

3. Revisions to the Draft EIR

This chapter includes text revisions to the 2017 Draft EIR and the Revised Draft EIR that were made in response to public, agency, and organization comments, as well as staff-directed changes. These text revisions include typographical corrections, insignificant modifications, amplifications and clarifications of the 2017 Draft EIR and the Revised Draft EIR. In each case, the revised page and location on the page is presented, followed by the textual, tabular, or graphical revision. Underlined text represents language that has been added to this Final Revised EIR; text with ~~striketrough~~ represents language that has been deleted from the 2017 Draft EIR and the Revised Draft EIR.

None of the revisions to the 2017 Draft EIR or the Revised Draft EIR constitute significant new information as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5; therefore, the Draft EIR does not need to be recirculated.

CHAPTER 3, PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Parks and Recreation description under Section 3.5.1.1, Proposed Land Use Concept, on page 3-17 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

- **Parks and Recreation.** Parkland with a mostly natural appearance would maintain a minimum width of ~~100~~ 125 feet (but often wider) for the length of the Southeast Greenway Area, and would include pathways for pedestrians, bicyclists, and non-motorized access; native plantings; and some areas dedicated to play areas and picnic areas near access points. Within the parkland, select areas are appropriate for the following uses:
 - Greenway, Picnic Areas, and Playgrounds. These areas of the Greenway would have pathways, playgrounds, picnic areas and other recreational uses serving the needs of the neighborhood and community. Native vegetation and plantings would be incorporated where possible to maintain a natural appearance.

Policy LUL-NN-3 under subheading “Land Use and Livability Goals and Policies, on page 3-22 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Policy LUL-NN-3 Improve stormwater management to increase infiltration and groundwater recharge, reduce flood risk, and/or enhance the environment. ~~Increase stormwater infiltration and groundwater recharge.~~

Policy LUL-OO-4 under subheading “Land Use and Livability Goals and Policies, on page 3-22 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Policy LUL-OO-4 ~~Seek opportunities for shared parking to serve the Southeast Greenway. These include Montgomery High School, Spring Lake Regional Park, and adjacent non-residential uses.~~

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

Policy LUL-PP-4 under subheading “Land Use and Livability Goals and Policies, on page 3-23 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Policy LUL-PP-4 In future design phases of the project, minimize parking impacts on surrounding neighborhoods by providing parking on the Southeast Greenway and seeking opportunities to share parking with adjacent non-residential uses, such as Montgomery High School and Spring Lake Regional Park. Provide for parking on the Southeast Greenway in future design phases of the project to minimize parking in surrounding neighborhoods.

CHAPTER 4.1, AESTHETICS

The first bullet in the list of zoning districts in the Southeast Greenway Area on page 4.1-8 is hereby amended as follows:

- **Open Space Recreation (OSR) district.** The maximum height for allowable residential uses in the OSR district is 35 feet; non-residential structures may be greater height if authorized by a Conditional Use Permit per Zoning Code Section 20-26-040. However, no residential development is permitted in the OSR district in the Southeast Greenway Area.

CHAPTER 4.2, AIR QUALITY

The mitigation numbering under Impact AQ-6 on page 4.2-36 is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure AQ-56: Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-2 through AQ-4.

CHAPTER 4.4, CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

The text under subheading “Outreach to Native American Tribes” on pages 4.4-4 to 4.4-5 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

In compliance with SB 18, on July 29, 2016 a letter was sent to the NAHC seeking information from the sacred lands files, which track Native American cultural resources, and the names of Native American individuals and groups that would be appropriate to contact regarding this project. The NAHC replied with a letter dated August 12, 2016, in which they indicated that the sacred land file has no information about the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area, and provided a list of Native American contacts (groups and individuals) who may have information regarding known and recorded sites. The NAHC also provided a list of additional Tribal contacts.

In response to AB 52, the City received requests from Tribes to be notified about projects in the City of Santa Rosa, which is the geographic area with which they are traditionally and culturally affiliated. Tribes include the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, Lytton Rancheria of California, and Middletown

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California. In February 2017, the Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians notified the City that notification of projects in the city was no longer required.

