Smith Village/Pantoja Lane
3625 Sebastopol Road, Santa Rosa, CA (Sonoma County)
Assessor’s Parcel No. 035-850-001 through 035-850-059

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
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City of Santa Rosa
Community Development Department
100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Rm. 3
Santa Rosa, CA  95404

Contact: Noah Housh, Senior Planner

Date: September 30, 2014
DATE: September 30, 2014  
TO: Public Agencies, Organizations and Interested Parties  
FROM: City of Santa Rosa Community Development Department  
SUBJECT: NOTICE OF PUBLIC REVIEW AND INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code and the “Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970” as amended to date, this is to advise you that the Department of Community Development of the City of Santa Rosa has prepared an Initial Study on the following project:

Project Name: Smith Village/Pantoja Lane

Location:

3625 Sebastopol Road, Santa Rosa, CA (Sonoma County) Assessor’s Parcel No. 035-850-001 through 035-850-059

Property Description:

The project site, 3625 Sebastopol Road is an approximately 9 acre site located on the north side of Sebastopol Road in southwest Santa Rosa and is relatively flat with few natural features. The northern boundary fronts onto the Joe Rodota Trail, with State Highway 12 directly beyond the trail. To the west is a small-lot, detached single family residential neighborhood and to the east is a larger single family residential parcel consistent with the rural residential development pattern typical of this area of Santa Rosa 50 years ago.

This site was previously subdivided into 59 individual parcels, with 51 intended for detached single family residential development and 8 parcels intended for a mixed use development directly adjacent to Sebastopol Road. This subdivision had received all necessary discretionary approvals, was formally subdivided through the Final Map process and construction of much of the infrastructure (roadways, street lights, etc.) was completed. However, the properties were lost in foreclosure soon after this work was finished, prior to any homes being built. Given this, the site is partially paved with some streets and sidewalks, an existing (unpermitted) soil stock pile is located adjacent to Sebastopol Road, but none of the home construction was begun, giving the individual parcels the appearance of a grass field separated by the streets and sidewalks.

This site is located in southwest Santa Rosa and was previously included in the Southwest Area Plan. This plan included various design requirements and established additional impact fees to cover the costs associated with increased infrastructure needs in this portion of the City due to its (historical) rural residential and agricultural development pattern. This plan was superseded however with the adoption of the Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 (SCH# 2008092114) which incorporated many of the development policies and design guidelines of the Plan however, many of the impact fees are still required for development to occur.
Project Description:

The project proposes to modify the existing Planned Development (Zoning District) Policy Statement and development plan through a rezoning process to eliminate the requirement for mixed use development and to slightly modify the detached single-family home designs (from those previously approved) proposed on the individual lots reducing the average size of the homes and eliminating the second dwelling units from the development; a new Tentative Map to separate the parcels fronting onto Sebastopol Road (Pantoja Lane) from the previous subdivision (Smith Village) and to construct 16 attached single family homes; and a Design Review application to modify the previously approved mixed-use design to eliminate the commercial component of the previous approval in favor of row-house style homes.

The proposed projects would allow development of 67 single family residential lots in two proposed subdivisions. Fifty one of the lots (ranging in size from 3,828 square feet to 6,526 square feet) would be developed with detached single family homes while 16 of the lots (ranging in size from 1,923 square feet to 4,304 square feet) would be developed with attached single family row houses constructed as duets, fronting onto Sebastopol Road. The project applicants have provided a Climate Action Plan Checklist which specifies individual measures and features that will be incorporated into the project design to bring Green House Gas impacts to less than significant levels.
The specific elements of each of these applications is further described below.

Rezoning: The applicant requests a zoning code text amendment to modify the existing Planned Development Zoning District Policy Statement and Development Plan to delete the mixed-use/live work component of the zoning in favor of incorporating single family attached/row house type residential units and to modify the detached single family home designs approved with the previous project.

Tentative Map-A Tentative Map application was filed to allow the separation of the front portion of the project (row houses which front onto Sebastopol Road) Pantoja Lane, from the remainder of the (previously approved) project (Smith Village) which include detached single family residential homes. This new map also proposes 16 lots to allow the construction of single family attached row homes in the form of duets.

Design Review-A design review application was filed requesting approval of the revised design of the homes fronting onto Sebastopol Road. The City of Santa Rosa requires design review for any multi-family or attached single family residential proposal. The design of the proposed row houses incorporates a variety of siding materials, courtyards for each unit and are accessed from rear loaded garages and parking areas.

Environmental Issues:

The proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts in Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology/Water Quality, Land Use/Planning, Noise, Transportation/Traffic, Utilities/Service Systems and Mandatory Findings of Significance. The project impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through implementation of recommended mitigation measures or through compliance with existing Municipal Code requirements or City standards. Recommended measures are summarized in the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) and Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration document has been prepared in consultation with local, and state responsible and trustee agencies and in accordance with Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Furthermore, the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration will serve as the environmental compliance document required under CEQA for any subsequent phases of the project and for permits/approvals required by a responsible agency.

A thirty-day (30-day) public review period shall commence on September 30, 2014. Written comments must be sent to the City of Santa Rosa, Community Development Department, Planning Division, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3, Santa Rosa CA 95404 by October 30, 2014. The City of Santa Rosa Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and project merits on November 13, 2014, in the Santa Rosa City Council Chamber at City Hall (address listed above). Correspondence and comments can be delivered to Noah Housh, project planner, phone: (707) 543-4322, email: nhoush@srcity.org
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Project Title: Smith Village/Pantoja Lane

2. Lead Agency Name & Address: City of Santa Rosa
   Community Development Department
   Planning Division
   100 Santa Rosa Avenue
   Santa Rosa, California 95404

3. Contact Person & Phone Number: Noah Housh, Senior Planner
   Phone number: (707) 543-4322
   Email: nhoush@srcity.org

4. Project Location: The site is located in the City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California at 3625 Sebastopol Road, Assessor’s Parcel Nos. 035-850-001 through 035-850-059.

5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address: Project Sponsor
   Dana Kuhn
   Sunwood Santa Rosa LLC
   9820 Willow Creek Rd., Suite 490
   San Diego, CA 92131

   Sponsor’s Representative
   Geoff Coleman
   BKF Engineers Surveyors Planners
   325 Tesconi Circle
   Santa Rosa, CA 95401

6. General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential

7. Zoning: Planed Development (PD)

8. Description of Project:
The project proposes to modify the existing Planned Development (Zoning District) Policy Statement and development plan through a rezoning process to eliminate the requirement for mixed use development and to slightly modify the detached single-family home designs (from those previously approved) proposed on the individual lots reducing the average size of the homes and eliminating the second dwelling units from the development; a new Tentative Map to separate the parcels fronting onto Sebastopol Road (Pantoja Lane) from the previous subdivision (Smith Village) and to construct 16 attached single family homes; and a Design Review application to modify the previously approved mixed-use design to eliminate the commercial component of the previous approval in favor of row-house style homes.

The proposed projects would allow development of 67 single family residential lots in two proposed subdivisions. Fifty one of the lots (ranging in size from 3,828 square feet to 6,526 square feet) would be developed with detached single family homes while 16 of the lots (ranging in size from 1,923 square feet to 4,304 square feet) would be developed with attached single family row houses constructed as duets, fronting onto Sebastopol Road. The project applicants have provided a Climate Action Plan Checklist which specifies individual measures and
features that will be incorporated into the project design to bring Green House Gas impacts to less than significant levels.

The specific elements of each of these applications is further described below.

Rezoning: The applicant requests a zoning code text amendment to modify the existing Planed Development Zoning District Policy Statement and Development Plan to delete the mixed-use/live work component of the zoning in favor of incorporating single family attached/row house type residential units and to modify the detached single family home designs approved with the previous project.

Tentative Map-A Tentative Map application was filed to allow the separation of the front portion of the project (row houses which front onto Sebastopol Road) Pantoja Lane, from the remainder of the (previously approved) project (Smith Village) which include detached single family residential homes. This new map also proposes 16 lots to allow the construction of single family attached row homes in the form of duets.

Design Review-A design review application was filed requesting approval of the revised design of the homes fronting onto Sebastopol Road. The City of Santa Rosa requires design review for any multi-family or attached single family residential proposal. The design of the proposed row houses incorporates a variety of siding materials, courtyards for each unit and are accessed from rear loaded garages and parking areas.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
The project location, 3625 Sebastopol Road is an approximately 9 acre site located on the north side of Sebastopol Road in southwest Santa Rosa and is relatively flat with few natural features. The northern boundary of the project site fronts onto the Joe Rodota Trail, with Highway 12 directly beyond the trail. To the west is a small lot detached single family residential neighborhood and to the east is a larger single family residential parcel in keeping with the past rural residential development pattern typical of this area of Santa Rosa.

10. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:**
North Coast Water Quality Control Board Water Board
Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
California Fish and Wildlife Service
Proposed Site Plan
ALL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- ☒ Aesthetics
- ☒ Biological Resources
- ☒ Air Quality
- ☒ Agriculture Resources
- ☐ Cultural Resources
- ☒ Geology /Soils
- ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- ☒ Hydrology / Water Quality
- ☒ Land Use / Planning
- ☐ Mineral Resources
- ☒ Noise
- ☐ Population / Housing
- ☐ Public Services
- ☒ Recreation
- ☒ Transportation / Traffic
- ☒ Utilities / Service Systems
- ☐ Mandatory Findings Of Significance

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an EARLIER EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_________________________________________  __________________
Signature                                      Date
I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? 

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

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

I(a) Less-Than-Significant-Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. The site does provide some views to Mt. Taylor to the east. However, because these properties are relatively flat sites, proposed to be developed with single family homes and adjacent to properties developed with single-family residential developments and vacant (or under-developed) sites that will likely be developed with similar single-family residential subdivisions, impacts on visual character and quality of the site, as well as the views of Mt. Taylor, are expected to be less than significant.

The site is adjacent to Scenic Highway 12 to the north, with the Joe Rodota Trail separating the Smith Village project site, from the Highway.

The Pantoja Lane attached single family element of the proposal will go through the Design Review process to ensure that the project implements superior design, and will review potential aesthetic impacts associated with the location of the attached single-family buildings adjacent to the public right-of-way. Additionally, the architecture of the individual detached single family homes will be reviewed by the Design Review Board on referral prior to the Planning Commission action on the Tentative Map, as identified in the Planned Development Section of the City of Santa Rosa Zoning Code.

I(b) Less-Than-Significant-Impact with Mitigation. There are no waterways, or historic buildings or other scenic resources located on the project site, however the site abuts State Highway 12 along the northern frontage which is a designated Scenic Road in the Santa Rosa General Plan 2035. The Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan designates this highway as a Scenic Corridor, but does not establish any standards for development adjacent to the site. Currently the view of residential developments to the south of Highway 12 is buffered by a combination of large established oak trees, mature trees planted as residential
landscaping when these projects were built and a sound fence between the Highway and the Joe Rodota Trail, located atop an earthen berm. This view changes significantly when adjacent to the project sites. The site is setback from Highway 12 by approximately 90 feet and is buffered from the Highway only by the Joe Rodota Trail and a number of juvenile but well established Oak trees. This view of the project site could be softened through the use of landscaping located on either side of the sound wall proposed to be located on the northern boundary of the Smith Village project site.

Additional concerns regarding the construction of the sound wall along this northern boundary, given the potential for impacts to the existing trees as a result of the sound wall construction also need to be addressed.

I(c) Less-Than-Significant Impact. The proposed residential project meets the objectives of the City’s Design Review Guidelines for single family attached and detached residential development. Specifically, the proposed project minimizes the appearance of garage doors through the use of allies accessing garages located at the rear of most homes, one story homes are provided along each block, and a variety of siding materials are incorporated into the homes designs.

The flat sites are surrounded by similar single-family residential and some mixed use development to the west, and similar projects that have been approved to the west and south of the subject properties. Given this, the project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

I(d) Less-Than-Significant Impact. The City of Santa Rosa Design Guidelines require that all single-family outdoor lighting fixtures be limited to a maximum height of 16 feet. In addition, the City of Santa Rosa Zoning Code (Code) Section 20-30.080 requires that lighting fixtures be shielded or recessed to reduce light bleed to adjoining properties, and that each light fixture be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of-way, so that no on-site light fixture directly illuminates an area off the site. With these requirements in place, the proposed project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Standard Measures

- Design Review is required for the attached single family residential portions of the project. Design Review will be obtained prior to issuance of a building permit.

- A standard condition of approval regarding exterior lighting requirements will be placed on the project.

- Conformance review shall occur with each development decision utilizing the General Plan Urban Design Element, the City’s Subdivision Design Guidelines, Small Lot Subdivision Requirements and the Design Guidelines to make decisions regarding proposed developments.

Recommended Mitigation Measures

I(b). Mitigation Measure. To soften the appearance of the development proposed on the site, the developer is required to plant large canopy trees (with a minimum size of 24” box) along the northern property lines of lots 24-26 and 58-59. The locations of these trees shall be determined through consultation with the consulting arborist as well as to provide a visual buffer of the view from the Scenic Highway 12.

