI.a.: None Required.

- b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

_____ _____ X _____

Comment XVI.b.: Construction of New Water or Wastewater Facilities. Less Than Significant Impact. The site is currently served by an on-site wastewater system. This system will be completely rebuilt as described above. The on-site water system will include an alternative wastewater treatment system, a shallow pressure dosed leachfield, and shallow subsurface drip dispersal system as described above. The treatment system planned will meet State and County water quality standards for removal of biochemical oxygen demand, total suspended solids, nitrogen and pathogens. The proposed subsurface disposal systems meet the State and County standards by providing for over 200 percent of installed disposal capacity and over 200 percent of expansion capacity. The system is designed to meet all setback requirements to critical biotic resources (wetlands and coastal bluffs) and property

lines, groundwater separation and mounding, nitrate loading, protection of surface water quality. The Proposed Project will meet the beneficial use of surface and groundwater resources on the property and the wastewater project will not impact water quality objectives, as established by the County of Sonoma and the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region. The project is also outside any protected, designated or sensitive Coastal Zone areas.

The planned upgrade of the on-site wastewater system will not result in any significant impacts to biotic, cultural, and historic resources on the property. A more comprehensive analysis of potential environmental impacts is presented in the *Wastewater Management Plan*, prepared by Fall Creek Engineering, dated August 2007 and amended August 20, 2008.

Mitigation Measure XVI.b.: None Required.

- c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

_____ X _____

Comment XVI.c.: Stormwater. Less Than Significant With Mitigation. See discussion in Section VIII.e.

Mitigation Measure XVI.c.: See Mitigation Measure VIII.e.

- d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed?

_____ _____ X _____

Comment XVI.d.: Water Supply. Less Than Significant. The Sea Ranch Lodge is within the Sea Ranch Water Company (Water Company) service area, which includes the entire Sea Ranch community. The Water Company serves approximately 2,293 residential lots, seven non-Association residential customers and 24 commercial customers, plus 90 units at a site to be determined (the “transfer site”).

The water supply operated by the Water Company has a production capacity of 1.58 MGD and a treatment capacity of 1.01 MGD. The Water Company reported that the estimate that maximum daily demand at build-out will be approximately 0.64 MGD, and based on present water consumption and population projections, the Water Company anticipates that it will be able to meet the present and future demand.²

² Sonoma County PRMD, 2003, *Water and Sewer Capacities - Final Report*. Staff Memorandum prepared by R.C. Rogers to the General Plan 2020 Citizens’ Advisory Committee.

Two domestic water lines supply the existing facilities. One line supplies the 20 guest units; the other supplies the lodge building housing the restaurant, bar and offices. In 2005, Fall Creek Engineers conducted a Water Use Study and continuously monitored water usage in these two buildings. Based on this study, average and peak domestic water usage was determined and estimated to be approximately 4,000 and 6,500 gallons per day, respectively, during spring and summer months.

Projected Domestic Water Use

Average and peak domestic water usage was projected for the Proposed Project based on actual water usage measured at the Lodge and using typical water usage values reported at other hotels. Based on the number of new rooms, adjustments for occupancy (assumed to be 60% on average over the year), and expanded facilities on the property, the average and peak domestic daily water usage is estimated to be 9,976 and 16,627 gallons, respectively.

Based on the projected total water demand, the daily water demand per room (60 rooms) is estimated to range between 166 and 277 gpd. According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board's (CIWMB) Green Lodging Program, typical water use in hotels in the State is approximately 218 gpd per room, which indicates that the projected average daily water use is within the range of the typical water usage and the peak water usage.

Based on water supply and availability information provided by the County of Sonoma, the Proposed Project will have less than a significant impact on existing groundwater resources both on- and off-site. The project will not measurably alter the quantity of groundwater stored and discharged from aquifers on- and off-site affiliated with the Proposed Project.

The Lodge is connected to the Sea Ranch Water Company, a public water system, and the Lodge will be provided with expanded water service from Water Company for the proposed expansion plan.

Mitigation Measure XVI.d.: None Required.

- e. Result in 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 XVI.e.: Wastewater Treatment. No Impact. The project will be served by a new on-site wastewater treatment facility; not impacting any wastewater treatment provider. Therefore, there will be no impact.

Mitigation Measure XVI.e.: None Required.

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?

_____ _____

Comment XVI.f. and g.: Landfills and Solid Waste. Less Than Significant. Solid waste generated within the Sea Ranch area is collected by a private company, West Sonoma County Disposal (WSCD), taken to the Annapolis Transfer Station near Annapolis, and transported to the Central Landfill facility. The proposed expansion project would result in a small increase in the amount of solid waste generated within the County. However, the Proposed Project would not violate national, state or local standards for solid waste or local statutes as the Annapolis Transfer Station has a permitted daily capacity of 50 tons/day and is currently loading at less than 30 tons/day. Based on the available landfill capacity, the increase in solid waste would be a less than significant impact.

The Proposed Project would generate short-term construction and demolition debris during construction. Sonoma County requires as a condition of project approval, the construction contractor to recover or recycle construction debris.

Mitigation Measure XVI.f. and g.: None Required.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	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 and 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 considerably 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 probably future projects?)	_____	__X__	_____	_____
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	_____	_____	_____	__X__

All impacts relating to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services, traffic and transportation, and utilities and service systems can be reduced to less than significant levels with the mitigation measures identified in this document.