

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

This checklist is taken from Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. For each item, one of four responses is given:

No Impact: The project would not have the impact described. The project may have a beneficial effect, but there is no potential for the project to create or add increment to the impact described.

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would have the impact described, but the impact would not be significant. Mitigation is not required, although the project applicant may choose to modify the project to avoid the impacts.

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated: The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. One or more mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Potentially Significant Impact: The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. The impact cannot be reduced to less than significant by incorporating mitigation measures. An environmental impact report must be prepared for this project.

Each question on the checklist was answered by evaluating the project as proposed, that is, without considering the effect of any added mitigation measures. The checklist includes a discussion of the impacts and mitigation measures that have been identified. Sources used in this Initial Study are numbered and listed on pages 71-73. Following the discussion of each checklist item one or more sources used are noted in parentheses.

The Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works - Airport Division has agreed to accept all mitigation measures listed in this checklist as conditions of approval of the proposed AMP and to obtain all necessary permits prior to construction of individual projects.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

1. AESTHETICS Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? G G G O

The project site does not currently provide views over a large area and the proposed project would not establish those types of views. Because the Airport is located in a relatively flat landscape, there are no scenic vistas on Airport property or on nearby properties which overlook the Airport. The viewshed of the project area as seen from adjacent public roads will not substantially change; therefore, the Project will have **No Impact** on a scenic vista. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

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

There are no state scenic highways in the vicinity of the project area. Highway 101 to the east and River Road to the south of the project area are designated Scenic Corridors by the Sonoma County General Plan. The Airport is not visible from either of these roadways. The River Road Scenic Landscape Unit is immediately south of Airport property, but the proposed Project would have **No Impact** on this adjacent scenic resource. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 2)

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

Sonoma County has developed Visual Assessment Guidelines for use in the preparation of CEQA documents. The procedure requires establishing the level of visual sensitivity of the project site using pre-selected criteria, such as zoning, land use, and topography. The visual dominance of the proposed project is also characterized by comparing the project with its surroundings, again using pre-selected criteria (i.e., form, line, color, texture, and lighting). The guidelines include thresholds of significance, which identify an acceptable level of visual dominance for a given site sensitivity. A project is determined to have a significant visual impact if its visual dominance within its surroundings would exceed an acceptable level for the applicable site sensitivity, as set forth by the guidelines.

Existing Airport Property

One of the existing Airport parcels adjacent to Laughlin Road (APN: 059-260-010) has a Scenic Resources combining district overlay due to its location adjacent to the River

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Road Scenic Landscape Unit for which it supplies a scenic backdrop. However, this parcel is primarily composed of the east side building area, containing the existing terminal and other buildings, hangars, a control tower, runways, taxiways, and parking lots. Only a small portion of the parcel south of Taxiway D is undeveloped. All construction projects currently proposed in this parcel would be minimally visible from Laughlin Road. Although the visual sensitivity of this parcel along Laughlin Road is considered to be high due to its zoning as a Scenic Resource, the visual dominance of the project in this area is subordinate (minimally visible from public view). Therefore, impacts to the visual character of this area from currently planned projects would be **Less Than Significant**. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 2, 3, 4)

It is anticipated that hangar development might be proposed in the southern portion of this parcel (south of Taxiway D) at some point in the future, possibly during the 20-year time-span of this AMP. Development of this area would be visible from Laughlin Road, and could result in a **Potentially Significant** visual impact, which will be further evaluated in the EIR.

No other Airport parcels are zoned as Scenic Resources. In addition, most of the Airport is closed to the general public, the primary exception being the terminal area. The proposed new terminal building would be larger than the existing building, but would not significantly alter the visual character of the already developed east-side building area. The appearance of the Airport from other public access roads around the perimeter of the Airport would not substantially change from pre-project conditions. The primary construction projects proposed as a part of this AMP are the runway extensions, taxiway improvements, and the new terminal building, including associated roadway and parking improvements (see next paragraph for discussion on control tower relocation). The runway extensions and taxiway improvements would not be visible from public roads. The relocated localizer antenna may be visible from Sanders Road, but would not substantially alter the existing view. The new terminal and associated infrastructure would be visible from Airport Boulevard, but regardless of the exact location and size of the building (still to be determined) it would not result in a substantial change from the already developed character of the east-side building area. Lighting improvements proposed in the infield would be minimally visible outside the Airport (if at all). The visual dominance of various development projects proposed by the AMP would be co-dominant (e.g., new terminal) to subordinant (e.g., new perimeter fencing) to inevident (e.g., various infield projects) depending on specific location and visibility from public roadways. However, because the visual sensitivity of the remaining Airport parcels is low (in developed areas, i.e., east-side building area) or moderate (in primarily undeveloped areas, i.e., infield, west and north sides), project impacts in these parcels

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

would be **Less Than Significant**. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR (1, 2, 3, 4)

The existing air traffic control tower will be relocated when the new terminal is constructed. Two potential locations within the infield have been identified on the ALP (Figure 3); the actual location will be determined by an independent site selection and analysis study. If the selected location is in the central infield in the vicinity of the area illustrated on the ALP, the tower would be only minimally visible from Laughlin Road, and therefore, would result in a **Less Than Significant** visual impact. However, if a west-side location near the corner of Mark West Station Road and Windsor Road is selected, the tower would be clearly visible from these roadways, and may also be visible from the residential neighborhood in this area. This location could result in a **Potentially Significant** visual impact, which will be further evaluated in the EIR.

See 1d below for a discussion of potential light or glare impacts.

Future Airport Property

Two parcels (APN: 057-070-043 & -044) adjacent to the southwest corner of the Airport are proposed for acquisition and are located within the River Road Scenic Landscape Unit. These are also in the Scenic Resources combining district. These parcels are proposed for acquisition to provide an open space buffer for the Runway 1 protection zone. The parcels are currently planted with grapevines, and likely would continue to be leased to the existing grower. If at some point in the future the vineyard land use is no longer viable, the Airport would convert the land to another compatible agricultural/open space land use. No development would occur in this area. The visual appearance of the parcels would not change substantially. Therefore, project impacts in this area would be **Less Than Significant**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 2, 3, 4)

Additional properties adjacent to the Airport are proposed for future acquisition to provide approach zone protection for the proposed runway extensions or other non-developed open space buffer areas (APN: 059-200-010, 066-210-061 & -46; 066-250-017, -018, -020, -022; 164-170-004, -006, -007, -008, -009, 010, -011, -012, -013). Existing land uses on these properties are primarily agricultural/pastoral, and none are zoned as Scenic Resources. Existing residences would be removed (see Section 5 for a discussion of potential impacts to historical resources). If present, tall trees considered to be airspace or visual obstructions would be removed or pruned, and any open water bodies (i.e., stock ponds) would be filled, as required by the FAA. (See Section 4 for discussion of potential impacts to biological resources). Airport perimeter fencing would be installed around the properties. However, the overall visual character of these areas

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

would not change substantially from pre-project conditions. The visual sensitivity of these parcels is considered to be moderate due to their relatively natural rural setting. The visual dominance of the project (new fencing) is subordinate (minimally visible from public view). Therefore, the impact of the project in these parcels is **Less Than Significant**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 2, 3, 4)

Two parcels (APN: 059-200-002 & 018) adjacent to Laughlin Road on the southern border of the Airport are proposed for acquisition to provide an area for future aeronautical development. Such development could include new aircraft hangars, FBO facilities, or other aeronautical uses. The existing land use of these parcels is agricultural/pastoral. Neither is zoned as a scenic resource. Converting these relatively natural agricultural parcels to a commercial use could result in a substantial change to the visual character of the area. However, such development is not proposed over the life of this 20-year AMP. At this time, it is not known when Airport growth might necessitate development of these parcels. This AMP proposes acquisition only, including removal of structures, tall trees and water features, as described above. Acquisition of the parcels alone, as proposed by the Project, would be a **Less Than Significant** impact to aesthetic resources. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR². (1, 2, 3, 4)

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

O G G G

The proposed Project does include lighting upgrades and new lighting. Most of the proposed lighting improvements would be located adjacent to runways and taxiways, and therefore, would not introduce new sources of light or glare outside the Airport. Additional lighting improvements would include lighting at access gates around the Airport perimeter, in parking lots, and associated with new building construction. Security lights at access gates would need to meet security standards, but are typically low intensity, downward casting, and fully shielded to prevent glare to nearby properties. New parking lots and building construction would be located on the east side of the Airport in already developed areas adjacent to industrial uses where no residences occur. These sorts of lights may be visible to the public, but would not substantially affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, Project lighting improvements would be a **Less Than Significant** impact, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 4)

² It is reasonably foreseeable that a future AMP would propose buildout of one or both of these parcels. Additional CEQA review will be required to analyze potential project impacts to aesthetics at that time, but such review is not warranted under the current AMP Project.

The air traffic control tower will be relocated during construction of the new terminal building. The tower constitutes an existing light source, which would be moved to a new location. In general, the relocation is not expected to result in new lighting impacts, because the light beam is directed upward, not outward towards receptors. In addition, light emitted from the existing tower is already visible to all of the nearby receptors (the existing beam is visible for up to 2 miles). Two potential locations for the tower have been identified in the AMP (Figure 3). The ultimate location of the relocated tower will be determined through an independent site selection study. Depending on its ultimate location, the relocated tower could result in a **Potentially Significant** new source of light or glare, which will be further evaluated in the EIR.