Letters of project notification were also sent to the following contacts on the dates listed:

Sent by the City on August 12, 2016:

Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria

- Buffy McQuillen

Lytton Rancheria of California

- Brenda Tomaras

Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians

- Stephanie Reyes, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

Sent by Tom Origer and Associates on August 26, 2016:

Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria

- ~~Lytton Rancheria of California~~
- Greg Sarris
- Gene Buvelot
- Buffy McQuillen
- Peter Nelson

Lytton Rancheria of California

- Marjorie Mejia
- ~~Buffy McQuillen~~
- ~~Peter Nelson~~

A complete log of contact efforts is provided in Appendix D, Cultural Resources Data, of this Draft EIR, along with copies of all responses received. While responses were provided by the Lytton Rancheria of California on September 3, 2016, the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria on September 19, 2016, and the Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians on November 30, 2016, no specific requests for consultation regarding the proposed project were made. However, the Lytton Rancheria of California did request that a sensitive location be avoided during any future development and that they would be consulting further with the appropriate lead agency. In response to AB 52, the City has not received any request from any Tribes in the in the geographic area with which it is traditionally and culturally affiliated with or otherwise to be notified about projects in the City of Santa Rosa. Nonetheless, tThe evaluation of potential impacts to TCRs, including mitigation to avoid sensitive resources, is addressed below in Section 4.4.3, Impact Discussion, of this chapter.

Mitigation Measure CULT-2 under Section 4.4-3, Impact Discussion, on page 4.4-8 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure 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. If the resource is a tribal resource – whether historic or prehistoric – the City shall consult with the appropriate tribe(s) to evaluate the resource and determine appropriate avoidance, preservation or mitigation measures. If the resource is non-tribal, the archaeologist shall t 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 non-tribal 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. Where the materials are tribal, the City shall consult with the appropriate tribe(s) to determine

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

what types of testing and preservation are acceptable. In considering any suggested mitigation ~~proposed by the consulting archaeologist~~ to mitigate impacts to tribal cultural resources, historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the City, in consultation with the tribe(s) where appropriate, 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~~ may be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for tribal cultural resources, historical resources or unique archaeological resources is being carried out.

CHAPTER 4.7, HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The second paragraph under heading “Chapter 4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials” on page 4.7-1 of this 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Some of the information in this chapter was derived from a recent Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the Southeast Greenway Area dated ~~June~~ October 2017 and the Soil Sampling of Mound West of Yulupa Avenue; Southeast Greenway, Santa Rosa, CA Memorandum Dated June 13, 2017 and prepared by PlaceWorks. A copy of this report and memo ~~is~~ are included as Appendix E, Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, of this Draft EIR. This chapter was prepared by a California Registered Engineer.

CHAPTER 4.8, HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The text under subheading “Sonoma County Water Agency” on pages 4.8-3 to 4.8-4 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The SCWA is the flood control agency for the County. Their responsibilities include creek restoration, pollution prevention efforts, and groundwater recharge. The SCWA has partnered with federal agencies to help build and manage a variety of flood protection projects, including Warm Springs Dam, Spring Lake, Coyote Valley Dam, Matanzas Creek Reservoir, Piner Creek Reservoir, Brush Creek Middle Fork Reservoir and Spring Creek Reservoir. The SCWA also manages a proactive stream maintenance program for ~~more than 80 miles of creeks~~ approximately 75 miles of engineered flood control channels and 100 miles of natural channels throughout its service area, including portions of the three creeks that cross the Southeast Greenway Area.

The third paragraph under subheading “Hydrology and Surface Drainage” on page 4.8-8 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The SCWA maintains the system of open channels and creeks that divert flow to the Russian River. Sonoma County is divided into nine flood control zones that are managed by the SCWA. The Southeast Greenway Area and City of Santa Rosa are located in Flood Control Zone 1A (Mark West Creek-Laguna de Santa Rosa Watershed). The SCWA provides ~~system-wide~~ maintenance and improvements activities along 69 miles of Zone 1A engineered channels funded through Zone 1A funds including the repair of box culverts and dam spillways; cleaning of side drains leading into channels from subdivisions or city streets;

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

repair/replacement of in-channel control structures; removal of siltation in low-velocity channels to restore hydraulic capacity; repair of bank “wash-outs”; and removal of debris that collects in creek channels.

