

2.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

2.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This chapter summarizes the proposed project considered in this Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR), including environmental impacts associated with the proposed project and mitigation measures.

2.1 PROPOSED PROJECT

The project site, a portion of the Jack London Village, is located at 14301 Arnold Drive in the unincorporated community of Glen Ellen in Sonoma County. The project site is located on the east side of Arnold Drive south of the intersection with Hill Road near the Sonoma Valley Regional Park, approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Arnold Drive intersection with State Route 12. Arnold Drive is a two-lane road and designated as a Scenic Corridor by the *Sonoma County 1989 General Plan* near the Jack London Village.

The Jack London Village consists of three separate parcels totaling approximately 5.5 acres: the North Parcel (2.50 acres), the Central Parcel (2.63 acres), and the South Parcel (0.33 acres)

The three contiguous parcels of the Jack London Village are oriented in an elongated, north-south manner that narrows as it tends to the south. Existing topography is relatively flat and uniform from north to south across all three parcels. Arnold Drive bounds the project site to the west. Designated a *blue line stream*, Sonoma Creek bounds the Jack London Village on the east with greater than 1,300 linear feet of frontage.¹ Asbury Creek bisects the village from west to east while an unnamed drainage and the lands of Watkins (i.e., 14095 Arnold Drive) bound the village to the north.

Wolf House Inn, LLC proposes to develop a three-story, 46-room condominium hotel with 120 shared parking spaces with the adjoining Jack London Village commercial center, a “creek walk” (i.e., a pedestrian walkway) along Sonoma Creek, three “swimming holes” connected by “waterfalls”, a water garden, and spa facility. The proposed building would be approximately 45,000 square feet.

The proposed Wolf House Inn project would require the following approvals from Sonoma County:

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

It is proposed to revise the land use designation of the *1989 General Plan* from LC (Limited Commercial) to GC (General Commercial).

MAJOR SUBDIVISION

It is proposed to subdivide the 2.5-acre north parcel for the 46-room condominium hotel.

¹ A *blue line stream* refers to streams designated on United States Geological Survey Topographic Maps by either a solid or dashed blue line.

ZONING CHANGE

It is proposed to add hotels as a permitted use in the PC – Planned Community zoning district and add a definition of *condominium hotels* to the zoning ordinance.

USE PERMIT AND DESIGN REVIEW

A Use Permit / Precise Development Plan is proposed to allow:

- 46-room condominium hotel with a spa (open to the public by appointment only), meeting rooms (available for guest use), creek walk, and swimming holes occupying approximately 44,978 square feet; and
- Shared parking with the adjacent Jack London Village commercial center. The total number of parking spaces would be 120.

In addition, it is proposed to amend the adopted Precise Development Plan (PDP 86-736) for the Jack London Village to allow the proposed 46-room condominium hotel and to establish a shared parking program between the hotel site and the adjacent Jack London Village commercial center. The project would be subject to review by the Sonoma County Design Review Committee.

2.2 SCOPING COMMENTS AND AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

An Initial Study, completed by Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department in September 2004 and revised in February 2005, confirmed the need for an EIR. Sonoma County prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) in October 2004 and sent it to governmental agencies, special service districts, organizations, and individuals with an interest in or jurisdiction over the project in order to provide early consultation on the scope of the EIR. Several letters were received in response to the NOP.² In addition, the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department held a public scoping meeting for the project on November 16, 2004 at the Glen Ellen Fire Station. After reviewing comments relevant to the *Wolf House Inn*, Sonoma County identified the following areas of controversy that are further evaluated in this Draft EIR.

Land Use - Concern that proposed *Wolf House Inn* may not be consistent with adopted Sonoma County land use plans.

Traffic and Circulation - Concern with increased traffic, safety on Arnold Drive, and adequacy of existing and proposed parking.

Noise - Concern with compatibility of project site for hotel use and noise generated from daily operation of the proposed *Wolf House Inn*.

Hydrology / Water Quality - Concern with potential location of a hotel in the flood plain of Sonoma Creek plus water quality issues in Sonoma Creek.

² These letters are on file and available for public review during normal business hours at the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, 2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, California.

Biological Resources - Project could adversely affect special-status plant and animal species plus result in loss of important native habitat and sensitive natural communities.

Geology / Soils - Concern that fill material previously placed on the project site together with proposed fill may result in geologic problems.

Visual and Aesthetic Quality - Views from Arnold Drive and surrounding area may be adversely affected by the proposed *Wolf House Inn*. Also concerns with the size and scale of the proposed project.

Cultural Resources - Potential archaeological and historic resources require on-site survey.

Public Services - Public services, especially water supply from the Valley of the Moon Water District may not be adequate to serve the proposed *Wolf House Inn*.

Hazardous Materials - Concern that project site may be contaminated due to previous activities.

2.3 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

This section presents a complete summary of the environmental impacts discussed in this Draft EIR and detailed in *Chapter 5.0 Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures*. The following levels of significance were used to identify impacts in **Exhibit 2.0-1** and elsewhere in this Draft EIR.

- **Significant Impact (S)** – An adverse change in the environment, where the change exceeds a specific significance threshold. These thresholds are described under the "Significance Criteria" in sections 5.1 through 5.11.
- **Significant Unavoidable Impact (SU)** – A significant impact that cannot be avoided with mitigation. These include impacts which could be partly mitigated but could not be reduced to a less-than-significant level.
- **Less-than-Significant Impact (LTS)** – A change in the environment that does not exceed specific significance thresholds, or no change at all.

