2. Executive Summary

This chapter presents an overview of the proposed Southeast Greenway General Plan Amendment and Rezoning project (project or proposed project). This executive summary also provides a summary of the alternatives to the proposed project, identifies issues to be resolved, areas of concern, and conclusions of the analysis contained in Chapter 4.0, Environmental Evaluation, and each subchapter (Chapters 4.1 through 4.14) of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR). For a complete description of the proposed project, see Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft EIR. For a discussion of alternatives to the proposed project, see Chapter 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, of this Draft EIR.

This Draft EIR addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed project. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An EIR is a public document designed to provide the public and local and State governmental agency decision-makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision-making.

This Draft EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA[1] and the CEQA Guidelines[2] to determine if approval of the identified discretionary actions and related subsequent development could have a significant effect on the environment (i.e., significant impact). The City of Santa Rosa, as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable City technical personnel and review of all technical subconsultant reports. Information for this Draft EIR was obtained from on-site field observations; discussions with affected agencies; analysis of adopted plans and policies; review of available studies, reports, data, and similar literature in the public domain; and specialized environmental assessments (e.g., air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation and traffic).

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This Draft EIR has been prepared to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals.

[1] The CEQA Statute is found at California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Sections 21000 to 21177.

[2] The CEQA Guidelines are found at California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 to 15387.

The main purposes of this document as established by CEQA are:

- to disclose to decision-makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities;
- to identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage;
- to prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures;
- to disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects;
- to foster interagency coordination in the review of projects; and
- to enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in the statute and in the CEQA Guidelines. It provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. An EIR is intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

2.1.1 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This Draft EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- Chapter 1: Introduction. This chapter provides an overview describing the Draft EIR document.
- Chapter 2: Executive Summary. This chapter summarizes the environmental consequences that would result from implementation of the proposed project the alternatives to the proposed project, the recommended mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of environmental impacts with and without mitigation.
- Chapter 3: Project Description. Describes the proposed project in detail, including the characteristics, objectives, and the structural and technical elements of the proposed action.
- Chapter 4: Environmental Evaluation. This chapter is divided into 14 subchapters. Each subchapter corresponds to the environmental resource categories identified in CEQA Guidelines Appendix F, Energy Conservation, and Appendix G, Environmental Checklist, as amended per Assembly Bill 52 (Tribal Cultural Resources) and the California Supreme Court in a December 2015 opinion [*California Building Industry Association (CBIA) v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)*, 62 Cal. 4th 369 (No. S 213478)]. This chapter provides a description of the physical environmental conditions in the City of Santa Rosa, as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published, from both a local and regional perspective, as well as an analysis of the potential environmental impacts of

the proposed project, and recommended mitigation measures, if required, to reduce their significance. The environmental setting included in each subchapter provides baseline physical conditions from which the City of Santa Rosa acting as the lead agency determines the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Each subchapter also includes a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project; and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project.

- Chapter 5: Alternatives to the Proposed Project. This chapter includes an evaluation of four alternatives to the proposed project, which are the CEQA-required "No Project" Alternative, the No Commercial/Residential Alternative (No Commercial/Residential Development), the No Commercial Development Alternative, and the Reduced Density Alternative.
- Chapter 6: CEQA-Mandated Assessment. This chapter includes a discussion of growth inducement, cumulative impacts, significant unavoidable effects, and significant irreversible changes as a result of adoption and implementation of the proposed project.
- Chapter 7: Organizations and Persons Consulted. A list of people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this Draft EIR for the proposed project is included in this chapter.
- Appendices: The appendices for this Draft EIR (presented in portable document file [PDF] format attached to the back cover) contain the following supporting documents:
  - Appendix A: Notice of Preparation and Scoping Comments
  - Appendix B: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Data
  - Appendix C: Biological Resource Assessment
  - Appendix D: Cultural Resources Data
  - Appendix E: Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment
  - Appendix F: Noise Data
  - Appendix G: Public Service Provider Data
  - Appendix H: Traffic Impact Study
  - Appendix I: Existing Conditions Report