It is likely that temporary construction lighting would be used during some of the proposed projects, and could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact. At this time, details on location and need of construction lighting are not available, but will be addressed in the EIR.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

O G G G

Existing Airport Property

The majority of the existing Airport is mapped as Urban & Built Up Land. However, portions of the Airport are mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland of Local Importance is also present). A small amount of Farmland would be paved or graveled over by the proposed runway extensions and internal service roads. None of this area is currently under cultivation due to the incompatibility it would create with existing aircraft operations. Furthermore, this land

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

cannot be farmed in the future as long as the Airport remains active. Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of any active Farmland and there would be no change in existing land use, as the land would not be farmed in the foreseeable future with or without the proposed Project. Nevertheless, conversion of mapped Farmland to a paved or gravel surface could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact to Farmland, and will be further evaluated in the EIR. (1, 5)

Future Airport Property

Most of the parcels proposed for acquisition to provide approach zone protection are mapped as Farmland. The existing land use of these areas would not change. In many cases, these lands would continue to be leased to active agricultural operations. In others, they would not be actively cultivated, but would be maintained as fallow agricultural land, not converted to a non-agricultural land use. Therefore, impacts to Farmlands on these future Airport properties would be **Less Than Significant**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 5)

One parcel (APN: 059-200-018) adjacent to the southeast corner of the Airport is proposed for acquisition to provide an area for future aeronautical development. This parcel is mapped as Farmland of Statewide Importance. Converting this agricultural parcel to a commercial use could result in a loss of Farmland. However, such development is not proposed over the life of this 20-year Master Plan. At this time, it is not known when Airport growth might necessitate development of this parcel. This Master Plan proposes acquisition only, including removal of structures, tall trees and water features, as described above. Acquisition of the parcel alone, as proposed by the Project, would result in a **Less Than Significant** impact to Farmland resources, as the property would either be leased to an agricultural operation or be maintained as fallow agricultural land. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR³. (1,3, 5)

Additional parcels mapped as Farmland of Local Importance are proposed for acquisition. These lands are not considered to be important Farmland by the California Department of Conservation. Therefore, impacts to these parcels would be **Less Than Significant**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

³ It is reasonably foreseeable that a future AMP would propose buildout of this parcel, resulting in a permanent loss of Farmland. Additional CEQA review will be required to analyze potential project impacts to Farmlands at that time, but such review is not warranted under the current AMP Project.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Transportation control measures recommended by the local air plans have been considered by the proposed Project. Applicable TCMs include improved transit service and coordination and transit access to airports. The proposed Project contains elements which would encourage the use of transit services at the Airport, such as reconfiguring the existing terminal access road to have additional lanes and a longer curb, allowing easier curbside bus pick-up and drop-off. Transit access to the Airport is available through several public and private providers, including Sonoma County Transit, Mendocino Transit Authority, and Airport Express. Encouraging the use of public transportation compliments the recently constructed and planned future High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on Highway 101 through Santa Rosa, and may reduce project-related vehicle trips on Highway 101. (1, 7, 8)

In addition, the Airport is planning to obtain Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification of the new terminal complex to reduce emissions from building construction and operation. The LEED Green Building Rating System™ is a nationally accepted benchmark for the design, construction, and operation of high performance green buildings.

The EIR for the current ATE did not address compliance with local air plans, nor does the Draft 2020 ATE. Although the Project incorporates many of the measures set forth in the two local air plans, a detailed analysis of the AMP's compliance with these plans has not been conducted, nor has a comprehensive evaluation of potential Airport emissions compared to federal and state standards. If the AMP were to be in conflict with either of these local air plans, it could result in **Potentially Significant** impact. A detailed air quality analysis will be conducted in the EIR. (1, 2, 10)

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

O G G G

State and Federal standards have been established for the following "criteria pollutants": ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, lead, and particulates (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}).

The Project would result in an increase in criteria pollutants, primarily mobile source emissions (carbon monoxide and ozone precursors- ROG and NO_x) from motor vehicles and aircraft. Aircraft emissions can affect ground level pollutant concentrations not only when operating on the ground, but also during flight due to atmospheric mixing.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The Project would also result in an increase in particulates (primarily PM₁₀). Of the PM₁₀ emissions associated with aircraft/motor vehicle use, some would be exhaust pipe and tire wear emissions, but greater quantities would result from resuspended road dust, especially on unpaved service roads used by ground support equipment. PM₁₀ emissions are also associated with construction activities which include earthwork and/or demolition, both of which are proposed by the Project. (1, 7, 8, 9)

Aircraft Emissions: Scheduled air carrier service through Horizon Air currently consists of 6 average daily departures (ADD) with a maximum of 10 ADD. The AMP Project forecasts up to 13.33 ADD by the year 2030, approximately 7 more than are currently operating, but about 7 less than are currently allowed under the County’s ATE (which allows up to 21 ADD). Additional commercial flights could result in emissions that would exceed applicable air quality standards, and therefore, could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact, which will be addressed in the EIR. Although only 13.33 ADD are projected by the AMP, the EIR will analyze a maximum of 21 ADD. (1, 7, 8)

General aviation activity forecasts in the AMP are actually less than the current ATE projected. General aviation aircraft are not held to the same emission standards as commercial aircraft, and typically, emissions from general aviation activities are not quantified or analyzed. However, the EIR will include an assessment of general aviation emissions.

Transportation Emissions: The 13.33 ADD forecast by the AMP (year 2030) includes service by both air carrier (8.44 ADD) and commuter (4.89 ADD) airlines, and would result in an estimated total of 938 daily enplaned passengers⁴ requiring transportation to the Airport. Under current conditions, approximately 351 daily enplaned passengers⁵ require transportation to the Airport. The 2030 projected aviation activity forecast would increase the number of daily enplaned passengers by approximately 587; however, this increase would translate to a relatively small number of additional vehicle trips (see Section 15 for more discussion of potential traffic impacts).

According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, a detailed air quality analysis for projects generating less than 2,000 vehicle trips per day is not required, because this amount of additional traffic would not generate significant emissions under most conditions. It is unlikely that transportation of airline passengers resulting from the projected 13.33 ADD

⁴ Based on 101 average seats for air carrier aircraft and 76 average seats for commuter aircraft at standard FAA boarding load factor growth rates (77.2% for air carrier and 75.4% for commuter in 2030).

⁵ Based on 6 ADD using 76-seat aircraft at a 77% load factor.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

would generate greater than 2,000 vehicle trips per day. However, passenger vehicle trips associated with 21 ADD, in addition to general aviation and employee vehicle trips, may approach or exceed 2,000 vehicle trips per day. This level of traffic could result in emissions that would exceed applicable air quality standards, and therefore, could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact. A transportation study will be conducted for the EIR to determine the number of vehicle trips that might be generated by the Project, based on a maximum activity level of 21 ADD. The results of the traffic study will determine whether a detailed air quality analysis of transportation emissions in the EIR is warranted. (1, 9)

Airport Operations: Mobile source emissions from Airport support equipment are not anticipated to increase substantially over present conditions. Emissions may actually decrease over time as equipment is upgraded to be more energy efficient (i.e., electric, alternate fuel), as is the Airport’s intent. Other Airport operations, such as aircraft maintenance activities, and routine airfield, roadway, and building maintenance activities (e.g., mowing, painting, cleaning, repair, etc.) would emit only a small amount of criteria pollutants. The air traffic control tower’s existing backup generator would be replaced and upgraded to a low emission, energy efficient model during construction of the new tower. However, a new backup generator would be installed when the new terminal building is constructed (the existing terminal does not have a generator), and emissions from this new stationary source have not been quantified or analyzed. In addition, growth of the Airport over time may require the use of more service vehicles or other support equipment, which could result in an increase in emissions that could be **Potentially Significant**. Emissions from Airport operations will be included in the air quality study to be conducted by the EIR.

Construction: Construction-related emissions (vehicle and equipment exhaust and dust generation) would be short-term in duration, but could cause substantial increases in localized pollutant concentrations during construction. The primary construction projects that would require demolition, grading, and/or the use of heavy machinery are the runway extensions, taxiway improvements, construction of the new terminal building, relocation of the air traffic control tower and aircraft rescue and fire fighting building, and roadway/parking lot improvements. The runway extension projects, in particular, could require a large amount of fill to be trucked onto the site. Vehicle emissions from construction equipment, which would include diesel exhaust, could result in a **Potentially Significant**, although temporary, project-level impact to air quality, and could also contribute to a cumulative impact (see 3c below). Vehicle emissions from construction equipment will be analyzed in the EIR. (1)

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Dust generation during construction is a concern, especially when construction projects would require a substantial amount of earthwork, as is the case for the proposed runway extensions and new taxiway construction. The BAAQMD's approach to CEQA analyses of construction emissions of PM₁₀ is to emphasize implementation of effective and comprehensive dust control measures rather than conducting a detailed quantification of emissions. With the implementation of the following mitigation measures, Project impacts from construction emissions of PM₁₀ would be **Less Than Significant**. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 9)

Generation of PM₁₀ during building demolition is discussed in Section 7.

Mitigation Measure 3.1:

The following mitigation measures shall be implemented, as appropriate, during construction activities that involve grading, excavation, or soil disturbance, or when site access will occur along unpaved roadways.