I(b). Mitigation Measure. To ensure survival of the existing oak trees adjacent to the northern project boundary, an arborist shall be consulted prior to the design and construction of the required 8-foot sound wall along this boundary of the Smith Village project. Arborist recommendations shall address the method of construction and the required tree protection measures needed to ensure survival of the existing oak trees along this boundary during and after construction of the sound wall. These recommendations shall be incorporated into the design and construction methodology of the proposed Smith Village project.
Sources

- City of Santa Rosa Design Guidelines, September 2002
- City of Santa Rosa Code – Title 20, Zoning Code, adopted August 3, 2004, and revised March 1, 2004 and October 11, 2005
- City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? □ □ □ ☒

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? □ □ □ ☒

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? □ □ □ ☒

e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? □ □ □ ☒

Discussion

II(a) **Less-than-significant Impact.** The project site is not identified on the citywide GIS program or the California Department of Conservation Map as being farmland of local importance (important to the local economy). The subject properties were part of a previously approved subdivision, are not currently farmland and have not been used as farmland in the recent past. The proposed residential land use is consistent with the current Planned Development zoning of the property and the Low Density Residential General Plan designation. The Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan does not identify any Agricultural land within the Urban Growth Boundary.

II(b) **No Impact.** The project site is currently zoned Planned Development, and has been previously subdivided into single and multi-family residential parcels which do not allow agricultural uses. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contract for the property.
II(c&d) No Impact. The project site is located within Santa Rosa’s Urban Growth Boundary, is not currently used for forest production uses, and is zoned for residential development. Adjacent properties are similarly designated for residential development and there are no existing forestry uses in the immediate area. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to have no impact on conversion of forest land.

II(e) No Impact. The project site is located within Santa Rosa’s Urban Growth Boundary, is not currently used for forest production uses, agricultural uses and is zoned for residential development. Adjacent properties are similarly designated for residential development and there are no existing forestry uses or significant agricultural uses in the immediate area. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to have no impact on conversion of forest land or farmland.

Standard Measures
None.

Recommended Mitigation Measures
None.

Sources
- City of Santa Rosa GIS
- California Department of Conservation, Project Development Plan, Farmlands Map 2007
- City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2035
- City of Santa Rosa Code – Title 20, Zoning Code, adopted August 3, 2004, and revised March 1, 2004 and October 11, 2005

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project: (Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.)

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? □ □ □ □ ☒

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? □ □ ☒ □

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non–attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

  [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  [ ] Less-Than-Significant With Incorporation
  [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact
  [ ] No Impact

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

  [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
  [ ] Less-Than-Significant With Incorporation
  [ ] Less-Than-Significant Impact
  [ ] No Impact

Discussion:

Air quality impacts resulting from the project would occur due to temporary construction emissions and as a result of direct and indirect emissions from users of the project. Although insignificant, these impacts are addressed in the report prepared by James Reyff of Illingworth and Rodkin, Inc., including the effect on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. This analysis was conducted following guidance provided by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The draft traffic study report prepared for the project was used to predict changes to GHG emissions.

Significance Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Construction Thresholds (lbs./day)</th>
<th>Operational Thresholds (lbs./day)</th>
<th>Operational Thresholds (tons/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Air Pollutants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Daily</td>
<td>Annual Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Screening Size (in single-family dwelling units):</td>
<td>114 du</td>
<td>325 du</td>
<td>325 du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>9.0 ppm (8-hour average) or 20.0 ppm (1-hour average)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust</td>
<td>Construction Dust Ordinance or other Best Management Practices</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health Risks and Hazards for New Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Type</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excess Cancer Risk</td>
<td>10 per one million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic or Acute Hazard Index</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental annual average PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>0.3 µg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health Risks and Hazards for Sensitive Receptors (Cumulative from all sources within 1,000 foot zone of influence) and Cumulative Thresholds for New Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Type</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excess Cancer Risk</td>
<td>100 per one million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Hazard Index</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Average PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>0.8 µg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Annual Emissions</th>
<th>Compliance with Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy or 1,100 metric tons or 4.6 metric tons per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: ROG = reactive organic gases, NOx = nitrogen oxides, PM$_{10}$ = course particulate matter or particulates with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers (µm) or less, PM$_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter or particulates with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5µm or less; and GHG = greenhouse gas. Dwelling units are du and 1,000 square feet are ksf.

In June 2010, BAAQMD adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under CEQA. These thresholds were designed to establish the level at which BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and were posted on BAAQMD’s website and included in the Air District's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2011). The significance thresholds identified by BAAQMD and used in this analysis are summarized in Table 1 below.

**Table 1**
BAAQMD’s adoption of the thresholds was called into question by an order issued March 5, 2012, in *California Building Industry Association v. BAAQMD* (Alameda Superior Court Case No. RGI0548693). The order requires BAAQMD to set aside its approval of the thresholds until it has conducted environmental review under CEQA. The claims made in the case concerned the environmental impacts of adopting the thresholds, that is, how the thresholds would indirectly affect land use development patterns. Those issues are not relevant to the scientific basis of BAAQMD’s analysis of what levels of pollutants should be deemed significant. This analysis considers the science informing the thresholds as being supported by substantial evidence. Scientific information supporting the thresholds was documented in BAAQMD’s proposed thresholds of significance analysis. Moreover, the thresholds will not cause any indirect impact in terms of land use development patterns insofar as this project is concerned, because the proposal to construct the project is not influenced by the BAAQMD guidelines. Accordingly, the analysis herein uses the thresholds and methodologies from BAAQMD’s May 2011 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines to determine the potential impacts of the project on the existing environment.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**III (a). No Impact.** The most recent clean air plan is the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan that was adopted by BAAQMD in September 2010. The proposed project would not conflict with the latest Clean Air planning efforts since (1) the project would have emissions well below the BAAQMD thresholds (see Impact 2), (2) development of the project site would be considered urban “infill”, (3) development would occur near employment centers, and (4) development would be near existing transit. The project, which would construct up to 67 new residential dwelling units, is too small to exceed any of the significance thresholds and, thus, it is not required to incorporate project-specific transportation control measures listed in the latest Clean Air Plan.

**III(b). Less-than-Significant:** The Bay Area is considered a non-attainment area for ground-level ozone and fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) under both the Federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act. The area is also considered non-attainment for respirable particulates or particulate matter with a diameter of less than 10 micrometers (PM$_{10}$) under the California Clean Air Act, but not the Federal Act. The area has attained both State and Federal ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide. As part of an effort to attain and maintain ambient air quality standards for ozone and PM$_{10}$, the BAAQMD has established thresholds of significance for these air pollutants and their precursors. These thresholds are for ozone precursor pollutants (ROG and NO$_x$), PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$, and apply to both construction period and operational period impacts.

---

Due to the project size, construction period emissions would be less than significant. In their 2011 update to the *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, BAAQMD identified the size of land use projects that could result in significant air pollutant emissions. For construction impacts, the single-family project size was identified at 114 residential dwelling units. For operational impacts, the project size was identified at 325 residential dwelling units. Since the project proposes 67 new residences, it is concluded that emissions would be below the BAAQMD significance thresholds for both construction exhaust and operational emissions. Construction emissions would be low, because the project only involves minor site work, construction of new residential dwelling units and application of asphalt to the constructed roadways. Large equipment or diesel equipment operating for extended durations is not anticipated since all site preparation and grading was completed years ago. Thus, the project would not result in project-specific impacts for any criteria pollutant and would not have a considerable contribution to cumulative criteria pollutant impacts.

**III(c). Less-than-significant.** As discussed under Impact 2, the project would have emissions less than the significance thresholds adopted by BAAQMD for evaluating impacts related to ozone and particulate matter. Therefore, the project would not contribute substantially to existing or projected violations of those standards. Carbon monoxide emissions from traffic generated by the project would be the pollutant of greatest concern at the local level. Congested intersections with a large volume of traffic have the greatest potential to cause high-localized concentrations of carbon monoxide. Air pollutant monitoring data indicate that carbon monoxide levels have been at healthy levels (i.e., below State and Federal standards) in the Bay Area since the early 1990s. As a result, the region has been designated as attainment for the standard. There is an ambient air quality monitoring station in Santa Rosa that measures carbon monoxide concentrations. The highest measured level over any 8-hour averaging period during the last 3 years is less than 2 parts per million (ppm), compared to the ambient air quality standard of 9.0 ppm. The project would generate a small amount of traffic (less than 100 trips during the busiest hour). Intersections affected by the project would have traffic volumes less than the BAAQMD screening criteria and, thus, would not cause a violation of an ambient air quality standard or have a considerable contribution to cumulative violations of these standards.

**III(d). Less-than-Significant with Mitigation.** Operation of the project is not expected to cause any localized emissions that could expose sensitive receptors to unhealthy air pollutant levels. Construction activity would generate minor dust and equipment exhausts on a temporary basis. Site preparation and grading, which requires the most intensive equipment usage, would not be part of this project. The project would incorporate best management practices throughout all aspects of the construction. These measures are provided as Mitigation Measures to ensure less than significant impacts from fugitive dust.

---

2 For a land-use project type, the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines state that a proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to localized carbon monoxide concentrations if the project would not increase traffic at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour.

The project is located near State Route 12, which is considered a source of toxic air
contaminant (TAC) emissions. New residences that are part of the project are considered sensitive receptors.

A review of the project area using Google Earth along with the BAAQMD Highway Screening Analysis Tool identified impacts from State Route 12. The BAAQMD Highway Screening Analysis Tool and the Google Earth map tool are used to identify estimated risk and hazard impacts from highways throughout the Bay Area. Screening level TAC impacts are provided for each State highway in each county for discrete distances from 10 feet to 1,000 feet. The closest planned residence would be over 100 feet from the nearest highway travel lane. The community risk impacts associated with various distances from State Highway 12, based on the BAAQMD Highway Screening Analysis Tool, for a ground level (6-foot) elevation (Highway 12, Link 639, 6-foot elevation) are shown below. There are no other sources of TACs that have listed emissions. The screening community risk levels presented below are below the BAAQMD significance thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from Near Lane</th>
<th>Cancer Risk (per million)</th>
<th>Annual PM$_{2.5}$ (µg/m$^3$)</th>
<th>Chronic Hazard Index</th>
<th>Acute Hazard Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 feet South</td>
<td>9.078</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD Single Source Threshold</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III(e). Impact 5: Less-than-Significant.** The project would generate localized emissions of diesel exhaust during construction equipment operation and truck activity. These emissions may be noticeable from time to time by adjacent receptors. However, they would be localized and are not likely to adversely affect people off site by resulting in confirmed odor complaints. The project would not include any sources of significant odors that would cause complaints from surrounding uses.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

**III(d). Mitigation Measure**

*Include measures to control dust emissions.* Implementation of the measures recommended by BAAQMD and listed below would reduce the air quality and fugitive dust-related impacts associated with any grading and new construction to a less than significant. The contractor shall implement the following Best Management Practices:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.

2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.

3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.

5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible and feasible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible and feasible, as well, after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Sources

Bay Area Air Quality Control District CEQA Impact Thresholds
(accessed 8/15/2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

The Smith Village and Pantoja Lane subdivision projects propose to develop single family residential homes on an (approximately) 9 acre site made up of 59 individual parcels previously subdivided. A new tentative map and other discretionary applications mentioned above were filed to revise the previous approval into two separate subdivision projects which will consist of 51 detached single family residential parcels and 16 town home style single family homes built as two unit “duets”.

Much of the infrastructure needed to accommodate the previous subdivision was constructed on the project site. A Biological Analysis (written by Douglas Spicher of WRA Environmental Consultants) of the site as it currently exists was provided by the project applicant which identified little to no habitat value for the site, given that it has been completely graded and disturbed to accommodate the construction of the infrastructure. Existing vegetation is generally non-native, annual plans species. No site ponding was present or apparent given the site had been graded to provide positive drainage off site. The results of the analysis essentially determined there is no habitat value onsite.
However, previous analysis of the impacts of the approved 59-unit Smith Village subdivision identified impacts to wetland, Burke’s goldfield, Sonoma sunshine, Sebastopol meadowfoam and California tiger salamander (CTS) habitat, all of which required preservation of habitat as mitigation for impacts to the project site.

Specifically, the project was required to compensate for impacts to 7.25 acres of CTS habitat at a ratio of 3:1 due to the site’s proximity to known CTS breeding locations (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Letter 2005 referencing Army Corps File Number 28158N). The resulted in the need to preserve 21.75 acres of CTS occupied habitat. Additionally, the approved Smith Village project was identified as discharging fill material into 0.35 acres of jurisdictional wetlands. This impact resulted in the need to mitigate for the wetland impacts at a ratio of 2:1, therefore 0.70 acres of wetland habitat mitigation credits were required to be purchased.

Impacts

IV(a). Less-than-Significant-with-Mitigation. The proposed Smith Village and Pantoja Lane Projects will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. However, it is the responsibility of the property owner to demonstrate compliance with the mitigation measures previously required of the Smith Village 59-unit subdivision, to bring the impacts to wetlands, Burke’s goldfield, Sonoma sunshine, Sebastopol meadowfoam and California tiger salamander (CTS) habitat to less-than-significant levels.

Any remaining mitigation measures previously required by responsible agencies, but not completed prior to the construction of the existing on-site infrastructure, is the sole responsibility of the property owner to complete. Additional mitigation measures required by responsible agencies who did not previously require mitigation, including the California State Wildlife Service will be required to be met. It is unclear if the mitigation required under the 404 Permit (Army Corps of Engineers File No. 27538 and/or File No. 28158N) issued to Bijan Madjilessi (the previous property owner) were ever completed. These mitigations must be completed prior to the issuance of building permits for the proposed Smith Village and Pantoja Lane projects.