2.1.2 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THIS DRAFT EIR

According to Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of an EIR is to:

> *Inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.*

Because of the long-term planning horizon of the proposed project and the permitting, planning, and development actions that are related both geographically and as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions for implementation, this Draft EIR has been prepared as a program EIR for the proposed project, pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Once a program EIR has been certified, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether additional CEQA review needs to be prepared. However, if the program EIR addresses the program's effects as specifically and comprehensively as possible, subsequent activities could be found to be within the program EIR scope, and additional environmental review may not be required (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c]). When a program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into the subsequent activities (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c][3]). If a subsequent activity would have effects that are not within the scope of a program EIR, the lead agency must prepare a new Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR. For these subsequent environmental review documents, this program EIR will serve as the first-tier environmental analysis.

2.2 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Upon adoption by the City of Santa Rosa City Council, the proposed project would amend the General Plan land use designations and zoning for the parcels within the 57-acre Southeast Greenway Area also referred to as the project site. The proposed Land Use and Circulation Concepts are intended to guide development and conservation in the Southeast Greenway Area through the 2035 buildout horizon of the *Santa Rosa General Plan 2035* (General Plan 2035). The Land Use Concept describes the type and scale of potential development and the Circulation Concept addresses transportation improvements that may occur over the next 18 years in the Southeast Greenway Area. Both the Land Use Concept and the Circulation Concept have been written to be consistent with the other elements of the 2035 General Plan.

2.3 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

This Draft EIR analyzes alternatives to the proposed project that are designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and feasibly attain some of the proposed project objectives. There is no set methodology for comparing the alternatives or determining the environmentally superior alternative under CEQA. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative involves weighing and balancing all of the environmental resource areas by the City. The following alternatives to the proposed project were considered and analyzed in detail:

- No Project Alternative (Current General Plan)
- No Commercial/Residential Development
- No Commercial Development Alternative
- Reduced Density Alternative

Chapter 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, of this Draft EIR, includes a complete discussion of these alternatives and of alternatives that were considered, but not carried forward for detailed analysis.

2.4 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the

proposed project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the City of Santa Rosa, as lead agency, related to:

- whether this Draft EIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the proposed project;
- whether the benefits of the proposed project override those environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance;
- whether the proposed land use changes and zoning changes are compatible with the character of the existing area;
- whether the identified mitigation measures should be adopted or modified;
- whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the proposed project besides those mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR;
- whether there are any alternatives to the proposed project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic objectives.

2.5 AREAS OF CONCERN

The City of Santa Rosa issued a Notice of Preparation for the EIR on April 24, 2017 and held a scoping meeting on May 15, 2017 to receive scoping comments. During the 31-day scoping period for this EIR, which concluded on May 24, 2017, responsible agencies and interested members of the public were invited to submit comments as to the scope and content of the EIR. The comments received focused primarily on the following issues:

- Aesthetics: impacts to view corridors
- Air Quality: operation and construction
- Biological Resources: impacts to native vegetation, creeks, existing wetlands, wildlife, and wildlife corridor
- Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources: tribal cultural consultation
- Hydrology and Water Quality: potential run-off due to an increase in impervious surface area, and water use
- Land Use and Planning: parking demand, impacts on neighborhood cohesion, and increased development on the site
- Noise: traffic, operational, and construction noise
- Population and Housing: increased density
- Public Services: impacts to public service providers
- Transportation and Circulation: traffic impact, pedestrian access, and bicycle connections

2.6 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Under CEQA, a significant impact on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic and aesthetic significance.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed project has the potential to generate significant environmental impacts in a number of areas. As shown in Table 2-1, some significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level if the mitigation measures identified in this Draft EIR are adopted and implemented. However, pursuant to Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, which requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures, as shown in Table 2-1, significant unavoidable impacts were identified in the areas of air quality and transportation and circulation. For a complete summary of the significant and unavoidable impacts, please see Section 6.2 in Chapter 6, CEQA-Mandated Assessment, of this Draft EIR. As described in detail in Chapter 4, Environmental Evaluation, the proposed project would have no significant impact on agricultural, forestry and mineral resources due to existing conditions in the project area. Accordingly, these topics have not been analyzed further in this Draft EIR.