- *Trucks hauling soil, sand or other loose materials shall cover the loads, or shall keep the loads at least two feet below the level of the sides of the container, or shall wet the load sufficiently to prevent dust emissions.*
- *Water or dust palliative shall be sprayed on all active construction and staging areas, unpaved access roads, and unpaved parking areas during construction, as directed by the County.*
- *All paved surfaces (roads, runways, taxiways, parking areas) shall be swept (preferably with water sweepers) as needed to remove soil that has been carried onto them from the construction site.*
- *Exposed stockpiles of wind-susceptible material (dirt, sand, etc.) shall be enclosed or covered, or water or other dust palliative shall be applied as needed to control dust.*
- *Vehicle speeds on unpaved access roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
- *Disturbed surfaces that are to remain unpaved (i.e., infield areas) shall be reseeded or a non-toxic soil stabilizer shall be applied as soon as possible following construction activities.*

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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)?

O G G G

The Bay Area is a non-attainment area for two criteria pollutants- ozone and particulates (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}).

Ozone: As described above in 3b, the Project could result in a **Potentially Significant** level of ozone precursor emissions at the project-level, and could also contribute to a cumulatively considerable net increase of this criteria pollutant. The potential cumulative impact will be analyzed in the EIR. (1)

Particulates: The Project would have no long-term effect on PM₁₀ dust generation, because all disturbed surfaces would be paved or stabilized following construction activities, with the exception of internal dirt and gravel service roads which receive limited use. In addition, the dust control mitigation measures presented above (Mitigation Measure 3.1) would reduce the potential cumulative impact of dust generation during construction to a **Less Than Significant** level. However, PM₁₀ is also generated by aircraft emissions. Because the number of flights is projected to increase, it could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of PM₁₀, which may be **Potentially Significant**. Aircraft emissions of PM₁₀ will be analyzed in the EIR. (1)

Greenhouse Gases: Greenhouse gases (GHG) are not technically considered to be “criteria pollutants,” although some are or interact with ozone precursors. Nevertheless, GHG have come under close scrutiny in California since the enactment of Executive Order No. S-3-05 and Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32). In response, CEQA lead agencies have begun to address the potential cumulative impact of a project’s GHG contribution.

GHG are produced primarily from the burning of fossil fuels. The proposed terminal building would be designed to minimize use of fossil fuels as one of the steps to obtain LEED certification. However, GHG emissions from other Airport sources (i.e., aircraft and vehicle engines, backup generators, other support equipment) have not been analyzed. No significance thresholds have yet been set for GHG emissions; therefore, a determination of potential significance cannot be made at this time. However, the EIR will include an analysis of GHG emissions. (1)

plants, and generally exists as a result of disturbance. At the Airport, such disturbances include previous grading activities (most of the Airport was leveled during construction) and current land uses (i.e., wastewater irrigation, frequent mowing). The Airport does provide potentially suitable habitat for a number of special status plant species associated with vernal pool and other wetland habitats. Protocol-level plant surveys were conducted in 2002-2004 in the infield between the runways and taxiways, parcels adjacent to the existing runways and taxiways, and small parcels to the east of the eastern taxiway (wastewater irrigation areas were not surveyed due to habitat unsuitability). Survey results determined that special status plant species are absent from most of the Airport. However, the Project could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact to special status plant species, as discussed below. Additional analyses to quantify potential impacts to special status plants and to develop appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures will be required, and will be included in the EIR. (1, 11, 12, 13)

Burke's Goldfields: Burke's goldfields (*Lasthenia burkei*) is an annual species in the sunflower family (Asteraceae) that occurs in vernal pools and other seasonal wetlands. It is federal and state-listed as Endangered; the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) includes it on List 1B (rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere). There are several known occurrences of Burke's goldfields on Airport property; all of them are located within designated preserves (Goldfields Preserve, SACMA Preserve, SACMA II Preserve, Runway 14-32 Preserve). The Project proposes work in two of these Preserves (SACMA II, Runway 14-32). A service road is proposed to be constructed through SACMA II; Taxiway Z/B improvements will occur in the Runway 14-32 Preserve (Figure 3). These construction projects could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact to Burke's goldfields and occupied habitat, which will be addressed in the EIR. In addition, because the Airport is located within the Santa Rosa Plain, all seasonal wetlands are considered to be potential habitat for Burke's goldfields under the *Programmatic Biological Opinion* (PBO)⁶ between the USFWS and the ACOE, particularly because there are historic occurrences documented in other locations on Airport property. Therefore, any impacts to wetlands may be considered a **Potentially Significant** impact to potential rare plant habitat, and will be addressed in the EIR. (1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)

⁶ The Airport is also within the boundaries of the *Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy*, a local conservation plan published by an inter-agency task force and implemented by local jurisdictions (i.e., the County). However, for projects which require a federal permit from the ACOE, the federal jurisdiction has precedence over the local jurisdiction. The PBO is not applicable to projects which may impact greater 2,000 plants, in which case, individual consultation would be required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Sebastopol Meadowfoam: Sebastopol meadowfoam (*Limnanthes vinculans*) is an annual species in the meadowfoam family (Limnanthaceae) that occurs in vernal pools and other seasonal wetlands. It is federal and state-listed as Endangered, and included on CNPS List 1B (rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere). No Sebastopol meadowfoam was observed on the Airport during surveys. However, because the Airport is located within the Santa Rosa Plain, all seasonal wetlands are considered to be potential habitat under the PBO, and there is one historic occurrence of Sebastopol meadowfoam on Airport property. Therefore, any impacts to wetlands may be considered a **Potentially Significant** impact to potential rare plant habitat, and will be addressed in the EIR. (1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)

Sonoma Sunshine: Sonoma sunshine (*Blennosperma bakeri*) is an annual species in the sunflower family (Asteraceae) that occurs in vernal pools and other seasonal wetlands. It is federal and state-listed as Endangered, and included on CNPS List 1B (rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere). No Sonoma sunshine was observed on the Airport during surveys, and there are no documented occurrences (extant or historic) in the vicinity of the Airport. However, because the Airport is located within the Santa Rosa Plain, all seasonal wetlands are considered to be potential habitat for Sonoma sunshine under the PBO. Therefore, any impacts to wetlands may be considered a **Potentially Significant** impact to potential rare plant habitat, and will be addressed in the EIR. (1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15)

Other Special Status Plant Species: Additional special status plant species with potential to occur in Airport habitats are known to occur within one mile of the Airport: many-flowered navarretia (*Navarretia leucocephala* ssp. *plieantha*, FE, SE, CNPS List 1B); dwarf downingia (*Downingia pusilla*, CNPS List 2); and Baker's navarretia (*Navarretia leucocephala* ssp. *bakeri*, CNPS List 1B)⁷. All of these occur in vernal pools and seasonal wetlands, although the navarretias are usually associated with unique soil types (Baker's - adobe clay or alkaline soils; many-flowered - volcanic soils). None of these were observed on the Airport during 2002-2004 surveys. However, this survey data is now several years old, and may no longer be adequate to conclusively support a determination of species absence. Therefore, the EIR will evaluate whether the Project could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact to other special status plant species, and whether new surveys are warranted. (11, 12, 13)

⁷ FE = Federal Endangered; SE = State Endangered; CNPS List 1B = rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; CNPS List 2 = rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Recently Acquired and Future Airport Property: Plant surveys were not conducted on recently-acquired or proposed acquisition properties adjacent to the existing northern boundary of the Airport (between Redwood Creek and Sanders Road and immediately west of Windsor Road). This land is primarily agricultural/pastoral (grazing) and rural residential; some areas contain seasonal wetlands. These properties may provide suitable habitat for rare plant species. Properties proposed for acquisition adjacent to the existing southern boundary of the Airport (adjacent to Laughlin Road) were also excluded from surveys. Current land uses on these properties is intensive agriculture (vineyards) and

rural residential. Although the southern areas are less likely to support rare plants due to a higher degree of disturbance and limited wetland habitat, rare plants may be present. (1, 11, 12, 13)

Most of this land has been or would be acquired in order to provide approach zone protection for the runways. The land would not be developed but would be maintained as fallow agricultural land or other compatible land use (i.e., continued agriculture), and therefore, acquisition of the land for approach protection is not likely to result in an impact to rare plants or their habitats. Acquisition of these properties would include removal of structures, tall trees and water features, as needed, in compliance with FAA regulations. For properties without wetland or water features proposed for filling, potential impacts to rare plants and/or their habitat would be **Less Than Significant** as long as ground disturbance work occurs only within existing building envelopes and landscaped areas, and access occurs only along existing roads. No further EIR analysis related to rare plants is warranted for these properties. (1)

However, removal of wetlands or water features and/or disturbance of non-landscaped ground surfaces could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact to rare plants or rare plant habitats. Therefore, on properties where such activities would occur, additional environmental review of potential impacts to rare plants will be required and will be addressed in the EIR (1)

One parcel (APN: 059-200-018) adjacent to the southeast corner of the Airport has not been previously surveyed and is proposed for acquisition to provide an area for future aeronautical development. At this time, it is not known when Airport growth might necessitate development of this parcel. This AMP proposes acquisition only⁸, including

⁸ It is reasonably foreseeable that a future AMP would propose buildout of this parcel. Additional CEQA review, including plant surveys, will be required to analyze potential project impacts to rare plants at that time, but such review is not warranted under the current AMP Project.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

removal of structures, tall trees and water features in compliance with FAA regulations. As described above, potential impacts to rare plants and/or their habitat would be **Less Than Significant** as long as ground disturbance work occurs only within existing building envelopes and landscaped areas, and access occurs only along existing roads. However, removal of wetlands or water features and/or disturbance of non-landscaped ground surfaces could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact to rare plants or rare plant habitats. Potential impacts to rare plants on acquired properties where such activities would occur will be addressed in the EIR (1)

Potential Impacts to Special Status Wildlife Species

As described above, most of the Airport is developed; undeveloped areas are primarily composed of non-native grassland subjected to a high level of disturbance. The only relatively undisturbed areas which might provide suitable habitat for special status wildlife species are wetland and riparian areas.