Topical sections in *Chapter 5.0 Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures* list the thresholds and criteria used to determine significance for the respective environmental subject.

Exhibit 2.0-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Land Use			
<p><i>5.1-1 Conflict with Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation</i></p> <p>Implementation of the proposed project would result in potential conflicts with adopted plans and zoning resulting in adverse physical effects to the environment. These impacts are discussed in the appropriate sections of Chapter 5.0 Environmental Settings, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.</p>	S	<p>5.1-1 Mitigation measures are recommended in the relevant sections of the EIR to mitigate the adverse physical effects resulting from the conflict with relevant applicable land use plans.</p>	LTS
Traffic and Circulation			
<p><i>5.2-1 Near-Term Base Case plus Project Impacts to Study Intersections</i></p> <p>Project traffic would not cause an intersection currently operating at an acceptable level of service (LOS D or better) to operate below the standard (LOS E or F).</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>5.2-2 Long-Term Base Case General Plan 2020 Buildout Conditions plus Project Impacts to Study Intersections</i></p> <p>Project traffic would not cause an intersection currently operating at an acceptable level of service (LOS D or better) to operate below the standard (LOS E or F). Although the intersection of Arnold Drive and London Ranch Road currently operates or is projected to operate below the County standard (at LOS E or F), project traffic would not cause the delay to increase by five seconds or more.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>5.2-3 Intersection Signal Warrants – Near-Term Base Case Plus Project and Long-Term Base Case General Plan 2020 Buildout Conditions Plus Project</i></p> <p>Project vehicle or pedestrian traffic would not cause an intersection to meet or exceed Caltrans signal warrant criteria.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>5.2-4 Insufficient Roadway Width Along Arnold Drive</i></p> <p>The Wolf House Inn would add vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists to Arnold Drive, a designated secondary arterial and Class II Bikeway which does not meet County standards for roadway width between the project site and central Glen Ellen.</p>	S	<p>5.2-4(a) The applicant shall provide improvements along its Arnold Drive frontage to meet County standards (i.e., provide a 12-foot wide, paved travel lane and six-foot wide paved shoulder), for this roadway which is designated as a secondary arterial and Class II Bikeway.</p> <p>5.2-4(b) The applicant shall widen the roadway shoulder between the project site and the terminus of the Arnold Drive Shoulder Widening Project to provide a pedestrian/bicycle facility in accordance with County guidelines, or as modified subject to County approval, along this approximately 0.2-mile section of Arnold Drive.</p>	LTS
<p><i>5.2-5 Parking Safety on Arnold Drive</i></p>	S	<p>5.2-5 In order to reduce safety concerns associated with proposed parallel parking along Arnold Drive, the proposed six parallel spaces intended to replace angled parking fronting Jack London Village shall be reduced to three large (i.e., very long) parallel spaces to ensure easy ingress and egress to and from these spaces. This should eliminate the need for parking maneuvers in and out of these spaces involving backing into the northbound travel lane on Arnold Drive.</p>	LTS
<p>5.2-6 Consistency with County Standards for Parking Lot Dimensions</p> <p>Proposed parking lot dimensions would not meet the County's minimum design standards.</p>	S	<p>5.2-6 In order to meet County standards for parking lot dimensions, parking spaces must be shown (re-drawn) on the project <i>Site Plan</i> to meet County standards for minimum widths and lengths while maintaining sufficient width parking aisles. Re-striping to meet County standards must be shown to maintain the 68 spaces proposed for the North Parking lot. This may involve provision of angled parking, which can improve space efficiency, but would dictate the direction of traffic flow through the parking lot. The loading dock must be shown to conform to County standards for minimum width and length. This may affect the ease of use of the seven parking spaces shown adjacent to the loading dock. For this reason, it is suggested that the seven spaces be managed by the <i>Wolf House Inn</i> staff, and possibly reserved for use by hotel employees. Employees could arrange to move a parked truck if necessary or wait to park or unpark in these spaces before or after the loading dock is in use.</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>5.2-7 Provision of Safe Roadways – Driveways and Driveway Sight Lines</i></p> <p>Proposed site access driveways would have insufficient sight lines to see vehicles traveling on Arnold Drive. In addition, Driveway C does not meet County standards for minimum width.</p>	S	<p>5.2-7(a) The following measures would be required to mitigate insufficient sight line distance at project driveways:</p> <p>Relocate the proposed North Driveway (i.e., Driveway A) south by approximately 50 feet, or a sufficient distance to obtain adequate sight lines specified above; and</p> <p>Close Driveway D to eliminate inadequate sight line distance from this driveway or, alternatively, restrict use of this driveway to maintenance and emergency vehicle access, only.</p> <p>5.2-7(b) Widen Driveway C from the existing 16 feet to at least 20 feet to better accommodate two-way traffic and comply with minimum County standards for driveway width.</p>	LTS
<p><i>5.2-8 Provision of Safe Roadways – Turn Lanes</i></p> <p>Project traffic would cause an intersection to meet or exceed criteria for provision of turn lanes on an intersection approach.</p>	S	<p>5.2-8 Provide a southbound left turn lane on Arnold Drive at the North Driveway.</p>	LTS