IV(b). Less-than-Significant-with-Mitigation. Similar to the issues identified above, the current project is not expected to impact any riparian hábitat or natural community given that the site has been fully graded and much of the infrastructure required to serve the future homes has been installed. This is further substantiated by the biologic analysis prepared by Douglas Spicher of WRA Environmental Consultants. However, it is the responsibility of the property owner to demonstrate compliance with the mitigation measures previously required of the 59-unit Smith Village subdivision, to bring the impacts to any riparian or natural community habitat, such as wetlands, to less than significant levels. It is unclear if the mitigation required under the 404 Permit (Army Corps of Engineers File No. 27538 and/or File No. 28158N) issued to Bijan Madjilessi (the previous property owner) were ever completed. These mitigations must be completed prior to the issuance of building permits for the proposed Smith Village and Pantoja Lane projects.
IV(c). Less-than-Significant-with-Mitigation. The Smith Village and Pantoja Lane Projects will not a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means as the impacts associated with wetland fill on the project site were made with the infrastructure installation to accommodate the previously approved 59-unit Smith Village subdivision.

The current project does not propose to fill any wetlands, however it has been documented that the mitigation required under the previous 401 Permit (WDID No. 1B006158WNSO) issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board North Coast Region was not completed and the 401 permit has expired. Further, it is unclear if the mitigation required under the 404 Permit (Army Corps of Engineers File No. 27538 and/or File No. 28158N) issued to Bijan Madjilessi (the previous property owner) were ever completed. It is the responsibility of the property owner to demonstrate full compliance with these previous mitigation measures to ensure impacts to their Project(s) site have been mitigated to less than significant levels prior to the issuance of building permits for these proposed projects.

IV(d). Less than Significant. Based on the analysis of the Project site conducted by Douglas Spicher of WRA Environmental Consultants and the existing site conditions, it has been determined that the Smith Village and Pantoja Lane Projects will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. As identified and discussed above, the Project site currently has no habitat value.

IV(e). Less than Significant The Project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

IV(f). Less-than-Significant-with-Mitigation. The Smith Village and Pantoja Lane Projects will 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. This determination is based on the analysis of the Project site conducted by Douglas Spicher of WRA Environmental Consultants, the existing site conditions and the mitigation measures required of the previous Smith Village 59-unit subdivision and the requirement of Sections IV(a)-IV(c) above and Required Mitigation Measures below.

Standard Measures:

a. Install temporary protective fencing at the edge of the dripline or at the edge of the approved construction line for trees to be preserved prior to excavation and or grading on the site. Fencing shall be maintained for the duration of construction. The project Arborist shall approve all fence locations prior to placement. No fencing shall be removed without the project Arborist's approval.

b. Maintain existing grade within the fenced portion of the dripline of trees required to be preserved and maintained. Route drainage swales and underground work outside the dripline where possible.
Required Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure IV(a) - IV(c):
Project applicant shall demonstrate that all mitigation measures previously required of the Smith Village 59-unit subdivision, pertaining to the impacts to wetlands, Burke’s goldfield, Sonoma sunshine, Sebastopol meadowfoam and California tiger salamander (CTS) habitat as specified by past environmental review have been completed. If these requirements have not been completed, project applicant shall take all necessary steps to complete these requirements. Documentation of compliance with these requirements shall be provided to the City of Santa Rosa prior to issuance of a building permit for the proposed.

Sources:
- Biological Site Review, Douglas Spicher of WRA Environmental Consultants. August 27, 2014
- Letter/401 Permit Issued to Bijan Madjlessi for the Smith Village Project from Catherine Kuhlman, WDID 1B006158WNSO. January 25, 2007
- Letter to Peter Straub regarding formal Endangered Species Consultation for the Proposed Smith Village Development in Santa Rosa, CA Corps File No. 28158N, from Cay Goude. Date Stamped June 28, 2006
- Letter to Bijan Madjlessi regarding Clean Water Act compliance (Section 404) and issuance of a Nationwide Permit to allow construction of the Smith Village project from Peter Straub. Date stamped January 31, 2007.
- City of Santa Rosa GIS Website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

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

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

e. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?
Discussion:

V(a) No Impact. There are no buildings on the site and therefore the proposed project will not adversely impact a historical resource as defined under CEQA.

V.(b-e) Less than Significant Impact. The project site was previously subdivided and is currently developed with the road and utility infrastructure required to accommodate the recordation of this previous 59-unit approved subdivision. Given this, the entire site has been graded, trenched and substantially disturbed. The current Smith Village and Pantoja Lane Subdivision applications intend to utilize this existing infrastructure to serve the proposed residential units. This past approval was granted under the City of Santa Rosa Southwest Area Plan Environmental Impact Report (SW EIR) which did identify that projects in the Southwest area of Santa Rosa would have the potential to encounter cultural resources.

This EIR included mitigation measures to address the potential cultural resource impacts for sites that were not specifically studied at the project level under this EIR. These mitigation measures (3.1.9-1 & 3.1.9-14) were referenced and required in the Initial Study and resulting Mitigated Negative Declaration for the previous 59-unit approval and included archaeological monitoring during preconstruction vegetation removal and grading (3.1.9-14) and further excavation and testing of potentially pre-historic or historic materials discovered during any vegetation removal and grading activities. If this further analysis identified these materials were significant, avoidance, “capping” and excavation (as a last resort) were identified and required as mitigation measures. There is not record of any such resources being discovered during the initial vegetation removal and grading for the infrastructure existing on-site.

Given the level of disturbance on the project site, and the lack of any resources being discovered during these past disturbing activities, the likelihood of encountering and/or impacting any cultural resources is extremely limited in that the only additional grading necessary to construct the proposed homes will be on the existing residential lots and in areas which were previously disturbed with the construction of the infrastructure needed to serve these residential units. Based on this, the potential for the project to impact historic or cultural resources is determined to be less than significant.

Standard Measures:

Grading plans for the project are required to include the following notes:

- If cultural resources are discovered during the project construction (inadvertent discoveries), all work in the area of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and representatives of the appropriate tribe shall be retained by the project sponsor to investigate the find and make recommendations as to treatment and mitigation of any impacts to those resources.

- If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b) remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Sonoma County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within a reasonable timeframe. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the “most likely descendant.” The most likely descendant shall then make recommendations, and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code 5097.98.
• If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b) remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Sonoma County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within a reasonable timeframe. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the “most likely descendant.” The most likely descendant shall then make recommendations, and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code 5097.98.

Sources
City of Santa Rosa GIS Historic Preservation Layer
City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 Chapter 11 (Historic Preservation)
City of Santa Rosa Historic Properties Inventory

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

   i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

   iii) Seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

   iv) Landslides? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
on, or off, site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

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

e. 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?

Discussion:

Santa Rosa is located within a seismically active area in California. The project site is relatively flat and does not contain evidence of any geologic activities such as faulting and landsliding, but is located in an area considered to be susceptible to strong to very strong earthquake-induced ground shaking. The City is subject to geological hazards primarily related to earthquakes due to the presence of active faults. The development will require the application of City and California Building code (CBC) construction standards to address all potential impacts related to possible area seismic activity, making impacts from geologic hazards less than significant. The CBC requires earthquake resistant design and construction which reduces earthquake damages and losses.

The primary geologic hazard identified at the site is the potential for strong to very strong earthquake-induced ground shaking. Other hazards, as discussed below, are not considered significant at the site. A brief description of each geologic hazard and recommended mitigation measures are listed in the following sections.

Impacts

VI(a) i) Less Than Significant Impact. Fault Surface Rupture: Under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning (APEFZ) Act1, the California Division of Mines and Geology produced 1:24,000 scale maps showing known active and potentially active faults and defining zones within which special fault studies are required. Based on the APEFZ map for the Santa Rosa 7.5’ Quadrangle, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The closest active fault is the Rodgers Creek Fault, to the east. As a result, the potential for fault surface rupture at the site is therefore low.

ii) Less Than Significant. Seismic Shaking: The site will likely experience moderate to strong ground shaking from future earthquakes originating on active faults in the San Francisco Bay Region. Due to their close proximity and historical seismic activity, the San Andreas,
Hayward/Rodgers Creek, and Maacama South faults present the highest potential for severe ground shaking. The most significant adverse impact associated with strong seismic shaking is potential damage to structures and improvements. These potential impacts will be reduced to levels of less than significant through compliance with the California Building Code standards for residential construction.

iii) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation. Liquefaction Potential: Liquefaction refers to the sudden, temporary loss of soil shear strength during strong ground shaking. Liquefaction-related phenomena include liquefaction-induced settlement, flow failure, and lateral spreading. These phenomena can occur where there are saturated, loose, granular deposits. Recent advances in liquefaction studies indicate that liquefaction can occur in low plasticity clays and silts if the soil plasticity is less than 12, the liquid limit is less than 37 and the moisture content is greater than 85% of the liquid limit. The adverse effects of liquefaction occurring at the site are potential loss of bearing support and post liquefaction settlement. The magnitude of the settlement depends on the thickness of the liquefiable layer.

The site soils have been analyzed multiple times and design criteria to address seismic events have been included in this analysis. Seismic Design Parameters are identified on page 8 of the April 11, 2013, Giblin and Associated Soils Investigation. The findings of this analysis were confirmed and supported in supplemental analysis prepared by Reese & Associated on April 3, 2014.

iv) No Impact. The site is relatively flat and is, therefore, not susceptible to landsliding.

VI(b) Less-than-Significant with Mitigation: Erosion: Sandy soils on moderate slopes or clayey soils on steep slopes are susceptible to erosion when exposed to concentrated surface water flow. The potential for erosion is increased when established vegetation is disturbed or removed. No significant fill placement or excavation is anticipated as part of the proposed project. All previously laid fill was compacted with the construction of the infrastructure existing on the project site. This fill has been re-vegetated. The project site is relatively flat; therefore the risk of significant erosion is low. Additionally, erosion control plans are required as a part of the Regional Water Quality Control Board review and approval. See Sections IV. and IX. for mitigation measures.

VI(c) Less-than-Significant: Seismic Induced Ground Settlement: Seismic ground shaking can induce settlement of unsaturated, loose, granular soils. Settlement occurs as the loose soil particles rearrange into a denser configuration when subjected to seismic ground shaking. Varying degrees of settlement can occur throughout such a deposit and could result in differential settlement of structures founded on such deposits. As mentioned, the project site was previously graded and additional fill utilized to level the suite prior to the construction of the existing surface and sub-surface infrastructure. Given that this additional fill was compacted as directed by a licensed soils engineer, and occurred during (occasional) observation by a qualified individual from the engineering firm, no significant loose granular soil deposits are expected to occur on-site. Therefore, the risk of seismically induced settlement is low and therefore considered less than significant after the incorporation of mitigation measures.

Lateral Spreading, Lurching and Ground Cracking: Lurching and associated ground cracking can occur during strong ground shaking. The ground cracking generally occurs along the tops of slopes where stiff soils are underlain by soft deposits or along steep slopes or channel banks. Due to the relatively flat site, absence of nearby creek banks, non-continuous liquefiable layers, lateral spreading/lurching and ground cracking is not considered significant hazards at the project site.
Slope Instability: Weak soils and bedrock on moderate to steep slopes can move downslope due to gravity. Slope instability is often initiated or accelerated from soil saturation and groundwater pressure. Slope movement can vary from slow, shallow soil creep to large, sudden debris flows. Landslides can cause significant damage to structures and improvements, and sudden landslides can result in loss of life. The topography of the site is relatively flat. Therefore, the potential for landsliding at the project site is very low and no impacts are anticipated.

Settlement/Subsidence: Significant settlement can occur when new loads are placed at sites due to consolidation of soft compressible clays (i.e. bay mud) or compression of loose soils. Soft compressible materials were not observed during subsurface exploration, as identified in the April 11, 2013, Giblin and Associated Soils Investigation and confirmed and supported in supplemental analysis prepared by Reese & Associated on April 3, 2014. Further all foundations will be constructed to CBC standards as directed by the soils analysis. Therefore, the risk of settlement to the proposed structures at the project site is low and these impacts are determined to be less than significant.

VI(d) Less-than-Significant: The application of City and UBC construction standards will address any potential impacts related to the presence of expansive soils, making impacts from geologic hazards less than significant.

VI(e) Less-than-Significant: Impacts related to the use of septic tanks are not of concern for this project, as the project will include connection to City sewer systems for wastewater disposal, and therefore will not include use of a septic system.

Required Mitigation Measures:

VI(a)(iii)Mitigation Measure. Structures and foundations should be designed to account for some post-earthquake differential settlement as identified in the soils reports and required by the California Building Code based on the seismic zone and soil types of the project site.

VI(b) Mitigation Measure. The project Civil Engineer should design the site drainage to collect surface water into storm drain systems and discharge water at appropriate locations. Re-establishing vegetation on disturbed areas will minimize erosion. Erosion control measures during and after construction shall conform to the most recent version of the Erosion and Sediment Control Field Manual (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2002).

