DeTurk Winery Village
8 West Ninth Street, 700 to 820 Donahue Street, Santa Rosa, CA (Sonoma County)
Assessor’s Parcel Nos. 010-091-001 and 010-091-007

Draft Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration

Lead Agency:
City of Santa Rosa
Community Development Department
100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Rm. 3 (P.O. Box 1678)
Santa Rosa, CA 95402-1678

Contact: Clare Hartman, City Planner

Date: January 19, 2007
DATE: February 5th, 2007

TO: Public Agencies, Organizations and Interested Parties

FROM: Clare Hartman, City Planner

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: DeTurk Winery Village

Location: 8 West Ninth Street, 700 to 820 Donahue Street, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California, APN: 010-091-001 and 010-091-007.

Property Description:
The property consists of 3 acres bounded by Donahue Street to the west, 9th Street to the north, the Northwestern Pacific Railroad tracks on the east, and 8th Street on the south. Current improvements include the DeTurk Winery buildings and a cinder-block warehouse.

Project Description:
The existing cinder-block warehouse will be demolished as well as the existing parking lot at the southern end of the site. The roof and internal portions of the DeTurk Winery buildings, the brick winery and U.S. Bonded Warehouse, will be demolished to accommodate the housing units, while the exterior walls will be restored and preserved. Single-family zero lot line residences will be built within the shell of the historic buildings. New construction consists of 80 units of attached housing, including 10 units that will be affordable to those with low or very low income.

Environmental Issues:
The proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts in Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation, and Utilities and Service Systems. 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 30-day public review period shall commence on Tuesday, February 6th, 2007. 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 95402 by Wednesday, March 7th, 2007. The City of Santa Rosa Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and project merits on Thursday, March 8th, 2007 in the Santa Rosa City Council Chambers at City Hall (100 Santa Rosa Avenue). The City Council will consider adoption of the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration at a future regularly schedule meeting. Correspondence and comments can be delivered to Clare Hartman, Project Planner, by phone: (707) 543-3185, or email: chartman@srcity.org.
Addendum to the Draft Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration
January 29, 2007

After the Draft Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (Initial Study) was completed and printed on January 19, 2007 the total number of units was reduced from 80 to 73, with a corresponding change in the number of 1- and 2-bedroom units and required parking. The unit reduction occurs in Building D. The following table summarizes the changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Units - Building D</th>
<th>Revised Units - Building D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Required Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-bedroom (affordable)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-bedroom</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-bedroom</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34 units</strong></td>
<td><strong>58 spaces</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other than the reconfiguration of the interior of Building D, the reduction in the number of units does not result in any change to the proposed site plan as shown in Figure 3 of the Initial Study. As indicated in the table above the parking requirements remain the same. Therefore, the reduction in units would not increase or change any of the impacts and mitigation discussed in the Initial Study. The Mitigation and Monitoring Plan as presented in the Initial Study dated January 19, 2007 is still applicable.
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

**DeTurk Winery Village Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
<th>Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. AIR QUALITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure AIR-1: Basic Dust Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures for Construction Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The applicant shall implement the following dust control measures, as needed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all truck to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate into construction documents.</td>
<td>Building Division</td>
<td>Verify incorporation into construction documents prior to issuance of the building permit.</td>
<td>Deny issuance of building permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Mitigation Measure AIR-2: Equipment Exhaust Control | | | | | |
| Measures for Construction Activities | | | | | |
| The applicant shall control equipment emissions when heavy construction equipment is operating, including at construction staging areas. These measures shall include: | | | | | |
| • Reduce unnecessary idling of construction equipment (i.e., limit idling time to 10 minutes or less) in proximity to sensitive receptors. | | | | | |
| • Where possible, use newer, cleaner-burning diesel-powered construction equipment. | | | | | |
| • Properly maintain construction equipment per manufacturer specifications. | | | | | |
| • Designate a Disturbance Coordinator | | | | | |
| | Incorporate into construction documents. | Building Division | Verify incorporation into construction documents prior to issuance of the building permit. | Deny issuance of building permit. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
<th>Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>Review of Final Plans by qualified Architectural Historian</td>
<td>Planning Division</td>
<td>Receive written confirmation that the Plans meet Secretary of Interior’s Standards from Architectural Historian prior to issuance of building permit.</td>
<td>Deny issuance of building permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Preserve Historic Qualities of DeTurk Winery and U.S. Bonded Warehouse Buildings

The applicant shall comply with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties regarding all changes to be made. The applicant shall incorporate the following improvements, which are based on the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, into the design plans:

- The segmental arched windows along the west elevation and the string of round windows along the south elevation of the DeTurk Winery shall remain visible from the street.
- The segmental arched windows added along the western elevation of the southern section of the DeTurk Winery shall be retained, even though historical photographs indicate they were originally circular windows.
- The new buildings shall be harmonious with the old in scale, proportion, materials and color. The new buildings shall be readily distinguishable from the older buildings to protect the visual qualities that made the older buildings eligible for listing as a historic resource.
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
DeTurk Winery Village Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
<th>Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The new buildings shall be constructed in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the existing DeTurk Winery or U.S. Bonded Warehouse buildings that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings shall not be undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The blue stucco along the south elevation of the DeTurk Winery building shall be removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where applicable, the bricks covering the arched windows and doors of the DeTurk Winery and U.S. Bonded buildings shall be removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A qualified Architectural Historian, as approved by the City, shall review the final set of plans to ensure that these provisions have been incorporated into the final plans. If the Architectural Historian finds that the improvements have not been included in the plans, the applicant shall revise the plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Inspection and Repair of Masonry Walls</td>
<td>On-site inspection.</td>
<td>Building Division</td>
<td>Receive written recommendations prior to issuance of building permit.</td>
<td>Deny issuance of building permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The applicant shall have a licensed contractor inspect the masonry walls for deterioration. If such deterioration is found, the contractor shall prepare written recommendations for repair of the walls, which shall be incorporated into the building plans. If it is determined that replacement of a portion or a complete wall is necessary, the applicant shall notify the Building Division and present the recommendations for approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity</td>
<td>Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Perform Photographic Documentation</td>
<td>Plan for Photo Documentation</td>
<td>Planning Division</td>
<td>Receive and approve photo documentation plan Prior to issuance of a demolition permit.</td>
<td>Deny issuance of demolition permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photo Documentation</td>
<td>Planning Division</td>
<td>Receive photo documentation prior to issuance of demolition permit.</td>
<td>Deny issuance of demolition permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Kiosk</td>
<td>Planning Division</td>
<td>Verify incorporation of kiosk into construction plans</td>
<td>Deny issuance of building permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Construction Monitoring</td>
<td>On-site observation.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>Stop work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

necessary for structure safety, the wall shall be repaired in kind.

Prior to any work being performed on the DeTurk Winery or U.S. Bonded Warehouse the applicant shall hire a qualified Architectural Historian, as approved by the City, to perform a photo documentation of the buildings. The level and quality of the photo documentation shall be identified in a plan and submitted to the City for review and approval prior to conducting the documentation. Selections from the photo documentation shall be used to create a public historical display within the DeTurk Winery Village, such as a kiosk or other means as determined appropriate by the City.

The applicant shall retain a qualified professional archeologist, approved by the City, to be present during ground-disturbing activities to inspect exposed ground surfaces, identify State Historic Resources Commission-eligible resources, and provide written recommendations for their disposition. The applicant shall halt all ground-disturbing work in any area where concentrations of archaeological materials are encountered during construction. Work near the archaeological finds shall not resume until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the materials and offered recommendations for further action. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
<th>Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The contractor shall ensure a project manager is on-site at all times who shall stop all work in the immediate vicinity if human remains or evidence of remains are encountered during excavation, notify the City to issue a stop work order, and notify the County Coroner immediately. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of the identification. All work shall be halted until thorough evaluation of the discovery is made and determination from a qualified professional is provided to the City documenting the significance of the find and identifying the appropriate measures for their proper treatment and removal in compliance with CEQA guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3).

**VI. GEOLOGY**

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Seismic Calculations and Re-compaction of Soil Slated to Load Bearing.**

The structural design shall include seismic calculations to determine the correct construction practices to insure that the proposed buildings are able to withstand expected seismic forces. Pre-existing artificial fill materials shall be excavated and re-compacted prior to placing structures upon them. Additionally, upper soils deemed compressible in the geotechnical report (Giblin 2006) shall be removed and re-compacted or replaced.

Prepare seismic calculations and excavate artificial fill.  
Building Division  
Verify construction documents incorporate recommendations.  
Deny issuance of building permit.
### VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

#### Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Asbestos and Lead Testing and Removal.

The applicant shall retain a qualified and/or certified environmental specialist to inspect the building. The specialist shall identify whether any lead- or asbestos-containing materials – or other hazardous materials – are present. If found at levels that require special handling, these materials shall be managed as required by law and according to federal, state, and local regulations and guidelines concerning asbestos- or lead-containing materials removal. A written report of the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the City.

- **Implementation Procedure**: Inspection and report by certified environmental specialist.
- **Monitoring Responsibility**: Fire Department
- **Monitoring / Reporting Action & Schedule**: Submit report prior to demolition.
- **Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity**: Deny issuance of demolition permit.

#### Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: Compliance with federal and state regulations.

The applicant shall comply with all Federal and State laws and regulations regarding the use of hazardous materials during project construction and operation.

- **Implementation Procedure**: Incorporate into construction documents.
- **Monitoring Responsibility**: Building Division
- **Monitoring / Reporting Action & Schedule**: Verify inclusion in construction documents prior to issuance of a building permit.
- **Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity**: Deny issuance of building permit.

#### Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: Soil and Groundwater Management Plan (SGMP)

Prior to the issuance of a building permit the application shall obtain a remediation permit from Santa Rosa Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division for the clean up of contamination encountered on the project site. The applicant shall also prepare a SGMP to address areas of impact encountered during development that were previously unknown. The Plan shall include appropriate handling, treatment and disposal of contaminated

- **Implementation Procedure**: Prepare and submit SGMP for review.
- **Monitoring Responsibility**: Fire Department and Regional Water Quality Control Board
- **Monitoring / Reporting Action & Schedule**: Approve plan prior to issuance of a building permit.
- **Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity**: Deny issuance of building permit.
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
#### DeTurk Winery Village Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
<th>Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>groundwater and soil encountered during development in accordance with Santa Rosa Fire Department and the Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements. A qualified site supervisor who has been trained to recognize and respond to the presence of impacted groundwater and soil shall be present during dewatering and excavation activities. The Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the appropriate City of Santa Rosa Fire Department staff or Regional Water Quality Control Board staff prior to the start of construction. The applicant shall implement the recommendations in the SGMP. The applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed development will not interfere with the cleanup project and the development will be compatible with future groundwater remediation.</td>
<td>Incorporate into construction documents.</td>
<td>Building Division Verify inclusion in construction documents prior to issuance of a building permit.</td>
<td>Deny issuance of building permit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure HAZ-4: Traffic Control Procedures The applicant shall adopt standard traffic control procedures to minimize traffic congestion and traffic hazards. Construction flagging and signage, use of plates, and other safety measures shall be in conformance with Caltrans 2003 Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Other measures shall include:  • If temporary lane or street closures are required, the applicant shall contact emergency response providers (hospitals, police, fire, and ambulance) to determine if the streets impacted are considered primary routes.  • Where construction necessitates lane or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
DeTurk Winery Village Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
<th>Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| street closures along emergency response routes, the applicant shall recommend and obtain approval of alternate routes or other means from the affected service providers, at a minimum of one week prior to construction. | • During construction, the applicant shall notify the service providers on a weekly basis of the timing, location, and duration of construction.  
• The applicant shall maintain pedestrian and vehicular access to public facilities, businesses, and residences along the street during commute hours and shall minimize the closure of pedestrian and vehicular access at other times. Peak commute hours are between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM. | | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
<th>Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure HYD-1: Prepare Stormwater Prevention Pollution Plan</td>
<td>Prepare and submit SWPPP</td>
<td>Building Division</td>
<td>Approve plan and verify incorporation into construction documents prior to issuance of building permit.</td>
<td>Deny issuance of building permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. NOISE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Railroad Noise Reduction</td>
<td>Incorporate provisions into construction documents.</td>
<td>Building Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation Monitoring Program
### Mitigation Monitoring Program

#### DeTurk Winery Village Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
<th>Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The applicant shall:</td>
<td>documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td>issuance of a building permit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct an analysis of the necessary noise reduction measures to achieve the 55 dBA Lmax limit during the development of construction documents for the proposed project and implement the recommendations. Existing sound walls, setbacks, and building shielding should be taken into consideration during the building design phase. For example, high performance sound rated windows/doors may be necessary at unshielded residential units and could provide the needed sound attenuation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submit a report, found to be acceptable by the local building official, prior to issuance of a building permit delineating the noise control treatments that have been incorporated into the design of the project to achieve the 55 dBA Lmax/45 dBA Ldn interior noise limits for this project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure NOI-3: Construction Noise Impact Mitigation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Incorporate provisions into construction documents.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Building Division Verify inclusion in construction documents prior to issuance of a building permit.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deny issuance of building permit.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The applicant shall:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limit construction to the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM on weekdays, and 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM on Saturdays, with no noise-generating construction on Sundays or holidays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

#### DeTurk Winery Village Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
<th>Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Designate a noise disturbance coordinator who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### XV. TRANSPORTATION

**Mitigation Measure TR-1: New Traffic Signals:** The applicant shall conduct new traffic counts along Wilson Street to confirm existing LOS for each intersection. The traffic counts shall be conducted in September 2007 or at a time when the 9th Street and Railroad Square portions of the US Highway 101 widening project will be complete. If the PM hour counts are still determined to meet traffic signal warrants, the following mitigation can be implemented:

- Wilson Street/Ninth Street - install signal.
- Wilson Street/Fourth Street – install signal.

The implemented, the applicant shall be prepared and submit new traffic counts. Public Works Department will review new traffic counts and make a determination on need for signal. Deny issuance of occupancy permit.
**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

DeTurk Winery Village Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Procedure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring / Reporting Action &amp; Schedule</th>
<th>Non-Compliance Sanction/Activity</th>
<th>Monitoring Compliance Record (Name/Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>required to contribute the project’s fair share to the cost of signal installation as determined by the City. If at a later time signals are not considered desirable by the City Traffic Engineer, alternative mitigation measures as outlined in the City of Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan are recommended instead, which have the potential to reduce project trips and general traffic in the study area.</td>
<td>Include in construction documents.</td>
<td>Building Division</td>
<td>Verify inclusion in construction documents prior to issuance of a building permit.</td>
<td>Deny issuance of building permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Mitigation Measure USS-1: Construction Phase Recycling Plan

The applicant shall prepare and implement a construction phase recycling plan. The recycling plan shall address the major waste materials generated by the construction of the project and identify a means to divert these materials away from the Redwood Landfill. Materials that shall be included in such a plan consist of but are not limited to, soil, vegetated growth, concrete, lumber, metal scraps, cardboard packaging, and plastic wrap. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by North Bay Recycling or the County Integrated Waste Management Authority prior to issuance of demolition permits.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Project Title
   DeTurk Winery Village

2. Lead Agency Name & Address
   City of Santa Rosa
   Community Development Department
   Planning Division
   100 Santa Rosa Avenue (P.O. Box 1678)
   Santa Rosa, California 95402-1678

3. Contact Person & Phone Number
   Clare Hartman, City Planner
   Phone number:  (707) 543-3185
   Email:  chartman@srcity.org.

4. Project Location
   The site is located in the City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California at 8 West Ninth Street, 700 to 820 Donahue Street
   Assessor’s Parcel Nos: 010-091-001 and 007
   Refer to Figure 1 Location Map

5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address
   Railroad Square Village, LLC
   Richard Deringer
   P.O. Box 706
   Tiburon, CA  94920

6. General Plan Designation
   Medium Density Residential

7. Zoning
   Industrial – Historic Combining

8. Description of Project
   See below

Setting and Background
The project site is located in Santa Rosa and consists of the entire block of Donahue Street between West Ninth and West Eighth (see Figure 1 Project Location). The property is approximately 3 acres in size and is currently occupied by a cinder-block warehouse and the DeTurk Winery complex (see Figure 2 Existing Conditions). The buildings include, from north to south, the warehouse built in 1947, the brick winery built in 1879, and the U.S. Bonded Warehouse built between 1888 and 1893. The U.S. Bonded Warehouse is considered part of the DeTurk Winery complex but the cinder-block warehouse is not as it does not date from the same period. The complex has been deemed eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. The site is bounded by West Ninth Street to the north, the Northwestern Pacific Railroad to the east, West Eighth Street to the south, and Donahue Street to the west. Surrounding land uses includes a neighborhood park and single family residential to the west, and industrial and commercial to the north, south and east. The park is home to the DeTurk Round Barn which was placed on the National Register in 2004.

Project Description
The existing cinder-block warehouse will be demolished as well as the existing parking lot at the southern end of the site. The roof and internal portions of the DeTurk Winery buildings, the brick winery and U.S. Bonded Warehouse, will be demolished to accommodate the housing units, while the exterior walls will be restored and preserved. In essence, town homes will be built within the shell of the historic buildings. New construction consists of 80 units of attached housing to be built in four buildings (see Figure 3 Site Plan). The existing zoning would normally allow for 56 units; however a density bonus may be granted by the Planning Division in exchange for the provision of 10 low and very low income units. Therefore, 70 units will be market rate and the
remaining 10 will be affordable to those with low or very low income. The following is a breakdown of the proposed units by building, as labeled on Figure 3 Site Plan:

“Building A”: Nine 2-bedroom single-family zero lot line residences with 2-car garages located at the southeast corner of the property.

“Building B”: Ten 1-bedroom single-family zero lot line residences. These residences will be located within the U.S. Bonded Warehouse building located in the southeast corner.

“Building C”: Twenty-seven 3-bedroom single-family zero lot line residences. These residences will be within the brick winery located centrally on the site.

“Building D”: Twelve 3-bedroom single-family zero lot line residences located on the northwest corner of the project site and twenty-two 1-bedroom condominiums, of which ten will be affordable units, located on the northeast corner of the site.

Buildings A and D will be approximately 45 feet tall and Buildings B and C will be approximately 35 feet tall.

Building A provides 2-car garages for each unit, for a total of 18 spaces. Building B has one covered-parking space per unit plus 5 visitor parking spaces, located adjacent to the building. Seventy-nine on-site spaces are provided for Buildings D and C. An additional 53 on-street parking spaces will be provided along Donahue and West 8th Streets. Overall parking totals 165 spaces.

Construction is expected to begin in Spring of 2007 and will last approximately 24 months until Spring of 2009. Construction will be phased starting with Buildings A and B, then Building C, and finally Building D. Construction staging will occur on-site and along surrounding streets.

Public and Offsite Improvements
As part of the project 48 angled parking spaces will be added to the east side of Donahue Street and 5 parallel spaces will be added to the north side of West 8th Street. The existing 6- and 8-inch water mains beneath Donahue Street and the existing 6-inch water main beneath West 8th Street between Donahue Street and the railroad track will be abandoned. A new 12-inch water main will connect to an existing 6-inch main at West 9th Street, continue down Donahue to West 8th Street, then continue east on West 8th until just before reaching the railroad tracks where it will connect to an existing 6-inch main.

Entitlements and Permits Required from the City of Santa Rosa
The project requires the following City approvals and permits:

- Rezoning
- Variance
- Tentative Map (Airspace Condominium)
- Design Review
- Grading and demolition permits
- Building permit
- Tree removal permit
- Encroachment permit
- Storm Water Mitigation Plan
- Remediation Permit

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required
Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department
If the presence of water wells on the site is discovered the wells would need to be properly decommissioned under permit prior to construction.
North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
The North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) will review the Soil and Groundwater Remediation Plan and Dewatering Plan called for in this Initial Study. Depending on the discharge location identified in the dewatering plan a Waste Discharge Permit may be required by the Regional Board.

State Water Resources Control Board
If the project will disturb more than 1 acre of soil a Stormwater Prevention Pollution Plan would need to be prepared and a Notice of Intent submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board.

Cumulative Projects Scenario
Impacts of the Project have been considered in the context of past, present and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts. CEQA Guidelines section 15130(b) provides that evaluation of cumulative impacts rely upon either a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan, or a list of past, present, and probable future projects. The evaluation of cumulative impacts in this Initial Study relies principally upon the impact projections in the City of Santa Rosa General Plan EIR certified in 2002, but is supplemented by impact projections due to the cumulative projects identified below.

The following is a list of the future or proposed projects within the project area for which an application for development has been received by the Community Development Department or which are considered reasonably foreseeable projects.

