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PRELIMINARY NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Date of Publication of Preliminary Negative Declaration: 

Lead Agency: City of Santa Rosa, Department of Public Works  
69 Stony Circle, Santa Rosa, CA 95401
Agency Contact Person: Lori Urbanek  
Telephone: (707) 543-3854

Project Title: Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project
Project Sponsor: City of Santa Rosa
Project Contact Person: Lori Urbanek, Assistant Engineer  
Telephone: (707) 543-3854

Project Address: Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road.
Assessor's Block(s) and Lot(s): N/A
City and County: City of Santa Rosa, County of Sonoma

Project Description: Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road to include roadway widening; the addition of through and turning movement lanes; the provision of sidewalks, bike lanes, a planter strip, street trees, median and re-striping requiring right-of-way acquisition. Refer to Initial Study Section 1.3, Project Description for further information and project maps showing the project location and construction details.

THIS PROJECT COULD NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.
This finding is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary for Resources, Sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance) and 15070 (Decision to Prepare a Negative Declaration), and the following reasons as documented in the CEQA Environmental Checklist of the Initial Study (Sections 1 and 2 inclusive) for the project, which is attached. Mitigation measures are included in this project to avoid potentially significant effects. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is included, as Appendix A to the Initial Study.

Final Negative Declaration adopted and issued:

Date: 

By: 

Title: 

For: 

P:\Projects - WP Only\D40000.00 +\D41140.00 Santa Rosa Avenue\VOL. 1 IS_MND\Santa Rosa Negative Declaration (Mar 07).doc
1. Introduction

1.1 Project Location

The Santa Rosa Avenue widening project encompasses the full width of Santa Rosa Avenue between the intersections of Santa Rosa Avenue/Yolanda Avenue and Santa Rosa Avenue/Kawana Springs Road, a distance of approximately 1,180 feet (Santa Rosa Avenue will be restriped from Kawana Springs Road to Colgan Avenue). The project site is located immediately east of U.S. Highway 101 and two miles south of the Santa Rosa downtown area. See Figure 1.1-1, Regional Location Map, and Figure 1.1-2, Site Location Map for project site regional and local orientation.

1.2 Need for Project

Santa Rosa Avenue is a north-south four-lane regional/arterial street in southeast Santa Rosa and serves as a major corridor connecting the downtown area with newly developing lands in the southeast quadrant of the City. Because Santa Rosa Avenue runs parallel to U.S. 101, the street corridor often serves as an alternative route for commuters during the morning and evening peak hours. Also, Santa Rosa Avenue has experienced increased congestion in response to growth and development of the southeast portion of the City. The average northbound vehicle speed is less than 17 miles per hour during the evening peak hour.

The Department of Public Works has proposed a series of traffic and circulation adjustments (herein referred to as the project) to relieve congestion, reduce delay and improve safety for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians along Santa Rosa Avenue. These adjustments include increasing the number of travel lanes, providing additional turning and stacking lanes at specific locations, adjusting signal timing and providing bicycle lanes and sidewalks within an increased right-of-way width.

The completed project would be consistent with Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Transportation Element Goals and Policies to develop strategies to improve service levels (Policy T-A-2), improve traffic flows and reduce neighborhood traffic impacts (Policy T-C-4), maintain acceptable levels of service (Policy T-D-1), provide full access to transit services (Policy T-H-6), provide safe streets for pedestrians and bicyclists (Goal T-J), among other Goals and Policies as cited in the General Plan.

1.3 Project Description

Road Widening Project

The Santa Rosa Avenue widening project is included in the City’s 2004/2005 adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The project would include widening Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue (US 101 northbound ramps) and Kawana Springs Road and involve the following lane/turning movement modifications:¹
FIGURE 1.1-1: REGIONAL LOCATION MAP
NOTE:
See Figures 1.3-1, 1.3-2, and 1.3-3 for details regarding project construction, and Figures 1.3-2 and 1.3-4 regarding roadway restripping north of the project site.
• Kawana Springs Road at Santa Rosa Avenue – the addition of a second westbound left turn lane.