Sources:
City of Santa Rosa GIS System
City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2035
Giblin and Associates Soils Investigation April 11, 2013
Supplemental soils analysis prepared by Reese & Associated on April 3, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Environmental Checklist Form 27 Smith Village/Pantoja Lane
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

a. Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Discussion:

Global Climate Change

According to the US Environmental Protection Agency, climate change refers to any significant change in measures of climate, such as average temperature, precipitation, or wind patterns over a period of time. Climate change may result from natural factors, natural processes, and human activities that change the composition of the atmosphere and alter the surface and features of the land. Significant changes in global climate patterns have recently been associated with global warming, an average increase in the temperature of the atmosphere near the Earth’s surface, attributed to accumulation of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in the atmosphere. Greenhouse gases trap heat in the atmosphere, which in turn heats the surface of the Earth. Some GHGs occur naturally and are emitted to the atmosphere through natural processes, while others are created and emitted solely through human activities. The emission of GHGs through the combustion of fossil fuels (i.e., fuels containing carbon) in conjunction with other human activities, appears to be closely associated with global warming. State law defines GHG to include the following: carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride (Health and Safety Code, section 38505(g).) The most common GHG that results from human activity is carbon dioxide, followed by methane and nitrous oxide.

Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, recognizes that California is the source of substantial amounts of GHG emissions. The potential adverse impacts of global warming include the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snow pack, a rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of thousands of coastal businesses and residences, damage to marine ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems. In order to avert these consequences, AB 32 establishes a state goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 (a reduction of approximately 25 percent from forecast emission levels) with further reductions to follow.

Lead agencies are required to make a good-faith effort, based on available information, to calculate, model, or estimate the amount of CO2 and other GHG emissions from a project, including the emissions associated with vehicular traffic, energy consumption, water usage and construction activities.

Several aspects of the proposed project, identified below, would result in a reduction of GHG emissions. These aspects of the project support a finding that the impacts of this project on climate change are not significant or cumulatively considerable.
Impacts

VII(a). Less than significant. The BAAQMD May 2011 CEQA Guidelines included GHG significance thresholds. Compliance of a project with a qualified GHG reduction strategy would result in a less than significant impact.

The City adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) on June 5, 2012 and on August 6, 2013 they adopted the Municipal Climate Action Plan. The City developed this Climate Action Plan to meet the requirements of the BAAQMD’s criteria for a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Appendix D of the CAP describes how the plan complies with BAAQMD’s criteria. In addition, the City is also part of Sonoma County’s Community Climate Action Plan, spearheaded by the Climate Protection Campaign, and is working with other local cities to facilitate the reduction of GHG emissions by 25% below 1990 levels by 2015. The project would be subject to the applicable CAP requirements that are included as Appendix E of the CAP and identified on the Climate Action Plan Checklist submitted with the project applications. To ensure new development projects are compliant with the City’s CAP, a CAP New Development Checklist was developed. This checklist must be filled out for each new project, subject to discretionary review, to allow new development to find a less than significant impact for greenhouse gas emissions during the environmental review process. The project has demonstrated compliance with the Climate Action Plan requirements and therefore is determined to have a less than significant impact on the environment.

VII(b). Less-than-Significant: The project would be subject to new requirements under rule making developed at the State and local level regarding greenhouse gas emissions and be subject to local policies that may affect emissions of greenhouse gases. As discussed above, the City of Santa Rosa has adopted a Climate Action Plan, where Appendix E is the CAP New Development Checklist. This checklist is intended to apply to new construction projects, such as this project. The project has demonstrated compliance with the requirements identified on this checklist and has included compliance with these requirements in the description of the project. Given this, the project would not conflict with applicable plans or policies pertaining to GHG emissions as the project applicants have committed to implementing the GHG reduction measures required by the Climate Action Plan. Therefore the GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources associated with the project would be below the significance thresholds that the City uses to evaluate project effects, both directly and cumulatively.

Required Mitigation Measures

None.

Sources:

- City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR.
- BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines 2010.
### VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The site has been the subject of a recent Phase I Environmental Assessment prepared by Geologica, Inc. on January 12, 2011. The eight acres of the project site have been previously graded and surface and underground infrastructure constructed to accommodate the previously approved subdivision of the property. Historical information reviewed as a part of the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan EIR discussed the past use of this part of the City for agricultural land uses. The 3665 Sebastopol Road site was previously developed with a single family home built in 1918 and the property was utilized as a ranch and/or farm until the 1990s. This agricultural land use was supported by up to 13 structures, a well and a septic system. No evidence of this past development remains on the project site.

The City of Santa Rosa Global Information Systems (GIS) website identifies a toxic site (Northcoast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Case #1NSR416) located along the frontage of the project site, adjacent to Sebastopol Road. The case is identified as soil containing solvents as the potential contaminants of concern with a report date of 1965. The status of this case is identified as closed (as of 09-13-2005). A referral of the project to the NCRWQCB did not result in any response from this agency. The State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker website identifies that a “No Further Action Letter” was issued on 09-19-2005.

Several other property assessments have been conducted (Terrasearch, 2001 and Geologica, 2005) on the project site. Terrasearch conducted a subsequent Phase II Subsurface Evaluation which identified low levels of chlorinated solvents and elevated concentrations of soluble lead in groundwater beneath the project site. Chlorinated ground water impacts are well documented in the vicinity of the project and detected levels did not exceed California maximum contaminant levels (MCLs).

Based on the results of this monitoring, the RWQCB placed this property into the California Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanups (SLIC) program in 2004 and required additional investigation of the site. In 2005 Clayton Group Services conducted a Phase II of the project site, which included nine site borings, on- and off-site. No VOCs were detected in the six conducted onsite, but VOCs were detected at low levels in two of the offsite borings. No dissolved lead was detected in any of the groundwater samples. Clayton concluded that the VOCs detected onsite were the result of sources east and south of the property, and were not originating onsite. Based on this conclusion, they recommended closure of the SLIC case and the RWQCB agreed with this recommendation and presented a No Further Action Status for Site Investigations letter to the property owners on September, 5, 2005 identified above.

Available information obtained and reviewed for the parcel indicates that there is a low likelihood that hazardous materials are present at the Site as a result of the historical and recent site land use, despite the fact that agricultural operations were present at the site historically and that there was a Hazardous Materials Incident Report filed in 1965. The proposed use of the site for single family residential land uses, the amount of time that has passed since these events potentially occurred, the listing of the case as closed, and the proximity of any other active contamination sites (the nearest is nearly 0.5 miles away east of Brittain Lane) combine to identify a relatively low likelihood of project related hazardous material impacts as a result of the proposed project.

Impacts.

VIII(a,b,c) Less-than-Significant. The proposed project is a residential subdivision to allow the construction of single family homes not located within ¼ mile of an existing school (Lawrence Cook Middle School is approximately ½ mile to the east). Residential land uses generally do not generate, transport or store hazardous materials. Although some heavy construction equipment will be used to construct the proposed homes, a majority of the site work was completed with the previously approved subdivision. This will minimize the amount of diesel and gasoline vehicles on site. Given these factors, the potential
for any project related hazardous material impacts are extremely remote. For this reason the impact has been identified as less-than-significant.

VIII(d) **Less-than-Significant.** As discussed above, The City of Santa Rosa GIS website identifies a toxic site (Northcoast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Case #1NSR416) located along the frontage of the project site, adjacent to Sebastopol Road. However, the status of this case is identified as closed (as of 09-13-2005) and a referral of the project to the NCRWQCB did not result in any response from this agency. Additionally, the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker website identifies that a “No Further Action Letter” was issued on 09-19-2005. Given this, the impacts associated with past uses of the property have been identified as less than significant.

VIII(e,f,g,h) **No Impact.** The project site is not near an airport or airstrip, is not located on a site listed on the Cortese list pursuant to Section 65962.5, and is not in or near wildlands. The project has provided emergency access onto and around the site. The site will not interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

**Standard Measures:**

Chemicals and /or vehicles should not be stored in close proximity to wellheads.

Any water supply wells on the Site that are not planned to be used for irrigation following site development shall properly be destroyed in accordance with local and state well standards.

**Sources:**

City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR.
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Project Site Santa Rosa, California, Geologica, January 2011
City of Santa Rosa Global Information Systems (GIS) website
State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>◯</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.   HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.   Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.   Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

**Water Supply**

To determine the water supply needs of the City’s current and proposed General Plan, the Utilities Department has calculated water demand and water supply projections. These projections are included in the City’s 2005 Urban Water Management Plan and the Water Supply Assessment for the Santa Rosa General Plan 2035. To meet the current water supply needs, the City has an agreement for water supply with the Sonoma County Water Agency to receive up to 29,100 acre-feet per year of
water. In addition, the City has two groundwater wells that can produce up to 2,300 acre-feet per year and the City is the owner and operator of the Subregional System, which produces recycled water for irrigation. To meet the needs of the City’s General Plan growth projections, additional water sources beyond what the City has currently developed could be needed as early as 2015. To augment currently developed supply, the City will use water conservation, recycled water, additional groundwater (wells), and possibly additional supply from the Sonoma County Water Agency. At this time, there is adequate reliable water supply during most hydrologic conditions for both current users and future users as dictated by the City’s growth management regulations.

The City has had a long-standing commitment to water conservation, resulting in savings of over 3,900 acre-feet per year. In 1976-77, the City began its water conservation program and over the years has implemented many innovative water conservation incentives, such as the Go Low Flow program (replaced over 47,000 high flow toilets, showerheads and faucet aerators with ultra-low flow versions), washing machine rebate programs, landscape irrigation rebate programs, and other residential and commercial programs. Development fees fund the City’s Water Conservation Program. In addition, new development is required to install ultra-low flush toilets and low flow showerheads and faucet aerators, as well as water efficient landscapes.

To deal with water supply shortages, the City has an adopted Urban Water Shortage Contingency Plan (Shortage Plan), which outlines how the City will respond to a reduction in water supply and which addresses the effect on new development when a cutback of 35% or greater is required. The Shortage Plan was updated in 2006 and adopted by City Council on June 27, 2006. Water supply shortages of 35% and greater require development to offset the water demand from their projects by conserving 2 times and 3 times the amount, depending on the level of the water supply shortage.

The Sonoma County Water Agency has not declared a water shortage to date. Should the Water Agency declare a water shortage and allocate water per the Water Shortage Allocation Methodology as outlined in the Restructured Agreement for water supply, the City will enact the appropriate stage of our Shortage Plan. Depending on when the project is developed, the appropriate demand offset will be required if needed.

Water Quality

Storm water, or runoff generated from rain, that is not absorbed into the ground accumulates debris, chemicals and other polluting substances harmful to water quality. Polluted stormwater entering creeks is a huge concern because of its threat to public health and the plant and animal life that inhabit waterways. Additionally, rain runoff from developments may increase flow rates and durations that cause hydromodification in creeks contributing to loss of habitat and decreased aquatic biological diversity. In areas with known groundwater pollution, infiltration of stormwater may need to be avoided as it could contribute to the movement or dispersion of groundwater contamination.

The project was required to provide a Preliminary Stormwater Treatment Plan for the project. The plan was reviewed by the City’s Public Works - Engineering Development Services Division for consistency with the Storm Water Low Impact Development Technical Design Manual and the City’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and found to be consistent with the requirements. The plan is attached to this report.

Impacts

IX(a,e,f). Less Than Signification With Mitigation Incorporation. The Project’s Preliminary Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) identifies permanent Storm Water Best Management Practices (BMP’s) designed in accordance with the City of Santa Rosa and County of
Sonoma Low Impact Development (LID) Technical Design Manual and/or North Coast Regional Water Quality control Board to achieve volume capture and treatment requirements.

**IX(b). Less Than Significant Impact.** As the project is consistent with the City’s General Plan, the project’s water demand has been addressed in the City’s 2005 Urban Water Management Plan and Water Supply Assessment. The impacts are therefore considered less than significant after the implementation of the City’s standard conservation measures are implemented.

**IX(c,d). Less Than Significant Impact.** There are no streams located onsite and the site is not subject to flooding. The Project will alter on-site drainage by increasing the area of impervious surfaces. However, this increase in runoff will be offset by incorporating BMP’s designed in accordance with the City of Santa Rosa and County of Sonoma Low Impact Development (LID) Technical Design Manual or an alternatively approved stormwater management design, to achieve volume capture and treatment requirements which will control and minimize the potential for erosion, siltation, and flooding.

**IX(g,h,i,j). No Impact.** The site is not located within a flood zone of within miles of a dam or levee. Therefore, there is no impact related to flooding as a result of a levee or dam failure.

Seiche and tsunamis are short duration, earthquake-generated water waves in large enclosed bodies of water and the open ocean, respectively. The extent and severity of a seiche would be dependent upon ground motions and fault offset from nearby active faults. The site is not located near the Pacific Ocean or large bodies of water. Therefore, the risk of seiche or tsunami damage at the site is very low.

**STANDARD MEASURES**

- Developer's engineer shall comply with all requirements of the City Standard Storm Water Mitigation Plan Guidelines using Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMPs). Final Plans shall address the storm water quality and quantity along with a maintenance agreement or comparable document to assure continuous maintenance of the source and treatment. Alternative mitigation measures may be approved by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- Submit landscape and irrigation plans in conformance with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance adopted by the Santa Rosa City Council, Resolution No. 27518, on November 17, 2009. Plans shall be submitted with the Building Permit application. Submit the following with the above mentioned plans: Maximum Applied Water Allowance (Appendix A) and Hydrozone Table (Appendix B).