<p><i>5.2-9 Parking Supply</i></p> <p>Proposed on-site parking supply would be adequate to accommodate typical day and evening parking demand.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required	LTS
<p><i>5.2-10 Event Parking Supply</i></p> <p>Proposed on-site parking supply might not be adequate to accommodate one large, or two or more concurrent planned or unplanned events at the Wolf House Inn and Jack London Village.</p>	S	<p>5.2-10 The applicant, in consultation with Jack London Village, shall prepare a parking management plan to address parking demand at all times, focusing on event activity to insure sufficient on-site parking at all times. The applicant and Jack London Village shall make provision for valet parking of guests to manage parking during peak demand periods, as needed. The applicant and Jack London Village shall coordinate event activities at all times to insure no overlapping events, or single events so large that the on-site parking supply would be exceeded. The management plan shall incorporate monitoring and enforcement provisions as well as remedies to permanently reduce parking demand if demand is found to exceed supply during the initial years of hotel operation. Remedies shall include measures such as mandatory valet parking of all hotel guests to manage hotel parking at all times, and/or reduction in rooms available for rent and/or cessation of public use of the spa.</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>5.2-11 Facilities for Alternative Transportation Modes</i></p> <p>The project would not provide adequate bicycle facilities as required by adopted County policies, plans, and programs that support alternative transportation.</p>	S	<p>5.2-11 The applicant shall provide adequate bicycle facilities, at a ratio of one bicycle parking space per every five required vehicle parking spaces.</p>	LTS
Noise			
<p><i>5.3-1 Land Use Compatibility and Traffic Noise</i></p> <p>Implementation of the Wolf House Inn would expose project land uses to traffic noise from vehicles traveling along Arnold Drive to an L_{dn} greater than 60 dBA.</p>	S	<p>5.3-1 The project applicant shall submit an acoustical report to Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department (PRMD) that demonstrates how interior noise levels would be controlled to an L_{dn} of 45 dBA since outdoor levels would exceed an L_{dn} of 60 dBA.</p>	LTS
<p><i>5.3-2 Operational Noise</i></p> <p>Noise generated from daily operation of the proposed Wolf House Inn would expose nearby residents to noise levels in excess of the County's Noise Level Performance Standards.</p>	S	<p>5.3-2(a) Rooftop equipment must be designed so as to comply with the noise level limits set forth in Table NE-2 of the Sonoma County General Plan Noise Element. Typical methods include selection of quiet equipment or installation of acoustical baffles (e.g., silencers) and / or noise barriers.</p> <p>5.3-2(b) In order for noise from the swimming holes to meet levels specified in the <i>1989 Noise Element</i> either of the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <p>Construct a sound wall located along the north side of the project site, adjacent to the proposed swimming holes. OR</p> <p>Relocate the swimming holes a minimum of 20 feet in the southerly direction.</p>	LTS
<p><i>5.3-3 Project Traffic Noise</i></p> <p>Additional traffic volumes generated by the project would be negligible on surrounding roads and the resultant increase in traffic noise would be less than one dBA.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>5.3-4 Construction Noise</i></p> <p>Existing noise-sensitive residential land uses would be exposed to elevated construction noise levels over a temporary period.</p>	S	<p>5.3-4 Mitigation of the noise produced by construction shall be accomplished by the following measures:</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>All internal combustion engines used during construction of this project shall be operated with mufflers that meet the requirements of the State Resources Code, and, where applicable, the Vehicle Code. Equipment shall be properly maintained and turned off when not in use;</p> <p>Except for actions taken to prevent an emergency, or to deal with an existing emergency, all construction activities shall be restricted to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays, 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturday and not at all on Sundays and holidays. If work outside the times specified above becomes necessary, the applicant shall notify the PRMD Project Review Division as soon as practical</p> <p>There shall be no start-up of machines or equipment prior to 7:00 AM Monday through Friday; no delivery of materials or equipment prior to 7:00 AM or past 7:00 PM Monday through Friday and no servicing of equipment past 7:00 PM. A sign(s) shall be posted on the site regarding the allowable hours of construction, and including the developer's phone number for public contact;</p> <p>Construction maintenance, storage, and staging areas for construction equipment shall avoid proximity to residential areas to the maximum extent practicable. Stationary construction equipment (e.g., compressors, mixers, etc.) shall be placed away from residential areas and / or provided with acoustical shielding. Quiet construction equipment shall be used when possible; and</p> <p>The developer shall designate a Project Manager with authority to implement the mitigation prior to issuance of a building / grading permit. The Project Manager's phone number shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site. The Project Manager shall determine the cause of noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, faulty muffler, etc.) and shall take prompt action to correct the problem.</p>	