Jennings Avenue Phase II (889 Jennings Avenue) This project is on a 0.4-acre site located west of State Highway 101 between Cleveland Avenue and Range Avenue. The project would develop 6 single-family attached units. This project would require rezoning.

Jennings Ave Family Housing (1090 Jennings Avenue) This project is on a 2.96-acre site located northwest of North Dutton Avenue. The project would develop 70 multi-family units. This project is consistent with the General Plan.

Jennings Ave Duplexes (1213 & 1215 Jennings Avenue) This project is on a 1.36-acre site located west of North Dutton Avenue. The project would develop 6 multi-family units. This project is consistent with the General Plan.

College Village (810 College Avenue) This project is on a 1.1-acre site located west of North Dutton Avenue. The project would develop 8 units of single-family dwellings and 4 units of SCND. This project would require rezoning.

Jennings Avenue Subdivision (910 Jennings Avenue) This project is on a 0.97-acre site located west of State Highway 101 between Cleveland Avenue and Range Avenue. The project would develop 14 single-family attached units. This project would require rezoning and a conditional use permit.

Keaney Subdivision (824 Dutton Avenue) This project is on a 0.77-acre site located on the southwest corner of North Dutton Avenue and West Ninth Street. The project would develop 6 single-family detached units. This project would require rezoning and a conditional use permit.

Terracina at Santa Rosa (471 West College Avenue) This project is on a 3.2-acre site located west of North Dutton Avenue. The project would develop 98 multi-family units. This project would require rezoning.

The Crossing at Santa Rosa (1627 & 1709 Cleveland Avenue) This project is on a 2.19-acre site located west of State Highway 101 and south of Jennings Avenue. The project would develop 49 multi-family units. This project would require rezoning.
The Cannery (3 West Third Street) This project is on a 1.32-acre site located on 3rd Street west of Railroad Square. The building would be 5 stories and include 80 residential air space condominiums, 16 of which are proposed to be live/work units. This project is consistent with the General Plan.

In addition, the Northwestern Pacific Railroad corridor has been proposed as a rail transit corridor by the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART). SMART proposes to operate trains consisting of diesel-powered, self-propelled vehicles called Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) vehicles. SMART proposes 12 passenger train movements per day. According to the SMART Final EIR, approximately 3 to 6 freight trains in each direction per week are expected to operate north of the Ignacio Wye independent of approval of the SMART project.
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture Resources ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology /Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology / Water Quality ☐ Land Use / Planning
☐ Mineral Resources ☐ Noise ☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation ☐ Transportation / Traffic
☐ Utilities / Service Systems ☐ Mandatory Finding 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.

_____________________________________ __________________________
Clare Hartman Date
City Planner
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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion

I.a thru c) Less than Significant. The project is not located within a designated scenic vista (Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan, 2002). The project is not located within a state scenic highway. The project site is located less than a quarter of a mile from U.S. Highway 101 which has been designated a scenic road by the City of Santa Rosa (Santa Rosa General Plan, 2002) and a scenic corridor by Sonoma County (Sonoma County General Plan, 1994). The County General Plan prohibits buildings within 200 feet of a scenic corridor. This project is 730 feet from Highway 101 and therefore consistent with the County General Plan restrictions. In addition, the project site is obscured by trees and urban development and cannot be seen from travelers along Highway 101 until the vehicles are parallel with the project site and then the view lasts for a few seconds.

The existing buildings at the project site are currently used as warehouses and show signs of neglect. The warehouse on the north end of the property is an ordinary cinder-block building with little visual appeal. The parking and dock area to the south is surrounded by chain-link fencing. From the outside, the historic nature of the DeTurk winery buildings will appear approximately the same or better as the existing condition. The original windows in the two buildings of the DeTurk Winery complex have been bricked over. Much of the site, with the exception of the southwest corner, lacks any public improvements such as landscaping, sidewalks, or gutters. The frontage street shows signs of where and tear and lacks any parking improvements. The Project will replace the cinder-block warehouse with a new three-story building featuring old-style architectural elements that blend with the existing neighborhood. Much of the new buildings will continue the brick theme from the DeTurk Winery complex buildings. Improvements will be made to the exterior of the DeTurk Winery complex buildings including reopening the windows and doors that have been bricked in and removal of the blue stucco from the southern elevation. Sidewalks, trees, and street furniture will be added along all three street frontages. Street improvements will be made to Donahue. All of these factors taken together will improve the visual character and quality of the site. See the following Figures A1 to A4 to view the computer-generated visual simulations of the Project site.
VIEW FROM DE TURK ROUND
BARN PARK LOOKING EAST

FIGURE A1
VIEW FROM CORNER OF WEST
8TH STREET & DONAHUE
LOOKING NORTHEAST

FIGURE A3
VIEW FROM WEST 8TH STREET
AT THE RAILROAD TRACKS
LOOKING NORTHWEST

FIGURE A4
I.d) **Less than Significant.** Construction of the Project would introduce new sources of light and glare into the project area. The Project includes several new street lamps and entry-way lighting to accommodate normal residential uses. While these activities would introduce a new light source to the area, compliance with the City’s Design Guidelines regarding lighting will minimize the obtrusiveness of new lighting to the project area. Therefore this impact is considered less than significant.

**References:**


County of Sonoma. 1994. Sonoma County General Plan

II. AGRICULTURE

Would the project: (In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.)

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. 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 through c) No Impact. The project is within the urban confines of Santa Rosa and is located on an existing developed parcel. The project is not located on any Prime or Unique farmlands, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as mapped by the California Resources Agency. The project also is not located on any agriculturally-zoned properties or properties under a Williamson Act contract. The project will not affect any active agricultural activities or convert farmland to a non-agricultural use.
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 which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? □ □ ☒ □

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? □ ☒ □ □

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

Discussion:

IIIa, b, c) Less than Significant. The proposed project is consistent with the growth projections presented in the City of Santa Rosa General Plan. Trip length and trip generation from site redevelopment are consistent with air quality planning objectives presented in the most recent Clean Air Plan prepared by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Regional attainment of clean air standards is predicted to occur if the basin-wide rate of growth and its location are consistent with regional growth projections. The proposed project would, therefore, not interfere with the applicable air quality plan, making this potential impact less than significant.

The Bay Area, including Sonoma County, is currently in marginal non-attainment for the federal 8-hour ozone (O3) standard and non-attainment for the State 1-hour O3 standard (classified by the U.S. EPA). The Bay Area also is designated a non-attainment area for particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) under the California Clean Air Act (BAAQMD 2006). Particulate matter includes dust, dirt, soot, smoke, and liquid droplets directly emitted into the air by sources such as factories, power plants, cars, construction activity, fires, and natural windblown dust.

A project would be considered a substantial contributor to an existing air quality violation if project-related emissions exceeded the identified emissions-based BAAQMD significance thresholds. The threshold for single family development is 320 units with an average of 9.4 daily trips per unit (approximately 3,008 daily trips). If a project were to approach (within 20%) or exceed this level, the impact is considered significant and warrants a detailed air quality analysis. (BAAQMD 1999) This Project is 80 units with projected average daily trips of 469. Therefore this impact is considered less than significant.

Potential construction impacts attributable to the project are discussed under Item IIIId below.

IIIId) Less than Significant with Mitigation. Construction-related emissions are generally short-term in duration, but may still cause adverse air quality impacts, particularly from fugitive dust (PM10 and PM2.5).
BAAQMD has developed mitigation measures which, if fully implemented, are presumed to achieve a less-than-significant air quality impact. The range of mitigation measures includes a set of “Basic Control Measures” and a set of “Enhanced Control Measures” if the project construction area exceeds 4.0 acres. This Project is 3.01 acres, therefore the Basic Control Measures are applicable. Implementation of a dust control program during construction is recommended to reduce potential dust nuisance impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure AIR-1: Basic Dust Control Measures for Construction Activities**

The applicant shall implement the following dust control measures, as needed:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all truck to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

Construction vehicle/equipment exhaust contains reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx) which are of concern because they add to the regional ozone (O3) problem. Construction activities would result in minor, temporary emissions of diesel and gasoline engine combustion. Therefore, the project would temporarily increase O3 and NOx concentrations and may temporarily expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations. The BAAQMD does not consider this increase and exposure to be significant given the duration of construction activities, so long as the following exhaust control measures are implemented.

**Mitigation Measure AIR-2: Equipment Exhaust Control**

The applicant shall control equipment emissions when heavy construction equipment is operating, including at construction staging areas. These measures shall include:

- Reduce unnecessary idling of construction equipment (i.e., limit idling time to 10 minutes or less) in proximity to sensitive receptors.
- Where possible, use newer, cleaner-burning diesel-powered construction equipment.
- Properly maintain construction equipment per manufacturer specifications.
- Designate a Disturbance Coordinator responsible for ensuring that mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts from construction are properly implemented.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-2 reduces this impact to less than significant by limiting the amount of dust and exhaust created during construction.

IIIe) **No Impact.** Residential uses typically do not generate odor emissions in any substantial quantity.

**References:**


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 Game 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 plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

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?

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?

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

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?

Discussion:
IV.a through f) No Impact. The project site is located in a highly developed area of Santa Rosa. The site is currently fully developed and includes several warehouse buildings and associated improvements such as paved parking. There is no habitat for rare or endangered species, riparian habitat, sensitive habitat, wetlands, or migratory corridor located on or near the project site. There are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources that apply to this site. Ten trees located near the southwest corner of the property will be removed as part of the project. None of these trees are considered heritage trees as defined by Section 17-24.020(L) of the Santa Rosa City Code. There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved conservation plan that applies to the project area.