• Santa Rosa Avenue at Kawana Springs Road – the addition of a northbound right turn lane.

• Santa Rosa Avenue at Hearn Avenue – the addition of a second northbound left turn lane and third northbound thru lane that leads to a right turn lane at Kawana Springs Road.

• Santa Rosa Avenue at Yolanda Avenue – extension of the existing southbound right turn lane onto the US 101 northbound on-ramp.

• Santa Rosa Avenue at Yolanda Avenue- the addition of a southbound second left turn lane into Yolanda Avenue.

No new intersection signals would be required for the project. The existing signals at Kawana Springs Road, Hearn Avenue and Yolanda Avenue would be reconfigured consistent with the reconfigured lanes with the objective to enhance traffic flow. The signal at Kawana Springs Road would also be modified to provide controlled access at the northern driveway of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park located at 2389 Santa Rosa Avenue.

West Side of Road

Between Yolanda Avenue and Hearn Avenue, the existing road right-of-way is 111 feet wide with the exception of a parcel at the southwest corner of the intersection of Santa Rosa Avenue and Hearn Avenue where the right-of-way is 100 feet wide (2549 Santa Rosa Avenue). Between Hearn Avenue and Kawana Springs Road the existing right-of-way is 100 feet wide. New right-of-way would be acquired at 2549 Santa Rosa Avenue to match the existing right-of-way and achieve a continuous right-of-way alignment on the west side of the road between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road. The back of the new sidewalk on the west side of the road would align with the existing right-of-way line and the new right-of-way line at 2549 Santa Rosa Avenue (see Figures 1.3-1, 1.3-2 and 1.3-3). The reconfigured face of curb on the west side of the road would be located from zero up to about nine feet west of the existing face of curb, depending on location.

East Side of Road

Between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road, the right-of-way would be expanded by 11 feet. The reconfigured face of curb on the east side of the road would be located approximately 12 feet east of the existing face of curb.

At completion, the widening project would contain the following:

• Five- to eight-foot wide sidewalks on each side of the roadway.

• An eight-foot wide planter strip on the west side of the roadway between Yolanda Avenue and Hearn Avenue (constructed by others).
• Tree wells constructed along the eight foot wide sidewalk sections where there would be insufficient space for planter strips.

• One five-foot wide bike lane on each side of the roadway.

• One to two eleven-foot wide southbound and northbound left-turn lanes.

• Single eleven-foot wide southbound and northbound right-turn lanes.

The sidewalks, bike lane, through lane and turning lane configurations would vary throughout the roadway alignment between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road depending on location (see Figure 1.3-1 and 1.3-2, Project Plan, and Figure 1.3-3, Project Sections for illustrative roadway lane configurations).

Utilities and Street Trees

There is an existing 115 kV PG&E overhead transmission line supported on five wooden poles within an easement on City right-of-way along the east side of Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road. Due to the widening project, this transmission line would require relocation by PG&E to a point outside of the travel lanes behind the curb line and may require additional overhead easements (PG&E would bear the cost of transmission line relocation).

Similarly, the existing street lights between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road would need to be relocated to allow for the roadway widening project. The relocated lights would be situated about 12 feet to a point outside of the travel lanes as reconfigured under the project behind the new curb line with the lighting fixtures extending over the outboard travel lanes. The existing electrical service vaults would need to be relocated as well.

The Department of Public Works Utilities Department indicates that 2,500 linear feet of 12-inch diameter water main would be installed from the location of the Chapel of the Chimes Mortuary north of Yolanda Avenue to the north side of Colgan Avenue and tie in to an existing eight-inch diameter water main to meet current fire flow requirements. In addition, a six-inch diameter sewer main along the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue from the Chapel of the Chimes extending to the Santa Rosa Travel Lodge at Colgan Avenue would be removed and replaced with an eight-inch diameter sewer main, a distance of about 2,300 feet. This is because the existing six-inch sewer main is in poor condition with failing sections and offset joints.
Note: See Figure 1.3-3 for cross sections A and B.
FIGURE 1.3-2: PROJECT PLAN, HEARN AVENUE TO KAWANA SPRINGS ROAD (RESTRIPPING ONLY NORTH OF KAWANA SPRINGS ROAD)

Notes: See Figure 1.3-3 for cross section C.
See Figure 1.3-4 for continuation of road restriping to Colgan Avenue.
FIGURE 1.3-3: PROJECT SECTIONS

SECTION A LOOKING NORTH

Note: See Figures 1.3-1 and 1.3-2 for location of project cross sections.