Table 2-1 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this Draft EIR and presents a summary of impacts and mitigation measures identified. It is organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapters 4.1 through 4.14. Table 2-1 is arranged in four columns: 1) environmental impact; 2) significance without mitigation; 3) mitigation measures; and 4) significance with mitigation. For a complete description of potential impacts, please refer to the specific discussions in Chapters 4.1 through 4.14.

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
AESTHETICS			
AES-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-5: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to aesthetics.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AIR QUALITY			
AQ-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-2: Operation of the proposed project could contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.	S	**AQ-2:** Prior to issuance of construction permits, development project applicants that are subject to CEQA and exceed the screening sizes in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines shall prepare and submit to the City of Santa Rosa a technical assessment evaluating potential air quality impacts related to the project's operation phase. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with the BAAQMD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, as identified in BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines, the City of Santa Rosa shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operation activities.	SU

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
AQ-3: Future potential development projects associated with the proposed project could cumulatively contribute to the non-attainment designations of the SFBAAB.	S	**AQ-3:** Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-2.	SU
AQ-4: Construction activities associated with potential future development projects accommodated under the proposed project could expose nearby receptors to substantial concentrations of TACs.	S	**AQ-4:** Applicants for construction within 1,000 feet of residential and other sensitive land use projects (e.g., hospitals, nursing homes, day care centers) in the City of Santa Rosa, as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the source/edge of the nearest travel lane, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Santa Rosa prior to future discretionary project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children ages 0 to 16 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06), $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations exceed 0.3 $\mu g/m^3$, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include, but are not limited to: During construction, use of construction equipment fitted with Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF) for all equipment of 50 horsepower or more. ▪ Use of construction equipment fitted with Tier 3 engines for all equipment of 50 horsepower or more. ▪ Equipment shall be properly serviced and maintained in accordance with manufacturer recommendations. ▪ The construction contractor shall ensure that all non-essential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less in compliance with Section 2449 of the California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Article 4.8, Chapter 9. Measures identified in the HRA shall be included in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		development plan as a component of the proposed project. Prior to issuance of any construction permit, the construction contractor shall ensure that all construction plans submitted to the City of Santa Rosa Planning Division and/or Building Division clearly show incorporation of all applicable mitigation measures.	
AQ-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not create or expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-6: Despite implementation of the proposed project policies, criteria air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would generate a substantial net increase in emissions that exceeds the BAAQMD regional significance thresholds.	S	**AQ-5**: Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-2 through AQ-4.	SU
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
BIO-1a: Proposed development could potentially result in an inadvertent take of individual California red-legged frog (CLRF) in the remote instance that individuals were to disperse onto the site in the future, in which case this could result in a potential violation of the federal and California Endangered Species Acts if adequate controls and preconstruction surveys are not implemented.	