References:
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?
   - □ Potentially Significant Impact
   - □ Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - □ Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation
   - □ No Impact

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
   - □ Potentially Significant Impact
   - □ Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - □ Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation
   - □ No Impact

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
   - □ Potentially Significant Impact
   - □ Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - □ Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation
   - □ No Impact

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
   - □ Potentially Significant Impact
   - □ Less-Than-Significant Impact
   - □ Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation
   - □ No Impact

Discussion

Less than Significant with Mitigation. **Historical Resources:** There are three buildings on the Project site: a cinder-block warehouse built in 1947, the DeTurk Winery built in 1879, and the U.S. Bonded Warehouse built in 1888 and 1893. The DeTurk Winery and the U.S. Bonded Warehouse form the DeTurk Winery complex which has been deemed eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. To the west of the Project site, across Donahue Street, is the DeTurk Round Barn which was placed on the National Register in 2004. In a 1989 cultural heritage survey for Santa Rosa, the complex was listed as contributing elements to the proposed National Register of Historic Places “North Railroad District.” The North Railroad District is described as a strip of commercial and industrial buildings along both sides of Wilson Street and the Northwestern Pacific Railroad tracks. The North Railroad District has not, to this date, been placed on the Nation Register of Historic Places. In 1996 the locally designated West End Preservation District was created by the Santa Rosa City Council. The district is bounded by Dutton Avenue to the west, the railroad tracks to the east, West 9th Street to the north and West 8th Street to the south. The DeTurk Winery complex was included as a contributing element within the West End Preservation District. (Clark Historic Resource Consultants 2006, and Anthropological Studies Center, 2006)

Section 15064.5(a)(1) of the California Environmental Quality Act establishes the California Register of Historical Resources Criteria for Evaluation as the standards to be used for historical and architectural evaluations of properties. The California Register Criteria for Evaluation is based on the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. If a property does not meet the California Register requirements for state significance, it will not meet the federal requirements for significance at the National Register level. According to the guidelines of the California Register Criteria for Evaluation, a building, structure, or object is considered to be a historically significant resource if it is at least 50 years old, has integrity, and meets one or more of the following criteria:

1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history; or
2) Is associated with the lives of individuals significant in local or regional history or cultural heritage; or
3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values; or
4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The DeTurk Winery complex is more than 50 years old, has been determined to have integrity, and is eligible for the California Register under Criterion 1, 2, and 3. The complex also has been determined to be a contributor to a
designated local preservation district. (Clark Historic Resource Consultants 2006)  The cinder-block warehouse is not considered part of the DeTurk Winery complex. It does not date from the same period and the architecture is not of the same character and design of the DeTurk Winery complex. Furthermore, although it is more than 50 years old, it does not have integrity nor does it meet any of the four criteria to be eligible on its own. (personal communication Clark September 2006)

Both buildings in the DeTurk Winery complex will be gutted to accommodate the residential units, with only the exterior walls remaining. It is these exterior walls that contribute to the visual character of the West End Preservation District. The distinctive visual character of the exterior of the buildings also make the complex eligible for the California Register of Historic Places. The interior of the buildings have been changed numerous times over the years and no longer have the contributing characteristics that would convey their historical significance. (personal communication Clark September 2006)

The following mitigation is designed to preserve visual character of this historic resource.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Preserve Historic Qualities of DeTurk Winery and U.S. Bonded Warehouse Buildings

The applicant shall comply with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties regarding all changes to be made. The applicant shall incorporate the following improvements, which are based on the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, into the design plans:

- The segmental arched windows along the west elevation and the string of round windows along the south elevation of the DeTurk Winery shall remain visible from the street.
- The segmental arched windows added along the western elevation of the southern section of the DeTurk Winery shall be retained, even though historical photographs indicate they were originally circular windows.
- The new buildings shall be harmonious with the old in scale, proportion, materials and color. At The new buildings shall be readily distinguishable from the older buildings to protect the visual qualities that made the older buildings eligible for listing as a historic resource.
- The new buildings shall be constructed in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
- Changes to the existing DeTurk Winery or U.S. Bonded Warehouse buildings that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings shall not be undertaken.
- The blue stucco along the south elevation of the DeTurk Winery building shall be removed.
- Where applicable, the bricks covering the arched windows and doors of the DeTurk Winery and U.S. Bonded buildings shall be removed.

A qualified Architectural Historian, as approved by the City, shall review the final set of plans to ensure that these provisions have been incorporated into the final plans. If the Architectural Historian finds that the improvements have not been included in the plans, the applicant shall revise the plans.

Clark Historic Resource Consultants reviewed the Site Improvement Plans dated August 14, 2006 and made a determination that the proposed buildings were compatible with the existing buildings and that the project, as currently proposed, complies with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Inspection and Repair of Masonry Walls

The applicant shall have a licensed contractor inspect the masonry walls for deterioration. If such deterioration is found, the contractor shall prepare written recommendations for repair of the walls, which
shall be incorporated into the building plans. If it is determined that replacement of a portion or a complete wall is necessary for structure safety, the wall shall be repaired in kind.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Perform Photographic Documentation**
Prior to any work being performed on the DeTurk Winery or U.S. Bonded Warehouse the applicant shall hire a qualified Architectural Historian, as approved by the City, to perform a photo documentation of the buildings. The level and quality of the photo documentation shall be identified in a plan and submitted to the City for review and approval prior to conducting the documentation. Selections from the photo documentation shall be used to create a public historical display within the DeTurk Winery Village, such as a kiosk or other means as determined appropriate by the City.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3 would preserve and document the DeTurk Winery complex to meet the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and thus reduce the impact to less than significant.

**Archeological Resources:** A cultural resources record search was conducted for the project (Anthropological Studies Center, 2006). Several archaeological sites have been recorded within the vicinity of the Project site. Within ¼ mile are two historic-period sites: one is a concentration of domestic debris and a concrete foundation, the other is a well shaft backfilled with domestic debris. Within ½ mile of the Project site is a historic-period site and a multi-component site that has both historic-era and prehistoric deposits. The historic-period site is a surface scatter of domestic debris. The multi-component site consists of flaked-stone tools and faunal remains, in addition to a house foundation dating to the early 1850’s. Consequently the Project area has a high sensitivity for prehistoric archeological sites and a moderate sensitivity for historic-era archeological resources.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Construction Monitoring**
The applicant shall retain a qualified professional archeologist, approved by the City, to be present during ground-disturbing activities to inspect exposed ground surfaces, identify State Historic Resources Commission-eligible resources, and provide written recommendations for their disposition. The applicant shall halt all ground-disturbing work in any area where concentrations of archaeological materials are encountered during construction. Work near the archaeological finds shall not resume until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the materials and offered recommendations for further action. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources.

Mitigation Measure CUL-4 would provide the means to find and recover archeological remains potentially present at the project site and identify the need for further mitigation. Therefore this impact is considered less than significant after mitigation.

Vd) **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** The possibility of encountering human remains cannot be discounted entirely, given the known presence of prehistoric sites in the vicinity of the project area. If human remains are encountered during construction, the impact would be significant and require mitigation to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-5: Encountering Human Remains**
The contractor shall ensure a project manager is on-site at all times who shall stop all work in the immediate vicinity if human remains or evidence of remains are encountered during excavation, notify the City to issue a stop work order, and notify the County Coroner immediately. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of the identification. All work shall be halted until thorough evaluation of the discovery is made and determination from a qualified professional is provided to the City documenting the significance of the find and identifying the appropriate measures for their proper treatment and removal in compliance with CEQA guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3).

Mitigation Measure CUL-5 provides guidance for the treatment of human remains, if found, and therefore this impact is considered less than significant after mitigation.
References:
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VI. GEOLGY AND SOILS

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

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, 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:

VI.a.i) No Impact. Based upon published maps, recognized active faults are not present within the project boundary, and the project site is not located within an Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (California Division of Mines and Geology 1983). Although fault rupture can occur in previously unfaulted areas, such an occurrence is rare. More typically, fault rupture occurs along pre-existing planes of weakness in the earth’s crust, most commonly associated with active fault zones. The nearest active fault is the Rodgers Creek Fault, located approximately 1.25 miles east-northeast of the project site (California Division of Mines and Geology 1983).

VI.a.ii – a.iii) Less than Significant with Mitigation. There is a high potential for the project site to experience ground shaking resulting from moderate to large earthquakes during the life of the project. Shaking will be amplified by the presence of unconsolidated sediments underlying the site. Consequently, the site is considered to have a potential to experience strong to violent ground shaking as a result of future earthquakes. Although ground shaking may result from earthquakes generated on a number of different faults in the region, the fault with the greatest potential to affect the site is the Rodgers Creek Fault.

Loose alluvial materials underlie the project area, which increases the potential for significant damage due to ground shaking and seismic related activities. If surface fault rupture occurs along the active trace of the Rodgers Creek Fault.
Creek Fault, buildings, roadways, and utilities will experience damage proportionate to the magnitude and nature of the event, with the potential for severe damage. Overall, it is likely that the City of Santa Rosa will experience at least one major earthquake (greater than a magnitude 7.0) within the next 30 years. The severity and intensity of such an event will depend on the fault, the distance to the epicenter, the magnitude, and the shaking duration.

Liquefaction is the phenomenon where loose, saturated, granular soils experience a complete loss of shear strength as a result of seismic shaking. Liquefaction can induce sand boils, densification, differential settlement, and lateral spread where slopes are present. Portions of the project site are underlain by poorly consolidated alluvium. Subsurface information obtained from the geotechnical investigation (Giblin 2006) indicates that although the site is located in an area that has been reported to be moderately susceptible to liquefaction, the soils encountered in the test borings indicated that susceptibility for liquefaction is low beneath the site.

Based on the types of soil at the project site, the potential to experience strong to violent ground shaking, and a moderate potential for liquefaction, this impact is considered significant.

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Seismic Calculations and Re-compaction of Soil Slated to Load Bearing.**
The structural design shall include seismic calculations to determine the correct construction practices to insure that the proposed buildings are able to withstand expected seismic forces. Pre-existing artificial fill materials shall be excavated and re-compacted prior to placing structures upon them. Additionally, upper soils deemed compressible in the geotechnical report (Giblin 2006) shall be removed and re-compacted or replaced.

Implementation of GEO-1 reduces this impact to less than significant.

VI.a.iv) **No Impact.** The project site is located on a relatively flat plain, surrounded by existing structures and paved ground surfaces. There is no potential for landslides in or around the immediate project site vicinity.

VI.b) **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** During the early stages of construction there is potential for soil erosion after demolition of the existing buildings and surrounding parking areas when the earth will be exposed. There is no potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil after construction as the site is relatively flat and will be 100% developed.

**Mitigation Measure HYD-2: Prepare Stormwater Prevention Pollution Plan**
Implementation of SWPPP best management practices will reduce the potential for off-site erosion. Therefore, Mitigation Measure HYD-2 reduces this impact to less than significant.