SOURCE: City of Santa Rosa, Department of Public Works.
Street trees are proposed for installation in the planter strip and in tree wells where the sidewalk is eight and one-half feet in width as part of the project in accordance with Department of Public Works policy to avoid conflicts with utilities and driveways while maintaining lines of sight. The new trees would need to be permanently irrigated, by the adjacent property owner(s). Tree selections would reflect the need to plant species that do not exceed 20 feet in height in order to avoid conflicts with encountering overhead utility lines consistent with the City Council approved “Major Existing Streets — Tree Program 2000”.

Other Property Improvements and Driveways

The owners of Chapel of the Chimes property occupying a site on the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue between the Yolanda Avenue/U.S. 101 on-off ramps and Hearn Avenue would complete sidewalk and planter strip additions in accordance with City design and construction requirements as part of site and building renovations planned for the property. Similarly, driveways and curbs would be constructed to a point about 250 feet east of Santa Rosa Avenue on Kawana Springs road in accordance with City design and construction requirements as part of property improvements proposed by the Council on Aging. This includes the dedication of right-of-way, a sidewalk easement and public utility easement to the City for the ultimate future widening of Kawana Springs Road (not part of this project). For all properties fronting Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road, the widening and reconstruction of Santa Rosa Avenue and adjacent portion of Kawana Springs Road as noted above is to consist of the removal and replacement of driveway approaches and failed existing asphalt concrete pavement and sidewalks along the frontages of the project.

Project Scheduling

Construction of the road widening project is projected to begin in 2009. Construction would extend over a period of about 18 months with completion of the project in 2010. Some nighttime construction activity is anticipated. There would be no construction allowed during the Thanksgiving/Christmas holiday season.

Required Approvals

The Santa Rosa Avenue widening project must first be approved for implementation by the Santa Rosa City Council. The project would need to comply with City of Santa Rosa plans and specifications for regional/arterial street design and construction. Plans and specifications for the widening project would be developed, reviewed and approved by the City in accordance with standard City Department of Public Works procedures and adopted mitigation measures as specified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for the project (see Appendix A of this document, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).
Project construction plans and specification would be advertised for bid by the City Public Works Department for consideration by road construction contractors. Construction procedures as provided for in the construction bid documents (drawings and specifications), would be reviewed for conformity on a continuing basis in the field by City engineers from the Public Works Department. Final acceptance of the project by the City would be given after monitoring implementation of the required mitigation measures and final inspections for conformity of the project with the construction bid documents.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UNDER CEQA

Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project

This project is subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Guidelines Section 15301 because the project involves the expansion (acquisition of additional right-of-way) of an existing use. To determine whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be required for the project, an Initial Study has been prepared. Section 15365 of the CEQA Guidelines specifies: “‘Initial Study’ means a preliminary analysis prepared by the Lead Agency (the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works) to determine whether an EIR or a Negative Declaration must be prepared or to identify the significant environmental effects to be analyzed in an EIR.”

Section 15063 (b) (2) of the Guidelines notes: “The Lead Agency shall prepare a Negative Declaration if there is no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment.” A Negative Declaration is a written statement by the Lead Agency briefly describing the reasons that a proposed project, not exempt from CEQA, will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore does not require the preparation of an EIR.

A Negative Declaration will be issued for the Santa Rosa Avenue widening project in accordance with the findings of Section 2 of this document, CEQA Environmental Checklist, Part 2.3, Evaluation of Environmental Impacts.