S	**BIO-1a**: Ensure Avoidance of California Red-legged Frog. The following measures shall be implemented in locations within 100 feet of any drainage or seasonal wetland on the site to ensure avoidance of individual California red-legged frog (CRLF) in the remote instance individuals were to disperse onto the site in the future in advance of or during construction: ▪ *Wildlife exclusion fence*: Wildlife exclusion fencing shall be installed prior to the start of construction and maintained until construction of the proposed project is complete. Such fencing shall, at a minimum, run along the proposed project boundaries with riparian habitat and for a distance of at least 100 feet perpendicular to riparian habitat. Silt fence material may be used to also provide erosion control, however, per CRLF standards, it must be at least 42 inches in height (at least 36 inches above ground and buried at least 6 inches below the ground) and stakes must be place on the inside of the project (side on which work will take place). ▪ *Pre-construction survey*: Pre-construction surveys for CRLF shall be conducted prior to initiation of project activities (including fence installation) and within 48 hours of the start of ground	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		disturbance activities following completion of exclusion fence installation. Surveys are to be conducted by qualified biologists with experience surveying for CRLF. If project activities are stopped for greater than 7 days, a follow-up pre-construction survey may be required within 48 hours prior to reinitiating project activities. ▪ *Worker Training:* All workers for activities within 100 feet of riparian habitat shall be trained by the qualified biologist to understand the remote potential for occurrence of this listed species, need to avoid any potential inadvertent take, and process to follow if a frog is encountered, that all work must stop and the qualified biologist must determine whether it is CRLF before work proceeds. ▪ *Earth Disturbing Activities only during dry weather*: No earth disturbing activities shall take place during rain events when there is potential for accumulation greater than 0.25 inch in a 24-hour period. In addition, no earth disturbing activities shall occur for 48 hours following rain events in which 0.25 inch of rain accumulation within 24 hours. ▪ *Biological monitoring*: An approved biologist shall be required to inspect and approve installation of the exclusion fence. ▪ *Erosion Control Materials*: Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibians do not get trapped. Plastic mono-filament netting (erosion control matting), rolled erosion control products, or similar material shall not be used.	
BIO-1b: Project implementation could potentially result in loss or modifications to special-status plant species if present on the site and systematic surveys and adequate avoidance are not implemented.	S	BIO-1b: Appropriate measures shall be implemented to ensure adequate avoidance of special-status plant species, if present in the remaining natural areas on the project site east of Summerfield Road. A qualified botanist shall conduct systematic surveys of the portion of the project site east of the Summerfield Road in spring and summer months to confirm absence of any special-status plant species on the site. The survey shall focus on the special-status plant species considered to have a remote probability for occurrence on the project site. The surveys shall be completed and a report of findings submitted to the City before the onset of any initial ground-	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		disturbing activity or construction associated with project implementation. If any special-status plant species are encountered, then any occurrence(s) shall be avoided or potential impacts adequately mitigated as part of potential future project development. The qualified botanist shall develop and implement a Special-Status Plant Species Mitigation and Monitoring Program (SSPSMMP). The SSPSMMP shall only be required if a listed species or those with a ranking of 1A, 1B or 2 of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory are encountered during the preconstruction survey. Potential impacts on any species with a ranking of 3 and 4 of the CNPS Inventory would not be considered significant and no additional mitigation would be required for these species if encountered during the systematic survey(s). The SSPMMP shall be prepared in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and shall be approved by the City prior to any initial ground-disturbing activity or construction. The SSPMMP shall be based on the status and vulnerability of the species present, with avoidance of all or a majority of any populations on the site the preferred method of mitigation. Where complete or even partial avoidance of any special-status plant populations on the site is considered infeasible, options for mitigation may include a program to salvage and reestablish the population at an alternative, suitable location. Details of any salvage and habitat recreation effort shall include the following criteria and performance standards measures may include: ▪ Collection of seeds during the appropriate developmental stage of the plan. ▪ Procedures for sowing techniques appropriate to the life cycle of the plant. ▪ Preparation of a maintenance and monitoring plan specific to the environmental conditions necessary for survival of the new population. Maintenance and monitoring shall be provided for a minimum of five years to determine success of re-seeding and habitat creation, and need for additional preservation. ▪ Identification of funding sources to provide implementation of	