- A Final Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) using Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) is to be included with the Building Permit application. Alternative approaches to mitigating stormwater impacts may be approved by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

**Required Mitigation Measures**

**IX(a,e,f). Mitigation Measure.** Given the unique circumstances of the proposed project, with a majority of the street and sidewalk infrastructure having been constructed, the NCRWQCB has indicated support for offsite storm-water mitigation features to mitigate storm water impacts created as a result of the proposed project. Offsite bioretention and/or filtration is anticipated to be the primary BMP utilized by the project to provide both volume capture and stormwater treatment that enhances downstream water quality by using soil and plant based filtration and infiltration. Although unique, this approach is consistent with the NCRWQCB allowances identified in the City of Santa Rosa NPDES permit administered by the Board.
A formalized agreement between the NCRWQCB, the property owner allowing the off-site mitigation improvements to be constructed on their property and the City of Santa Rosa, which identifies and memorializes this mitigation process, and identifies the mitigation required shall be formalized and in place prior to action on any project entitlements.

**Sources:**
- Preliminary Stormwater Treatment Plan, date, prepared by BKF Consulting Engineers (date stamped March 27, 2014)
- Engineering Conditions of Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community? [ ] [ ] [ ] [X]

b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? [ ] [ ] [X] [ ]

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? [ ] [X] [ ] [ ]

**Discussion:**

**X (a.) No Impact.** The Smith Village/Pantoja Lane project is proposing single family homes on a site designated for low density residential development would be constructed on an existing property previously subdivided to accommodate the same development type which is currently developed with streets and underground infrastructure to accommodate that development type. The project site is surrounded by existing development including single family properties fronting Sebastopol Road to the west, and properties designated for single family homes to the to the south and east. Highway 12 and the Joe Rodota Trail are located to the north. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community and would have no impact related to such.

**X (b.) Less-than-Significant.** The project is proposing residential development in keeping with the General Plan designation of the site. However, the project is proposing to modify the Policy Statement of the current Planned Development zoning designation to eliminate the requirement for mixed-use housing to front onto Sebastopol Road. Additional modifications include revisions to the development criteria generally consistent with the existing Small Lot Residential criteria identified in the zoning code.

**X (c.) Less-than-Significant-with-Mitigation-Incorporation.** The project site is located within the boundaries of the Santa Rosa Plain, which is known to provide habitat to a variety of endangered...
and threatened species. The past development of the project site with infrastructure to accommodate the previously approved subdivision required a variety or regulatory permits from numerous agencies. These permits resulted in a variety of mitigation measures being required and/or implements to allow development of the project property. Several of these have been accomplished, while other mitigation measures have yet to be implemented. However, these measures have been carried through to this project and are required, as needed, as components of this document. Based on the requirements and results of these measures, all known impacts to habitat or natural communities have been reduced to less than significant levels (see Sections IV. of this document for documentation of required mitigation).

Sources:
City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR.
City of Santa Rosa Zoning Code
Smith Village/Pantoja Lane Planned Development Policy Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion:

XI(a-b). No Impact. The project site does not contain any locally or regionally-significant mineral resources. The development of the project site with residential land uses will not create an adverse impact upon locally or regionally-significant resources. The City of Santa Rosa General Plan does not identify any locally important mineral resource locations in the vicinity of the proposed project.

Recommended Mitigation Measures:
None.

Sources:
City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR (SCH# 2008092114).

XII. NOISE

Would the project result in:
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private aircstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Discussion:

Regulatory Background

The City of Santa Rosa’s General Plan establishes noise and land use compatibility standards that are used to evaluate a project’s compatibility with the noise environment. Table 4.E-1 in the Noise and Safety Element of the City’s General Plan shows that single-family uses are normally acceptable up to 60 dBA Ldn/CNEL, conditionally acceptable from 55 to 70 dBA Ldn/CNEL, normally unacceptable from 70 to 75 dBA Ldn/CNEL, and clearly unacceptable if above 75 dBA.
Ldn/CNEL. The City of Santa Rosa also establishes policies in the Noise and Safety Element of the General Plan in order to achieve the goal of maintaining an acceptable community noise level. The following policies are applicable to the proposed project:

NS-B-1 Do not locate noise-sensitive uses in proximity to major noise sources, except residential is allowed near rail to promote future ridership.

NS-B-2 Encourage residential developers to provide buffers other than sound walls, where practical. Allow sound walls only when projected noise levels at a site exceed land use compatibility standards in Figure 12-1 (not shown).

In some established neighborhoods and subdivisions, sound walls may provide the only alternative to reduce noise to acceptable community standards. The Design Review process shall evaluate sound wall aesthetics and landscaping to ensure attractiveness along with functionality.

NS-B-4 Require new projects in the following categories to submit an acoustical study, prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant:

- All new projects proposed for areas with existing noise above 60 dBA DNL. Mitigation shall be sufficient to reduce noise levels below 45 dBA DNL in habitable rooms and 60 dBA DNL in private and shared recreational facilities. Additions to existing housing units are exempt.
- All new projects that could generate noise whose impacts on other existing uses would be greater than those normally acceptable (as specified in the Land Use Compatibility Standards).

NS-B-5 Pursue measures to reduce noise impacts primarily through site planning. Engineering solutions for noise mitigation, such as sound walls, are the least desirable alternative.

NS-B-9 Encourage development to incorporate acoustical site planning into their projects. Recommended measures include:

- Incorporating buffers and/or landscaped earth berms;
- Orienting windows and outdoor living areas away from unacceptable noise exposure;
- Using reduced-noise pavement (rubberized-asphalt);
- Incorporating traffic calming measures, alternative intersection designs, and lower speed limits; and
- Incorporating state-of-the-art structural sound attenuation and setbacks.

Existing Noise Environment

The Smith Village project site is located south of SR 12 and northeast of the Sebastopol Road/Fresno Avenue intersection in Santa Rosa, California. In order to document existing noise levels at the project site, noise levels were measured at four locations from the afternoon.
Wednesday, June 25, 2014 to the afternoon of Friday, June 27, 2014. Figure 1 in the attached noise assessment shows the project site and noise monitoring locations. Based on the results of the noise survey, vehicular traffic along SR 12 and Sebastopol Road were determined to be the predominant sources of environmental noise affecting the site.

Long-term noise measurement LT-1 was made at the approximate setback of the nearest exterior use areas of residential lots (Lots 1 and 2) to Sebastopol Road, in the southeast corner of the Project Site. The measurement site was 100 feet from the center of Sebastopol Road, along Justin Drive, at an elevation of about 10 feet above the surrounding ground. Typical hourly average noise levels at this site ranged from 60 to 64 dBA during the weekday daytime periods and from 51 to 58 dBA during the weekday nighttime periods. The DNL at LT-1 was 64 dBA.

Long-term noise measurement LT-2 quantified existing noise levels along the north boundary of the project site adjacent to SR 12. The measurement site was 220 feet from the center of SR 12 at an elevation of about 12 feet above the surrounding ground. Ambient noise levels measured at this location were the result of traffic along SR 12. Typical hourly average noise levels at this site ranged from 62 to 67 dBA during the weekday daytime periods and from 55 to 63 dBA during the weekday nighttime periods. The DNL at LT-2 was 68 dBA. Figures 5-7 show the trend in noise levels measured at LT-2.

Two short-term noise measurements were made near corresponding long-term measurement sites. ST-1 was made at the approximate setback of the nearest residential façades along Sebastopol Road, 65 feet from the center of the roadway, at an elevation of 5 feet above the surrounding ground. The ten-minute average noise level at ST-1 was 64 dBA Leq. Noise measurement ST-2 was made at the approximate setback of the nearest exterior use areas for proposed residences along SR 12, 175 feet from the center of the roadway, at an elevation of 5 feet above the surrounding ground. The ten-minute average noise level at ST-2 was 58 dBA Leq.

Impacts.

XII (a).Less-than-significant-with-Mitigation-Incorporation. The predominant noise source affecting the northernmost portion of the project site is traffic along SR 12. An increase in traffic volumes on SR 12 would correlate to an increase in noise levels at the project site. According to the Sonoma County 2020 General Plan Draft EIR, traffic noise levels are anticipated to increase by up to 2 dBA along this segment of SR 12. The future DNL at LT-2 is calculated to reach 70 dBA.

A review of the project’s site plan indicates that residential units proposed on Lots 24 through 26, 58 and 59, nearest to SR 12 would have private outdoor use areas (rear yards) with direct line of sight to the adjacent roadway. Future noise levels at outdoor use areas 175 feet from SR 12 would reach 72 dBA DNL. The results of preliminary traffic noise modeling indicates that a twelve to fourteen-foot noise barrier measured above the residential pad elevation, would be required at the northernmost boundary of Lots 24 through 26, 58 and 59, to reduce noise levels at private outdoor use areas to “normally acceptable” levels.

This noise barrier (including east and west corner-lot return segments), in combination with the acoustical shielding provided by the residential units themselves, would reduce exterior noise levels in the private outdoor use areas of the lots nearest to SR 12 to below 60 dBA DNL. Alternatively, if a twelve to fourteen-foot noise barrier is determined to be unfeasible, an 8-foot noise barrier would reduce noise levels in the private outdoor use areas of Lots 24 through 26, 58 and 59, to approximately 65 dBA DNL. This resulting noise exposure would fall within the mid-point of the “conditionally acceptable” range of 60 to 70 dBA DNL, according to The City Santa Rosa’s Land Use Compatibility Standards.

Future DNL noise levels along the south boundary of the project site are projected to be 69 dBA. The
private outdoor use areas of Lots 1-16 would be shielded by the residential units themselves and exterior noise levels in shielded outdoor use areas would be less than 60 dBA DNL.

**Exterior noise levels at the outdoor use areas of the remaining lots within the subdivision would be less than 60 dBA DNL without additional noise barriers and would be considered “normally acceptable” with the future noise environment.**

Noise barriers designed for the project should maintain an overall height relative to residential pad elevation as identified in the previous discussions above to yield exterior noise levels at or below the City’s acceptable exterior noise standard. Suitable barriers could take the form of walls, earth berms, or a berm and wall barrier combination. To be effective, barriers should be constructed solidly over the entire surface and at the base of the barrier. Openings or gaps between barrier materials or the ground decrease the reduction provided by a noise barrier.

Suitable materials for barrier construction should have a minimum surface weight of 3 lbs./ft.² (such as one-inch thick wood, masonry block, concrete, or metal). The final design of noise barriers should be completed at the time the final site plan and grading plan are available.

**Future Interior Noise Environment**

The City of Santa Rosa requires interior noise levels to be maintained at or below 45 dBA DNL to be considered acceptable for residential development. Unshielded façades of residential units proposed nearest SR 12 (Plan 3 unit located on Lot 24) would be exposed to future noise levels of up to 72 dBA DNL. In residential units of standard construction, interior noise levels are approximately 15 decibels lower than exterior noise levels with the windows partially open. Standard construction with forced air ventilation (allowing the occupant to control noise by maintaining the windows shut) provides approximately 20 to 25 dBA of noise reduction in interior spaces. This method of reducing interior noise levels is normally used in noise environments ranging from 60 to 65 dBA DNL. Where noise levels exceed 65 dBA DNL, forced-air mechanical ventilation systems and sound-rated construction methods are normally required.

To determine the expected interior noise levels resulting from traffic, calculations were made to estimate the transmission loss provided by the proposed building elements. Interior noise levels were calculated based on a review of the project’s site plan, exterior building elevations, and floor plans dated February 2013. The relative areas of walls, windows, and doors were input into an acoustical model to calculate interior noise levels within individual units. The exterior walls of the proposed units were assumed to be 2x4 or 2x6 wood studs with fiberglass insulation, a single layer of gypsum board attached to the inside of the studs, and a 7/8” exterior cement plaster (Stucco) or wood siding finish. Windows and doors were then tested to determine the necessary sound transmission class ratings of these building elements in order to reduce interior noise levels due to traffic to acceptable levels.

Traffic noise levels at the exterior façades of single-family residences proposed nearest to SR 12 are calculated to range from 69 to 72 dBA Ldn by 2035 and would be considered “conditionally acceptable” to “normally unacceptable” according to the City of Santa Rosa General Plan, and the façades of single-family residences adjacent to SR 12 would require sound rated building elements to control traffic noise intrusion.

The Plan 3 unit located on Lot 24 would have a master bedroom located at the second-story which would overlook the noise barrier. Based on preliminary calculations, master bedroom windows on the north façade would need to be rated at a minimum of 38 STC (Sound Transmission Class) to
adequately reduce noise levels indoors assuming wood siding. The sound transmission class rating of master bedroom windows on the north façade could be reduced to STC 32 if the exterior wall construction method included resilient channels. With these measures considered, a standard window (typically with an STC rating of 24 or greater) would be sufficient for the west façade of the master bedroom in the unit on Lot 24.

Plan 5 units are proposed on Lots 25, 26, 58, and 59. The second-story façades of these units do not have windows that would look directly onto the highway, therefore, exterior noise levels are calculated to be approximately 69 dBA DNL by 2035 outside of Bedroom 3 or Bedroom 4. The sound transmission class rating of second-story windows should be STC 26 or greater assuming wood siding (without resilient channels).

At the exterior façades of rowhouse buildings proposed nearest to Sebastopol Road, exterior noise levels are calculated to reach 69 dBA DNL by 2035 and would be considered “conditionally acceptable”. The south, east, and west facing façades of row houses adjacent to Sebastopol Road would also require sound rated building elements to control traffic noise intrusion. Windows and doors of stucco sided building façades would need to be 26 STC to adequately reduce noise levels indoors. Where wood siding is proposed, the sound transmission class rating of the windows should be 30 STC or greater to adequately reduce noise levels indoors.