Three federal-listed animal species have been identified as potentially present within the Airport during baseline studies: California freshwater shrimp, Central California Coast steelhead, and California tiger salamander. However, habitat assessments and/or surveys conducted for these species during baseline biological studies determined that none are present within the Airport due to a lack of suitable habitat. (1, 11, 12)

California freshwater shrimp: California freshwater shrimp (*Syncaris pacifica*) are endemic to Napa, Marin, and Sonoma Counties, and occur in low gradient, perennial streams with a moderate to heavy riparian canopy. The shrimp is federal and state-listed as Endangered. Although both Redwood Creek and Airport Creek are perennial under current conditions, neither provides suitable habitat for California freshwater shrimp due to a lack of high flow refugia (i.e., undercut banks or cavities) and a shortage of foraging habitat (i.e., exposed roots, low-hanging branches or other vegetation within the stream fringe). There are no known occurrences of California freshwater shrimp within five miles of the Airport. Therefore, the Project would have **No Impact** on individuals or habitat of California freshwater shrimp, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 11, 12, 13)

Central California Coast steelhead: Central California Coast steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) occur in cold-water perennial streams with coarse, clean, well-oxygenated gravel bottoms for spawning and riffle-pool series for rearing. Central California Coast steelhead are federal-listed as Threatened. In the Airport vicinity, steelhead occur in the Laguna de Santa Rosa, Mark West Creek, and Windsor Creek. Redwood and Airport Creeks drain to Windsor Creek, but these small drainages do not contain suitable

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

spawning, rearing, or migration habitat for steelhead as both creeks are slow-moving and soft-bottomed. Although the Project would not impact steelhead individuals or habitat on-site, it could have an impact downstream if water quality were to be affected. Impacts to water quality are **Potentially Significant**, and will be addressed in the EIR. See Section 8 for more discussion of potential water quality impacts. (1, 11, 12, 13)

California tiger salamander: The California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*) is associated with vernal pools and seasonal wetlands on the Santa Rosa Plain. The salamander is federal-listed as Endangered and is a CDFG Species of Special Concern. The Airport is within the potential range of the salamander, and does contain suitable vernal pool and seasonal wetland habitat. However, no tiger salamanders have ever been observed north of Mark West Creek, and the only known site north of Santa Rosa Creek is an established population at the Alton Lane mitigation site (about 3 miles to the south). The Alton Lane site is a mitigation/restoration site which contains translocated CTS; it is not a naturally-occurring population. Since it is a transplanted population, it is not likely that an established migration corridor exists between the preserve and potential habitat within the Airport property. It is probable that Santa Rosa Creek and Mark West Creek form barriers to CTS migration. No CTS have been observed on the Airport during multiple years of surveys conducted by the County and consulting biologists. Therefore, CTS are not thought to be present and no impacts to the species are anticipated.

Nevertheless, the Airport will comply with procedures set forth in the *Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy* (Strategy) and the PBO for projects located within the Santa Rosa Plain. The Strategy and PBO require mitigation for impacts to CTS breeding and upland habitat at ratios determined by distance from a known breeding site or documented adult occurrence. For projects greater than 1.3 miles from a known breeding site and greater than 500 feet from an adult occurrence (the Airport is about 3 miles from both), mitigation is required for all non-hardscape land at a ratio of 0.2 (replacement) to 1 (impact). This mitigation agreement was designed to provide funding for various long-term conservation actions, including land or easement acquisition, restoration on public lands, and habitat management, monitoring and improvement on preserved lands that do not have other funding for management and/or enhancement. Mitigation credits may be purchased from an approved mitigation bank, or a comparable payment may be made into a Species Fund managed by the California Wildlife Foundation, at the discretion of the USFWS. The Airport will implement the Strategy and/or PBO prior to initiation of any grading work by purchasing appropriate mitigation, as authorized by the Service, and therefore, would have a **Less Than Significant** impact on the California tiger salamander. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16)

Other Special Status Wildlife Species: Several species of raptors and other nesting birds are known or expected to occur on the Airport, primarily in riparian areas along Redwood and Airport Creeks. These birds are not federal- or state-listed, but are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and some are considered to be Species of Special Concern by CDFG. Construction of the proposed runway extensions would require removal of a substantial amount of riparian vegetation along Redwood Creek. Removal of vegetation during the nesting season could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact to special status and nesting birds. Impacts will be quantified and appropriate compensatory mitigation will be developed in the EIR. (1, 11, 12, 13)

In addition, western pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*), a CDFG Species of Special Concern, may be present, at least as an occasional migrant, in Redwood or Airport Creeks, or in agricultural ponds proposed for filling on acquired parcels. Although impacts are not likely to occur, they could be **Potentially Significant**, and will be addressed in the EIR. (1, 11, 12, 13)

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

The proposed extension of Runway 14 would require an approximately 1,500-ft long segment of Redwood Creek to be culverted and all woody vegetation removed in order to obtain a barrier-free level surface for the RSA. Extension of the RSA for Runway 19 would not require any physical modifications to Redwood Creek, but may require some vegetation maintenance of the riparian zone to comply with FAA height restrictions (i.e., topping to a certain height). Redwood Creek is classified as an Urban Riparian Corridor by the County General Plan. Impacts to riparian habitat are **Potentially Significant**. Appropriate permits will be required from the ACOE, RWQCB, and/or CDFG prior to construction. Potential impacts to riparian habitat will be quantified and appropriate compensatory mitigation will be developed in the EIR. (1)

Seasonal wetland and vernal pool habitats are also considered to be sensitive natural communities. These are discussed in 4c below.

- 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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

removal filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

O G G G

Vernal pools and seasonal wetlands are present on the Airport; some of these may be located in areas where construction is proposed. A wetland delineation has been conducted on portions of the Airport, but a comprehensive study has not been conducted or verified by the ACOE. Wetlands may also be present on properties proposed for acquisition. Several of these parcels are known to contain agricultural ponds, which may or may not be jurisdictional under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Wetlands not under federal Section 404 jurisdiction may still be jurisdictional under the state Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Impacts to jurisdictional wetlands would be **Potentially Significant**. Appropriate permits will be required from the ACOE, and/or RWQCB prior to construction. Potential impacts to wetlands will be quantified and appropriate compensatory mitigation will be developed in the EIR. (1, 11, 12)

- 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?

O G G G

The Airport perimeter is currently fenced to preclude the movement of large terrestrial wildlife onto the property to the extent feasible. Wildlife moving through the property can be a safety hazard when they cross runways and taxiways, and the Airport operates a wildlife hazard management program to minimize populations of animals which pose a threat to aviation safety. Culverting of approximately 1,500 feet of Redwood Creek may have a **Potentially Significant** impact on the migratory or dispersal movements of native wildlife, and will be addressed in the EIR. (1)

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

G G G O

The County has several tree preservation ordinances, including the Valley Oak Protection Ordinance, the Tree Protection and Replacement Ordinance, and the Heritage or Landmark Tree Ordinance. None of these ordinances apply to public projects of the County. Therefore, there would be **No Impact**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. Although these ordinances do not apply, tree removal is still considered a potentially significant impact (discussed in 4b above). (1)

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- 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? G G G O

The *Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy* is a local conservation plan which includes the Airport property. As described in 4a above, the Airport will follow the Strategy where applicable, and therefore, would have **No Impact** on a local conservation plan. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 16)

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? O G G G

Some of the existing Airport structures may have historical significance due to their association with World War II military use. Cultural resource surveys have been conducted on most of the existing Airport property, but studies have not been conducted on lands proposed for acquisition. In addition, studies conducted to date have not included a detailed evaluation of the Project’s potential impacts to cultural/historical resources. Therefore, the Project could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact. A comprehensive cultural resource study will be conducted and potential impacts to cultural/historical resources will be addressed in the EIR. (1, 11)

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

Cultural resource surveys have been conducted on portions, but not all, of the areas proposed for improvement in the AMP. One prehistoric archaeological site (CA-SON-1322) has been identified on Airport property in an area which may be subject to grading or other disturbance. In addition, the Airport has the potential to contain unidentified prehistoric archaeological deposits due to its proximity to Laguna de Santa Rosa tributaries and its location in central Sonoma County. Unidentified historical archaeological deposits may also be present underlying contemporary development, since 19th century buildings were once located in the area. Studies conducted to date have not included a detailed evaluation of the Project’s potential impacts to cultural/archaeological resources. Therefore, the Project could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact. A

comprehensive cultural resource study will be conducted and potential impacts to cultural/archaeological resources will be addressed in the EIR. (1, 11)

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

G O G G

A fossil locality search and literature review for the project area did not identify any paleontological resources within or adjacent to the Airport property. The geologic units underlying the Project may contain fossils. However, proposed excavation activities would be relatively shallow and would not reach bedrock where paleontological resources would likely to be found. Nevertheless, the project could uncover such materials during construction. The following mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact to **Less Than Significant**. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 11)

Mitigation Measure 5.1:

If paleontological materials are discovered during project construction, all work within 25 feet of the discovery shall cease until a qualified paleontologist is consulted to determine the significance of the find, and has recommended appropriate measures to protect the resource. Further disturbance of the resource shall not be allowed until those recommendations deemed appropriate by the County have been implemented.