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		the plan in consultation with the qualified plant ecologist, landscape architect, and civil engineer. ▪ In addition, preservation of another existing occurrence of the affected special-status plant species shall be required if monitoring indicates that the reestablishment efforts have not been successful after five years. The preservation program shall provide for permanent protection of a different existing population in Sonoma County, which is equal or larger in size than that encountered on the site (minimum 1:1 replacement), through land acquisition or use of a conservation easement. Any off-site mitigation lands shall include establishment of a management endowment as necessary to provide for long-term management of the preserved population.	
BIO-1c: Proposed development could potentially result in inadvertent loss of bird nests in active use, which would conflict with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and CDFW code if adequate controls and preconstruction surveys are not implemented.	S	**BIO-1c:** Ensure Avoidance of Bird Nests in Active Use. Tree removal, landscape grubbing, and building demolition shall be performed in compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and relevant sections of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) code to avoid loss of nests in active use. This shall be accomplished by scheduling tree removal and landscape grubbing outside of the bird nesting season (which occurs from February 1 to August 31) to avoid possible impacts on nesting birds if new nests are established in the future. Alternatively, if building demolition, tree removal and landscape grubbing cannot be scheduled during the non-nesting season (September 1 to January 31), a pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted. The pre-construction nesting survey shall include the following: ▪ A qualified biologist (Biologist) shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird (both passerine and raptor) survey within seven calendar days prior to tree removal, landscape grubbing, and/or building demolition. ▪ If no nesting birds or active nests are observed, no further action is required and tree removal, landscape grubbing, and building demolition shall occur within seven calendar days of the survey. ▪ Another nest survey shall be conducted if more than seven calendar days elapse between the initial nest search and the beginning of tree removal, landscape grubbing, and building	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		demolition. ▪ If any active nests are encountered, the Biologist shall determine an appropriate disturbance-free buffer zone to be established around the nest location(s) until the young have fledged. Buffer zones vary depending on the species (i.e., typically 75 to 100 feet for passerines and 300 feet for raptors) and other factors such as ongoing disturbance in the vicinity of the nest location. If necessary, the dimensions of the buffer zone shall be determined in consultation with the CDFW. ▪ Orange construction fencing, flagging, or other marking system shall be installed to delineate the buffer zone around the nest location(s) within which no construction-related equipment or operations shall be permitted. Continued use of existing facilities such as surface parking and site maintenance may continue within this buffer zone. ▪ No restrictions on grading or construction activities outside the prescribed buffer zone are required once the zone has been identified and delineated in the field and workers have been properly trained to avoid the buffer zone area. ▪ Construction activities shall be restricted from the buffer zone until the Biologist has determined that young birds have fledged and the buffer zone is no longer needed. ▪ A survey report of findings verifying that any young have fledged shall be submitted by the Biologist for review and approval by the City prior to initiation of any tree removal, landscape grubbing, building demolition, and other construction activities within the buffer zone. Following written approval by the City, tree removal, and construction within the nest-buffer zone may proceed.	
BIO-2: Implementation of the proposed project would generally not 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 Wildlife or United States Fish and Wildlife Service.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-3: Potential future development would result in adverse impacts to regulated waters and special-status	S	**BIO-3: Provide Compensatory Mitigation for Wetland Modifications.** The City shall require future project applicants to develop and	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
species within the regulatory waters, and would require appropriate authorizations from regulatory agencies and adequate compensatory mitigation where avoidance is infeasible.		implement a compensatory mitigation program to provide adequate mitigation for jurisdictional waters affected by proposed improvements in the Southeast Greenway Area for submittal to the City. A jurisdictional wetland delineation shall be prepared by a qualified wetland specialist and submitted for verification by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) where jurisdictional waters may be affected by project-related improvements. A Wetland Protection and Replacement Program (WPRP) shall be prepared by the qualified wetland specialist and implemented to provide compensatory mitigation at a minimum 2:1 ratio where wetland habitat is affected, shall minimize disturbance to unvegetated waters, and shall be reviewed and approved by appropriate regulatory agencies (e.g., USACE, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The WPRP shall include appropriate implementation measures to prevent inadvertent loss and degradation of jurisdictional waters to be protected, and replacement for those wetland features eliminated or modified as a result of potential future project development. The WPRP shall contain the following components: ▪ Where verified waters of the United States are present and cannot be avoided, authorization for modifications to these features shall be obtained from regulatory agencies with jurisdiction. This includes the USACE through the Section 404 permitting process where waters of the United States are affected by the potential future project development and the RWQCB as part of the Section 401 Certification process. Together with a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) secured from CDFW, if required as part of the SAA Notification process for proposed fills to the man-made ditch and possibly the pond on the golf course. All conditions required as part of the authorizations by the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW shall be implemented as part of the project. ▪ Consultation or incidental take permitting may be required under the California and federal Endangered Species Acts. Future project applicants shall obtain all legally required permits or other authorizations from the USFWS, National Marine Fisheries Service	