Single-family residences on the interior of the site would be exposed to exterior noise levels of 65 dBA DNL or less. Proposed residences would meet the interior standard (45 dBA DNL) assuming standard California construction methods (STC 26).

Second-floor residential façades throughout the site have potential to be exposed to exterior noise levels of 60 dBA DNL or more, including maximum noise levels above 70 dBA during peak hour traffic. Therefore, forced-air mechanical ventilation, satisfactory to the local building official, would be required throughout the site to allow occupants to keep the windows closed to control noise.

The final specifications for noise insulation treatments should be confirmed during the final design of the project. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, shall be submitted to the City along with the building plans prior to issuance of a building permit. Lots requiring sound rated construction methods are shown in the graphic below (and in Figure 8 of the attached report).
XII(b) Less-Than-Significant Impact: Operation of the proposed project would not result in perceivable ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels as the project proposes residential land uses which do not typically create perceivable ground bore vibrations. However, heavy equipment associated with the proposed project construction activities could generate perceptible vibration in the immediate vicinity of the site. Heavy trucks passing by and the use of jack hammers during concrete or pavement removal are activities that would be most likely to cause temporary ground borne vibration. The proposed project would not include the use of blasting techniques or pile driving which can cause excessive vibration.

The level of ground borne vibration that could reach sensitive receptors would depend on the distance to the receptor, what equipment is used, and the soil conditions surrounding the construction site. The nearest residences are to the east and west of the project site. Given that a majority of the project infrastructure has been constructed, the use of heavy ground moving equipment will be minimized as the work associated with residential home construction involves lighter-duty equipment and does not require significant grading activities. Additionally, the impact from construction related vibration would be temporary and short-term and confined to only the immediate area, and therefore the impact would be less than significant.
XII(c) Less-Than-Significant Impact: Residential uses do not typically generate substantial sources of noise, therefore, it is not anticipated that this residential project will substantially and permanently increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels without the project.

The proposed project does not include the construction or long-term operation of any facilities that would result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The proposed project would generate project-related traffic. However, the amount of trips in comparison to the existing is relatively small, and, therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

XII(d) Less-Than-Significant Impact: The project would result in noise impacts related to construction of the proposed project. The project will result in short-term noise impacts related to minor site grading and construction activities. However, because they are short-term and temporary, and the project will be conditioned to comply with standard construction hours, impacts will be reduced to a level of less-than-significant. Construction hours shall comply with the City's Noise Ordinance.

XII(e) No Impact. The project site is not located near a public or private airport, and therefore would not be subject to air-traffic related noise impacts.

Standard Measures:

Standard City conditions of project approval limit the hours of construction to 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Saturdays. No construction is permitted on Sundays and holidays.

Recommended Mitigation Measures:

XII(a). Construct an 8-foot noise barrier (sound wall) along the northern boundary of the project site (adjacent to Lots 24 through 26, 58 and 59, those nearest to SR 12), as described in the Environmental Noise Assessment, prepared by Jordan Roberts, Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., dated August 19, 2014, to reduce sound levels to conditionally acceptable levels in the rear yards of the proposed residences on Lots 24 through 26, 58 and 59. Evidence of this STC rating shall be indicated on all plans submitted for building permit review.

XII(a). Provide double-paned thermal insulating windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 38 on all second floor facades of homes on Lots 24 through 26, 58 and 59 (those nearest to SR 12) and double-paned thermal insulating windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 30 on the facades of the row houses facing Sebastopol Road. Evidence of this STC rating shall be indicated on all plans submitted for building permit review.

XII(a). Additionally, mechanical ventilation shall be provided for all residences of the proposed Smith Village and Pantoja Lane residential subdivisions, as described in the Environmental Noise Assessment, prepared by Jordan Roberts, Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., dated August 19, 2014.

Sources:

- City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009 and Final EIR, certified November 2009 (SCH No. 2008092114).
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

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

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

Discussion:

The project would increase the population of the City by approximately 167 persons (67 units at 2.49 persons/household). This growth is consistent with the City’s General Plan which calls for Low Density Residential land use (2-8 units/acre) on the project site. All infrastructure to the site is part of the City’s planned infrastructure, and is located adjacent to the property, or has already been constructed as part of the previously approved project. There are no houses existing on the site.

XIII(a). Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not significantly impact population growth or housing because the population and growth proposed as a result of the project was anticipated by the General Plan resulting in a less than significant impact.

XIII(b-c). No Impact. There are no existing houses or residents that will be impacted by the proposed project.

Sources:

- City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR.
- 2010 Census Report.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

- a. Fire protection? □ □ ✓
- b. Police protection? □ □ ✓
- c. Schools? □ □ ✓
- d. Parks? □ □ ✓
- e. Other public facilities? □ □ ✓

Discussion:

The project site is located within the City of Santa Rosa and would receive all necessary public services.

Fire & Police
Fire protection services will be provided by the City of Santa Rosa. Police protection services will be provided by the City’s Police Department. The site is served by 3 fire stations within 1.5 miles of the project site (Station 10 on Circadian Way, Station 2 on Stony Point Road and Station 8 on Burbank Avenue, which is operated by the Roseland Fire Protection Department but is available for responses in the project area).

Police protection services will be provided by the Santa Rosa Police Department.

This project parcels have been identified as appropriate for Low Density Residential development by the City of Santa Rosa General Plan for many years and as such, public safety needs for this site have been anticipated.

This site has been included within the City’s General Plan for many years at a comparable density to that of the Proposed Project.

Schools
The Project is within the boundaries of the Wright School District for elementary school services and the Santa Rosa School District for High schools. The Project proposes single family residential development in an area designated for such development and previously approved for single family homes and mixed use development. Based on the proposed housing type, there is a high potential for individuals residing within the project boundaries to have school aged children. The City requires the payment of school fees for new residential development to the Districts serving the project sites. The Santa Rosa City School District collects $2.63 per square foot of residential development in impact fees to cover the cost of providing these services. The Wright School District also collects similar fees. Impacts to schools are considered fully mitigated under State law through the collection of State mandated school impact fees (per Senate Bill 50).

Parks
The project site is served by several parks and park like facilities (such as school grounds, churches and privately maintained parks with public access) within approximately one-and-a-half miles (A Place to Play, Burbank Avenue
Open Space, Finley Community Center, Spring Lake County Park, Village Green Park, and Cook School Park) providing recreational opportunities for residents of the proposed project. Given the relatively limited number of proposed residents (167 residents phased in as homes are built) and the variety of options these parks provide, the project is not expected to result in substantial or adverse impacts associated with the provision of new or altered facilities as no additional park facilities will be required as a result of the project. Additionally, residential development projects require Parks impacts would be addressed through payment of City of Santa Rosa Park impact fees (see discussion below under Initial Study Section XV).

Impacts:

XIII(a-e). Less Than Significant Impacts. The Project was referred to the departments identified above and no issues or impacts were identified with any of the proposed elements of the project. The project site is located within the City of Santa Rosa and would receive all necessary public services. Fire protection services will be provided by the City of Santa Rosa Fire Department. Police protection services will be provided by the City’s Police Department. No additional Fire or Police personnel or equipment are necessary to serve the proposed project. Public school services, as needed, would be provided by the Santa Rosa City and Wright School Districts. Park facilities would be provided primarily by the City, based on the project’s proximity to existing recreational facilities.

Standard Measures:

- Evidence of school impact fees would be made to the applicable school district offices prior to City issuance of any building permits.

- The Fire Department has reviewed plans for the proposed project and imposed conditions of approval.

- Other standard conditions of approval may apply, including provision of a fire flow analysis to ensure adequate water pressure and flow rates.

- In accordance with California Government Code Section 65996, the developer shall pay a school impact fee to the School District to offset the increased demands on school facilities caused by the proposed project.

- Street trees will be required and planted by the developer. Selection will be made by the city’s approved master plan list and approved by the city’s Parks Division. Planting shall be done in accordance with the city “Standards and Specifications for Planting Parkway Trees.” Tree planting locations will be marked by the city Parks Division Tree Section personnel.

- Parks acquisition and/or park development fees will be paid at the time of building permit issuance. The fee amount will be determined by the resolution in the effect at the time.

Recommended Mitigation Measures:
None.

Sources:
- City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR (SCH#2008092114)
- Community Development Department's Standard Conditions of Approval dated March 1, 2004
- Santa Rosa City and Wright School Districts
XV. RECREATION

Would the project:

a. 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?

☐ ☐ ☒

b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

☐ ☐ ☐

Discussion:

XV(a). Less-than-Significant Impacts. Generally, Southwest Santa Rosa has been identified as deficient of park facilities based on the General Plan policy of 6-acres of park land per 1000 residents. The City currently meets this standard through the inclusion of City parks (3.5 acres/1000 residents), school recreation land (1.4 acres/1000 residents) and open space (1.1 acres/1000 residents).

The project site is served by several parks and park like facilities within approximately one-and-a-half miles (A Place to Play, Burbank Avenue Open Space, Finley Community Center, Village Green Park, and Cook School Park) of the project which provide recreational opportunities for residents of the proposed project. Although the southwest area is identified as deficient in park lands providing recreational opportunities, the project site itself is within relatively close proximity to a variety of recreation facilities.

Given the relatively limited number of proposed residents (167 residents phased in as homes are built) and the variety of options these parks and open space areas provide, the project is not expected to result in substantial or adverse impacts associated with an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and/or regional park facilities to the extent that substantial physical deterioration of these facilities would occur. Additionally, a project referral to the Recreation and Parks Department did not identify significant impacts or concerns. Additionally, residential development projects require payment of City of Santa Rosa Park impact fees which contribute to the construction and maintenance of City park facilities.

XV(b). No Impact. The project does not propose recreational facilities or require the expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, there would be no adverse effects to the physical environment from the construction or expansion of recreational facilities on-site. Any residential facilities constructed with the projects development impact fees will receive their own, separate environmental review and determination.

Standard Measures:

- Payment of required in-lieu park impact fees is required at building permit issuance.
Recommended Mitigation Measures:
None.

Sources:
City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR (SCH#2008092114)

City of Santa Rosa GIS System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b. 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?

c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Discussion:

Existing Conditions

Roadway Network

*Stony Point Road* is classified as a Regional/Arterial Street in the City of Santa Rosa General Plan. It is a two to four-lane, north-south roadway beginning at College Avenue north of the project site and continuing south into unincorporated Sonoma County.

*Sebastopol Road* is classified a Regional/Arterial Street in the City of Santa Rosa General Plan. It is a two-to four-lane, east-west roadway beginning west of Wright Road and terminating east of Stony Point Road at Olive Street. The proposed project fronts onto Sebastopol Road.

*Corporate Center Parkway* is classified a Regional/Arterial Street in the City of Santa Rosa General Plan. It is a four-lane, north-south roadway beginning at Sebastopol Road and terminating south at Northpoint Parkway.

*Wright Road* is classified a Regional/Arterial Street in the City of Santa Rosa General Plan. It is a four-lane, north-south roadway beginning at the State Route (SR) 12 interchange and terminating south at Ludwig Avenue.

*SR 12* is a four-lane roadway built to freeway standards from the Fulton Road/Wright Road intersection to the Farmers Lane interchange in Santa Rosa.

Existing Transit Facilities

Currently, Santa Rosa City Bus and Sonoma County Transit offer local bus transit service on the following routes in the vicinity of the project site:

- City Bus Route 9 (Roseland) provides weekday service at half-hour headways between 6:05 a.m. and 8:10 p.m., hourly service between 7:35 a.m. and 7:10 p.m. on Saturdays, and hourly service between 10:00 a.m. and 4:40 p.m. on Sundays. The route runs a loop from the Downtown Santa Rosa Transit Mall and stops along Sebastopol Road in the project vicinity.

- City Bus Route 15 (South City Connector) provides weekday service at half-hour headways between 6:05 a.m. and 8:10 p.m., hourly service between 7:30 a.m. and 7:10 p.m. on Saturdays, and hourly service between 10:30 a.m. and 5:10 p.m. on Sundays. The route runs a loop from the Downtown Santa Rosa Transit Mall and stops along Sebastopol Road and Corporate Center Parkway in the project vicinity.

- Sonoma County Transit Route 22 provides weekday service at one- to two-hour headways between 6:20 a.m. and 6:05 p.m. The route runs a loop from the Downtown Santa Rosa Transit Mall and stops along Sebastopol Road and Wright Road in the project vicinity.
Mall and stops along Sebastopol Road and Corporate Center Parkway in the project vicinity.

**Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities**
According to the latest Sonoma County Transportation Authority Countywide Bicycle Plan and the City of Santa Rosa Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, there are two existing Class II bicycle facilities (on-street, striped lanes) within the study area:

- Sebastopol Road – between Leddy Avenue and Fresno Avenue
- Sebastopol Road – between Corporate Center Parkway and Stony Point Road
- Corporate Center Parkway – between Sebastopol Road and Northpoint Parkway

There are no Class I (off-street, shared path) or Class III routes (signed on-street) currently in the vicinity of the project with the exception of the Joe Rodota Trail which runs along the northern boundary of the project site and connects the City of Sebastopol with the City of Santa Rosa. According to the aforementioned bicycle plans, Class II facilities are planned on Sebastopol Road between Fresno Avenue and Corporate Center Parkway.

In terms of existing pedestrian facilities in the project vicinity, crosswalks and actuated pedestrian signals are provided at all signalized study intersections. Along Sebastopol Road, Corporate Center Parkway, and Stony Point Road, sidewalks are discontinuous along one or both sides of the roadway.