Santa Rosa Avenue Restriping Project

It should be noted Santa Rosa Avenue north of the project, between Kawana Springs Road and Colgan Avenue (a distance of about 1,900 feet) is proposed to undergo a lane restriping program to improve traffic circulation. The restriping program is indicated on Figures 1.3-2 and 1.3-4 and is proposed to include the following:

- Santa Rosa Avenue from the Santa Rosa Marketplace main entrance to Kawana Springs Road – the addition of a third southbound through lane by re-striping existing lanes.
- Santa Rosa Avenue from the Baker Avenue/Colgan Avenue intersection to the Santa Rosa Marketplace main entrance – the addition of a third southbound through lane by re-striping lanes and removing a northbound right-turn only lane at Santa Rosa Avenue approach to Colgan Avenue.
FIGURE 1.3-4: PROJECT PLAN (RESTRIPPING ONLY TO COLGAN AVENUE)
Bike lane striping would be installed along both sides of the road between Kawana Springs Road and Colgan Avenue.

The restriping program would not be subject to environmental review under CEQA because the street segment is an existing facility and would not undergo expansion (qualifies as a Categorical Exemption under CEQA Guidelines Article 19, Section 15301 (c) existing highways and streets). There would be no additional right-of-way or expansion of the existing roadway required for the restriping project. Therefore, this environmental review of the proposed modifications and improvements to Santa Rosa Avenue concentrates on the segment between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road with reference to the segment between Kawana Springs road and Colgan Avenue provided as required to accurately portray existing conditions in the project area and for informational purposes.

**Amended Initial Study**

This Initial Study has been amended. An Initial Study for the Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project was prepared and issued for agency and public review in July, 2006. The document was forwarded to the State Clearinghouse. Subsequent to issuance of the July, 2006 Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration and letters of comment received on the documents, the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public works held a public community meeting regarding the project at 6 PM on the evening of September 27, 2006 in the conference room at the Department of Public Works, 69 Stony Circle in Santa Rosa. The purpose of the meeting was to provide the opportunity for Public Works staff to explain to interested individuals the purpose and need for the project as designed, access options for residents of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park complex located at the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Hearn Avenue and Santa Rosa Avenue, answer questions about the project and explain the next steps in project design and construction.

As a result of the community meeting, additional examination of the project design was conducted by Department of Public Works engineering staff and several modifications to the project were made. The modifications included: 1) reducing the number of southbound right-turn lanes on Santa Rosa Avenue at the westbound Hearn Avenue/US 101 overcrossing in front of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park complex from two to one (as currently exists) to maintain the existing right-of-way line on the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue, and 2) modifying traffic signal operation at the Kawana Springs Road and Santa Rosa Avenue intersection to provide controlled access at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park northern driveway.

It is further noted maintaining the existing west right-of-way limit at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park would preserve existing on-site Wayside Gardens parking and allow for the enhancement of an existing landscape buffer between the Mobile Home Park and Santa Rosa Avenue. The buffer would also be augmented with additional plantings of street trees in tree wells to be provided within an eight-foot wide sidewalk along the west side of the road as part of the road widening project. City staff plans to collaborate with the owners of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Court on the design of replacement landscaping for the buffer and visual barrier. While the existing landscape buffer would be reduced in width because of the road widening project, a wall or fence could be installed as part of
the buffer enhancement program to enhance security and privacy. In accordance with the above project changes, this Initial Study text with project maps has been amended as of April 2007 to reflect those changes and is reissued for agency/public review.

Endnotes

1 Related projects near or within the study area include:

- Yolanda Avenue widening -- Santa Rosa Avenue to Petaluma Hill Road. Yolanda Avenue is projected to be widened to three lanes (one travel lane in each direction, along with a center two-way left turn lane), along with bike lanes and sidewalk on one side (CIP Project #8114). Ultimately as the adjoining parcels develop, Yolanda Avenue will include three travel lanes (two eastbound, one westbound), a center two-way left-turn lane, bike lanes, a planter strip, and sidewalks on both sides.
- Yolanda Avenue— the installation of a traffic signal at Petaluma Hill Road (CIP Project #8188). This signal installation is part of the Kawana Meadows project; construction is scheduled for mid-2007.
- The installation of a Hearn Avenue traffic signal interconnect from Corby Avenue to Santa Rosa Avenue (CIP Project #8128).

