

## 4.0 Environmental Evaluation

### 4.1 Introduction

Chapter 4: Environmental Evaluation and Chapter 3: Affected Environment constitute the scientific and analytic basis for the comparison of effects presented in Chapter 2 of this ND/Final EA.

### 4.2 NEPA Cumulative Effects

As an Environmental Assessment (EA) under NEPA, this document must consider cumulative effects when determining whether the proposed project would significantly affect the quality of the human environment. If it were reasonable to anticipate cumulatively significant impacts, then an Environmental Impact Statement would have to be prepared.

The term "cumulative impact" is defined in 40 CFR 1508.7 as follows: "The impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what federal or local agency, entity or person undertakes such other actions."

The proposed project would have incremental impacts when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. However, the impacts would not be cumulatively significant, and an EIS does not have to be prepared. A consideration of cumulative impacts under CEQA reached a similar conclusion; see Section 5.XVII.b.

### 4.3 List of technical studies/reports

Several studies and reports were conducted and are incorporated as reference in this environmental evaluation for this project. The following studies and evaluations are available for review at **Caltrans District 4 Office, 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, CA.**<sup>3</sup>

Sonoma/Marin Multi-Modal Transportation & Land Use Study (Calthorpe Study), June 6, 1997

\*1998 Regional Transportation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area, October 1998

MTC North Bay Corridor Study, Draft Final Report, December 1997

1997 High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane Master Plan Update for the San Francisco Bay Area, MTC, November 1997

Noise Impact Report for the Proposed Widening Project on Route 101 in Sonoma County in the City of Santa Rosa from Wilfred Avenue to Route 12, October 1998

Project Study Report – Construct Median Barriers, Sonoma 12, Caltrans, September 1997

Preliminary Biological Assessment Sonoma 101 Freeway Modification, Caltrans, Office of Environmental Planning North, Sonoma 101 Widening, September 1998

Major Investment Study (MIS) Analysis for the Route 101 Lane Project in Sonoma County from Wilfred Avenue to Route 12, Caltrans, Office of Transportation Planning, September 1997

Traffic Report: Route-101 Widening Project in Sonoma County from Wilfred Avenue to Route 12, Office of Highway Operations, November 1998

Caltrans. "Technical Memorandum #1 - Reconstruction of Year 2015 Forecasts," California Department of Transportation, Office of Highway Operations, August 13, 1999

Caltrans. "Technical Memorandum #2 - New Traffic Performance Comparisons," California Department of

---

<sup>3</sup> Asterisked documents may also be reviewed on-line at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/fson101.htm>.

Transportation, Office of Highway Operations, October 5, 1999

Caltrans. "Technical Memorandum #3 - New FREQ Traffic Analysis, February 4, 2000

"Caltrans Environmental Handbook Volume 4, Community Impact Assessment", Caltrans Environmental Program Cultural Studies Office, June 1997

Caltrans, District 4 Interregional Improvement Plan, December 9, 1998

Preliminary Materials Recommendations for SON 101-14.9/19.7, Caltrans, Geotechnical, September 1994

Negative Archaeology Survey Report, Caltrans, August 1998

Initial Site Assessment, Office of Environmental Engineering, Sonoma 101 Widening Project, Volume 1, November 1998

"Environmental Site Investigation Report/ Route 101 and Route 12/Santa Rosa, Sonoma California", Office of Environmental Engineering, August 19, 1999

Visual Assessment, Caltrans, Office of Landscape Architecture, Sonoma 101 Widening and Sound Wall Construction, July 1997

Supplement to Visual Assessment of Proposed Improvements, Caltrans, Office of Landscape Architecture, Sonoma 101 HOV Widening Project, June 30, 1999

Air Quality Impact Report, Route 101 from Wilfred Avenue to Route 12 and Route 12 from Fulton Road to Farmers Lane in Sonoma County, Caltrans, Office of Environmental Engineering, October 1998

Draft Final Report, Sonoma County US 101 Variable Pricing Study, Parsons, Brinkerhoff, Quade & Douglass, Inc., MTC/Sonoma County Transportation Authority, September 1998

Draft Project Study Report, Modify Steele Lane Interchange/HOV Lanes, Caltrans, September 1999

Draft US 101 North Corridor, Transportation Corridor Concept Report, October 1, 1999.