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Air Quality</i>			
<p><i>5.4-1 Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Air Pollutant Levels</i></p> <p>Air pollutants emitted during construction could expose nearby sensitive receptors to unhealthy levels of particulate matter and possibly TACs.</p>	S	<p>5.4-1 A Construction Management Plan shall be prepared. The Construction Management Plan shall incorporate dust control measures and measures to reduce exhaust emissions specified in the mitigation measure.</p>	LTS
<p><i>5.4-2 Conflict With or Obstruct Implementation of the Applicable Air Quality Plan.</i></p> <p>The proposed project could generate a higher rate of vehicle miles traveled than buildout of a project under the existing Limited Commercial General Plan designation. This could lead to a higher rate of ozone precursor emissions than considered in regional clean air planning efforts.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>5.4-3 Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i></p> <p>Construction of cumulative projects in the project area would be an additional source of GHG emissions, primarily through consumption of energy for transportation and building operation. No accepted methodology or standards exist for determining the significance of these emissions.</p>	NA	<p>5.4-3 Although the determination of significance in regard to GHG emissions is speculative the design of individual cumulative projects in the project area (including the proposed project) shall incorporate measures to reduce a project's contribution to GHG emissions. A list of specific measures is provided.</p>	NA
<i>Hydrology / Water Quality</i>			
<p><i>5.5-1 Soil Erosion from Grading and Construction Activities</i></p> <p>Project grading activities, including the removal of soils from the northern half of the site and the construction of the pedestrian pathway along Sonoma Creek, could result in erosion and associated siltation / sedimentation impacts from runoff to Sonoma Creek and San Pablo Bay.</p>	S	<p>5.5-1(a) Pursuant to NPDES requirements, the Project applicant must develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to protect water quality during and after construction. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall file with the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board a Notice of Intent to comply with the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (General Permit) under the NPDES regulations, and comply with the requirements of the permit to minimize pollution to storm water discharge during construction activities.</p> <p>5.5-1(b) The applicant's drainage plan shall include a County-approved Erosion Control Plan that specifies controls for</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>winterization, dust, erosion, and pollution during project construction. This plan should conform to all standards adopted by the County. Many elements of the drainage plan will overlap with the SWPPP. The Plan shall describe the BMPs to be used during and following construction to control pollution resulting from both storm and construction water runoff. The Plan shall also include locations of vehicle and equipment staging, portable restrooms, mobilization areas, and planned access routes. Sonoma County staff or representatives shall visit the site during grading and construction to ensure compliance with the grading ordinance and plans, and note any violations, which shall be corrected immediately.</p> <p>5.5-1(c) The applicant shall upgrade the bank protection adjacent to the sewer line and to the toe of the bank where high flows may scour or undercut soil, vegetation, or existing rock. The necessary scour protection shall be designed to protect against the one percent design flow. Any work shall be approved by the California Department of Fish and Game and any other jurisdictional agencies, and meet State of California Department of Transportation methods for sizing and placing riprap.</p>	
<p><i>5.5-2 Nonpoint Source Pollution in Receiving Waters</i></p> <p>Surface water quality could be adversely affected by project-related runoff pollutants, such as suspended solids and floating debris, litter, nutrients, heavy metals, hydrocarbons, pesticides, and trace organics.</p>	S	<p>5.5-2 In accordance with SUSMP and NDPES permit requirements, the project shall incorporate storm water quality BMPs, including those listed in Mitigation Measure 5.5-1(a), that will provide for permanent treatment of project site runoff. Potential treatment control BMPs shall include landscape-based measures such as vegetated bio-swales and infiltration trenches or structural measures such as storm drain catch basins and hydrodynamic separators.</p>	LTS
<p><i>5.5-3 Increased Surface Runoff</i></p> <p>Development of the Wolf House Inn would add approximately one half-acre of impervious surface to the project site, thereby decreasing the amount of infiltrative ground surface at the site and increasing the amount of on-site runoff flowing into the surrounding creeks. Such runoff could result in an increase in erosion.</p>	S	<p>5.5-3 The applicant shall prepare a Drainage Plan (including appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic calculations) that minimizes changes in post-development runoff, site peak flows, and stream velocities as compared with pre-development conditions. The Drainage Plan must ensure that post project drainage conditions shall not exceed pre-project flows for a minimum ten-year recurrence storm interval in accordance with the Sonoma County</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Water Agency Flood Control Design Criteria manual.</p> <p>The Drainage Plan shall include design drawings and calculations of the capacity of the proposed storm drain system for the project, and shall be based on Sonoma County Water Agency procedures for Rational Method calculations of pre- and post-development site conditions. Regional SUSMP-recommended BMPs such as on-site storm water detention basins, trenches, pipes and/or infiltration areas shall be incorporated into the project design along with storm water treatment controls as described in Mitigation Measure 5.5-2. The Drainage Plan shall be prepared in conformance with Sonoma County Water Agency Flood Control Design Criteria by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall be submitted to Sonoma County PRMD for review prior to approval.</p> <p>All on-site drainage facilities shall be constructed according to Sonoma County Water Agency’s Flood Control Design Criteria and the Sonoma County PRMD standards and requirements, and shall be operated and maintained in accordance with the Drainage Plan for the life of the proposed project</p>	
<p><i>5.5-4 Placement of Structures in 100-Year Flood Hazard Area</i></p> <p>The 100-year flood plain of Sonoma Creek is estimated at elevations ranging between 206 and 210 along the eastern boundary of the project site. Portions of the proposed Creek Walk, which would be constructed at the top of the creek bank at elevations between 207 and 211 feet above sea level, would likely be located within the flood plain and could impede or redirect flood flows.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>5.5-4(a) In accordance with the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance (Chapter 7B) of the Sonoma County Code, the project applicant shall obtain a development permit from Sonoma County PRMD. The design of the pedestrian pathway shall adhere to all requirements set forth in the Ordinance, which includes a “no net-fill” grading plan within the boundaries of the 100-Year flood hazard zone. To minimize on-site drainage impacts further, the pedestrian pathway shall be composed of pervious materials.</p> <p>5.5-4(b) The applicant shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game. Any grading, construction, or removal or placement of vegetation within the 50-foot setback from the top of the creek bank must be approved by the California Department of Fish and Game.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources			