Other longer-term projects include:

- Hearn Avenue from Corby Avenue to Dutton Avenue – a complete widening to four lanes and the addition of bike lanes
- A widening of the Hearn Avenue bridge to four travel lanes, with sidewalk and bike lanes (CIP Project #5141)
- An upgrading of the Hearn Avenue railroad crossing
- Constructing the US 101/Bellevue Avenue interchange to connect Corby Avenue to US 101 and a future Northpoint Parkway Extension to connect with a future Bellevue Avenue/Farmers Lane Roadway Extension. The southbound on and off-ramps are included in the CIP as project #8053.
- Implementing an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) along Santa Rosa Avenue, from Maple Avenue to Burt Street; and along Hearn Avenue (CIP Project #5534)
- Completing a planline adoption and EIR for the Northpoint Parkway Extension between Bellevue/US 101 and Wright Road (CIP Project #8211).

2 As noted in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15063 (a) (3), an Initial Study is neither intended nor required to include the level of detail included in an EIR. The Initial Study is to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment.
Initial Study

2. CEQA Environmental Checklist

PROJECT TITLE: Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project

LEAD AGENCY: City of Santa Rosa

CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER: Lori Urbanek, Assistant Engineer lurbanek@ci.santa-rosa.ca.us (707) 543-3854 Fax: (707) 543-3801

PROJECT LOCATION: County: Sonoma City: Santa Rosa
Cross Streets: Yolanda Avenue, Kawana Springs Road
Roadway Project Length: 1,180 feet

PROJECT SPONSOR’S NAME AND ADDRESS: City of Santa Rosa, Department of Public Works 69 Stony Circle Santa Rosa, CA 95401

CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER: Lori Urbanek, Assistant Engineer lurbanek@ci.santa-rosa.ca.us (707) 543-3854 Fax: (707) 543-3801

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS: Project area is shown as primarily Retail and Business Services on the General Plan Land Use Diagram.

ZONING: Project area is shown a primarily General Commercial (CG) on the Santa Rosa Zoning Map.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road to include roadway widening; the addition of through and turning movement lanes; the provision of sidewalks, bike lanes, a planter strip, street trees, median and re-striping requiring right-of-way acquisition. Refer to Section 1.3, Project Description for further information and project maps.

SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING: The project area consists predominantly of commercial/retail development with some residential land uses. There are two regional shopping centers in the project area with direct access to Santa Rosa Avenue, including the Santa Rosa Marketplace and Southside Shopping Center consisting of nationally known retail businesses. Other commercial development fronts Santa Rosa Avenue in the area of road widening including a McDonald’s Restaurant, Citgo gas station and 7-Eleven store, Volvo Quality Motors, Cartronics, Advantage Manufactured Housing sales, Paper Zone, Mattress Discounters, BBQ Galore, Advanced
Auto Glass, Cartunes and other retail establishments. The Carriage Court Mobile Home Park is the major residential parcel with access off Kawana Springs Road. Also, the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park is located on the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue at Kawana Springs Road.

PUBLIC AGENCIES WITH INTEREST IN THE PROJECT (i.e. permits, financing approval, participation agreement, etc.): City of Santa Rosa, Department of Public Works, Department of Community Development, Engineering.