**Existing Traffic Volumes**
Turning movement counts were conducted during typical weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods (7:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., respectively) at the study intersections (as identified in the attached report) in July 2014. A seasonal adjustment factor was developed based on available counts from City staff that were taken in the fall and winter of 2012 and 2013. There adjustments were applied to the July counts since traffic volumes are typically lower in summer. Appendix B of the attached report includes the count sheets for the study intersections. Field verification of existing intersection lane configurations and traffic controls were also conducted in July 2014, and provided the basis for the level of service analysis for Existing Conditions.

**Intersection Collision Analysis**
TJKM obtained Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) collision data from January 2009 to December 2013, at all study intersections from the California Highway Patrol to evaluate any safety trends. Typically, intersections with higher traffic volumes may experience more collisions, such as the Stony Point Road / Sebastopol Road intersection. Generally, it is assumed that the layout and configuration of the intersection might be a contributing factor in collisions that occurred within 200 feet of the intersection, and therefore collisions within this radius have been analyzed.

TJKM has found that four of the five study intersections are experiencing average collision rates below statewide averages. The exception is the Stony Point Road/Sebastopol Road intersection, where 55 collisions were reported during the five-year study period. The collision rate of 0.65 at this intersection is above the statewide average rate of 0.55 for a four-leg, signalized intersection. The majority of collisions were rear-end and broadside types. There are several countermeasures that have the potential for lowering the number of annual collisions at the Stony Point Road/Sebastopol Road intersection as identified in the National Highway Cooperative Research Program Report 500 provides guidance for reducing collisions at signalized intersections. This report identifies several potential countermeasures applicable to this intersection, including the following:

- Signal retiming to reduce the potential for signal violations/red-light running
- Lengthen southbound right-turn lane to reduce rear-end collisions
- Delineate eastbound left-turn lanes to reduce side-swipe and broadside collisions
Existing plus Project Conditions

This scenario is similar to Existing Conditions, but with the addition of traffic generated by the proposed Smith Village and Pantoja Lane Residential Developments.

Project Description
The proposed Smith Village and Pantoja Lane Residential Developments consist of 67 total single-family homes. The site is split into two proposed Tentative Maps. Smith Village consists of 51 single-family detached homes, and Pantoja Lane consists of 16 single-family attached homes with shared walls similar to duplexes. The project is located on Sebastopol Road east of Fresno Avenue. The site will be accessed by Alvarez Avenue off Fresno Avenue and the study intersection of Justin Drive/S Sebastopol Road.

Project Trip Generation
TJKM developed estimated project trip generation for the proposed project based on the published trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) publication *Trip Generation (9th Edition)*. TJKM also followed the guidance of ITE’s *Trip Generation Handbook (2nd Edition)* in terms of applying average trip rates for the proposed land use.

TJKM used published trip rates for the ITE land use Single Family Detached (Code 210) for this project, as this land use most closely matches the trip characteristics of the two residential product types. Table III (in the attached report) shows the trip generation expected to be generated by the proposed project.

The project is expected to generate approximately 637 daily weekday trips, 50 weekday a.m. peak hour trips (13 inbound, 37 outbound) and 67 weekday p.m. peak hour trips (42 inbound, 25 outbound).

Project Trip Distribution and Assignment
Trip distribution assumptions for the proposed project were developed based on existing travel patterns, knowledge of the study area, and discussion with City staff. The distribution assumptions are as follows:

- 60 percent to/from Wright Road north of Sebastopol Road
- 10 percent to/from Wright Road south of Sebastopol Road
- 10 percent to/from Corporate Center Parkway
- 10 percent to/from Stony Point Road north of Sebastopol Road
- 5 percent to/from Stony Point Road south of Sebastopol Road
- 5 percent to/from Sebastopol Road east of Stony Point Road

The trip distribution and assignment assumptions at the study intersections for the proposed project are illustrated in Figure 4 in the attached report. The assigned trips were added to existing traffic volumes to generate Existing plus Project traffic volumes. The resulting intersection turning movement volumes at the study intersections for Existing plus Project Conditions are shown in Figure 5 of the report.

Impacts

XVI(a & b). Less Than Significant. Under Existing plus Project Conditions, all study intersections are expected to continue operating acceptably at LOS E or better during both a.m. and p.m. peak hours on a typical weekday, with minor changes in average delay. **Thus, no mitigations are necessary due to project traffic under Existing plus Project Conditions.**

Year 2035 plus Project Conditions

This scenario is similar to Year 2035 Conditions, but with the addition of traffic expected to be generated
by the proposed Smith Village and Pantoja Lane Residential Developments. Figure 7 in the report shows the turning movement volumes, lane geometry, and traffic controls under Year 2035 plus Proposed Project Conditions for all study intersections.

**Intersection Level of Service Analysis – Year 2035 plus Project Conditions**

Peak hour levels of service (LOS) at the study intersections under Year 2035 plus Project Conditions have also been analyzed and compared to the 2035 Conditions without the project.

Under Year 2035 plus Project Conditions, the following study intersections are expected to operate at an unacceptable LOS E: Wright Road/Sebastopol Road and Stony Point Road/Sebastopol Road. The Wright Road/Sebastopol Road intersection is expected to continue operating at LOS E during the p.m. peak hour, and the Stony Point Road/Sebastopol Road intersection is expected to continue operating at LOS E during both a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

With the addition of project traffic, the increase in average delay at Stony Point Road/Sebastopol Road is expected to be 0.2 seconds during the a.m. peak hour and 0.1 seconds during the p.m. peak hour, which is below the four-second threshold for intersections already operating at a deficient LOS. **Thus, the addition of project traffic is not expected to result in a significant impact and no mitigations are necessary at this intersection under Year 2035 plus Project Conditions.**

The increase in average delay at Wright Road/Sebastopol Road is expected to be 3.3 seconds during the p.m. peak hour, which is below the four-second threshold for intersections already operating at a deficient LOS. **Thus, the addition of project traffic is not expected to result in a significant impact and no mitigations are necessary at this intersection under Year 2035 plus Project Conditions.**

**XVI(c & d). No Impact.** The project will not result in any changes to air traffic levels or patterns and does not include any hazardous design features or incompatible uses.

**XVI(e). Less-than-Significant.** The project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts to emergency circulation or access. The project provides multiple access points to the site through the proposed and existing circulation network. Additionally, the proposed design was referred to both the Police and Fire Departments and no concerns were raised regarding circulation or access for emergency responders.

**XVI(f). Less-than-Significant with Mitigation.** The project is not expected to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. A new sidewalk and cross walk feature has been required as a condition of approval from the Traffic Division of the Department of Public Works to provide pedestrian access as a way to ensure safe routes to schools, including to Cook Middle School, east of the project site across Sebastopol Road.
**Recommended Mitigation Measures:**

**XVI(f). Mitigation Measure.** A new sidewalk on the north side of Sebastopol Road and an illuminated crosswalk feature is required to provide pedestrian access to the existing sidewalk circulation network as a way to ensure safe routes to schools, including to Cook Middle School, east of the project site across Sebastopol Road. The final design and location of this feature shall be determined in consultation with the City of Santa Rosa Traffic Division of the Department of Public Works Department.

**Sources:**
Traffic Study
City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR (SCH#2008092114)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? □ □ □ □

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

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

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? □ □ □ □

e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? □ □ □ □

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? □ □ □ □
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Discussion:

The proposed Smith Village and Pantoja Lane residential projects are located within an urbanized area within the City limits of Santa Rosa on parcels previously developed with the infrastructure needed to construct more residential units than these projects propose. Utilities and services exist or are available through local City services, Waste Removal, Pacific Gas & Electric and other providers. The project will use some of the existing service capacity. Services and supplies are adequate to serve the project which does not result in the need for new systems or supplies, therefore the impact is considered to be less than significant.

XVII(a). Less Than Significant. (See Mitigation Measure IX(a,e,f).)

XVII(b). Less Than Significant Impact. As the project is considered within the City’s General Plan, the project’s water demand is included within the City’s projections in their Urban Water Management Plan and Water Assessment.

XVII(c). Less-than-Significant Impact. Given the project site conditions and changed mitigation requirements since the previous Smith Village project was originally approved, the proposed Smith Village and Pantoja Lane projects will be constructing off-site stormwater treatment infrastructure to comply with the mitigation required under today’s standards. Given the conversations with the NCRWQCB, these improvements are anticipated to be constructed at the County of Sonoma Fairgrounds. This site is fully developed with typical infrastructure needed to serve the variety of uses accommodated at a fairground. Given this, the construction of this infrastructure, which will be done under the direction of the NCRWQCB and intended to improve stormwater filtration from current conditions, is not anticipated to cause significant environmental impacts. The project’s remaining stormwater and drainage facilities have been evaluated within the other sections of this Initial Study.

XVIII(d-f). Less-than-Significant Impact. Local City service providers such as Northbay Corporation, Pacific Gas & Electric and other providers all provide services to this area of Santa Rosa. No impacts to the drinking or waste water capacity were identified by the City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department. The Project will use some of the existing service capacity, including the wastewater, drinking water and solid waste capacity, however the services and supplies are adequate to serve the project (based on the previous capacity built into the system to serve the past hospital use) which is not anticipated to result in the need for new systems or supplies, therefore the impact is considered to be less than significant.

XVIII(e). No Impact. The project will comply with all federal, state and local regulations concerning solid waste.

Recommended Mitigation Measures:
None additional.

Sources:

City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009, and Final EIR.
North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Letter/401 Permit Issued to Bijan Madjlessi for the Smith Village Project from Catherine Kuhlman, WDID 1B006158WNSO. January 25, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Would the project:

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?  
   - No
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - Mitigation Incorporation
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - No Impact

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?  
   - No
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - Mitigation Incorporation
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - No Impact

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  
   - No
   - Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - Mitigation Incorporation
   - Potentially Significant Impact
   - No Impact

**Discussion:**

XVII(a) **Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation:** The proposed Smith Village and Pantoja Lane projects have been identified as having potentially significant biologic impacts. Additionally, the previously approved Smith Village development project was required to mitigate potentially significant site impacts to less than significant levels. However, the mitigation measures required in the analysis above and in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan attached have been determined to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

XVII(b) **Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation:** The project does have the potential to create impacts which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable to community wide areas such as traffic and storm water. However, the cumulative environmental effects of the project are reduced to less than significant levels through the application of mitigation measures required in the analysis above and in the attached Mitigation Monitoring Plan in addition to the standard City construction standards and practices.

XVII(c) **Less-Than-Significant Impact:** The project does not present potentially significant impacts which may cause adverse impacts upon human beings, either directly or indirectly. The project will be conditioned
to make City standard improvements with respect to noise impacts, roadways and storm drainage. Building and improvement plans will be reviewed to ensure compliance with applicable building codes and standards.

**Recommended Mitigation Measures:**
None additional.

**Sources:**
City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009 and Final EIR, certified November 2009 (SCH No. 2008092114).
Traffic report prepared by TJKM for the Smith Village/Pantoja Lane Residential Developments, dated August 20, 2014.
Biological Site Review, Douglas Spicher of WRA Environmental Consultants. August 27, 2014 and Summary of Previous Smith Village Mitigation Compliance from Darren Wiermeyer, Wiemeyer Ecological Sciences
Letter/401 Permit Issued to Bijan Majdlessi for the Smith Village Project from Catherine Kuhlman, WDID 1B006158WNSO. January 25, 2007
Letter to Peter Straub regarding formal Endangered Species Consultation for the Proposed Smith Village Development in Santa Rosa, CA Corps File No. 28158N, from Cay Goude. Date stamped June 28, 2006
Letter to Bijan Majdlessi regarding Clean Water Act compliance (Section 404) and issuance of a Nationwide Permit to allow construction of the Smith Village project from Peter Straub. Date stamped January 31, 2007.
City of Santa Rosa GIS Website
Giblin and Associates Soils Investigation April 11, 2013
Supplemental soils analysis prepared by Reese & Associates on April 3, 2014
Preliminary Stormwater Treatment Plan Worksheet, prepared by BKF Consulting Engineers (date stamped March 27, 2014)
Storm Water Low Impact Technical Design Manual, August 2011
APPENDIX

SOURCE REFERENCES

The following is a list of references used in the preparation of this document. Unless attached herein, copies of all reference reports, memorandums and letters are on file with the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development. References to Publications prepared by Federal or State agencies may be found with the agency responsible for providing such information.