<p><i>5.6-1 Special-Status Species</i></p> <p>The proposed project could result in inadvertent take of listed special-status species unless adequate protective measures are taken during construction. In addition, construction could affect raptor nests if established on the site in the future. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>5.6-1(a) Revise the proposed <i>Tentative Map</i> and <i>Preliminary Landscape Plan</i> to avoid removal of native riparian trees and ensure protection of the sensitive habitat along Sonoma Creek, Asbury Creek, and the unnamed drainage on the site.</p> <p>5.6-1(b) Adequate measures shall be taken to avoid any inadvertent take of listed species during construction. This shall include avoidance of any in-channel disturbance, implementation of preconstruction surveys to confirm absence of any listed species outside of the creek channels, and adherence to rigid measures to prevent any indirect degradation of water quality in the creeks as called for in Mitigation Measure 5.5-1. A preconstruction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to any grading or construction within 100 feet of the creek channels.</p> <p>5.6-1(c) Any active raptor nests in the vicinity of proposed grading shall be avoided until young birds are able to leave the nest (i.e., fledged) and forage on their own. Avoidance may be accomplished either by scheduling grading and tree removal during the non-nesting period (i.e., September through February), or if this is not feasible, by conducting a pre-construction survey for raptor nests.</p>	LTS
<p><i>5.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities</i></p> <p>The proposed project would result in loss of important native habitat and sensitive natural community types.</p>	S	<p>5.6-2 Revise Exhibit 3.0-9 (<i>Preliminary Landscape Plan</i>) to protect and enhance the sensitive riparian woodland and native oak habitat on the site. A qualified landscape architect or restoration ecologist who specializes in native habitat restoration shall be retained to prepare the revised landscaping plans.</p>	LTS
<p><i>5.6-3 Wetlands and Drainages</i></p> <p>The proposed project could result in indirect impacts to adjacent jurisdictional waters associated with Sonoma Creek and other drainages unless adequate erosion control measures are taken.</p>	S	<p>5.6-3 As recommended in Mitigation Measure 5.5-1, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared and implemented using Best Management Practices to control both construction-related erosion and sedimentation and project-related nonpoint discharge into waters on the site. The plan shall contain detailed measures to control erosion of exposed soil, provide for revegetation of graded slopes before the start of the first rainy season following grading, address nonpoint source</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		pollutants to protect wetlands and water quality in the drainages, and specify procedures for monitoring of the effectiveness of the measures.	
<p><i>5.6-4 Wildlife Habitat and Connectivity</i></p> <p>The proposed project could reduce the existing habitat values of the sensitive riparian corridors on the site.</p>	S	<p>5.6-4 Measures recommended in Mitigation Measures 5.6-1, 5.6-2, 5.6-3 and 5.6-4 would serve to avoid and minimize tree loss in the riparian woodland, prevent habitat degradation through further spread of invasive exotic plant species, and control access into the sensitive riparian corridors. The following additional provisions shall be implemented to further protect wildlife habitat resources:</p> <p>Fencing and sound walls that obstructs wildlife movement shall be prohibited along the creeks on the site;</p> <p>Lighting shall be carefully designed and controlled to prevent unnecessary illumination of the riparian corridors on the site. Lighting shall be restricted to the minimum level necessary to illuminate pathways, parking areas, and other outdoor areas. Lighting shall generally be kept low to the ground, directed downward, and shielded to prevent illumination into adjacent natural areas;</p> <p>All garbage, recycling, and composting shall be kept in closed containers and latched or locked to prevent wildlife from using the waste as a food source; and</p> <p>Humans and pets shall be restricted outside the sensitive creek corridors through installation of wildlife-friendly fencing and signage.</p>	LTS
<p><i>5.6-5 Conformance with Local Policies and Ordinances</i></p> <p>Aspects of the proposed project would conflict with policies in the Open Space and Resource Conservation Elements of the Sonoma County General Plan.</p>	S	<p>5.6-5(a) Measures recommended in Mitigation Measures 5.6-1 through 5.6-4 to mitigate potential impacts to special-status species, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and native habitat and wildlife movement would serve to provide conformance with the applicable local goals, objectives, policies, and ordinances. No additional mitigation is considered necessary</p> <p>5.6-5(b) All native trees with trunk diameters of nine inches or greater shall be accurately mapped, including tree trunk locations currently missing from proposed improvement plans along the unnamed drainage at the northern edge of the site, along the bank</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		of Sonoma Creek, and near the south parking lot. A certified arborist shall be retained by the applicant to prepare a tree evaluation, and develop detailed guidelines to protect and minimize damage to individual protected trees. Where complete avoidance to all trees is not feasible, a tree replacement program shall be incorporated into the <i>Final Landscape Plan</i> that provides the required replacement plantings necessary to ensure consistency with Tree Ordinance No. 4044.	
Geology / Soils			
<p><i>5.7-1 Seismic Ground Shaking</i></p> <p>Strong seismic ground shaking is expected to occur at the project site some time during the design life of the proposed Wolf House Inn that would expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death.</p>	S	<p>5.7-1 In order to reduce the impact to residents and structures from strong seismic ground shaking to an acceptable level, the following measures would be required:</p> <p><i>Compliance with California Building Code.</i> Project development shall meet requirements of the California Building Code as adopted by the County of Sonoma. Incorporation of seismic construction standards would reduce the potential for catastrophic effects of ground shaking (e.g., complete structural failure) but would not completely eliminate the hazard of seismically induced ground shaking. Seismic design parameters used at the project site shall be identified using California Building Code Chapter 16 by the Geotechnical Engineer of record and implemented in project design by the Structural Engineer of record.</p> <p><i>Compliance with a Design Level Geotechnical Investigation Report Prepared by a Registered Geotechnical Engineer and with Structural Design Plans as Prepared by a Registered Structural Engineer.</i> Foundation engineering, design, and construction shall be in accordance with recommendations of a licensed geotechnical engineer and a licensed structural engineer shall prepare structural design plans. The existing geotechnical report shall be updated to confirm recommendations, or a new geotechnical investigation shall be prepared by the Geotechnical Engineer of record. The design professionals (engineers) or their representatives shall monitor all construction, and documentation of the construction process will be provided to the Building Official. The structural engineering design shall incorporate seismic parameters as</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		outlined in the California Building Code Chapter 16. <i>Complete Final Design Review and Obtain a Building Permit.</i> Final Design Review shall be performed by a licensed civil / structural engineer for adherence to the seismic design criteria for residential structures in Sonoma County and structural design shall be in accordance with the requirements of the California Building Code.	