"Transforming the State Transportation Improvement Program," <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/sb45/FAOSB45.html>, Caltrans

"The Citizens' Guide to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission", MTC, Third Edition, June 1997

"Highway Safety Improvement Program Guidelines", Caltrans Highway Safety Improvement Program, Caltrans Office of Transportation Safety, December 1998

Association of Bay Area Governments "Projection 98", December 1997

Sonoma/Marin Multi-Modal Transportation & Land Use Study (Calthorpe Study), June 6, 1997

Sonoma County Growth Management Ordinance, 1992

Santa Rosa General Plan (Vision 2020), 1998

Association of Bay Area Governments/Sonoma County Subregional Issues and Policies Paper

Federal Highway Administration, "Position Paper: Secondary and Cumulative Impact Assessment in the Highway Project Development Process", April 1992

"Growth Inducement Technical Report", Highway 101/Route 12 Widening and Soundwall Improvement Project, February 2000

"Final Socio-Economic Report I-680/Sunol Grade Improvement Project", November 1999

Robert Blizzard, Record of Conversation with CDFG & NMFS on Route 101 Project Impacts to Laguna de Santa Rosa and Colgon Creek, February 2000

Ahmad Hashemi, Record of Conversation with USFWS on Route 101 species impacts, April 2000

#### **4.4 CEQA Environmental Significance Checklist**

This section evaluates the potential project impacts and, where necessary, proposes mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts. The CEQA Environmental Checklist in **Table 4-4**, which follows, provides a structure for this document's assessment of potential environmental impacts.

The CEQA Environmental Checklist Form that follows replaces the checklist included in the draft version of this IS/EA, as required by the Revisions to the CEQA Guidelines dated October 26, 1998. The format of this checklist is noticeably different from the previous format, which was in general use at the time the draft IS/EA was issued. For the benefit of readers who want to refer to the checklist responses from the draft document, the original checklist for the draft IS/EA is attached in **Appendix A**.

**TABLE 4-4**  
**CEQA**  
**Environmental Checklist Form**

**1. Project title:** Sonoma 101 Widening and Soundwall Construction

**2. Lead agency name and address:** California Department of Transportation  
District 4,111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, CA 94612

**3. Contact person and phone number:** Susan Simpson, Chief, Office of Environmental Planning, North (510) 286-5617

**4. Project location:** Sonoma County, in Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park

**5. Project sponsor's name and address:**  
California Department of Transportation, District 4

**6. General plan designation:** Industrial **7. Zoning:** Industrial

**8. Description of project:** (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is proposing to widen Sonoma 101 (KP 23.7-31.7) from 4 to 6 lanes and construct soundwalls. This project is in the City of Santa Rosa and near Rohnert Park.

**9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:**

The proposed project is situated primarily in the Santa Rosa Valley and extends southward into the Cotati Valley. Sonoma County is one of the fastest growing regions within the greater San Francisco Bay Area and is composed of a series of cities with well-defined edges that are dispersed along the Route 101 corridor. The project area stretches 7.4 km from the Wilfred Avenue Interchange in Rohnert Park to the Route 101/12 Separation in Santa Rosa. Route 101 is the only through route that connects the major population and commercial centers and is the primary commute corridor between communities and the San Francisco Bay Area.