Footnote 16 at the bottom of page 4.8-13 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

¹⁶ Sonoma County, ~~2011~~ 2017, Sonoma County Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The second paragraph under Impact Discussion HYDRO-2 on page 4.9-19 of this 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The new trail, bike path, and recreational space associated with the proposed project would not lead to an increase in water demand. Future potential development of a joint school facility, plazas/trailheads, public gathering place, urban agriculture, and commercial and residential uses associated with the proposed project would create additional water demand. Additional discussion of the impacts associated with water supply is provided in Chapter 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, of this Draft EIR. In addition, the proposed project would protect onsite groundwater recharge areas, including creeks and riparian corridors in accordance with General Plan 2035 Policy OSC-I-6, and implement LID features that prioritize infiltration. Additionally, proposed Land Use and Livability Policy LUL-NN-3 requires the City to improve stormwater management to increase infiltration and groundwater recharge, reduce flood risk, and enhance the environment ~~increase stormwater infiltration and groundwater recharge~~ in the Southeast Greenway Area. This would allow for percolation, groundwater recharge, and minimize stormwater runoff from the site, thus further reducing potential impacts to groundwater recharge.

CHAPTER 4.9, LAND USE AND PLANNING

The list of proposed policies under Impact Discussion LU-2, on page 4.9-7 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

~~Policy LUL-OO-4 Seek opportunities for shared parking to serve the Southeast Greenway. These include Montgomery High School, Spring Lake Regional Park, and adjacent non-residential uses.~~

Policy LUL-PP-4 In future design phases of the project, minimize parking impacts on surrounding neighborhoods by providing parking on the Southeast Greenway and seeking opportunities to share parking with adjacent non-residential uses, such as Montgomery High School and Spring Lake Regional Park.

Policy T-N-5 Provide for parking on the Southeast Greenway and seek shared parking opportunities in adjacent non-residential uses, such as Montgomery High School, the Friedman Center, and Spring Lake Regional Park in future design phases of the project to maximize a park once experience and minimize parking in surrounding neighborhoods.

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

Policy LUL-NN-3 under Impact Discussion LU-2, on page 4.9-9 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Policy LUL-NN-3 Improve stormwater management to increase infiltration and groundwater recharge, reduce flood risk, and/or enhance the environment. ~~Increase stormwater infiltration and groundwater recharge.~~

CHAPTER 4.12, PUBLIC SERVICES

The list of schools under the subheading for “Rincon Valley Union School District” on page 4.12-12 has been amended as follows:

Although not identified as a school where future students generated by the proposed project would attend by the Superintendent of the Rincon Valley School District (RVUSD), at the request of the public the Village Elementary School is included as a school where students generated from the proposed project could potentially attend.

CHAPTER 4.13, TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

The text on item #5 of the list of study intersections on page 4.13-9 of the Revised Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

5. **Farmers Lane/Hoen Avenue** is a four-legged signalized intersection with permitted left-turn ~~phasing~~ pockets on all four approaches, and marked pedestrian crosswalks on the north, east, and west legs.

The text in the second and third paragraphs under the subheading “Bicycles Facilities” on page 4.13-12 of the Revised Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

There are some existing bicycle facilities which would provide access to the Southeast Greenway planning area. There is an existing Class II bike lane on Yulupa Avenue, which runs for over 2 miles from Bennett Valley Road to Montgomery Drive and passes through the Southeast Greenway Area. There are also existing Class II bike lanes on ~~the~~ Hoen Avenue-Hoen Frontage Road corridor, parallel to the Southeast Greenway, from ~~Farmers Lane~~ Townview Avenue (just east of Farmers Lane) to Summerfield Road. Existing Class II bike lanes are also provided on Summerfield Road, extending from Bethards Drive to Montgomery Drive for about two miles. There is also an existing Class III bike route on Hahman Drive, between Montgomery Drive and Hoen Avenue.

Future bicycle facilities identified in the BPMP includes plans for a Class I multi-use path along an approximately one-mile stretch of the Southeast Greenway Area, from Hoen Avenue/Hoen Avenue Frontage Road to Spring Lake Regional Park. This path would provide interior connections to neighborhoods and connect to Montgomery High School and Montgomery Village to the west. The eastern end of the Class I path would ~~access cross~~ access cross Summerfield Road, ~~providing access on surface streets and continue~~ to Spring Lake County Regional Park. In the western portion of the Southeast Greenway

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

planning area, the BPMP depicts the Class I multi-use path extending westward from Hoen Avenue, crossing Matanzas Creek and connecting to the terminus of Vallejo Street.