<i>5.7-2 Seismic Related Ground Failure, Including Liquefaction</i> Soils at the project site are not unstable or prone to liquefaction and the risk of seismic related ground failure is considered minimal.	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<i>5.7-3 Landslides and Slope Instability</i> Grading or other disruption of soils near bank tops for the proposed creek walk, swimming holes and other features, could result in slope failure, particularly from sloughing and minor slides along the steepest slopes.	S	5.7-3(a) The proposed <i>Wolf House Inn</i> shall be constructed in accordance with geotechnical recommendations inside and outside the 50-foot creek setback. 5.7-3(b) The project applicant shall adopt and implement a Long-Term Slope Stability Plan within the 50-foot creek setback. This plan shall consider all proposed elements within the setback such as the creek walk, swimming holes, waterfalls, and all other planned elements.	LTS
<i>5.7-4 Unstable Geologic Unit or Soils</i> Unstable fill underlies portions of the project site where development would occur.	S	5.7-4 The proposed <i>Wolf House Inn</i> shall be designed and constructed in accordance with updated geotechnical recommendations to be provided by a licensed Geotechnical Engineer retained by the project applicant. The updated geotechnical recommendations shall take into account the current existing conditions of fill soils present on the project site.	LTS
<i>5.7-5 Expansive Soils</i> Expansive soils may be encountered during project grading and construction activities. Development on such soils could result in damage to foundations, slabs, or pavements.	S	5.7-5 Expansive soils shall be mitigated by the following measures in conformance with recommendations of a licensed Geotechnical Engineer. These recommendations can be from the existing <i>1990 Geotechnical Investigation Report</i> , provided the report is updated to confirm recommendations, or a new geotechnical investigation shall be performed.	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Visual and Aesthetic Quality			
<p>5.8-1 View from Southbound Arnold Drive North of Jack London Village (Viewpoint No. 1)</p> <p>From this viewpoint, existing vegetation would obscure most of the proposed Wolf House Inn structure.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p>5.8-2 View from Northbound Arnold Drive at Jack London Village (Viewpoint No. 2)</p> <p>From this viewpoint, the Wolf House Inn structure would be seen clearly. The structure's height and proximity to Arnold Drive would block existing views of the distant ridgeline and riparian vegetation along Sonoma Creek and the Sonoma Valley Regional Park.</p>	S	<p>5.8-2 In order to minimize the visual impact from its proximity to Arnold Drive, measures to reduce the dominance of the project in the existing landscape would be necessary. Since the project already borrows architectural elements (e.g., building materials), color, and lines from the existing landscape, additional screening by vegetation would be necessary.</p> <p>In order to provide as much screening as possible, the applicant shall revise the <i>Preliminary Landscape Plan (Exhibit 3.0-9)</i> to include a mix of species of trees and shrubs to be planted along the frontage of Arnold Drive. The plants should be selected to provide depth of screening both vertically and horizontally. The species mix also shall be selected so that at least 30 percent of the trees would be evergreens to provide screening during the winter months. The species selected shall be consistent with the list of native plants proposed in Mitigation Measure 5.6-2 of <i>Impact 5.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities</i>. Furthermore, the species shall reflect a range of native plants so that if one species fails to thrive in the landscape area adequate plants would remain to achieve the goal of screening the proposed development.</p> <p>Additionally, the revised <i>Landscape Plan</i> shall include a range of sizes from one gallon to 50 gallon plants to be planted so that the view of the proposed development would be screened immediately upon planting.</p> <p>Prior to building permit issuance for the <i>Wolf House Inn</i>, the proposed landscaping, signage, elevations, and colors and materials shall receive review and approval from the County's Design Review Committee (DRC). The DRC would be responsible for determining the mix of trees and shrubs required at the time of planting. Furthermore, the applicant and the County</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		shall develop approved survivorship criteria for vegetation to ensure the <i>Wolf House Inn</i> is screened adequately over the life of the project.	
<p><i>5.8-3 Light Pollution and Nighttime Sky</i></p> <p>Development of the proposed Wolf House Inn would result in new sources of nighttime lighting, which could result in sky glow, light trespass, and glare. In addition, the project could result in new sources of daytime glare.</p>	S	<p>5.8-3 In order to minimize impacts associated with nighttime lighting and daytime glare, prior to issuance of a building permit, the following measures would be required:</p> <p>To minimize daytime glare from the Wolf House Inn, windows with non-glare glazing shall be used on the Wolf House Inn; and</p> <p>A detailed Lighting Plan shall be submitted to the Sonoma County Design Review Committee for approval. The Lighting Plan shall require:</p> <p>All light sources shall be shielded from off-site view;</p> <p>All lights shall be downcast;</p> <p>Escape of light to the atmosphere and trespass to Sonoma Creek shall be minimized;</p> <p>Low intensity, indirect light sources shall be encouraged.</p> <p>On-demand lighting systems shall be encouraged.</p> <p>Mercury, sodium vapor, and similar intense and bright lights shall not be permitted except where their need is specifically approved and their source of light is restricted.</p>	LTS
Cultural Resources			