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		(NOAA Fisheries), and CDFW for the potential "take" of protected species under the Endangered Species Acts. ▪ Install orange construction fencing around the boundary of all wetland areas and waters to be preserved at the interface with proposed fills and grading so that they are not disturbed during construction. The fencing shall be placed a minimum of 25 feet out from the boundary of the wetlands/waters but may need to be adjusted if restoration activities are to be conducted within this area. Grading, construction, and restoration work within the wetland/waters buffer zones shall be conducted in a way that avoids or minimizes disturbance of existing wetlands and aquatic habitat. ▪ A qualified biologist/restoration specialist shall be available during construction to provide situation-specific wetland avoidance measures or planting recommendation, as needed. ▪ Success criteria, maintenance and long-term management responsibilities, monitoring requirements, and contingency measures in the WPRP should be specified. Monitoring shall be conducted by the qualified wetland specialist for a minimum of five years and continue until the success criteria are met. Permanent monitoring transects shall be established as part of the program and vegetation data collected in the spring and summer months when plant identification is possible. Photo stations shall be established along each monitoring transect, and photographs taken every year during the required monitoring period. ▪ Annual monitoring reports shall be prepared by the qualified wetland specialist and submitted to resource agency representatives by December 31 of each monitoring year for a minimum of 5 years or until the defined success criteria are met. The annual report shall summarize the results of the monitoring effort, performance standards, and any required contingency measures, and shall include photographs of the monitoring transects and program success. Maps shall be included in the monitoring report to show the location of monitoring transects and photo stations.	