1) City of Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan, adopted November 3, 2009 and Final EIR, certified November 2009 (SCH No. 2008092114).
2) Traffic report prepared by TJKM for the Smith Village/Pantoja Lane Residential Developments, dated August 20, 2014.
4) Biological Site Review, Douglas Spicher of WRA Environmental Consultants. August 27, 2014 and Summary of Previous Smith Village Mitigation Compliance from Darren Wiermeyer, Wiemeyer Ecological Sciences
5) Letter/401 Permit Issued to Bijan Madjlessi for the Smith Village Project from Catherine Kuhlman, WDID 1B006158WNSO. January 25, 2007
6) Letter to Peter Straub regarding formal Endangered Species Consultation for the Proposed Smith Village Development in Santa Rosa, CA Corps File No. 28158N, from Cay Goude. Date Stamped June 28, 2006
7) Letter to Bijan Madjilessi regarding Clean Water Act compliance (Section 404) and issuance of a Nationwide Permit to allow construction of the Smith Village project from Peter Straub. Date stamped January 31, 2007.
8) City of Santa Rosa GIS Website
9) Giblin and Associates Soils Investigation April 11, 2013
10) Supplemental soils analysis prepared by Reese & Associates on April 3, 2014
12) Preliminary Stormwater Treatment Plan Worksheet, prepared by BKF Consulting Engineers (date stamped March 27, 2014)
13) Storm Water Low Impact Technical Design Manual, August 2011

PROJECT SPONSOR’S INCORPORATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES

As the project sponsor or the authorized agent of the project sponsor, I, ________________________________, undersigned, have reviewed the Initial Study for the ________________________________ and have particularly reviewed all mitigation measures and monitoring programs identified herein. I accept the findings of the Initial Study and mitigation measures and hereby agree to modify the proposed project applications now on file with the City of Santa Rosa to include and incorporate all mitigation measures and monitoring programs set out in this Initial Study.

___________________________________________________________________________________________
Property Owner (authorized agent)                                Date

DETERMINATION FOR PROJECT

On the basis of this Initial Study and Environmental Checklist I find that the proposed project (choose the appropriate text):

☒ could have a Potentially Significant Effect on the environment; however, the aforementioned mitigation measures to be performed by the property owner (authorized agent) will reduce the potential environmental
impacts to a point where no significant effects on the environment will occur. A Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared.

Signature          Date

Noah Housh        Senior Planner

Report Authors and Consultants
Noah Housh, Senior Planner
City of Santa Rosa, Community Development Department.

Douglas Spicher of WRA Environmental Consultants
Darren Wiermeyer, Wiemeyer Ecological Sciences
Giblin and Associates
Reese & Associates
TJKM Transportation Consultants
Geologica, Inc.

Attachments:
Traffic report prepared by TJKM for the Smith Village/Pantoja Lane Residential Developments, dated August 20, 2014.
Biological Site Review, Douglas Spicher of WRA Environmental Consultants. August 27, 2014 and Summary of Previous Smith Village Mitigation Compliance from Darren Wiermeyer, Wiemeyer Ecological Sciences
Letter/401 Permit Issued to Bijan Madjlessi for the Smith Village Project from Catherine Kuhlman, WDID 1B006158WNSO. January 25, 2007
Letter to Peter Straub regarding formal Endangered Species Consultation for the Proposed Smith Village Development in Santa Rosa, CA Corps File No. 28158N, from Cay Goude. Date Stamped June 28, 2006
Letter to Bijan Madjlessi regarding Clean Water Act compliance (Section 404) and issuance of a Nationwide Permit to allow construction of the Smith Village project from Peter Straub. Date stamped January 31, 2007.
Giblin and Associates Soils Investigation April 11, 2013
Supplemental soils analysis prepared by Reese & Associates on April 3, 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. AESTHETICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I(b). Mitigation Measure. To soften the appearance of the development proposed on the site, the developer is required to plant large canopy trees (with a minimum size of 24” box) along the northern property lines of lots 24-26 and 58-59. The locations of these trees shall be determined through consultation with the consulting arborist as well as to provide a visual buffer of the view from the Scenic Highway 12. Tree Locations, Sizes and Species are required to be identified on all plans submitted for building permits and/or subdivision improvement plans. City of Santa Rosa Community Development Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I(b). Mitigation Measure. To ensure survival of the existing oak trees adjacent to the northern project boundary, an arborist shall be consulted prior to the design and construction of the required 8-foot sound wall along this boundary of the Smith Village project. Arborist recommendations shall address the method of construction and the required tree protection measures needed to ensure survival of the existing oak trees along this boundary during and after construction of the sound wall. These recommendations shall be incorporated into the design and construction methodology of the proposed Smith Village project. A summary of the arborist recommendations regarding construction of the sound wall shall be submitted with building/improvement plans for the sound wall. City of Santa Rosa Community Development Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III(d). Mitigation Measure Include measures to control dust emissions. Implementation of the measures recommended by BAAQMD and listed below would reduce the air quality and fugitive dust-related impacts associated with any grading and new construction to a less than significant. The contractor shall implement the following Best Management Practices: Notes specifying these requirements shall be placed on all subdivision improvement plans, final maps and or any comprehensive plan set identifying subdivision improvements. City of Santa Rosa Community Development Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Procedure</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible and feasible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible and feasible, as well, after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust</td>
<td>Notes specifying these requirements shall be placed on all subdivision improvement plans, final maps or any other comprehensive plan set</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa Community Development Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Procedure</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</td>
<td>identifying subdivision improvements.</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. BIOLOGIC RESOURCES**

Mitigation Measure IV(a) -IV(c):

Project applicant shall demonstrate that all mitigation measures previously required of the Smith Village 59-unit subdivision, pertaining to the impacts to wetlands, Burke’s goldfield, Sonoma sunshine, Sebastopol meadowfoam and California tiger salamander (CTS) habitat as specified by past environmental review have been completed. If these requirements have not been completed, project applicant shall take all necessary steps to complete these requirements. Documentation of compliance with these requirements shall be provided to the City of Santa Rosa prior to issuance of a building permit for the proposed.

**VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS**

VI(a)(iii)Mitigation Measure. Structures and foundations should be designed to account for some post-earthquake differential settlement as identified in the soils reports and required by the California Building Code based on the seismic zone and soil types of the project site.

VI(b) Mitigation Measure. The project Civil Engineer should design the site drainage to collect surface water into storm drain systems and discharge water at appropriate locations. Re-establishing vegetation on disturbed areas will minimize erosion. Erosion control measures during and after construction shall conform to the most recent version of the Erosion and Sediment Control Documents shall be submitted to the City of Santa Rosa Community Development Department identifying compliance with the required mitigation.

Structure design shall meet all building code and soils engineer requirements and recommendations. Drainage plans shall meet City of Santa Rosa and State of California requirements for drainage. Building permit and/or subdivision improvement plans shall state “All disturbed areas to be re-vegetated as required by NCRWQCB. City of Santa Rosa Community Development Department & NCRWQCB.
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
Smith Village/Pantoja Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX. HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER QUALITY</td>
<td>Project applicant shall provide documentation of offsite mitigation approval from NCRWQCB.</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa Community Development Department and NCRWQCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX(a,e,f). Mitigation Measure. Given the unique circumstances of the proposed project, with a majority of the street and sidewalk infrastructure having been constructed, the NCRWQCB has indicated support for offsite storm-water mitigation features to mitigate storm water impacts created as a result of the proposed project. Offsite bioretention and/or filtration is anticipated to be the primary BMP utilized by the project to provide both volume capture and stormwater treatment that enhances downstream water quality by using soil and plant based filtration and infiltration. Although unique, this approach is consistent with the NCRWQCB allowances identified in the City of Santa Rosa NPDES permit administered by the Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING</td>
<td>See Section IV. For mitigation requirements.</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. NOISE</td>
<td>XII(a). Construct an 8-foot noise barrier (sound wall) along the northern boundary</td>
<td>Sound wall shall be constructed prior to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Procedure</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the project site (adjacent to Lots 24 through 26, 58 and 59, those nearest to SR 12), as described in the Environmental Noise Assessment, prepared by Jordan Roberts, Illingworth &amp; Rodkin, Inc., dated August 19, 2014, to reduce sound levels to conditionally acceptable levels in the rear yards of the proposed residences on Lots 24 through 26, 58 and 59. Evidence of this STC rating shall be indicated on all plans submitted for building permit review.</td>
<td>occupancy of any residential units relying on the sound wall to mitigate noise impacts.</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Building permit plans for individual homes shall identify specific window STC ratings for each residential unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII(a). Provide double-paned thermal insulating windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 38 on all second floor facades of homes on Lots 24 through 26, 58 and 59 (those nearest to SR 12) and double-paned thermal insulating windows with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 30 on the facades of the row houses facing Sebastopol Road. Evidence of this STC rating shall be indicated on all plans submitted for building permit review.</td>
<td>Building permit plans for individual homes shall identify specific window STC ratings for each residential unit.</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII(a). Additionally, mechanical ventilation shall be provided for all residences of the proposed Smith Village and Pantoja Lane residential subdivisions, as described in the Environmental Noise Assessment, prepared by Jordan Roberts, Illingworth &amp; Rodkin, Inc., dated August 19, 2014.</td>
<td>Evidence of mechanical ventilation for each residential unit shall be indicated on all plans submitted for building permits.</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Implementation Procedure</td>
<td>Monitoring Responsibility</td>
<td>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safe routes to schools, including to Cook Middle School, east of the project site across Sebastopol Road. The final design and location of this feature shall be determined in consultation with the City of Santa Rosa Traffic Division of the Department of Public Works Department.</td>
<td>submitted to the City of Santa Rosa Engineering Development Services Division (EDS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

**Mail to:** State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044  
**For Hand Delivery/Street Address:** 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

**Project Title:** Smith Village/Pantoja Lane  
**Lead Agency:** City of Santa Rosa  
**Mailing Address:** 100 Santa Rosa Ave, Room 3  
**City:** Santa Rosa, CA  
**Zip:** 95404  
**Contact Person:** Noah Housh  
**Phone:** 707-543-4322  
**County:** Sonoma

**Project Location:**  
**County:** Sonoma  
**City/Nearest Community:** Santa Rosa  
**Cross Streets:** Sebastopol Road and Fresno Ave  
**Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds):** 38° 25' 32.0680" N / -122° 45' 30.8208" W  
**Total Acres:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor's Parcel No.</th>
<th>Multiple-035-850-001</th>
<th>Section: n/a</th>
<th>Twp.: n/a</th>
<th>Range: n/a</th>
<th>Base: Land Grid</th>
<th>Zip Code: 95407</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Within 2 Miles:**  
**State Hwy #:** Highway 12  
**Waterways:** Riccas Creek, Irwin Creek, Roseland Creek, Gravensteeg  
**Railways:** n/a  
**Schools:** Cook Middle and Wright

**Document Type:**  
- CEQA: ☑ NOP  
- CEQA: ☑ Early Cons  
- CEQA: ☑ Neg Dec  
- CEQA: ☑ Mit Neg Dec  
- NEPA: ☑ NOI  
- Other: ☐ Joint Document  
- Other: ☐ Final Document

**Local Action Type:**  
- General Plan Update  
- General Plan Amendment  
- General Plan Element  
- Community Plan  
- Specific Plan  
- Master Plan  
- Planned Unit Development  
- Site Plan  
- Rezone  
- Prezone  
- Use Permit  
- Land Division (Subdivision, etc.)  
- Annexation  
- Redevelopment  
- Coastal Permit  
- Other: Design Review

**Development Type:**  
- Residential:  
  - Units: 67  
  - Acres: 9  
- Office:  
  - Sq.ft.: Acres:  
  - Employees:  
- Commercial:  
  - Sq.ft.: Acres:  
  - Employees:  
- Industrial:  
  - Sq.ft.: Acres:  
  - Employees:  
- Educational:  
- Recreational:  
- Water Facilities: Type: MGD

**Project Issues Discussed in Document:**  
- Aesthetic/Visual  
- Agricultural Land  
- Air Quality  
- Archeological/Historical  
- Biological Resources  
- Coastal Zone  
- Drainage/Absorption  
- Economic/Jobs  
- Fiscal  
- Flood Plain/Flooding  
- Forest Land/Fire Hazard  
- Geologic/Seismic  
- Minerals  
- Noise  
- Population/Housing Balance  
- Public Services/Facilities  
- Recreation/Parks  
- Schools/Universities  
- Septic Systems  
- Sewer Capacity  
- Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading  
- Solid Waste  
- Toxic/Hazardous  
- Traffic/Circulation  
- Vegetation  
- Water Quality  
- Water Supply/Groundwater  
- Wetland/Riparian  
- Growth Inducement  
- Land Use  
- Cumulative Effects  
- Other:  

**Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:**

Subdivided but undeveloped/Planned Development/Low Density Residential

**Project Description:** (please use a separate page if necessary)

See Attached

---

*Note: The State Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.*

Revised 2010
### Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with an "X". If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "S".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Other Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Air Resources Board</td>
<td>Office of Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Boating &amp; Waterways, Department of California Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>Office of Public School Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation, Department of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Caltrans District #4</td>
<td>Pesticide Regulation, Department of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Division of Aeronautics</td>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Planning</td>
<td>Regional WQCB # NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Flood Protection Board</td>
<td>Resources Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy</td>
<td>Resources Recycling and Recovery, Department of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Commission</td>
<td>S.F. Bay Conservation &amp; Development Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado River Board</td>
<td>San Gabriel &amp; Lower L.A. Rivers &amp; Mtns. Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation, Department of</td>
<td>San Joaquin River Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections, Department of</td>
<td>Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Protection Commission</td>
<td>State Lands Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Department of</td>
<td>SWRCB: Clean Water Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Commission</td>
<td>SWRCB: Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region #6</td>
<td>SWRCB: Water Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Agriculture, Department of</td>
<td>Tahoe Regional Planning Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of</td>
<td>Toxic Substances Control, Department of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services, Department of</td>
<td>Water Resources, Department of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services, Department of</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)**

Starting Date: September 30, 2014  
Ending Date: October 30, 2014

---

**Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):**

Consulting Firm:  
Address:  
City/State/Zip:  
Contact:  
Phone:  
Applicant:  
Address:  
City/State/Zip:  
Phone:  

***Signature of Lead Agency Representative:***  

---