<p><i>5.9-1 Potential Subsurface Cultural Deposits</i></p> <p>While no discernible impacts to subsurface cultural resources including human remains are anticipated, the possibility cannot be precluded that prehistoric cultural deposits and features are present below the ground surface and could be damaged during land alteration activities.</p>	S	<p>5.9-1 The following mitigation measure would be required to mitigate potential significant cultural resources impacts:</p> <p>Workers involved in ground disturbing activities shall be trained in the recognition of archaeological resources (e.g., historic and prehistoric artifacts typical of the general area), procedures to report such discoveries, and other appropriate protocols to ensure that construction activities avoid or minimize impacts to potentially significant cultural resources;</p> <p>In the event that archaeological artifacts, features or other cultural deposits are encountered during future grading, excavating, or</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>other land alterations, stop all work in the immediate vicinity of the find until the discovery area can be evaluated by an archaeologist. This would include prehistoric and historic materials. Depending on the extent and cultural composition of the discovered materials, it may be advisable to have subsequent excavation monitored by an archaeologist who would be ready to record, recover, and / or protect significant cultural materials from further damage. In the case of prehistoric resources, consultation with interested Native American groups is advised; and</p> <p>In the event that human skeletal remains are discovered anywhere on the site, discontinue work in the vicinity of the discovery and contact the Sonoma County Coroner. If skeletal remains are found to be prehistoric Native American (not modern), the Coroner shall call the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento within 24 hours who will identify the person(s) it believes to be the "Most Likely Descendant" of the deceased Native American. The Most Likely Descendant would be responsible for recommending the disposition and treatment of the remains. The most likely descendant may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.</p>	
<p><i>5.9-2 Historical Structures of Glen Ellen</i></p> <p>Development of the proposed Wolf House Inn project would not result in adverse changes to identified historical resources located in Jack London Village: Glen Ellen Mill, Winery Building, and Winery Waterwheel.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
Public Services			
<p><i>5.10-1 Project Water Demand</i></p> <p>Operation of the Wolf House Inn would use approximately 10,441 gallons per day supplied by the Valley of the Moon Water District.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>5.10-2 Inadequate Fireflow</i></p> <p>Fireflow (i.e., water pressure in gallons per minute at fire hydrants) at the project site is inadequate to serve the proposed Wolf House Inn.</p>	S	<p>5.10-2 The applicant shall increase fireflow to hydrants and sprinklers serving the project site in order to meet standards set forth in both the California Fire Code (Article 9) and National Fire Protection Association Codes and Standards (Document 1142). This can be accomplished by either of the following methods.</p> <p>Provide an on site water storage tank and pump system to supply the fire sprinkler system and on site fire hydrants; OR</p> <p>Work with the Valley of the Moon Water District to replace the existing six-inch water main constraining water pressure at the site and make other upgrades to the water distribution system as needed to increase fire flow.</p>	LTS
<p><i>5.10-3 Increased Wastewater Treatment Demand</i></p> <p>Operation of the Wolf House Inn would generate approximately 9,641 gallons per day of wastewater. The Sonoma Valley Treatment Plant has sufficient capacity to treat wastewater generated by the project. The additional flow would not require the construction of additional treatment facilities nor would it exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board or violate water quality standards.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>5.10-4 Increased Demand for Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services</i></p> <p>Development of the Wolf House Inn project would result in an increased demand for fire protection and emergency services by the Glen Ellen Fire Protection District. However, increased demand for these services would be within their capability and would not require new or expanded facilities.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>5.10-5 Wildland Fire</i></p> <p>Development of the Wolf House Inn would be subject to risks associated with wildland fires, particularly in severe weather conditions of drought, excessive heat, and strong winds. Conformance to Sonoma County regulations would reduce wildland-building fire exposure impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>5.10-6 Increased Demand for Police Protection Services</i></p> <p>The Sonoma County Sheriff's Department would provide police protection to the proposed Wolf House Inn. The proposed project would not generate a substantial increase in calls for Sheriff's services and would not require additional deputies or improvements to the Sheriff's Sonoma Valley Substation.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>5.10-7 Increased Demand for Solid Waste Services</i></p> <p>Construction and operation of the Wolf House Inn would result in an increased demand for disposal of solid waste.</p>	S	<p>5.10-7 The project applicant shall prepare and implement a recycling plan for the construction phase and daily operation of the <i>Wolf House Inn</i>. The recycling plan shall address major materials generated by a construction project and shall identify the means to divert these materials away from landfill disposal. Typical materials included in such a plan are soil, brush and other vegetative growth, sheetrock, dimensional lumber, metal scraps, cardboard packaging, and plastic wrap. The recycling plan shall also address the daily operation of the <i>Wolf House Inn</i> and efforts to encourage guests to participate in the program. In addition the site plan shall provide adequate storage space for recyclable and compostable materials.</p>	LTS
Hazardous Materials			
<p><i>5.11-1 Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials</i></p> <p>Accidental release of hazardous materials during construction and grading activities or future operations of the Wolf House Inn could result in adverse environmental impacts, primarily to Sonoma and Asbury Creeks from contaminated runoff during storm events.</p>	S	<p>5.11-1(a) To reduce impacts from accidental hazardous materials associated with short-term construction and grading activities, required mitigation would be the same as Mitigation Measures 5.5-1(a) and 5.5-1(b) (see <i>Impact 5.5-1 Soil Erosion from Grading and Construction Activities</i>).</p> <p>These measures would require the applicant file with the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board a Notice of Intent to comply with the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (General Permit) under the NPDES regulations, and comply with the requirements of the permit to minimize pollution to storm water discharge during construction activities. The General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) using Best Management Practices (BMPs) as well as a monitoring program to evaluate</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		their effectiveness. 5.11-1(b) To reduce impacts from accidental hazardous materials associated with long-term operation of the proposed <i>Wolf House Inn</i> , the following mitigation would be required. The project applicant shall develop a long-term Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to prevent runoff from dumpsters, maintenance areas, and any other areas where potentially hazardous or hazardous materials are stored or used from discharging into site waterways and into Sonoma Creek. This plan shall be approved by Sonoma County in conjunction with design approval for the project. This plan shall be in accordance with mitigations described in the Hydrology section of this EIR.	
<p><i>5.11-2 Soil Contamination</i></p> <p>The Wolf House Inn project site contains fill soils of unknown origin that were tested for the presence of hazardous materials including hydrocarbons and metals. While certain metals were discovered in excess of Environmental Screening Level (ESL) guidelines established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), they are present at concentrations consistent with background levels for Northern California.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS