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

G G O G

No burial sites are known to occur in the vicinity of the Airport, and most of the Airport has already been disturbed by past construction. In the event that human remains are unearthed during construction, the following mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact to **Less Than Significant**. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 11)

Mitigation Measure 5.2:

State law requires that the County Coroner be notified to investigate the nature and circumstances of the discovery of any human remains. At the time of discovery, work in the immediate vicinity shall cease until the Coroner permits work to proceed. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the find shall be treated as an archaeological site. All work within 25 feet of the discovery shall cease until a qualified archaeologist is consulted to determine the significance of the find, and has recommended

appropriate measures to protect the resource. Further disturbance of the resource shall not be allowed until those recommendations deemed appropriate by the County have been implemented.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

G G O G

The Airport is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest such zone (Healdsburg-Rodgers Creek Fault) is about 2.5 miles east of the Airport. A second, unnamed fault zone present about 2 miles to the southeast of Airport property is considered to be potentially active, but it does not fit the criteria used to identify an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The Project does include construction of a new terminal building, which would be occupied by people on a daily basis. Construction of the terminal would meet the standards of the Uniform Building Code for seismic resistance, site stability, grading, and geologic studies. Because the building would be designed to withstand seismic-related damage, and because of the distance between the Airport and the nearest fault (Healdsburg Fault), it is not expected that the proposed terminal building (or other structures) would be affected by fault rupture. Therefore, this would be a **Less Than Significant** impact, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 17, 18)

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

G G O G

All of Sonoma County is subject to seismic shaking that would result from earthquakes along the San Andreas fault system. Predicting seismic events is not possible, nor is providing mitigation that can entirely reduce the potential for injury and damage that can occur during a seismic event. However, as described above, construction of the terminal (and all structures) would meet the standards of the Uniform Building Code for seismic resistance, site stability, grading, and geologic studies. Therefore, little or no risk to

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

people or structures created by the Project would occur, and this impact would be **Less Than Significant**. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? G G O G

According to studies conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey, most of the Airport has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction, including the east-side building area where the new terminal and other structures are proposed. Alluvial floodplain soils surrounding Redwood and Airport Creeks north of the existing runways have moderate or high susceptibility (very high in the creek itself). The localizer antenna would be relocated to this area; however, no buildings or public structures are proposed here. Therefore, little or no risk to people or structures created by the Project would occur, and this impact would be **Less Than Significant**. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 19)

iv) Landslides? G G G O

The Airport does not have a history of landslides or earth flows, and due to the generally flat nature of the site, landslides are not likely to occur. Therefore, the Project would have **No Impact** on people or structures as a result of landslides. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 20)

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

The majority of the Airport is mapped as Huichica loam by USGS, with Zamora silty clay loam surrounding Redwood and Airport Creeks. Both of these soils have a slight to moderate potential for erosion (depending on slope). The AMP proposes a number of projects which would require grading and earthwork. The runway extensions and associated RSA improvements, in particular, would involve a large amount of earthwork in close proximity to Redwood Creek. Work may be conducted during winter months. Without implementation of appropriate erosion control measures, the Project could result in a **Potentially Significant** loss of topsoil. The potential of individual projects to result in soil erosion will be evaluated in the EIR and appropriate mitigation measures will be developed. (1, 21)

See Section 8 below for a discussion of potential impacts to water quality.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

G G G O

As described above under 6a, soils underlying the Airport have a low potential for landslide, liquefaction, or other geologic instability. The Project would not cause geologic instability on- or off-site. Therefore, there would be **No Impact**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

G G O G

Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code is an index of the relative expansive characteristics of soil as determined through laboratory testing. The expansion index typically is not determined until site-specific geological investigations are conducted. Portions of the Airport are known to contain old fill material and porous natural surface soils that may require amending prior to construction of buildings or paving. The expansion index will be determined through project-specific geological studies as each individual project proposed by the AMP is designed and developed, and all construction will be designed to meet the Building Code. Therefore, little or no risk to people or property would occur as a result of the Project, and this impact would be **Less Than Significant**. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

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

G G G O

The Airport is and will continue to be serviced by public sewer. The Project would not have any effect on the function of existing waste water systems, and therefore, would have **No Impact**. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

See Section 16 below for a discussion of available capacity of existing utilities and service systems.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	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?

G G O G

A variety of common petrochemical and chemical products are routinely used at the Airport, including avgas, Jet A, solvents, cleaning products, and various lubricants. The Airport is a licensed hazardous waste generator, and follows all State and Federal laws applicable to the transport and storage of these materials. In addition, the Airport has an existing General Industrial Storm Water Permit with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (WDID# 1 49I000836). This permit requires inspections and monitoring of Airport facilities. The AMP does not propose any modification to existing Airport operations related to transport, use, or storage of hazardous materials, and therefore, would result in a **Less Than Significant** impact. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

- 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?

G G O G

During construction there could be spills of hazardous materials. In addition, buildings proposed for removal (e.g., the existing terminal) may contain asbestos or lead paint. Hazardous materials use, storage, and disposal are controlled by state and federal laws. The Airport will follow all of the appropriate laws regarding use, storage and transport of hazardous materials into the environment during construction, and therefore, would result in a **Less Than Significant** impact. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR

Accidents involving release of routinely used hazardous materials, including avgas, Jet A, solvents, cleaning products, and various lubricants could also result in an impact to the public or the environment. However, the AMP does not propose any changes to existing operations, which might result in an increase in the potential for accidents. Therefore, the Project will result in a **Less Than Significant** impact, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. See also 7a discussion above. (1)

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

G G G O

There are no existing or proposed schools within 0.25 mile of the Airport. The nearest school (Sonoma County Day School) is located about 0.8 mile to the east of the Airport's east property boundary. Therefore, the Project will have **No Impact** on hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of a school. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

O G G G

There are multiple Cortese list hazardous materials sites in the vicinity of the Airport; several occur on Airport property. Most are associated with old underground storage tanks. However, buried chemical ordnance is also known to occur on portions of Airport property from its prior use as a military base (the former Santa Rosa Army Airfield). During World War II, the former Airfield was used to complete training for fighter pilots and crews in gunnery, bombing, and chemical warfare training. This training took place near Ordinance Road, north of Airport Boulevard. The site was remediated by the Army in the mid-1980s; however, additional ordnance could still exist in this location. Other areas of the Airport are not expected to contain buried ordnance. However, the possibility that future construction projects might encounter hazardous materials and expose these materials to the public or the environment would be a **Potentially Significant** impact, which will be addressed in the EIR. (1, 11, 22)

- 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?

G G G O

The purpose of the AMP is to provide a planning document to guide future development of a safe and efficient airport. The AMP does not propose to change flight patterns, fleet mix, or aircraft type from those already allowed by the existing AMP and ATE, and therefore, would not result in a new or increased safety hazard for people working or residing in the project vicinity. The Project would have **No Impact**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

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

G G G O

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Sonoma County Airport is a public-use airport. See item 7 (e), above.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | G | G | G | O |
|---|---|---|---|---|

The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with the County's adopted emergency operations plan. There is no separate emergency evacuation plan for the County. The Airport has staff to respond to emergencies on Airport property. The AMP would not interfere with existing Airport or County emergency response operations, and therefore, would have **No Impact**. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. See item 15e for a discussion of emergency access during construction. (1)

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

The Airport is not within a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone as mapped by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). Airport land is mapped as Moderate in the infield; most of the rest of the property is Unzoned (i.e., urban development). The Airport has a vegetation maintenance program, which includes regular mowing of grassed infield areas, thereby reducing the fuel load of grassed areas and decreasing the likelihood of fire. In addition, the Airport has aircraft rescue and fire fighting staff on the Airport to contain any aviation-related fires. The Project would not construct buildings that would be affected by wildland fires or expose people to a significant risk of wildland fire, and therefore, would have **No Impact**. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 23, 24)

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | O | G | G | G |
|---|---|---|---|---|

The Airport complies with operational waste discharge requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program through an existing General Industrial Storm Water Permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (WDID# 1 49I000836). This permit regulates discharges associated with broad

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

categories of industrial activities, and requires annual monitoring of Airport facilities and operations. The Airport’s permit would need to be amended to incorporate Project improvements. The NPDES permit program also regulates construction discharges. Therefore, a General Construction Storm Water Permit would also be required. In addition, any impacts to jurisdictional waters or wetlands that would occur during construction would require permits from the ACOE and/or North Coast RWQCB to ensure that federal and state water quality standards are met. Applicable permits will be identified in the EIR.

The Project would result in construction of new impervious surfaces, including runways, taxiways, service roads, and aircraft aprons in the infield, and buildings and parking areas in the east-side building area. An increase in impervious surface area would result in an increase in storm water runoff which may contain pollutants. The Airport is within the boundary of the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) program. New development and significant redevelopment projects that are determined to be “applicable projects” must comply with requirements of the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Projects proposed by the AMP would be evaluated for SUSMP applicability and would be designed to meet SUSMP requirements if determined to be applicable projects.