VI.c - d) **Less than Significant after Mitigation.** The project includes construction of at-grade buildings and parking areas. The building foundations are anticipated to be composed of slab-on-grade. The project site is underlain by areas of expansive clay, as determined by Giblin Associates. Such soil compositions are susceptible to expansion and differential settlement. Settlement could also occur in soils previously placed during poorly engineered construction fills. Differential settlement can damage building foundations and roads and may affect underground utilities. Compressible soils can damage foundations of structures due to lateral spreading or subsidence. The expansion and contraction of soils depending on the season and the amount of surface water infiltration can exert enough pressure on structures to result in cracking, settlement, and uplift. The project site is underlain by areas of expansive clay, at depths ranging from approximately 3.5 feet to below 14 feet. Although the expansion index was not measured in the geotechnical soil samples collected beneath the site, high plasticity clays were encountered, and site soils were reported to have an expansion potential varying from low to high (Giblin 2006).

The geotechnical information (Giblin 2006) indicates that the groundwater levels at the site were observed at depths between approximately 4 and 12.5 feet below the ground surface. Groundwater levels in the site vicinity are expected to vary considerably dependent on the season and amount of precipitation received.
Expansive soils can undergo strength and volume changes with seasonal variation in moisture content and can heave and distress lightly loaded footings and slabs. Expansive soils can damage foundations of above-ground structures, paved roadways, and concrete slabs. Expansive clay was encountered in nine of the 14 geotechnical borings (Giblin 2006), at depths from 2.5 to greater than 15 feet. The expansion index for this soil is expected to be in the range of greater than 50, which places the soil in a “medium” potential expansion category. Therefore this impact is considered significant.

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Seismic Calculations and Re-compaction of Soil Slated to Load Bearing**

Implementation of measure GEO-1 would re-compact or replace the artificial fill and weak soils thus reducing this impact to less than significant.

VI.e) **No Impact.** The project will connect to the City of Santa Rosa sanitary sewer system. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

**References:**


VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Discussion

VII.a) Less than Significant. Project construction will likely require the use of typical materials associated with construction activities such as diesel fuel, gasoline, oil, and solvent. Any hazardous materials used in construction of the project will be transported, used, and stored in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations regarding hazardous material. The potential for a spill during construction is small and, if a spill were to occur, it would be controlled and cleaned up in accordance with Santa Rosa Fire Department requirements with minimal environmental impact. The completed project will not involve the storage, handling, transportation, or production of hazardous materials, except those used commonly by residences. These uses will conform to applicable state and federal regulations. This will yield a less than significant impact.

VII.b) Less than Significant after Mitigation. Asbestos is commonly found in structures built prior to 1980 and high concentrations of lead can be found in structures built prior to 1978. The existing structures on the project site were built in 1879, 1888, and 1947. An investigation concentrating on lead- or asbestos-containing materials...
has not been conducted at the site. Because of its age, asbestos or lead related contaminants may exist in the building.

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Asbestos and Lead Testing and Removal.**
The applicant shall retain a qualified and/or certified environmental specialist to inspect the building. The specialist shall identify whether any lead- or asbestos-containing materials – or other hazardous materials – are present. If found at levels that require special handling, these materials shall be managed as required by law and according to federal, state, and local regulations and guidelines concerning asbestos- or lead-containing materials removal. A written report of the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the City.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 ensures that any lead- and/or asbestos-containing materials found on the project site would be appropriately removed, contained, or otherwise remediated to allow for development of the site to proceed.

VII.c) **Less than Significant after Mitigation.** The Kid Street Charter Elementary School is located at 709 Davis Street, approximately 600 feet from the site. New College of California is located at Wilson and 6th Street, approximately 700 feet from the site. Although unlikely, children and adults at nearby schools could be exposed to hazardous materials used at the site. This impact is considered potentially significant.

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: Compliance with federal and state regulations.**
The applicant shall comply with all Federal and State laws and regulations regarding the use of hazardous materials during project construction and operation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 will reduce impacts to school children and adults to a level below significance through adherence to state and federal laws and regulations governing hazardous materials.

VII.d) **Less than Significant after Mitigation.** The project site consists of two legal parcels: 010-091-001 and 010-091-007. Parcel 010-091-007 (southern parcel) is currently under investigation for petroleum discharge from leaking underground storage tanks (UST) by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Three underground storage tanks (one diesel and two gasoline) have been removed from the southern parcel.

The diesel UST, removed in May 1986, was formerly located at the southwest corner of the warehouse building (SCS, 2005; Cambria, 2004, 2005). Significant soil and groundwater impacts exist in this area. The fuel delivery pipeline for the tank remains in place beneath Donahue Street (the street fronting the project site). Petroleum discharges have been documented along the pipeline, with elevated levels found adjacent to parcel 010-091-001 near the location of former boilers. Separate phase product removal was conducted as interim remediation from the diesel tank area. A final corrective action method associated with the diesel tank and delivery pipe has not been conducted.

A 550-gallon gasoline UST was formerly located in the on-site outdoor parking area on the west side of the Project site. SCS Engineers (SCS) reported in December, 2005, that the gasoline tank was removed in February, 2003, under permit from the Santa Rosa Fire Department. After removal of this tank, impacted soil was over-excavated and removed from the project site, after which confirmation soil samples were collected from the excavation pit (SCS, 2005; Cambria, 2005). During removal and excavation of the gasoline tank a third tank was discovered in the vicinity. Petroleum hydrocarbons were detected in 15 of the 16 soil sidewall and bottom samples at varying concentrations. Impacted soil was left in place due to site constraints.

On July 20, 2005, NCRWQCB issued a letter – to Wells Fargo Bank, as trustee of the May McDonald Grace Trust – indicating that impacted soil had been removed from the gasoline tank area to the extent practicable at that time and requested the submittal of a Feasibility Study/Corrective Action Plan (FS/CAP) for corrective action at the former diesel tank area. A FS/CAP was completed and submitted to NCRWQCB on January 20, 2006. On March 23, 2006, NCRWQCB responded with a comment letter which gave the previous property owner permission to proceed with bench-scale tests at the site and also described additional compliance procedures.
This bench-scale testing was to determine the optimum persulfate and activator concentrations for injections, the efficacy of persulfate to reduce diesel concentration over time, and the degree of pH changes, sulfate increases, and any concerns regarding the leaching of metals. As of January 2007, the bench-scale testing has not been conducted. The selection of a final cleanup remedy is pending the identification of all legally responsible parties.

A monitoring well network was originally installed for the diesel tank investigation and was expanded to include the former gasoline tank vicinity.

The Phase I report stated that the presence of the Northwestern Pacific Railroad tracks adjacent on the east side of the site could provide the potential for shallow soil contamination by heavy metals and petroleum residue commonly associated with rail facilities (SCS, 2005). Although no staining or other obvious evidence of past events were observed during the site reconnaissance, the Phase I report recommended that soil sampling and analysis would be needed to confirm the absence or presence of contamination.

A Phase II investigation was conducted in January 2007 including the collection of soil and groundwater samples on both parcels. The results are pending.

Due to these considerations, the following mitigation measure is proposed to ameliorate any potential hazards materials impacts.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: Soil and Groundwater Management Plan (SGMP)

Prior to the issuance of a building permit the application shall obtain a remediation permit from Santa Rosa Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division for the clean up of contamination encountered on the project site. The applicant shall also prepare a SGMP to address areas of impact encountered during development that were previously unknown. The Plan shall include appropriate handling, treatment and disposal of contaminated groundwater and soil encountered during development in accordance with Santa Rosa Fire Department and the Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements. A qualified site supervisor who has been trained to recognize and respond to the presence of impacted groundwater and soil shall be present during dewatering and excavation activities. The Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the appropriate City of Santa Rosa Fire Department staff or Regional Water Quality Control Board staff prior to the start of construction. The applicant shall implement the recommendations in the SGMP. The applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed development will not interfere with the cleanup project and the development will be compatible with future groundwater remediation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 will provide a means for the proper handling and disposal of contaminated groundwater and soil. In addition, this measure will sufficiently address these contamination concerns to allow residential development of the site. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant after mitigation.

VII.e - f) No Impact. The project is not located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

VII.g) Less than Significant after Mitigation. Construction at the project site will not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. There may be brief and intermittent disruptions to traffic during construction at the site. These minor disruptions will be monitored by flaggers who will clear the road for on-coming emergency vehicles.

Some off-site trenching may occur on nearby streets to connect to private utilities such as cable, as well as upgrade the water main beneath Donahue and West 8th Streets. This impact is considered potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-4: Traffic Control Procedures

The applicant shall adopt standard traffic control procedures to minimize traffic congestion and traffic hazards. Construction flagging and signage, use of plates, and other safety measures shall be in
conformance with Caltrans 2003 Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devises. Other measures shall include:

- If temporary lane or street closures are required, the applicant shall contact emergency response providers (hospitals, police, fire, and ambulance) to determine if the streets impacted are considered primary routes.
- Where construction necessitates lane or street closures along emergency response routes, the applicant shall recommend and obtain approval of alternate routes or other means from the affected service providers, at a minimum of one week prior to construction.
- During construction, the applicant shall notify the service providers on a weekly basis of the timing, location, and duration of construction.
- The applicant shall maintain pedestrian and vehicular access to public facilities, businesses, and residences along the street during commute hours and shall minimize the closure of pedestrian and vehicular access at other times. Peak commute hours are between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM.

Through proper notification of emergency service providers, establishment of alternate routes, and implementation of other traffic safety measures this impact is considered less than significant after mitigation.

VII.h) No Impact. The project site is in an urban setting not subject to wildland fires, nor are there wildlands adjacent to the site.
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VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
- 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)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- 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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- 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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- 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? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐
- f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- 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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- 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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
VIII.a) **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** During construction, discharge of groundwater may occur as a result of potential dewatering activities. As discussed in Section VII Hazards and Hazardous Materials, soil and groundwater contamination has been known to occur at the site. Therefore this impact is considered significant.

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: Soil and Groundwater Management Plan (SGMP)**

Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 would outline the method for treatment and disposal of impacted water encountered during excavation, as required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This impact is considered less than significant after mitigation.
There would be no discharge involved with the completed project.

VIII.b – d and f) **No Impact.** The completed project will tie in to the City of Santa Rosa’s water distribution system. The site is relatively flat and will remain so post-construction. The post-construction impervious area will decrease from 96.4% to 89.7% (Civil Design Consulting 2006). Runoff will not increase as the amount of impervious area will actually decrease post-construction.

VIII.e) **Less than Significant after Mitigation.** Pre-construction impervious area at the project site is 126,236 square feet. New or reconstructed impervious area will equal 117,411 square feet or 2.7 acres (Impervious Worksheet, 2006). Since the project will disturb more than one acre of land a construction storm water permit must be obtained. Therefore this impact is considered significant without mitigation.