### 2.1 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” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [x] Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Services Systems
- [ ] Agriculture Resources
- [x] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation
- [x] Mandatory Findings of Significance
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [x] Transportation/Traffic
2.2 DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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 a “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 standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_________________________________    ______________________
Signature                          Date

_____________________________    ______________________
Printed Name                      Title
2.3 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3-1 Aesthetics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The area immediately east of U.S. 101 where Santa Rosa Avenue is located is highly urbanized and devoted primarily to retail land uses. Most of the land area in the project vicinity is designated as Retail and Business Services on the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan Map. Buildings for the most part retain a utilitarian appearance. The project area does not contain important visual landmarks, areas of scenic interest or well defined entry/exit points. Amenities such as street trees to give rhythm, cadence and shade are notably lacking throughout the project area. An exception is the landscape treatment along the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue south of Yolanda Avenue where the Southside Shopping Center is located. Here, a generous growth of mature sycamore trees supported with a grass covered earth mound understory provides a park like setting to the environment, relieving the tension otherwise provided through commercial advertising, the clutter of overhead utilities and traffic congestion in the area.

Overhead lights and utility lines suspended from numerous vertical utility poles predominate within the field of view along with eye-level semaphores and signs to guide and control traffic throughout the area. There are no General Plan designated scenic viewpoints in the project area. However, the General Plan Transportation Element lists Highway 101 as a scenic road. Scenic roads are defined in the General Plan as roads that “have unique scenic qualities because of their natural setting as well as historical and cultural features.”3 In addition, Farmers Lane Extension (planned south of Bennett Valley Road) is listed as a scenic road. Farmers Lane Extension ties into Yolanda Avenue extending from Petaluma Hill road in the east to Santa Rosa Avenue in the west at the south portion of the roadway widening project. Yolanda Avenue is a paved two lane road without curbs, sidewalks or designated bicycle lanes.4
Project Evaluation

There are no significant scenic resources in the project area and the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. As a road widening project, the Santa Rosa Avenue project would not obstruct a line of sight of adversely impact a scenic vista. All construction work would be at ground level or below in utility trenches and not above ground level within the field of view with the exception of relocating the above-grade PG&E 115 kV electrical transmission line poles and City light standards. New street paving, concrete curbs, sidewalks, bicycle lanes and a planter strip with ornamental street trees provided where there currently are no ornamental trees adjacent to the road would be expected to improve appearances in the project area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to item 2.3-1 a) above for a description of existing conditions in the project area. In addition to conditions of the setting described previously, there are shrubs and trees located between the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Court and Santa Rosa Avenue (southwest portion of the intersection of Kawana Springs Road and Santa Rosa Avenue). The shrubs consist of a mix of plant materials extending from the ground surface upward. Plant species consist of junipers, oleander, ligustrum, pyracantha, species of prunus up to about 12 feet high and of tree-like form, and other non-native species. These plant materials as a grouping tend to screen portions of the Wayside Gardens complex from views along Santa Rosa Avenue. Also, there are two walnut trees about 15 to 25 feet in height (10-inches to 14-inches trunk diameter at breast height) and two pine trees up to about 35 feet in height (up to 18-inches trunk diameter at breast height) located between the Wayside Gardens and Santa Rosa Avenue. There are no rock outcroppings (cultural resources are discussed in Section 2.3-5 of this Initial Study).

Project Evaluation

The existing right-of-way limit on the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue north of Hearn Avenue would be maintained in its current location. The outside edge of the new sidewalk would be located where the existing right-of-way line is currently located. Maintaining the existing right-of-way limit at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park would preserve existing on-site parking and reduce the amount of plant materials needed to be removed from the existing planted buffer area between the Wayside Gardens and Santa Rosa Avenue.
The existing approximate 10 to 12-foot wide landscape buffer would be reduced in width by about one-half because of the road widening project and the installation of sidewalk area. This would require the removal of portions of existing shrubbery in the buffer. In addition, two walnut trees and two pine trees would be expected to be removed as a result of project construction. While some of the visual screen and privacy these plant materials currently provide would be removed, the change in visual conditions would not be expected to be substantial or extensive and thus the impact of plant material removal is considered to be less than significant.

Maintaining the existing right-of-way in front of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park would allow for the enhancement of the existing landscape buffer between the Mobile Home Park and Santa Rosa Avenue. A wall or fence could be installed as part of a buffer enhancement program to enhance security and privacy. The buffer would also be augmented with additional plantings of street trees in tree wells to be provided within the eight and one-half foot wide sidewalk along the west side of the road. City staff plans to collaborate with the owners of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Court on the design of replacement landscaping for the buffer and visual barrier.