Table 4.13-15 (Existing plus Project Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service) on page 4.14-27 is hereby amended as follows:

TABLE 4.13-15 EXISTING PLUS PROJECT PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE

#	Study Intersection/Approach	AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		Existing		Existing + Project		Existing		Existing + Project	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1.	Farmers Lane/Fourth St-Sonoma Hwy	48.9	D	49.0	D	51.2	D	52.1	D
2.	Farmers Lane/Montgomery Drive	28.4	C	28.5	C	37.9	D	38.2	D
3.	Farmers Lane/Sonoma Avenue	27.2	C	27.4	C	39.3	D	40.0	D
4.	Farmers Lane/Patio Court	11.9	B	12.0	B	12.5	B	12.9	B
5.	Farmers Lane/Hoen Avenue	9.6	A	10.0	A	6.9	A	7.5	A
6.	Farmers Lane/Vallejo Street	19.5	B	19.3 <u>19.6</u>	B	6.9	A	7.3 <u>7.4</u>	A
7.	Farmers Lane/SR 12 West On-ramp	9.0	A	9.2	A	7.5	A	7.9	A
8.	Farmers Lane/SR 12 EastBound Off-ramp-Hoen Avenue Frontage Road	40.6	D	41.9	D	57.2	E	66.8	E
9.	Farmers Lane/Bennett Valley Road	14.2	B	14.2	B	12.9	B	13.0	B
10.	Hoen Avenue Frontage Road/Townview Avenue	1.4	A	1.4	A	2.3	A	2.5	A
	<i>Northbound Approach</i>	<i>15.9</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>17.0</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>25.7</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>31.7</i>	<i>D</i>
11.	Hoen Avenue Frontage Road/New Mixed Use Street ^a	-	-	1.2	A	-	-	1.0	A
	<i>Southbound Approach</i>	-	-	<i>11.7</i>	<i>B</i>	-	-	<i>15.0</i>	<i>C</i>
12.	Hoen Avenue Frontage Road/Hoen Avenue-Cypress Way	13.9	B	14.4	B	12.9	B	14.1	B
13.	Hoen Avenue/Franquette Avenue	2.2	A	2.3	A	2.2	A	2.2	A
	<i>Southbound Approach</i>	<i>28.4</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>30.1</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>24.4</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>26.8</i>	<i>D</i>
14.	Yulupa Avenue/Mayette Avenue	8.5	A	8.7	A	5.2	A	5.2	A
15.	Hoen Avenue/Yulupa Avenue	38.8	D	41.2	D	43.2	D	44.0	D
16.	Hoen Avenue/Summerfield Road	19.1	B	19.2	B	34.1	C	34.0	C

Note: Delay is measured in average seconds per vehicle; LOS = Level of Service; Results for minor approaches to two-way stop-controlled intersections are indicated in *italics*; **Bold** indicates operation below City level-of-service standard.

a. Future intersection.

Source: W-Trans, 2017. Traffic Impact Study for the Southeast Greenway Plan, July 10. Table 14.

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

Table 4.13-18 (Future plus Project (With Farmers Lane Extension) Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service) is hereby amended as follows:

TABLE 4.13-18 FUTURE PLUS PROJECT (WITH FARMERS LANE EXTENSION) PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE

#	Study Intersection/Approach	AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
		Future		Future + Project		Future		Future + Project	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1.	Farmers Lane/Fourth St-Sonoma Hwy	57.6	E	58.5	E	78.5	E	81.4	F
2.	Farmers Lane/Montgomery Drive	30.2	C	30.5	C	47.0	D	47.8	D
3.	Farmers Lane/Sonoma Avenue	30.4	C	30.4	C	32.1	C	32.6	C
4.	Farmers Lane/Patio Court	7.1	A	7.2	A	11.4	B	11.7	B
5.	Farmers Lane/Hoen Avenue	29.4	C	31.1	C	32.7	C	35.6	D
6.	Farmers Lane/Vallejo Street	11.1	B	11.6 <u>12.2</u>	B	8.1	A	8.7 <u>9.3</u>	A
7.	Farmers Lane/SR 12 West On-ramp	5.0	A	5.4	A	5.2	A	5.4	A
8.	Farmers Lane/SR 12 Eastbound Off-ramp-Hoen Avenue Frontage Road	41.7	D	43.3	D	45.0	D	52.5	D
9.	Farmers Lane/Bennett Valley Road	43.9	D	43.9	D	46.5	D	46.6	D
10.	Hoen Avenue Frontage Road/Townview Avenue	1.4	A	1.4	A	2.7	A	3.1	A
	<i>Northbound Approach^b</i>	<i>17.6</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>19.1</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>34.2</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>44.4</i>	<i>E</i>
11.	Hoen Avenue Frontage Road/New Mixed Use Street ^a	-	-	1.1	A	-	-	1.0	A
	<i>Southbound Approach</i>	-	-	<i>13.2</i>	<i>B</i>	-	-	<i>17.6</i>	<i>C</i>
12.	Hoen Avenue Frontage Road/Hoen Avenue-Cypress Way	19.3	B	20.0	C	27.2	C	29.6	C
13.	Hoen Avenue/Franquette Avenue	5.0	A	5.4	A	2.6	A	2.8	A
	<i>Southbound Approach^c</i>	<i>53.9</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>60.0</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>31.6</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>36.1</i>	<i>E</i>
14.	Yulupa Avenue/Mayette Avenue	10.3	B	10.6	B	6.4	A	6.5	A
15.	Hoen Avenue/Yulupa Avenue	44.6	D	47.0	D	44.1	D	44.6	D
16.	Hoen Avenue/Summerfield Road	20.7	C	20.8	C	35.0	C	34.8	C

Note: Delay is measured in average seconds per vehicle; LOS = Level of Service; Results for minor approaches to two-way stop-controlled intersections are indicated in *italics*; **Bold** indicates operation below City level-of-service standard.

a. Future intersection.

b. Operation considered acceptable because the CAMUTCD "Peak Hour Volume" warrant would be unmet

c. The CAMUTCD "Peak Hour Volume" warrant would be met under all future scenarios both without and with the project.

Source: W-Trans, 2017. Traffic Impact Study for the Southeast Greenway Plan. July 10. Table 16.

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

The traffic volumes for intersections #6 and #7 have been revised on Figures 4.13-3 (Project Traffic Volumes), 4.13-4 (Existing plus Project Traffic Volumes), 4.13-5 (Future plus Project With Farmers Extension), and 4.13-7 (Future plus Project Without Farmers Extension Traffic Volumes) of the Traffic Impact Study of the Draft EIR and are hereby amended as follows:

	Farmers Lane/Vallejo Street (Int #6)		Farmers Lane/SR 12 West On-ramp (Int #7)	
	Original Volumes	Corrected Volumes	Original Volumes	Corrected Volumes
Figure 4.13-3 Project Traffic Volumes				
Figure 4.13-4 Existing plus Project Traffic Volumes				
Figure 4.13-5 Future plus Project Traffic Volumes (with Farmers extension)				
Figure 4.13-7 Future plus Project Traffic Volumes (without Farmers extension)				

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

CHAPTER 4.14, UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The second paragraph under Impact Discussion UTIL-1, on page 4.14-8 and 4.14-9 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

As shown on Table 4.14-2, the projected water demand for the proposed project would be 36 AFY. Given that the City would have 3,297 AFY of potable water available for future projects in 2035, sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the proposed project and impacts would be *less than significant*. In addition, the General Plan 2035 also includes policies (listed above) which require that an adequate amount of water supply be available to serve existing and future needs of the city. The proposed project would also be required to comply with the standards for water efficient landscape design included in SRCC Chapter 14-30 in an effort to reduce water consumption in the city. To supplement these existing regulations, the proposed project includes proposed Policy LUL-NN-3, which requires the City to improve stormwater management to increase infiltration and groundwater recharge ~~increase stormwater infiltration and groundwater recharge~~, which will ultimately improve water supply conditions in the region. Consistency with these regulations and additional water from groundwater wells would ensure that future development under the proposed project would reduce impacts to the City's water supply. Furthermore, as part of the City's Emergency Groundwater Supply Program implementation discussed in the GWMP, the City would seek to design and construct emergency wells and associated facilities in the Southeast Greenway Area due to a successful test well in the Southeast Greenway Area near Martha Way.