2.4 MAJOR EIR CONCLUSIONS AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The EIR reached the following major conclusions:

- As discussed in **Section 5.2 Traffic and Circulation**, the Draft EIR concludes that the proposed project would add vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists to Arnold Drive, which has existing safety concerns due to insufficient roadway width between the project site and central Glen Ellen. Mitigation is proposed to require the applicant to widen the roadway shoulder between the project site and the terminus of the Arnold Drive Shoulder Widening Project to provide a pedestrian/bicycle facility in accordance with County guidelines along this approximately 0.2-mile section of Arnold Drive. In addition, proposed on-site parking supply may not be adequate to accommodate one large, or two or more concurrent planned or unplanned events at the *Wolf House Inn* and Jack London Village. Mitigation measures are proposed to ensure an adequate parking supply.
- As discussed in **Section 5.3 Noise**, the Draft EIR concludes that noise generated from daily operation of the proposed *Wolf House Inn* would expose nearby residents to noise levels in excess of the County's Noise Level Performance Standards. Mitigation measures that include the construction of a noise barrier along the north side of the project are proposed.
- As discussed in **Section 5.5 Hydrology and Water Quality**, implementation of the proposed project would result in erosion and associated siltation / sedimentation impacts from runoff to Sonoma Creek and San Pablo Bay during grading and construction activities. In addition, surface water quality could be adversely affected by project-related runoff pollutants. Project impacts would be mitigated through development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) together with other required mitigation measures.
- As discussed in **Section 5.6 Biological Resources**, during construction there could be the inadvertent take of listed special-status species. The proposed project would result in loss of important native habitat and sensitive natural community types as well as indirect impacts to adjacent jurisdictional waters associated with Sonoma Creek. Mitigation measures are proposed to protect adversely affected biological resources.
- As discussed in **Section 5.7 Geology and Soils**, strong seismic ground shaking is expected to occur at the project site some time during the design life of the proposed *Wolf House Inn* that would expose people or structure to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death. In addition, unstable fill underlies portions of the project site where development would occur. Proposed mitigation measures including the requirement that geotechnical recommendations, provided by a licensed Geotechnical Engineer, take into account the current existing conditions of fill soils present on the project site.
- As discussed in **Section 5.8 Visual and Aesthetic Quality**, the Draft EIR concludes that existing vegetation would obscure most of the proposed *Wolf House Inn* from southbound Arnold Drive north of Jack London Village. From northbound Arnold Drive at Jack London Village the *Wolf House Inn* would be seen clearly. Additional landscaping is proposed to minimize the visual impact from this viewpoint. The project could result in additional sources of glare and nighttime lighting. Recommended mitigation includes the preparation of a Lighting Plan.

- As discussed in **Section 5.9 Cultural Resources**, the Draft EIR concludes that no known archaeological or historic sites exist on the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in adverse changes to identified historical resources located in Jack London Village (Glen Ellen Mill, Winery Building, and Winery Waterwheel).
- **Section 5.10 Public Services** evaluates water supply services, wastewater management, fire protection and emergency services, police services, and solid waste services. In general, the Draft EIR concludes that adequate public services are available for the proposed project. Fireflow (i.e. water pressure in gallons per minute at fire hydrants) would, however, be inadequate at the project site. Mitigation measures to increase fireflow to hydrants serving the project site are proposed, including the possible construction of an on-site water storage tank and pump system.
- As discussed in **Section 5.11 Hazardous Materials**, on-site fill soils were sampled and tested for hazardous materials including hydrocarbons and metals. Eight soil sample tests were conducted on the project site. Testing results indicate no significant contamination of fill soils on the site.
- As discussed in **Chapter 6.0 Alternative to the Proposed Project**, the Draft EIR concludes that of the build alternatives, *Alternative 3* is superior to the proposed project due to its incorporation of recommended mitigation measures into project design.