In addition, the Project would include large-scale grading during construction of the runway extensions and associated clearing of the RSA. Most of this work would be in close proximity to Redwood Creek, and in some cases, will occur in the creek. (An approximately 1,500-ft portion of Redwood Creek will need to be culverted to meet FAA RSA requirements). Redwood Creek is a tributary to the Russian River, via Mark West Creek and Windsor Creek. The Russian River system is listed as impaired for sediment and temperature by the SWRCB⁹. Earthwork could result in soil erosion and discharges of sediment or other pollutants into the creek. In addition, various hazardous materials are used during operational activities, such as aircraft and building maintenance. Accidents or improper use of these materials could result in a release of pollutants into the storm drain system, and ultimately, to an impaired waterway. Project-related discharges of polluted storm water or hazardous materials could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact to water quality. Potential impacts to water quality will be analyzed in the EIR and appropriate mitigation measures will be developed for both construction and operational impacts. (1, 25, 26)

⁹ CWA Section 303(d) List

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted) ?

G G G O

The Airport does not currently use groundwater, nor are any groundwater wells proposed. The Airport is not within a groundwater recharge area identified by the County General Plan. The Project would include additional pavement, but would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge and would have **No Impact** on the local groundwater supply. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 2)

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

O G G G

An approximately 1,500-ft segment of Redwood Creek would be culverted (design not yet determined - may be an arch, box, or open bottom) to allow for a level, obstacle-free runway safety area for Runway 14. This activity is not expected to result in erosion or siltation downstream (erosion control mitigation measures will be implemented during construction; see 6b above), as the course of the stream itself will not be substantially altered. However, the County has not yet completed design for this work, and not enough information is available to make a determination of potential impact. Further CEQA review will be required and will be included in the EIR.

Some drainage improvements would also be conducted in association with construction of runways, taxiways, aprons, and service roads. A new storm water detention basin is proposed to be constructed north of Taxiway A, immediately east of Ordinance Creek. The basin would discharge into Redwood Creek. The detention basin would function to reduce peak storm water discharge and sediment input into Redwood Creek, and therefore, is expected to reduce erosion and siltation in the creek. However, a comprehensive evaluation of proposed drainage improvements, and their potential impact on erosion and siltation will be included in the EIR. (1)

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- 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?

O G G G

The Project proposes construction of additional impervious surfaces. This would result in an increase in the amount of runoff over existing conditions, although the increase is not expected to be substantial. In addition, the Project includes drainage improvements to process on-site runoff (i.e., the new detention basin) and minimize post-project peak discharge rates. However, other Project components, such as culverting approximately 1,500 feet of Redwood Creek and filling of seasonal wetlands and man-made ponds, could affect on-site surface water drainage patterns resulting in flooding. This would be a **Potentially Significant** impact, and will be addressed in the EIR. (1)

- 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?

O G G G

The Project includes construction of a storm water detention basin to process additional runoff generated by new impervious surfaces, and would not generate runoff in excess of planned drainage system capacity. In addition, all storm water drainage systems would be designed to meet SUSMP standards. However, because design has not yet been completed, not enough information is available to make a determination of significance. The EIR will include a review of the drainage plan and will address any identified potentially significant impacts. (1)

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

O G G G

As described in 8a and 8c above, Project-related discharges of polluted storm water, sediments, or hazardous materials, could result in a **Potentially Significant** impact to water quality, which will be addressed in the EIR.

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

G G G O

Redwood and Airport Creeks are both mapped as F1 waterways with F2 floodplains. However, the Project would not construct any housing within the flood zone, and therefore, has **No Impact**. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 27)

- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? O G G G

An approximately 1,500-ft segment of Redwood Creek would be culverted to meet FAA RSA requirements for the proposed extension of Runway 14. The structure would be designed to avoid impeding flood flows; however, not enough information is currently available to make a determination of significance. The potential of the Redwood Creek culvert to impede or redirect flood flows will be analyzed in the EIR. (1)

- i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? G G G O

No structures sheltering people would be constructed in a flood zone. There are no levees or dams upstream of the Airport. Therefore, the Project would have **No Impact**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

- j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? G G G O

The Airport is not subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflows. Therefore, the Project would have **No Impact**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 20)

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community? G G G O

The Project would not physically divide a community. All construction projects are proposed on land within the boundaries of the AMP. Therefore, the Project would have **No Impact**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

- 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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

O G G G

Section 65402 of the California Government Code of Regulations requires that public and private projects be reviewed for conformity with the applicable County General Plan. The proposed AMP is not consistent with some policies of the General Plan ATE, including runway length and aircraft operating weight limits. In addition, some figures (i.e. noise contour maps) and terminology used in the ATE will need to be revised. A General Plan Amendment would be required after approval of the AMP. The EIR will include a consistency determination and an evaluation of potential impacts associated with the proposed General Plan Amendment. (2, 6, 10)

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

G G G O

The Airport is located within the boundaries of the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy. The Strategy provides recommended avoidance and mitigation measures for impacts to three federal-listed Santa Rosa Plain plant species and California tiger salamander. Potential impacts to these species are discussed in Section 4a, and will be further evaluated in the EIR. All mitigations proposed in the EIR will follow the Strategy guidelines, and therefore, would not be in conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan. The Project would have **No Impact** on a habitat conservation plan, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 16)

10. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:

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?

G G G O

There is no known mineral resource on the Airport. Therefore, the Project would have **No Impact**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 2, 10, 28)

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?

G G G O

The project site is not a mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, the Project would have **No Impact**, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 2, 10, 28)

11. NOISE Would the project result in:

- 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?

O G G G

Noise levels are typically measured in one of two ways, as the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or the Day-Night Average Level (L_{dn}). Both methods provide a measurements of total noise exposure at a given location for an average day. The most common unit of sound measurement is the decibel (dB). Because the human ear is more sensitive to some sound wave frequencies than others, different sound weighting scales have been developed. The "A" weighting scale is the most commonly used for environmental noise assessment, as it correlates well with the human response to noise sources such as aircraft and traffic (A-weighted decibels is abbreviated as dBA).

The Noise Element of the 1989 *Sonoma County General Plan* contains standards for both transportation and operational noise. Noise levels are rarely constant, but typically vary over time. Under General Plan criteria for operational noise, the louder the noise, the shorter the duration of time that it is allowed to occur. The General Plan operational noise performance standards specify a daytime and nighttime noise level and the permissible duration of that noise level as measured at the exterior property line of any adjacent noise sensitive land use. Such uses include residences, schools, long-term care medical facilities, places of worship, and libraries.

For transportation noise, the General Plan indicates that the noise level should not exceed 60 dBA L_{dn} as measured in outdoor activity areas (e.g., patio or back yard) of sensitive receptors.

Infrequent single events, such as overflight by an airplane, may interfere with adjacent uses even though the cumulative noise exposure is within General Plan operational noise limits. The potential for sleep disturbance is often the main concern in these cases. When a project-related noise source will consist of intermittent single events, the General Plan recommends that a single event noise standard be developed.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The General Plan ATE also contains noise contours and noise standards applicable to proposed development in the vicinity of airports. Noise exposure contours for airports use the CNEL metric as required by California Airport Noise Regulations (CCR Title 21). The CNEL contours are included on ATE and CLUP noise contour maps.

Previous noise analyses conducted for the 1989 General Plan and General Plan 2020 were based on a projected number of annual operations and/or an aircraft fleet mix which differ from those of the AMP. Therefore, a new noise analysis will be conducted as part of the EIR environmental review process to identify actual noise levels associated with AMP activities and AMP aviation forecasts. AMP compliance with General Plan standards will be determined in the EIR. (1, 2, 10)

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? G G O G

The project would not generate excessive ground borne vibration. Construction activities may result in minor generation of ground borne vibrations from heavy construction equipment. No pile-driving, blasting, or other high vibration producing activities are proposed as part of Project construction. Ground borne vibrations generated by construction activities would be of low magnitude, would be temporary, and would result in a **Less Than Significant** ground borne noise impact. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

The AMP forecasts an increase in the number of flight operations compared to baseline levels, which could result in an increase in the ambient noise level in the Airport vicinity. A baseline noise analysis was conducted to develop new noise contours associated with AMP improvements (i.e, runway extensions) and aviation forecasts. The resulting contours are different from those included in the current AMP and ATE. A new noise analysis will be conducted as part of the EIR environmental review process to determine whether these changes would result in a substantial permanent increase over existing noise levels. (1, 29)

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

There will be temporary noise generation by construction equipment during various construction projects, including demolition of existing buildings. All of these construction activities would occur on Airport property. Residences and office buildings in the vicinity are generally too far away from the Airport to be affected by construction noise occurring on the Airport property. Therefore, construction activities occurring on Airport property would result in a **Less Than Significant** noise impact, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

However, construction traffic noise (i.e., heavy trucks) may affect receptors along access routes. Airport Boulevard is the most likely access route to be used by construction equipment. There are no residences along Airport Boulevard, but there are a number of office buildings. Not enough information is available (i.e., number of trucks, proposed route) to make a determination of potential impact at this time. Further CEQA review of construction traffic noise will be required and will be included in the EIR.

- 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?

O G G G

The Project is located on a public airport and an airport land use plan (Sonoma County CLUP) applies to the surrounding area. Noise contours will be generated and impacts analyzed for the proposed runway extensions as part of the EIR noise study. In addition, updated maps will be prepared for the use of the ALUC. Refer to 11(a) and 11(d) above.

- 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?