**10. Other public agencies whose approval is required**

Army Corp of Engineers - (404 Permits-Nationwide #14 & 33)

City of Santa Rosa Park & Recreation - 4(F) Temporary Use Agreement

City of Santa Rosa - Temporary Construction Permits, Permanent Construction Easements

California Transportation Commission - vote of funds

California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Water Quality Certification

California Department of Fish and Game- 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources              | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality          | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems   | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
  
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
  
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
  
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
  
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Susan Simpson  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed name

Environmental Planning, North  
\_\_\_\_\_  
For

**Sonoma 101 Widening & Soundwall Construction (Wilfred to Route 12)  
Final Negative Declaration/Final Environmental Assessment**

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b><u>Reference Section</u></b>
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> -- Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.10/5.I</b>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and Historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.10/5.I</b>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.10/5.I</b>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.10/5.I</b>
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:</b> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.II</b>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.II</b>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.II</b>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b><u>Reference Section</u></b>
<b>III. AIR QUALITY --</b> Where available, the Significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.4/5.III</b>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.4/5.III</b>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.4/5.III</b>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.4/5.III</b>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.4/5.III</b>
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES --</b> Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.8/5.IV</b>
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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.8/5.IV</b>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.8/5.IV</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.8/5.IV</b>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b>Reference Section</b>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.IV</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.IV</b>
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</b>					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.12/5.V 12.0</b>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.12/5.V 12.0</b>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.12/5.V 12.0</b>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.12/5.V 12.0</b>
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:</b>					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.3/5.VI</b>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.3/5.VI</b>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.3/5.VI</b>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.3/5.VI</b>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.3/5.VI</b>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.3/5.VI</b>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b><u>Reference Section</u></b>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.3/5.VI</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.3/5.VI</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.3/5.VI</b>

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS --**

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/5.VII 5.VIII</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/5.VII 5.VIII</b>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/5.VII 5.VIII</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/5.VII 5.VIII</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/5.VII 5.VIII</b>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/5.VII 5.VIII</b>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/5.VII 5.VIII</b>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b>Reference Section</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/5.VII 5.VIII</b>
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY –</b> Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/3.7 5.VII/5.VIII</b>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/3.7 5.VII/5.VIII</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/3.7 5.VII/5.VIII</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/3.7 5.VII/5.VIII</b>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/3.7 5.VII/5.VIII</b>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/3.7 5.VII/5.VIII</b>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/3.7 5.VII/5.VIII</b>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/3.7 5.VII/5.VIII</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/3.7 5.VII/5.VIII</b>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reference Section
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.6/3.7 5.VII/5.VIII</b>
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -</b> Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>2.3/3.9 5.IX</b>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>2.3/3.9 5.IX</b>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>2.3/3.9 5.IX</b>
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES --</b> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.X</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.X</b>
<b>XI. NOISE --</b> Would the project:					
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.5/5.XI</b>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.5/5.XI</b>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.5/5.XI</b>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.5/5.XI</b>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b>Reference Section</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.5/5.XI</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.5/5.XI</b>
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:</b>					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>2.3/5.XII</b>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>2.3/2.6.1 5.XII</b>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>2.3/2.6.1 5.XII</b>
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>					
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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XIII</b>
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XIII</b>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XIII</b>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XIII</b>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>3.5/3.11 5.XIII</b>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XIII</b>
<b>XIV. RECREATION --</b>					
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XIV</b>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>	<b>Reference Section</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XIV</b>

**XV. 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>1.3/2.3 5.XV</b>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>1.3/2.3 5.XV</b>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>1.3/2.3 5.XV</b>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>1.3/2.3 5.XV</b>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>1.3/2.3 5.XV</b>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>1.3/2.3 5.XV</b>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>1.3/2.3 5.XV</b>

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --**

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.VIII/ 5.XVI</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.VIII/ 5.XVI</b>

**Sonoma 101 Widening & Soundwall Construction (Wilfred to Route 12)  
Final Negative Declaration/Final Environmental Assessment**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Reference Section
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.VIII/ 5.XVI</b>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XVI</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XVI</b>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XVI</b>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XVI</b>
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --</b>					
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XVII.a</b>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XVII.b</b>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>5.XVII.c</b>