CHAPTER 6, CEQA MANDATED ASSESSMENT

The list of impacts under Section 6.2, Significant and Unavoidable Impacts, of the 2017 Draft EIR and Revised Draft EIR are combined and Table 6-1 is hereby amended as follows:

TABLE 6-1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Air Quality

Impact AQ-2: Operation of the proposed project could contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Impact AQ-3: Future potential development projects associated with the proposed project could cumulatively contribute to the non-attainment designations of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB).

Impact AQ-6: Despite implementation of the proposed project policies, criteria air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project could generate a substantial net increase in emissions that exceeds the BAAQMD regional significance thresholds, and impacts would be *significant*.

Transportation and Circulation

Impact 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.

Impact TRANS-1b: On Farmers Lane under Future plus Project (With Farmers Lane Extension) conditions, the project is anticipated to cause operation to drop from LOS D to LOS E in the southbound direction during the AM peak hour.

Impact 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.

Impact TRANS-1e: Under the Future plus Project (Without Farmers Lane Extension) scenario, the Farmers Lane/SR 12 Eastbound Off-ramp-Hoen Avenue Frontage Road intersection (#8) is projected to operate unacceptably at LOS E during the PM peak hour.

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

TABLE 6-1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Air Quality

with the project increasing the intersection's average vehicle delay by 8.0 seconds.

Impact TRANS-6b: Adequate pedestrian and bicycle circulation facilities to cross the SR 12 Westbound On-ramp cannot be assured, as both of the options in the proposed project for creating this linkage entail modifications to Caltrans facilities that are outside of the City's control.

Impact TRANS-6c: 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.

The third paragraph under Section 6.3, Growth Inducement, on page 6-2 of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Future development of the proposed project would involve demolition and construction activities that could generate some temporary employment opportunities; however, given the temporary nature of such opportunities, it is unlikely that construction workers would relocate to ~~Sunnyvale~~ Santa Rosa as a result of the proposed project. Thus, the proposed project would not be considered growth-inducing from an employment perspective.

APPENDIX E, PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT

The text under Section 6.3.13, Monitoring, Water Supply or Dry Wells, on page 17 of Appendix E of the 2017 Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

There is one ~~inactive~~ groundwater ~~test~~ monitoring well owned by the City located adjacent to ~~in~~ the central portion of the Site at the end of Martha Way, east of Albert Drive. Off-site, there are two abandoned or inactive groundwater monitoring wells just south of the Site in the side walk north of Hoen Frontage Road. The two monitoring wells are associated with the Valero cleanup site, as discussed in Section 5.2. No other evidence of active groundwater monitoring wells, water supply wells, or dry wells were observed on or in the vicinity of the Site during the inspection.

The description of Photo Number 6 included in Appendix G, Site Photographs, on page 487 of Appendix E of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

View looking to the northeast along Martha Way. A water well, owned by ~~USGS~~ the City of Santa Rosa, is shown in the background on the left side of the photograph. The Greenway is shown on the right side of the photo, south of Martha Way.

APPENDIX 1: JULY 2017 W-TRANS TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY & NOVEMBER 2018 W-TRANS TRANSPORTATION MEMORANDUM

The first paragraph under subheading, "Study Intersections" on page 5 of the 2017 Traffic Impact Study for the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

Farmers Lane/Hoen Avenue is a four-legged signalized intersection with ~~protected~~ left-turn pockets ~~phasing~~ on the northbound and southbound approaches, permitted left-turn phasing on the eastbound and westbound approaches, and marked pedestrian crosswalks on the north, east, and west legs.