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
BIO-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially interfere 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-7: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to biological resources.	LTS	N/A	N/A
CULTUAL RESOURCES			
CULT-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	LTS	N/A	N/A
CULT-2: Implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to cause a significant impact to an unknown archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	S	**CULT-2**: If any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to assess the significance of the find according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. If any find is determined to be significant, representatives from the City and the archaeologist would meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be, as necessary and at the discretion of the consulting archaeologist, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and documentation according to current professional standards. In considering any suggested mitigation	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		proposed by the consulting archaeologist to mitigate impacts to historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the City shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, proposed project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) would be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for historical resources or unique archaeological resources is being carried out.	
CULT-3: Implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to directly or indirectly affect a unique paleontological resources or site, or unique geological feature.	S	**CULT-3**: In the event that fossils or fossil-bearing deposits are discovered during construction, excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted. The contractor shall notify a qualified paleontologist to examine the discovery. The paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995), evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the finding under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the project proponent determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the project based on the qualities that make the resource important. The plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to implementation.	LTS
CULT-4: Implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to disturb humans remains interred outside of formal territories, the disturbance of those remains could result in a significant impact under CEQA.	S	**CULT-4:** Procedures of conduct following the discovery of human remains have been mandated by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e) (CEQA). According to the provisions in CEQA, if human remains are encountered at the site, all work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease and necessary steps to ensure the integrity of the immediate area shall be taken. The Sonoma County Coroner shall be notified immediately. The Coroner shall then determine whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC within 24 hours, who	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		will, in turn, notify the person the NAHC identifies as the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of any human remains. Further actions shall be determined, in part, by the desires of the MLD. The MLD has 48 hours to make recommendations regarding the disposition of the remains following notification from the NAHC of the discovery. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the owner shall, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance. Alternatively, if the owner does not accept the MLD's recommendations, the owner or the descendent may request mediation by the NAHC.	
CULT-5: Implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to impact TCRs the disturbance of which could result in a significant impact under CEQA.	S	**CULT-5a:** Implement Mitigation Measure CULT-2 **CULT-5b**: Implement Mitigation Measure CULT-4	LTS
CULT-6: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, could result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to cultural resources.	S	**CULT-6**: Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-2, CULT-3, CULT-4, and CULT-5.	LTS
GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
GEO-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to development on unstable geologic units and soils or result in on- or off-site landsliding, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not create substantial risks to property as a result of its location on expansive soil, as defined by Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
GEO-5: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to geology, soils, and seismicity.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
GHG-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not directly and indirectly generate greenhouse gas emissions that would result in an increase in community emissions from baseline conditions that would have a significant impact on the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GHG-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GHG-3: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to greenhouse gas emissions.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
HAZ-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-miles of an existing or proposed school.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
HAZ-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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 not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not be within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-7: Implementation of the proposed project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-8: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-9: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
HYDRO-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
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).			
HYDRO-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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 amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYDRO-7: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
LU-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LU-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
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.			
LU-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LU-4: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to land use and planning.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOISE			
NOISE-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause exposure of people to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or the Municipal Code, and/or the applicable standards of other agencies.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOISE-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause exposure of people to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOISE-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOISE-4: Implementation of the proposed project would cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOISE-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause exposure of people residing or working in the vicinity of the study area to excessive aircraft noise levels, for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
of a public airport or public use airport.			
NOISE-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause exposure of people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOISE-7: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impacts with respect to noise.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
POP-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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).	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-4: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in significant cumulative impact with respect to population and housing.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION			
PS-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-2: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to fire protection services.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-4: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to police services.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-6: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to school services.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-7: The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
service ratios, or other performance objectives.			
PS-8: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to the construction of other public facilities.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-9: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered park facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-10: Implementation of the proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-11: The proposed project would include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A
PS-12: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to parks.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION			
TRANS-1a: The Farmers Lane/SR 12 Eastbound Off-ramp-Hoen Avenue Frontage Road intersection (#8) currently operates unacceptably at LOS E during the PM peak hour and is projected to continue operating at LOS E upon the addition of project-generated traffic, with increases in delay of approximately 9.6 seconds. This is considered to be a significant impact.	S	As discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, under impact discussion TRANS-1, measures that could potentially reduce this impact were considered and were determined to be infeasible. See Chapter 4.13 for more discussion.	SU
TRANS-1b: On Farmers Lane under Future plus Project conditions, the project is anticipated to cause a 1-mile per hour reduction in average southbound speeds during the	S	As discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, under impact discussion TRANS-1, measures that could potentially reduce this impact were considered and were determined to be infeasible.	SU