**Mitigation Measure HYD-1: Prepare Stormwater Prevention Pollution Plan**

In accordance with the State of California’s General Permit for Construction Activities (General Permit) the applicant shall prepare a Stormwater Prevention Pollution Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall comply with the requirements of the General Permit and be incorporated into the construction documents. As part of the coverage under the General Permit the applicant will file a Notice of Intent with the State Water Resources Control Board within 30 days prior to the start of construction.

The SWPPP will provide specific information regarding best management practices during construction and post-construction stormwater management that will be incorporated into the project. Therefore, Mitigation Measure HYD-1 reduces this impact to less than significant.

The City of Santa Rosa’s Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) was implemented after submittal of the project application therefore SUSMP does not apply to this project.

VIII.g - j) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. There are no levees or dams within the vicinity of the project. The project site is not in an area subject to seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

**References:**


IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community? □ □ □ ☒

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? □ □ ☒ □

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? □ □ □ ☒

Discussion:
IX.a) **No Impact.** The proposed project is located in a developed area of Santa Rosa, in the middle of a city block, on a parcel that is current developed. It will not divide an established community.

XI.b) **Less than Significant.** The General Plan designation for the site is Medium Density Residential. The proposed project does not conflict with this designation. The existing zoning at the project site is General Industrial – Historic Combining. As part of the project the applicant has submitted a rezoning application to change the designation to R-3-18-H (Multi-family Residential - Historic Combining). Approval of the application will bring the zoning into compliance with the General Plan designation. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

IX.c) **No Impact.** There is no habitat or natural community conservation plan that covers the project site.

References:

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

d. 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?

\[\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Potentially Significant Impact} & \text{Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation Incorporation} & \text{Less-Than-Significant Impact} & \text{No Impact} \\
\hline
\square & \square & \square & \checkmark \\
\end{array}\]

e. 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?

\[\begin{array}{cccc}
\square & \square & \square & \checkmark \\
\end{array}\]

Discussion:
X.a – b) **No Impact.** No known mineral resources occur within the project site, and the site is not identified as an important mineral source on any plans.
XI. 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 airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☑ ☐ ☐

Discussion:

XI.a) Less than Significant after Mitigation. The project would locate residences where noise from vehicular traffic exceeds 60 dBA DNL, the threshold for multi-family housing set forth in the State Building Code, and 65 dBA DNL, the threshold for multi-family housing set forth in the City of Santa Rosa Noise Element of the General Plan. This is a significant impact.

Vehicular traffic on West 9th Street generates a noise level of up to about 70 dBA DNL at a distance of approximately 50 feet from the centerline of the street. By the year 2020, the $L_{dn}$ is calculated to increase 2-3 dBA due to cumulative growth in the area. The site plan for the proposed project shows Building D adjoined by 9th Street. The first level is parking. The second level is a podium level with an outdoor courtyard on the podium. The courtyard is effectively shielded from the 9th Street traffic noise by the differential in elevation. The noise exposure in this outdoor courtyard area would be below 65 dBA DNL near the 9th Street end and would be below 60 dBA DNL throughout most of the courtyard area. Other outdoor courtyards areas in Building C, located in the interior of the site, would similarly be shielded from vehicular traffic noise to levels below 60 dBA DNL. The design for the project, therefore, results in a compatible noise environment in proposed outdoor activity areas.

The second noise and land use compatibility issue is the noise environment expected inside the new residences. Building facades of Building D near 9th Street would be exposed to noise levels exceeding 60 dBA DNL. Because the units nearest 9th Street would be exposed to up to 69-72 dBA DNL, and the outdoor-to-indoor noise reduction with windows open for ventilation is about 15 dBA, interior noise levels would be as high as 57 dBA DNL with windows open, exceeding the City and State standards by 12 dBA. With windows assumed in the closed position, an assumption which can be made if adequate forced air mechanical ventilation is included in the project, standard building facades provide 20-25 dBA of noise reduction. Given the outdoor noise exposure, the
noise levels inside end units nearest 9th Street still may exceed the interior noise level limit of 45 dBA L_{dn} even with standard windows closed.

**Mitigation Measures NOI-1: Noise Reduction Building Design Program**

Conduct an analysis during detailed design as required by the State Building Code of the outdoor-to-indoor noise reduction of units near 9th Street to determine the necessary noise control treatments to reduce interior levels to less than 45 dBA L_{dn}, and implement the recommendations of the study. For example, forced air mechanical ventilation and/or windows and doors with sound ratings above standard windows may be required in certain rooms. The application of sound rated windows/doors (STC ratings estimated to be 30-34 range) would result in interior noise levels compliant with state and local standards.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would decrease exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards through design features such as sound-rated windows and doors.

XI.b) **Less than Significant.** Residents of the proposed project would be exposed to perceptible ground-borne vibration from renewed railroad train operations; vibration levels would be below the Federal Transit Agency vibration threshold. This is a less-than-significant impact.

Ground-borne vibration levels from railroad train operations were discussed in the SMART Draft EIR (page 3-132). The 80 VdB FTA threshold for infrequent events is applicable because fewer than 30 events per day are projected. Ground-borne vibration levels are projected to be below 0.01 inches per second rms vibration velocity (80 VdB re micro inch per second) at distances greater than 20 feet from the tracks. This is consistent with ground vibration from low speed train movements in other areas. As noted above, the nearest residential buildings are proposed at a distance of at least 40 feet from the tracks. Because ground vibration levels would be less than the FTA impact significance criteria, this is a less-than-significant impact.

XI.c) **Less than Significant.** The increase in traffic noise on the street network was calculated by comparing future traffic with the project to existing traffic volumes. Traffic data were taken from the traffic study prepared by TJKM for the Railroad Square Village Development (September 5, 2006). Traffic noise levels are calculated to increase less than 1 dBA as a result of project-generated trips. A 1 dBA increase is not substantial and would cause a less-than-significant noise impact. As a result of cumulative development in the Santa Rosa area, traffic noise levels are calculated to increase 2-3 dBA along West 9th Street between now and the year 2020. The increase would occur with or without the development of the proposed project, so the project does not measurably affect the projected cumulative noise increase. This is a less-than-significant impact.

XI.d) **Less than Significant after Mitigation.** Approval and implementation of the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) Project would result in the exposure of the site to noise from railroad train operations on the Northwestern Pacific Railroad track. This is a potentially significant impact.

The Northwestern Pacific Railroad corridor has been proposed as a rail transit corridor by the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART). SMART proposes to operate trains consisting of diesel-powered, self-propelled vehicles called Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) vehicles. Information regarding noise levels from the proposed SMART project is set forth in the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit Draft EIR (November 2005) and Final EIR (June 2006). SMART proposes 12 passenger train movements in each direction between 5:00 AM and 8:00 PM. Noise from train operations includes noise from the engines and wheel-rail interaction. In addition, the sound of railroad train warning horns is a dominant source within approximately one-quarter mile of grade crossings. Data presented in Table 3.7-5 of the Final EIR indicate that the 60 L_{dn} noise exposure level is predicted to be at a distance of 25 feet from the tracks in areas where there are not at-grade crossings requiring the sounding of train horns. The proposed project is located between West 8th Street and West 9th Street in Santa Rosa. Train horns would be expected to be prominent during passages through this area. The instantaneous maximum noise level from a train horn is about 100 dBA at 100 feet. At a distance of 40 feet, the nearest proposed building setback from the railroad tracks, the maximum instantaneous noise level is calculated to be about 108 dBA.
Day/night average noise levels were not presented in the SMART documents for areas near at-grade crossings. The analysis focused on maximum instantaneous noise levels in these areas. The $L_{dn}$ can be calculated if certain assumptions are made. In this instance, it is assumed that there would be two train passages during the early morning hours when train movements might occur (5:00 AM to 7:00 AM) and the balance of train movements would be during daytime hours (7:00 AM – 8:00 PM). Given this assumption and the assumption that the sound of a horn at the maximum amplitude of 108 dBA would be sustained for one second adjacent to a given unit, the calculated 24-hour average noise level is 75 dBA $L_{dn}$ at 40 feet. This is a reasonable estimate for noise exposure at the property boundary of the property site adjoining the Northwestern Pacific Railroad.

As discussed under Impact a), outdoor activity areas at the project site are located in courtyards and podium areas. These areas would be shielded from the Northwestern Pacific Railroad right-of-way by the proposed buildings themselves. Cross sections shown in the architectural plans for the proposed project indicate that these areas will be shielded by building masses at least 30 feet high as measured above the ground. These building are expected to provide at least 15 dBA of noise reduction in the courtyard areas resulting in outdoor noise levels consistent with City of Santa Rosa General Plan Guidelines. As noted above, standard residential construction with windows closed would typically provide 20-25 dBA of noise reduction. Interior noise levels at unprotected building facades would, therefore, be expected to exceed the 45 dBA $L_{dn}$ interior standard. The plans for this project are somewhat complex from a community noise standpoint. Building A, located along Donahue Street, is set back about 150 feet from the railroad tracks, and is partly shielded by Building B. Building B is located in the southeast corner of the site and would retain the existing exterior façade of the building on the site as a noise barrier. Building C in the central portion of the site also would retain the existing exterior façade of the building on the site as a noise barrier. This façade is about 30 feet high and would provide extensive shielding for the residential facade located behind it. Building D would experience an unattenuated noise exposure of 75 dBA $L_{dn}$ at the upper stories. As currently designed, the bedrooms of Building D are on the west side of the building and oriented away from the railroad tracks. This is a positive feature that will reduce the noise levels and make the bedrooms more livable.

Consideration should be given to controlling the maximum instantaneous noise levels of the train horn to acceptable levels inside the units. It is recommended that the maximum instantaneous noise levels from the train horns not exceed 55 dBA. The SMART Final EIR identified that the sound of train horns could cause a significant environmental impact. The EIR outlined the methods by which communities could obtain Quiet Zone applications from the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). SMART has committed to work with any local jurisdictions wishing to be designated Quiet Zones to cooperatively meet the requirements for designation and budgeted for supplementary safety measures for Quiet Zones.\(^1\) The FRA has final jurisdiction over Quiet Zones so they cannot be counted on yet. Noise from train horns is, therefore, found to cause a potentially significant impact at this site if the SMART project is approved.