G G G O

The Project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. It is located on a public airport. (1)

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

G G O G

The Project would have no direct or indirect effect on population growth. All of the improvements proposed in the AMP are in response to the existing demand for aviation services and/or forecasts of aviation demand projected to 2030. The Project would not result in construction of new homes or businesses, nor would it induce a significant number of new passengers or new employees to move to the area. Therefore, the Project would have a **Less Than Significant** impact on population growth, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

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

G G O G

The AMP proposes acquisition of several properties adjacent to the Airport, primarily to provide approach protection for existing and extended runways. Many of these properties have existing residences, which would be removed following acquisition, in which case the residents would require replacement housing. The General Plan allows purchase of properties identified in the ATE to reduce the land use incompatibility created by low overflight and resulting noise impacts to residences. Current policy does not support condemnation of these parcels, thus acquisition is by fee ownership when properties are offered for sale by owners. General Plan 2020 (Policy AT-1h) does propose to allow eminent domain to protect approach zones if authorized by the County Board of Supervisors. However, the relocation of a few residential households would not constitute a substantial displacement, and is therefore, a **Less Than Significant** impact. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 2, 10)

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

G G O G

As described in 12b above, a small number of people will be displaced from existing residences on properties to be acquired. This would result in a **Less Than Significant** impact on local housing. (1)

13. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	G	G	G	O
------------------	---	---	---	---

The project would not affect fire services. The Airport has fire suppression equipment, and has the primary responsibility for responding to aviation crash incidents with mutual aid support by local fire districts. Primary fire protection for non-aircraft fires is provided by the Rincon Valley Fire District. The Project would not result in construction of a substantial number of new buildings that would require additional fire protection (most AMP proposed projects involve relocation or redevelopment of existing facilities, not creation of additional ones), and therefore, would have **No Impact** on fire protection services. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

Police protection?	G	G	G	O
--------------------	---	---	---	---

The Sonoma County Sheriff will continue to serve the Airport and the Airport vicinity. There would be no increased need for police protection resulting from the proposed AMP as the project does not include development of new residential or business communities. Airport security within the passenger terminal is provided by the TSA, and would have **No Impact** on local police forces. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

Schools, parks, or other public facilities?	G	G	G	O
---	---	---	---	---

The AMP would not result in the need for new schools, parks, public facilities or utilities, but it is possible that existing public utilities buried within construction areas could be affected during construction activities. Standard contract language requires that the construction contractor call Underground Service Alert (USA) and provide them with all necessary data relative to the proposed work so that participating agencies with utilities in the area will mark their locations in the field using USA standard colors and codes to identify the facility. The contractor is then required to work around public utilities and other improvements that are to remain in place within construction areas. Therefore, the

Project would have **No Impact** on public facilities, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

14. RECREATION

- 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? G G G O

The project would have no effect on population growth or the distribution of the population, and therefore, would have **No Impact** on park use. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

- 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? G G G O

The Airport is not open to the public and does not provide recreational opportunities, except for general aviators with access through controlled gates. No public recreational facilities would be constructed by the Project, and therefore, it would have **No Impact** on public recreation. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:

- 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 intersections)? O G G G

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Existing Conditions

Traffic congestion in the Airport vicinity already exists, primarily as a result of increasing traffic related to development of the Airport Business Center. The Airport Boulevard/ Highway 101 southbound ramp intersection is currently operating at level of service (LOS) F during AM peak hour traffic¹⁰. Airport Boulevard east of Regional Parkway also experiences recurring congestion due to back-ups at the unsignalized interchange. This road segment currently operates at LOS D-F during AM peak and LOS F during PM peak hour traffic¹¹. Several road projects to improve LOS and decrease congestion are anticipated to be constructed in the Airport vicinity at some point in the future. These include widening Airport Boulevard, widening/ reconfiguration of the Airport Boulevard/ Highway 101 interchange, and extension of Brickway Boulevard to connect Airport Boulevard to River Road via Laughlin Road. The interchange project is part of the larger Caltrans/ SCTA Highway 101 Project currently in construction and anticipated to be completed in 2011. There are no known time frames for the other projects. However, it is likely that Airport-related traffic would begin to increase prior to the completion of all of these projects.

AMP Traffic Generation

Commercial air service at the Airport is expected to increase over time to accommodate the growing demand. The AMP forecasts 13.33 average daily departures (ADD) by year 2030, resulting in an estimated total of 938 daily enplaned passengers requiring transport to the Airport¹². Under current conditions, approximately 351 daily enplaned passengers require transportation to the Airport¹³. The 2030 projected aviation activity forecast would increase the number of daily enplaned passengers by approximately 587; however,

¹⁰ Highway 101 HOV Lane Widening and Improvements Project- From Steel Lane to Windsor River Road, Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report. State of California Department of Transportation and Sonoma County Transportation Authority. October 2007. Table H-3.

¹¹ Sonoma County General Plan 2020 - General Plan Update, Final Environmental Impact Report. Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. June 12, 2007 (EIR will not be certified until the Board of Supervisors adopts the General Plan). Exhibits 4.2-7, 4.2-8 & 4.2-10.

¹² Based on 8.44 ADD and 101 average seats for air carrier aircraft and 4.89 ADD and 76 average seats for commuter aircraft at standard FAA boarding load factor growth rates (77.2% for air carrier and 75.4% for commuter in 2030).

¹³ Based on 6 ADD using 76-seat aircraft at a 77% load factor.

this increase would translate to a relatively small number of additional vehicle trips in relation to the existing traffic load on the local road system.

Although implementation of the AMP is not expected to generate a substantial number of additional vehicle trips, the County of Sonoma Traffic Guidelines require a traffic study for any project area where one or more streets or intersections are currently operating at LOS D or worse. Therefore, additional analysis, including a new traffic study, is necessary. The EIR will include a new traffic study, after which a determination of significance will be made. Although only 13.33 ADD are projected by the AMP, the EIR will analyze traffic associated with a maximum of 21 ADD. (1, 10, 30, 31)

Construction activities would also generate a temporary increase in traffic because workers would drive to and from work sites and building materials would be transported to the site. In particular, construction of the runway extensions may require a significant amount of fill material to be imported. Potential impacts from construction-generated traffic will be evaluated in the EIR.

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

O G G G

There is no regional congestion management agency which includes Sonoma County. Therefore, LOS standards are set by local jurisdictions. The County General Plan has established LOS standards for unincorporated areas of Sonoma County. The County's level of service standard on roadways is LOS C or better. However, lower LOS standards have been adopted for specific roadway segments in the General Plan. Airport Boulevard is one of these segments; the adopted standard on Airport Boulevard is LOS D. The County's level of service standard for intersections is LOS D.

As described above in 15a, the primary Airport access road, Airport Boulevard, is already operating at LOS F during peak hour traffic, as is the Highway 101 southbound ramp intersection. In cases where existing conditions already exceed the adopted LOS, a project is considered to have a significant traffic impact if it would further decrease the average travel speed by 0.5 miles per hour (mph) on LOS F roadways and/or increase the delay at LOS E or F intersections by five seconds or more. The EIR will include a new traffic study, after which a determination of significance will be made. (1, 10, 30, 31)

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic

and the stockpiling of materials shall not occur in public roadways or any other area that may impede emergency access.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | G | G | G | ■ |
|---|---|---|---|---|

The terminal design study included an analysis of parking space requirements which evaluated the projected number of passengers to go through the terminal in one year and anticipated public use of amenities (i.e., meetings rooms, restaurants). The study determined that 1,500 spaces would be adequate to serve the existing and future parking needs of the Airport. Therefore, the AMP proposes to reconfigure and expand existing parking lots to provide parking for up to 1,500 cars in a combination of short-term and long term parking lots. This would result in an increase of 610 spaces over existing conditions (890 spaces, inclusive of the 175 to be completed in early 2009). The AMP would not result in inadequate parking capacity, and therefore, would have **No Impact**. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

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

The proposed Project contains elements which would encourage the use of transit services at the Airport, such as reconfiguring the existing terminal access road to have additional lanes and a longer curb, allowing easier curbside bus pick-up and drop-off. Transit access to the Airport is available through several public and private providers, including Sonoma County Transit, Mendocino Transit Authority, and Airport Express.

Airport Boulevard is designated a Class II Bikeway. All road improvements on Airport Boulevard (the terminal access road) would comply with shoulder requirements for Class II Bikeways. Bicycle racks are already present at the Airport terminal. The new terminal would also include bicycle racks, although bicycle racks are primarily provided for use by employees, not airline passengers. The AMP Project would support the use of alternative transportation systems and would not conflict with alternative transportation policies, plans, or programs, and therefore, would have **No Impact**. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1, 2, 10, 32)

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | G | G | G | O |
|---|---|---|---|---|

The Project is within the jurisdiction of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, which issues discharge permits for wastewater treatment facilities. Wastewater treatment for the Airport is provided by the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone managed by the Sonoma County Water Agency. The Sanitation Zone has adequate capacity to serve the project (see 16b for more details); therefore, the Project would have **No Impact** on the Sanitation Zone’s ability to meet wastewater treatment requirements. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

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

G G O G

Proposed AMP improvements would generate greater amounts of wastewater than the existing Airport, due primarily to expansion of visitor-serving facilities in the new terminal complex (i.e., additional restrooms and food-serving establishments). The Airport is within the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone. Airport operations currently use 78 Equivalent Single Family Dwelling (ESD) units; 150 more ESD units are available to the Airport for future needs. The proposed expanded facilities associated with the new terminal complex are anticipated to require 25-30 additional ESD units, which would not approach or exceed the Airport’s ESD allotment, and therefore, would have a **Less Than Significant** impact. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