The text in the second paragraph on page 8 under the subheading “Bicycle Facilities” is hereby amended as follows:

There are some existing bicycle facilities which would provide access to the Southeast Greenway planning area. There is an existing Class II bike lane on Yulupa Avenue, which runs for approximately 1.2 miles from Bennett Valley Road to Montgomery Drive and passes through the Southeast Greenway. There are also existing Class II bike lanes on the Hoen Avenue-Hoen Frontage Road corridor, parallel to the Southeast Greenway, from ~~Farmers Lane~~ Townview Avenue (just east of Farmers Lane) to Summerfield Road. Existing Class II bike lanes are also provided on Summerfield Road, extending from Bethards Drive to Montgomery Drive for about two miles. There is also an existing Class III bike route on Hahman Drive, between Montgomery Drive and Hoen Avenue.

The text in the third paragraph on page 8 under the subheading “Bicycle Facilities” is hereby amended as follows:

Future bicycle facilities identified in the BPMP includes plans for a Class I multi-use path along an approximately one-mile stretch of the Southeast Greenway, from Hoen Avenue/Hoen Avenue Frontage Road to Spring Lake Regional Park. This path would provide interior connections to neighborhoods and connect to Montgomery High School and Montgomery Village to the west. The eastern end of the Class I path would ~~access~~ cross Summerfield Road, ~~providing access on surface streets and continue~~ to Spring Lake ~~County~~ Regional Park. In the western portion of the Southeast Greenway planning area, the BPMP depicts the Class I multi-use path extending westward from Hoen Avenue, crossing Matanzas Creek and connecting to the terminus of Vallejo Street.

The text in Table 2, Bicycle Facility Summary, on page 9 of the Traffic Impact Study for the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Status Facility	Class	Length (miles)	Begin Point	End Point
Existing				
Sonoma Ave	II	1.56	Santa Rosa Ave	Hahman Dr
Sonoma Ave	III	0.46	Hahman Dr	Yulupa Ave
Sonoma Ave	II	0.51	Yulupa Ave	Summerfield Rd
Yulupa Ave	II	2.35	Bennett Valley Rd	Montgomery Dr
Hoen Ave	II	1.50	Farmers Ln	Summerfield Rd
Summerfield Rd	II	1.93	Bethards Dr	Montgomery Dr
Hahman Dr	III	0.59	Montgomery Dr	Hoen Ave
Planned				
Southeast Greenway Multi- <u>Use</u>	I	1.00	Hoen Ave	Spring Lake Regional Park

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

Table 2 – Bicycle Facility Summary

Status Facility	Class	Length (miles)	Begin Point	End Point
Path			<u>Vallejo St</u>	
Vallejo Street	III	1.12	Farmers Lane	South E Street
Hoen Avenue	III	0.52	Farmers Lane	Sonoma Ave
Franquette Ave	III	0.75	Hoen Ave	Montgomery Dr

Source: *Santa Rosa Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*, City of Santa Rosa, 2010.

The text under subheading “Crossing of SR 12 Eastbound Onramp” on page 37 of the Traffic Impact Study of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Crossing of SR 12 ~~East~~Westbound Onramp

The Plan identifies two potential options for establishing a pedestrian and bicycle crossing of the SR 12 ~~east~~westbound onramp. One entails constructing an underpass for exclusive use by pedestrians and bicyclists, connecting the Mixed Use area to an area designated by the Plan for 2- to 3-story multifamily housing. This option would create an off-street connection to the Greenway’s multi-use path, as well as Vallejo Street and the surrounding pedestrian and bicycle network.

The second crossing option would be to construct an at-grade crossing on the north leg of the Hoen Frontage Road/SR 12 ~~east~~westbound ramp intersection. Currently, the westbound right-turn movement from Hoen Frontage Road onto the SR 12 ~~east~~westbound ramp is a high-speed movement that is inappropriate for pedestrian crossing activity. The Plan indicates that implementation of this option would entail modification of the intersection to create a viable location for a crossing to be installed. The intersection would need to be modified to include 1) a signal or pedestrian hybrid beacon that provides an exclusive phase for pedestrian-bicycle movements, stopping the traffic flow to the on-ramp while the phase is active, 2) horizontal realignment that geometrically regulates vehicle speeds to no greater than 35 mph at the crossing, 3) clear lines of sight between drivers and pedestrians/bicyclists on the crossing, and 4) a right-turn lane on westbound Hoen Frontage Road, if needed, to provide vehicle queue storage for the brief periods when the crossing phase is active.

REVISIONS TO DRAFT EIR

This page intentionally left blank.