According to the SMART Final EIR, approximately 3 to 6 freight trains in each direction per week are expected to operate north of the Ignacio Wye independent of approval of the SMART project. Train horn noise would be similar for freight and passenger trains in the vicinity of grade crossings. Given the infrequency of expected freight train movements, and the assumption that the trains would only operate during the daytime (7:00 AM to 10:00 PM), the noise from these infrequent freight movements would not, by themselves, constitute a significant noise impact at the project site.

**Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Noise Reduction Building Design Program**

**Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Railroad Noise Reduction**  
The applicant shall:
- Conduct an analysis of the necessary noise reduction measures to achieve the 55 dBA $L_{max}$ limit during the development of construction documents for the proposed project and implement the recommendations. Existing sound walls, setbacks, and building shielding should be taken into consideration during the building design phase. For example, high performance sound rated

---

\(^1\) SMART Final EIR, page 4-55, June 2006.
windows/doors may be necessary at unshielded residential units and could provide the needed sound attenuation.

- Submit a report, found to be acceptable by the local building official, prior to issuance of a building permit delineating the noise control treatments that have been incorporated into the design of the project to achieve the 55 dBA $L_{max}$/45 dBA $L_{dn}$ interior noise limits for this project.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 and NOI-2 will reduce noise exposure for project occupants to a level consistent with Santa Rosa General Plan guidelines and the State Building Code.

Noise during construction activities would temporarily elevate noise levels in the project vicinity. This is a less-than-significant impact assuming standard controls are implemented. Construction activities for the proposed project would include demolition activities, excavation, foundation work, framing, and finishing. Construction noise levels vary by phase of construction and within each phase, they vary from hour to hour and day to day.

Hourly average noise levels typically range from about 70-80 dBA Leq 100 feet from the active construction areas. Residences are located directly across Donahue Street from the project site. These residences will experience a temporary increase in ambient noise levels above existing levels during the construction period. Implementation of the following standard controls would reduce potential construction noise effects to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure NOI-3: Construction Noise Impact Mitigation**

The applicant shall:

- Limit construction to the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM on weekdays, and 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM on Saturdays, with no noise-generating construction on Sundays or holidays.
- Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
- Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area.
- Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engine.
- Designate a noise disturbance coordinator who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site.

XI.e and f) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**References:**


State of California, Building Code.
XII. 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:

XII.a) Less than Significant. The proposed project will provide 80 residential units and is consistent with the General Plan. Although offsite water mains will be improved as a result of this project, the existing capacity of these mains has not been a substantial impediment to growth, and the upgrade of the mains will not indirectly induce additional growth in Santa Rosa.

XII.b and c) No Impact. The existing use is warehouse/industrial not residential; therefore the project would not displace people or housing units.
XIII. 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:
XIII.a) Less than Significant after Mitigation. The nearest fire station is located approximately 1 mile southwest of the project site. Fire response time goals identified in Policy PSF-E-1 of the Santa Rosa General Plan are 80 percent of emergency calls within 4 minutes, 90 percent of emergency calls within 5 minutes, and 100 percent of emergency calls within 6 minutes or less. In *Protecting Santa Rosa: A Strategic Plan for the Santa Rosa Fire Department* it is indicated that these goals do not follow current national standards and that the fire department is unable to meet the goals. Furthermore, it recommends that the response time goals be reviewed and modified in the future. The response time achieved by the Santa Rosa Fire Department is 30 percent of calls in 4 minutes, 57 percent of calls in 5 minutes or less, and 81 percent of calls in 6 minutes or less.

A memorandum regarding the project plans was submitted to the Community Development Department by the Santa Rosa Fire Department on January 12, 2007. The memorandum approved the project subject to specific conditions. The conditions cover such items as access, fire sprinklers, fire hydrants, and standpipe systems. These conditions will be incorporated into the project.

Given the recommendation to review the current goals and the conditioned approval of the project by the Fire Department, the project’s impacts on fire services are considered less than significant.

XIII.b) Less than Significant. The City is divided into eleven patrol zones. The project site is in Zone 9. The police response goal identified in Policy PSF-E-1 of the Santa Rosa General Plan is 6 minutes for emergency calls, 14 minutes for urgent calls, and 32 minutes for routine calls. The average response time for Zone 9 in 2005 was 4.8 minutes for emergency calls, 10.2 minutes for urgent calls, and 23.5 minutes for routine calls. As response times for Zone 9 are well below the response goal established in the General Plan this impact is considered less than significant.

XIII.c) Less than Significant. The project site is located within the Santa Rosa City School District and the Santa Rosa City High School District. According to Figure 6-2 School Facilities of the Santa Rosa General Plan the project site is not designated as a site for a potential school facility. The project could have an impact on the performance objectives of the schools as a result of the additional school-age population within the district. However, the project would be subject to the mandatory school impact fee which would offset any impact on school facilities resulting from the project.
XIII.d) **Less than Significant.** According to Figure 6-1 Parks and Recreation of the Santa Rosa General Plan the project site is not designated as a site for a proposed park. Policies PSF-A-3 and PSF-A-6 of the General Plan establish a ½-mile standard for neighborhood parks and a one-mile standard for community parks in regard to the distance between residences and parks. This project would be adequately served by existing parks. DeTurk, Railroad, Olive, Demeo, and Jacobs Memorial Parks are within ½ mile of the project site, and Finley Community and Northwest Community Parks are within 1 mile of the project site.

Policy PSF-A-2 sets forth the City of Santa Rosa’s park standard as six acres of park land per one thousand residents. All new residential developments in the City pay a park fee, on a per unit basis, at the time of building permit issuance. These fees are used to help fund the costs of acquiring and constructing neighborhood and community parks so the park standard ratio set forth in the General Plan can be met.

Because the number of parks serving the project site exceeds the standard set in the General Plan, and park fees would be applied to this project, this impact is considered less than significant.

XIII.e) **No Impact.** No other public facilities have been identified as potentially impacted by this project. For potential impacts to sewer and water refer to section XVI Utilities and Services.

**References:**


Warr, Kathleen, Manager, Technical Services Division, Santa Rosa Police Department. 2006. Personal Communication. September.
XIV. 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:
XIV.a) Less than Significant. The project would add 80 residential units within walking distance of four neighborhood parks and one community park. The increased park use by the additional residents of the project would be dispersed among the five parks and is considered less than significant.

XIV.b) No Impact. The project does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

a. Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? 

<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>

b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

<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>

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?

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

<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. Result in inadequate emergency access?

<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. Result in inadequate parking capacity?

<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. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

<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:
XV.a and b) **Less than Significant.** The following evaluation is based upon the Traffic Impact Study for the Railroad Square Village Development prepared by TJKM Transportation Consultants (December 2006). A copy of the report is included as Appendix D in this Draft Initial Study.

The transportation element of the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan establishes the following policies about level of service on street corridors and intersections.

*T-D-1 Maintain a Level of Service (LOS) D or better along all major corridors. Exceptions to meeting the standard include:*
- Within downtown
- Where attainment would result in significant environmental degradation
- Where topography or environmental impacts makes the improvement impossible
- Where attainment would ensure loss of an area’s unique character

*The LOS is to be calculated using the average traffic demand over the highest 60-minute period.*

*T-D-2 Monitor LOS at intersections to assure that improvements or alterations to improve corridor LOS do not cause severe impacts at any single intersection.*
The proposed project is expected to generate 469 total daily trips including 35 AM peak hour and 42 PM peak hour trips. Table 1 compares existing conditions to existing plus approved plus project conditions corridor levels of service. The Wilson Street southbound PM peak changes from LOS E under existing conditions to F under exiting plus approved plus project conditions. For Cleveland Avenue all LOS remain the same between the two conditions including an existing LOS F for the southbound PM peak.

**Table T-1: Corridor LOS – Existing and Existing + Approved/Pending + Project Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Existing + Approved/Pending + Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed LOS</td>
<td>Speed LOS</td>
<td>Speed LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Street (3rd Steet to 9th Street)</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>16.7 C 9.9 D</td>
<td>16.6 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>15.1 C 7.6 E</td>
<td>14.9 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Avenue (9th Street to College Avenue)</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>17.2 C 15.6 C</td>
<td>17.0 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>23.1 B 6.3 F</td>
<td>23.0 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table T-2 compares existing conditions to existing plus approved plus project conditions intersection levels of service. The addition of project traffic does not cause any appreciable effect on average delays and does not cause any change in level of service. Two of the intersections analyzed (Wilson & Ninth and Wilson & Fourth) currently operate at LOS F during the p.m. peak hour and are expected to continue to operate at LOS F under project conditions.

**Table T-2: Intersection Levels of Service – Existing and Existing + Approved/Pending + Project Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Existing + Approved/Pending + Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay LOS</td>
<td>Delay LOS</td>
<td>Delay LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Ave/College Ave</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>27.0 C 51.0 D</td>
<td>28.3 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson St/Ninth St</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>12.3 B 104.2 F</td>
<td>12.7 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson St/Fifth St</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>11.3 B 19.6 C</td>
<td>11.6 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson St/Fourth St</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>13.0 B 120+ F</td>
<td>13.2 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson St/Third St</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>25.8 C 29.3 C</td>
<td>26.1 C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table T-3 compares cumulative conditions to cumulative plus project conditions. Under cumulative conditions, the Wilson Street/Fifth Street intersection would decrease from LOS C to LOS D in the PM Peak; however this still meets City LOS Standards.

**Table T-3: Intersections Levels of Service - Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay LOS</td>
<td>Delay LOS</td>
<td>Delay LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Ave/College Ave</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>95.2 F 120+ F</td>
<td>96.9 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson St/Ninth St</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>120+ F</td>
<td>120+ F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson St/Fifth St</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>26.4 D 24.7 C</td>
<td>27.7 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson St/Fourth St</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>45.4 E 120+ F</td>
<td>47.0 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson St/Third St</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>17.5 B 30.9 C</td>
<td>17.9 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the project may contribute additional delays to existing failing corridors and intersections at LOS, it does not, on its own, reduce an existing acceptable LOS (D or better) to failing (LOS E or worse). Downtown corridors are exempt from meeting citywide level of service standards. The Wilson Street corridor is within the downtown. The Cleveland/College corridor is not within the downtown. The Cleveland Avenue corridor LOS remains the same for existing and existing plus approved plus project conditions with an average decrease in speed of between 0.1 and 0.5 miles per hour. The existing Cleveland/College intersection LOS is C (AM peak) and D (PM peak) and remains at C and D under existing plus approved plus project conditions with an increase in delay of 1.3 and 2.7 seconds respectively. These are not deemed a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact scenario and therefore the impact is considered less than significant.