G G O G

The AMP would result in construction of a variety of new impervious surfaces, including runway extensions, taxiways, service roads, parking aprons, and buildings. Various storm water drainage improvements would be constructed in association with these projects, including new (and replaced) subsurface drain system components and a new storm water detention basin. Potential impacts related to the construction of storm water drainage facilities are addressed in other sections of the Initial Study and will be included in the EIR, where appropriate. Potential impacts are primarily related to hydrology and ground disturbance activities, discussed under biology (Sec 4), cultural resources (Sec 5), geology/soils (Sec 6), and hydrology (Sec 8). However, construction of proposed

drainage improvements will have a **Less Than Significant** impact on public utilities and service systems. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

Water for the Airport is provided by the City of Windsor. The AMP proposes expanding some facilities that would require additional water consumption, such as restrooms and food-serving establishments, and aircraft wash facilities. However, these uses would not require a substantial increase in water use, and the available water supply is adequate to serve the needs of the Project. No new or expanded water entitlements are needed for the AMP Project. Therefore, the Project would have a **Less Than Significant** impact on the available water supply, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? G G O G

See item 16a and 16b, above. The Project would not exceed the available capacity of the wastewater treatment provider, the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone. The Airport has an additional 150 ESD units available for future needs, and is not expecting to require more than 30 ESD for proposed improvements. Therefore, the Project would have a **Less Than Significant** impact, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

The AMP proposes improvement projects which would result in greater generation of solid waste than under current conditions, primarily due to expansion of visitor-serving facilities (e.g., restrooms, restaurants) in the new terminal complex and the projected increase in the number of airline passengers anticipated to use these facilities. Sonoma County has a solid waste management program in place that provides solid waste collection and disposal services for the entire County. The program can accommodate the permitted collection and disposal of the waste that would result from the proposed Project. Therefore, the Project would have a **Less Than Significant** impact, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.(1)

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

G G G O

The Project would comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste during operation and construction, and therefore, would have **No Impact**. No further analysis is warranted in the EIR. (1)

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number of restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

O G G G

Project implementation could result in potential adverse impacts on: aesthetics, primarily as a result of new light or glare; agricultural resources; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; geology and soils (soil erosion); hazardous materials (possible buried ordnance); hydrology and water quality; land use and planning (General Plan Amendment); noise; and traffic (vehicular and aircraft). PRMD Environmental Review staff recommend that these impacts be evaluated in an EIR.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

O G G G

The AMP was created and is being updated to guide long-range planning and development on Airport property, in part to identify potential project-level impacts likely to occur within the 20-year life of the AMP which could contribute to a cumulative impact. The Initial Study has identified potential cumulative impacts in air quality and traffic. PRMD Environmental Review staff recommend that these impacts be evaluated in an EIR.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

O G G G

The AMP proposes projects which could result in direct and/or indirect adverse effects to humans in the areas of noise, and land use compatibility. PRMD Environmental Review staff recommend that these impacts be evaluated in an EIR.

SOURCES

Documents Incorporated by Reference:

Charles M. Schulz - Sonoma County Airport Master Plan Update. Mead & Hunt. November 2007.

Sonoma County Airport Master Plan. Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. December 15, 1998.

Charles M. Schulz - Sonoma County Airport, Airport Layout Plan Narrative Report and Technical Study. Mead & Hunt and LSA Associates. August 2004.

New Passenger Terminal Study, Sonoma County Airport, Santa Rosa, CA. Gerson/ Overstreet Architects, Edward Just Associates, and Shutt Moen Associates. August 28, 2002.

Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) for Sonoma County. Sonoma County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). January 2001 (amended October 2001).

California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics. January 2002.

Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics. December 1993.

Sources Cited in the Initial Study Checklist:

1. Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department (PRMD) staff evaluation of impact based on review of the project site, the AMP, and/or consultation with the Airport Manager.
2. Sonoma County General Plan and Program EIR. Sonoma County Board of Supervisors. March 23, 1989 (Revised December 31, 1998).
3. Assessors Parcel Map.
4. Visual Assessment Guidelines. Sonoma County PRMD. undated.
5. Sonoma County Important Farmland Map. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. 1996.
6. Official Zoning Database (OZD). Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department.
7. Bay Area Clean Air Plan (CAP) and Triennial Assessment. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. December 20, 2000.
8. Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and Association of Bay Area Governments. January 4, 2006.
9. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans. BAAQMD. December, 1999.

10. Sonoma County General Plan 2020- Planning Commission Recommended Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report. Sonoma County PRMD. (FEIR dated June 12, 2007, but will not be certified until the Board of Supervisors adopts the General Plan).
11. Environmental Baseline Data Report, Charles M. Schulz - Sonoma County Airport, Master Plan Update. LSA Associates, Inc. October 2007.
12. Biological Assessment, Charles M. Schulz - Sonoma County Airport, Sonoma County, California. LSA Associates, Inc. March 24, 2006.
13. California Natural Diversity Database. California Department of Fish & Game. Data dated December 31, 2007.
14. Programmatic Biological Opinion for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Permitted Projects that May Affect California Tiger Salamander and Three Endangered Plant Species on the Santa Rosa Plain, California. U. S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Sacramento Office. November 9, 2007.
15. Seasonal Wetland Baseline Report for the Santa Rosa Plain, Sonoma County. Charles A. Patterson. June 30, 1994.
16. Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy. Conservation Strategy Team. December 1, 2005.
17. Official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, Central Coastal Region. California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey. Data dated April 1, 2001.
18. Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California. Special Publication 42. California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. 1973 (Revised 1997).
19. Preliminary Maps of Quaternary Deposits and Liquefaction Susceptibility, Nine-County San Francisco Bay Region, California: A Digital Database (Version 1.0). Open-File Report 00-444. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey. 2000.
20. Summary Distribution of Slides and Earth Flows in the San Francisco Bay Region, California. Open-File Report 97-745 C. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey. 1997 (Revised 1998).
21. Soil Survey of Sonoma County, California. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. In cooperation with the University of California Agricultural Experiment Station. 1972.
22. Cortese List: California Environmental Protection Agency- <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/default.htm>; California Regional Water Quality Control Board- <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/>; California Dept of Toxic Substances Control- http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese_list.cfm; Integrated Waste Management Board- <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp>
23. Sonoma County Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas (SRA). California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). Adopted November 2007.
24. Draft Sonoma County Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas (LRA). California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). Draft September 2007.
25. 2006 CWA Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments Requiring TMDLS. State Water Resources Control Board. USEPA Approval June 28, 2007.
26. Guidelines for the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP)- Storm Water Best Management Practices for New Development and Redevelopment For the Santa Area and Unincorporated Areas around Petaluma and Sonoma. Sonoma County, City of Santa Rosa, and Russian River Watershed Association. June 3, 2005.

27. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Sonoma County, Community-Panel Number 0603750535B. Federal Emergency Management Agency. April 2, 1991.
28. Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan and Program EIR. November 1994.
29. Environmental Baseline Noise Analysis, Charles M. Schulz Sonoma County Airport. Mestre Greve Associates. October 2007.
30. Highway 101 HOV Lane Widening and Improvements Project- From Steel Lane to Windsor River Road, Environmental Assessment/ Final Environmental Impact Report. State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA). October 2007.
31. County of Sonoma Guidelines for Traffic Studies. Sonoma County PRMD. October 6, 2006.
32. Sonoma County Bikeways Plan. Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works. April, 1997.

ACRONYMS

AAC	Aircraft Approach Category
ACOE	Army Corps of Engineers
ADD	Average Daily Departures
ADG	Airplane Design Group
ALP	Airport Layout Plan
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission
AMP	Airport Master Plan
APN	Accessor Parcel Number
ARC	Airport Reference Code
ARFF	Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting
ATCT	Air Traffic Control Tower
ATE	(Sonoma County General Plan) Air Transportation Element
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BBJ2	Boeing Business Jet 2
BRL	Building Restriction Line
CAC	Community Advisory Committee
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CALUP/CLUP	Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CLUP/CALUP	Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
DA	Diverse Agriculture- County zoning designation
dB	Decibel(s)
dBA	A-weighted decibel(s)
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
ERJ 190	Embraer Regional Jet 190
ESA	(Federal) Endangered Species Act
ESD	Equivalent Single Family Dwellings
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAR	Federal Aviation Regulation
FBO	Fixed Base Operator
FE	Federal-Listed as Endangered under the ESA
GHG	Greenhouse gases
HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
ILS	Instrument Landing System
LAS	Las Vegas International Airport
LAX	Los Angeles International Airport

LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LIA	Land Intensive Agriculture- County zoning designation
MALSR	Medium-Intensity Approach Lighting System
MIRL	Medium Intensity Runway Lights
MITL	Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights
MSL	Mean Sea Level
NOI	Notice of Intent
NOx	Nitrogen Oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
ODALS	Omnidirectional Approach Lighting System
PAPI	Precision Approach Path Indicator
PDX	Portland International Airport
PRMD	(Sonoma County) Permit and Resource Management Department
RAIL	Runway Alignment Indicator Lights
REILS	Runway End Identifier Lights
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RPZ	Runway Protection Zone
RSA	Runway Safety Area
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SACMA	Sonoma County Consolidated Wetland Mitigation Area preserve
SCTA	Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SE	State-Listed as Endangered under the CESA
SEA	Seattle-Tacoma International Airport
STS	Charles M. Schulz - Sonoma County Airport
SUSMP	Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TCM	Transportation Control Measure
TSA	Transportation Security Administration
UPS	United parcel Service
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VASI	Visual Approach Slope Indicator