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
PM peak hour, and is anticipated to cause operation to drop from LOS D to LOS E in the southbound direction during the AM peak hour.		See Chapter 4.13 for more discussion.	
TRANS-1c: The Farmers Lane/Fourth Street-Sonoma Highway intersection (#1) is projected to operate unacceptably at LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours without the project and with the addition of project traffic would drop to LOS F during the AM peak hour.	S	As discussed in Chapter 4.3, Transportation and Circulation, under impact discussion TRANS-1, measures that could potentially reduce this impact were found to be infeasible.	SU
TRANS-1d: The southbound stop-controlled approach the Hoen Avenue/Franquette Avenue intersection (#13) is projected to operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour, with a 6.1-second increase in delay attributable to the project, which would meet the CA-MUTCD "Peak Hour Volume" warrant for signalization.	S	**TRANS-1d:** A traffic signal should be installed at the intersection of Hoen Avenue/Franquette Avenue in the future. The City's Department of Transportation and Public Works should monitor operation at the intersection through field observations and review of development traffic impact studies, and add signalization of the intersection to the Capital Improvement Program once the City Traffic Engineer determines that signalization is warranted.	LTS
TRANS-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANS-3: The proposed project would not 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.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANS-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment).	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANS-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANS-6a: The proposed multi-use pathway crossings could result in pedestrian and bicyclist safety concerns.	S	**TANS-6a.1**: The mid-block multi-use pathway crossings on Summerfield Road and Yulupa Avenue should include, at a minimum, an active pedestrian warning system (such as, but not limited to, pedestrian-activated flashing beacons or rapid rectangular flashing beacons) as well as high-visibility crosswalk markings.	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		TRANS-6a.2: The mid-block multi-use pathway crossing on Franquette Avenue should include, at a minimum, high-visibility crosswalk markings and signs. **TRANS-6a.3:** The multi-use pathway crossing at the Hoen Avenue/Hoen Avenue Frontage Road-Cypress Way signalized intersection should include, at a minimum, new high-visibility crosswalk markings and signal phasing to serve pedestrians and bicyclists, as well as signage (such as "Yield to Bikes" signs) alerting drivers to the presence of bike crossings. **TRANS-6a.4**: The ultimate configuration of multi-use pathway street crossing designs, including selection of warning devices if appropriate, shall be determined by the City's Traffic Engineer, in consideration of the physical characteristics of each site and best design practices that exist at the time the design is initiated.	
TRANS-6b: Potential development of an at-grade crossing at the Hoen Avenue Frontage Road/SR 12 Westbound On-ramp intersection could result in pedestrian safety concerns.	S	**TRANS-6b.1**: If an at-grade pedestrian crossing is to be implemented at Hoen Avenue Frontage Road/SR 12 Westbound On-ramp intersection, the intersection would need to be modified to include, at a minimum, the following components: ▪ Signal or pedestrian hybrid beacon with an exclusive phase for pedestrian-bicycle movements ▪ Horizontal realignment that regulates vehicle speeds to no greater than 35 mph at the crossing ▪ Maintained clear line of sight between drivers and pedestrians/bicyclists on the crossing ▪ Right-turn pocket on westbound Hoen Avenue Frontage Road to provide vehicle queue storage **TRANS-6b.2**: The ultimate configuration of any at-grade pedestrian crossing at the Hoen Avenue Frontage Road/SR 12 Westbound On-ramp intersection shall be evaluated and determined by the City's Traffic Engineer, in collaboration with Caltrans, and in consideration of the physical characteristics the site and best design practices that exist at the time the design is initiated. The City shall obtain an	LTS

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		encroachment permit and design approval from Caltrans prior to implementing the new pedestrian crossing.	
TRANS-6c: Construction activities associated with development in the Southeast Greenway Area may temporarily affect vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation.	S	**TRANS-6c**: Prior to commencement of construction activities, applicants seeking to construct projects within the Southeast Greenway Area should submit a construction traffic control plan to the City of Santa Rosa for review and approval. The proposed project should identify the timing and routing of all major construction-related traffic to avoid potential congestion and delays on the local street network. Any temporary road or sidewalk closures should be identified along with detour plans. If necessary, movement of major construction equipment and materials should be limited to off-peak hours to avoid conflicts with local traffic circulation.	LTS
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
UTIL-1: Implementation of the proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the proposed project from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded entitlements.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-3: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to water service.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
UTIL-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-7: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to wastewater service.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-8: Implementation of the proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-9: Implementation of the proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-10: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to solid waste.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-11: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in natural gas and electrical service demands, and would not require new energy supply facilities and transmission infrastructure or capacity enhancing alterations to existing facilities.	LTS	N/A	N/A
UTIL-12: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to energy conservation.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less than Significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and Unavoidable

This page intentionally left blank.