The intersections of Wilson & Ninth and Wilson & Fourth meet traffic signal warrants for PM peak hour traffic using Caltrans methodology, before any proposed project-related traffic is added. Therefore, signal warrants are met at these intersections under all subsequent conditions. Even though a signal may be warranted according to the Caltrans methodology, these intersections are still exempt from the City’s LOS standards because they are located in the downtown area and subject to City policy. The Traffic Impact Study (TJKM 2006) recommends that traffic signal warrants should be revisited at a later time since existing counts were collected during the current U.S. Highway 101 widening project and traffic rerouting may have led to higher than usual existing volumes contributing to warrants being met under existing conditions.

Although this impact is considered less than significant, the City may choose to incorporate the following project mitigation measure to alleviate existing and future project traffic conditions.

**Mitigation Measure TR-1: New Traffic Signals:**
The applicant shall conduct new traffic counts along Wilson Street to confirm existing LOS for each intersection. The traffic counts shall be conducted in September 2007 or at a time when the 9th Street and Railroad Square portions of the US Highway 101 widening project will be complete. If the PM hour counts are still determined to meet traffic signal warrants, the following mitigation can be implemented:
- Wilson Street / Ninth Street - install signal.
- Wilson Street / Fourth Street – install signal.

The implemented, the applicant shall be required to contribute the project’s fair share to the cost of signal installation as determined by the City.

If at a later time signals are not considered desirable by the City Traffic Engineer, alternative mitigation measures as outlined in the City of Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan are recommended instead, which have the potential to reduce project trips and general traffic in the study area.

Signal installation at the Wilson Street/Ninth Street intersection is expected to improve the intersection LOS to B or better under existing plus approve plus project conditions. Signal installation at the Wilson Street/Fourth Street intersection is expected to improve the intersection LOS to B or better. Street LOS for Wilson Street is expected to improve to D or better and for Cleveland would improve to C or better.

XV.c) **No Impact.** This project has no relation to air traffic patterns. Policy 8.7.4.a of the 2001 Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan for Sonoma County requests that any proposal for construction taller than 150 feet be referred to the Airport Land Use Commission. The project building maximum height is 45 feet which would not exceed 150 feet.

XV.d) **No Impact.** The project does not pose any vehicular hazards. It will provide on-street parking on Donahue Street and West Eight Street that meets City design standards.

XV.e) **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** Concerns raised by the Santa Rosa Fire Department, regarding the project’s fire emergency access, are addressed in Section XIII Public Services. Emergency access along surrounding streets where trenching may occur, such as West 8th Street, is addressed in Section VII Hazards and Hazardous Materials.
Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: Traffic Control Procedures

XV.f) No Impact. The project is estimated to provide 165 residential and visitor parking spaces. Based on Santa Rosa City Code, Title 20, Zoning Code, Table 3-4 Parking Requirements by Land Use, the project is required to provide a total of 163 parking spaces. The Project meets the City’s parking requirements; therefore there is no impact to parking.

XV.g) Less than Significant with Mitigation. The project is along the rail corridor, in proximity to one of the potential rail station sites identified in Figure 5-1, Roadway Network of Chapter 5 Transportation in the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan. Transportation Policy T-I supports implementation of rail service along the Northwestern Pacific Railroad. The potential rail station is approximately ¾ mile from the project site at the intersection of Jennings and North Dutton Avenues. Continued effort should be made to support alternative modes of transportation such as the potential rail station to avoid conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

The project is expected to generate bicycle travel by residents and visitors since the site is accessible via Class I bike routes on the Northwestern Pacific Railroad Right-of-Way and along Ninth Street via Class II bike routes. Based on Santa Rosa City Code, Title 20, Zoning Code, Chapter 20-36.090 Bicycle Parking Requirements and Design Standard, the project is required to provide 17.5 bicycle spaces equivalent to 10 percent of its required parking supply; none are shown on the project’s site plan.

Mitigation Measure TR-2: Bicycle Parking: The applicant shall provide a minimum of eight bicycle parking spaces based upon Chapter 20-36.090 Bicycle Parking Requirements and Design Standard.

The addition of bicycle parking for the project will avoid adopted policy conflicts and reduce project impact to less than significant.

References:


City of Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan

City of Santa Rosa Zoning Code

Sonoma County, 2001 Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan for Sonoma County

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<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>

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?  
   ![ ] [✓] ![ ] ![ ]

Discussion:

XVI.a) Less than Significant. Wastewater generated from the City is collected and transported to the Subregional Water Reclamation Facility (Laguna Plant) for treatment and disposal. The Laguna Plant provides tertiary treatment of wastewater. The proposed project is residential use which produces wastewater that is treatable with the tertiary system to the standards established by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

During construction, dewatering may be required as groundwater is encountered. Pumping clean groundwater into the City’s sewer system is an acceptable method of disposal and consistent with the treatment requirements of the Regional Board.

XVI.b) Less than Significant after Mitigation. The existing 6 and 8-inch water mains beneath Donahue Street and the existing 6-inch water main beneath West 8th Street between Donahue Street and the railroad track will be abandoned. A new 12-inch water main will be installed and will connect to an existing 6-inch main at West 9th Street continuing down Donahue to West 8th Street then continue east on West 8th until just before reaching the railroad tracks where it will connect to an existing 6-inch main. Installation of the main may result in temporary impacts during construction.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: Traffic Control Procedures
By implementing traffic control procedures implementation of Mitigation Measure Haz-3 will reduce the construction impacts to less than significant. No permanent impacts were identified from the upgrade of the water main.

XVI.c) **No Impact.** The site is currently developed. Under the proposed project the amount of impervious area would go down by nearly 7% (Civil Design Consultants 2006). There would be no additional runoff, and therefore no new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities would be needed.

XVI.d) **Less than Significant.** Water supply for the City of Santa Rosa comes from the Sonoma County Water Agency’s (SCWA) Russian River Project. SCWA’s supply comes from the Russian River watershed and, to a minor extent, from groundwater wells in the Santa Rosa Plain. The City also owns and operates two groundwater wells at Farmers Lane. Under its current contract with the SCWA, the City is entitled to receive 29,100 acre-feet per year (AFY), and the Farmers Lane wells provide up to 2,300 AFY for a total of 31,400 AFY. Existing demand in 2006 is estimated at 25,000 to 27,000 AFY, so the City’s water supplies are sufficient to meet current demands plus those associated with the project.

In the cumulative condition in 2020, City-wide demand is estimated at 30,500 to 35,300 AFY depending upon the number of private potable water wells within the City that will be converted to City supply due to groundwater contamination. The City’s General Plan EIR uses the average of these numbers to estimate future demand at 32,900 AFY. This exceeds existing supply by 1,500 AFY, so additional supply is expected to be needed between 2017 and 2019, depending on the number of private well conversions required. The City’s long-term annual water supply volume requirements will be met through a combination of sources: utilization of additional City groundwater resources, additional entitlement from SCWA, potable offsets from use of the City’s recycled water supplies, and conservation efforts. Therefore this impact is considered less than significant (West Yost 2002; Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan EIR).

XVI.e) **Less than Significant.** The Subregional Water Reclamation System is permitted to treat 21.3 million gallons per day (mgd) of average dry weather flow (ADWF). Existing demand for wastewater treatment at the Laguna Plant is currently 16.5 mgd, so the Subregional System’s capacity is sufficient to meet current demands plus those associated with the project.

As indicated in the Water Supply paragraph XVI.d, above, the density and land uses of the project are consistent with the Santa Rosa General Plan.

In the cumulative condition at buildout of the General Plan (estimated to occur in the mid 2020’s), demand in the Subregional System is estimated at 25.9 mgd ADWF. This exceeds existing capacity, and improvements will be needed in phases starting in 2010. The City’s long-term wastewater management needs will be met through the Incremental Recycled Water Program (IRWP) Master Plan, adopted by the City in 2004 and currently being implemented on a schedule to meet the 2010 date. Therefore this impact is considered less than significant (IRWP Master Plan and EIR 2004, 2003).

XVI.f and g) **Less than Significant after Mitigation.** Solid waste generated within the City is transported to the Redwood Landfill, which has a life expectancy of at least 18 years (J. Jones, Waste Management, personal communication, June 2006). This is a less-than-significance impact.

The City must comply with Assembly Bill 939 which mandates a 50 percent diversion rate for solid waste. Both construction of the project and the completed project would generate waste. Diversion of business and residential waste will be accomplished through implementing policy PSF-H-4 of the Santa Rosa General Plan which would require the project to provide attractive and convenient recycling bins and trash enclosures in the development. The developer has been directed to consult with North Bay Recycling, the contract refuse collection provider for the City. The waste hauler is responsible for implementing the City’s diversion and recycling program as part of its franchise agreement. The project has been referred to North Bay Recycling and their comments will be reflected as revisions in the building plans. Impacts in this category will be less-than-significant.
Diversion of construction waste would be addressed via the following mitigation measure:

**Mitigation Measure USS-1: Construction Phase Recycling Plan**
The applicant shall prepare and implement a construction phase recycling plan. The recycling plan shall address the major waste materials generated by the construction of the project and identify a means to divert these materials away from the Redwood Landfill. Materials that shall be included in such a plan consist of but are not limited to, soil, vegetated growth, concrete, lumber, metal scraps, cardboard packaging, and plastic wrap. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by North Bay Recycling or the County Integrated Waste Management Authority prior to issuance of demolition permits.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure USS-1 will divert construction waste from the landfill. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant after mitigation.

**References:**


XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<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>

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? □ □ □ ☒

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)? □ ☒ □ □

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? □ ☒ □ □

Discussion:
All potentially significant impacts have been reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation.
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.

2) Noise impact analysis prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, dated September 18, 2006. Attached
3) Traffic report prepared by TJKM, dated September 5, 2006. Attached
4) Visual Simulations prepared by the Digital Realm. See Figures A1-A4
6) Cultural resources records search prepared by SSU Anthropological Studies Center, dated August 16, 2006.
8) Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment prepared by SCS Engineers, dated November 14, 2005. Attached
9) Opinion Regarding Site Health Risks Based on Most recent soil and Groundwater Sampling prepared by SCS Engineers, dated June 7, 2006

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 DeTurk Winery Village 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 not have a Potentially Significant Effect on the environment. A Negative Declaration will be prepared.

☒ 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

Clare Hartman, City Planner
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