Based on the discussion above, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to items 2.3-1 a) and 2.3-1 b) above for a description of existing conditions in the project area.

Project Evaluation

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing street. In many locations within the project area, there are no curbs, crumbling sidewalks (or no sidewalks) and the pavement surface appears worn. While the removal of portions of shrubbery and up to four trees (two walnut trees and two pine trees) would be a less than significant aesthetic impact as noted above under the evaluation of item 2.3-1 b) and the impact criterion as listed, the project would more than compensate for the removal of these plant materials. This is because new street paving, new concrete curbs with sidewalks, clearly defined bicycle lanes and the introduction of ornamental street trees adjacent to the roadway where there currently are no ornamental trees would be expected to substantially improve overall appearances in the project area as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
**ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to item 2.3-1 (a) above for a description of existing conditions in the project area.

**Project Evaluation**

As indicated in Section 1.3, Project Description, the existing street lights between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road would need to be relocated to allow for the roadway widening project. The relocated lights would be situated about 12 feet to a point outside of the travel lanes as reconfigured under the project behind the new curb line with the lighting fixtures extending over the outboard travel lanes. Accordingly, the project would not introduce a new source of light to the project area and would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

**2.3-2 Agriculture Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

See Section 1.1, *Project Location*, for a discussion of the location of the project. Refer also to Section 1.3, *Project Description*, for a description of the project and its components.
Project Evaluation

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing street and the project site is not located within an agriculturally designated area. As an enhancement project for an existing facility, with a less than substantial acquisition of additional right-of-way to enable project completion, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

See Section 1.1, Project Location, for a discussion of the location of the project. Refer also to Section 1.3, Project Description, for a description of the project and its components.

Project Evaluation

As noted immediately above, Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing street and the project site is not located within an agriculturally designated area. The project area is shown a primarily General Commercial (CG) on the Santa Rosa Zoning Map. No Williamson Act contract applies to the project site area. Therefore, the project would not Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, because of their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to Section 1.3, Project Description, for a description of the project and its components.
Project Evaluation

The project site is not located within an agriculturally designated area. The project area is shown as primarily General Commercial (CG) on the Santa Rosa Zoning Map. Therefore, the project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, because of their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use.

### 2.3-3 Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ✗

Discussion

**Regional Regulations:** The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the primary agency responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the entire San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. To that end, the BAAQMD, a regional agency, works directly with the Association of Bay Area Governments, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and local governments and cooperates actively with all federal and state government agencies. The BAAQMD develops rules and regulations, establishes permitting requirements for stationary sources, inspects emissions sources, and enforces such measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary.

The BAAQMD is directly responsible for reducing emissions from stationary (area and point), mobile, and indirect sources. It has responded to this requirement by preparing a sequence of Ozone Attainment Plans and Clean Air Plans that comply with the federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act, accommodate growth, reduce the pollutant levels in the Bay Area, meet federal and state ambient air quality standards, and minimize the fiscal impact that pollution control measures have on the local economy. The Ozone Attainment Plans are prepared for the federal ozone standard, and the Clean Air Plans are prepared for the state ozone standards. The most recent Ozone Attainment Plan was adopted by the BAAQMD Board of Directors on October 2001 and demonstrates attainment of the federal ozone standard in the Bay Area by 2006. The current regional Clean Air Plan was adopted by the Board of Directors on December 20, 2000. It identifies the control measures that would be implemented through 2006 to reduce major sources of pollutants. These planning efforts have substantially decreased the population’s exposure to unhealthful levels of pollutants, even while substantial population growth has occurred within the Bay Area. The Clean Air Plan predicts that
regional ozone concentrations will decrease by 1.2 percent per year or 9.0 percent over the twelve years after it was adopted. As noted previously, 2003 marked the third consecutive year that ambient ozone concentrations throughout the Bay Area did not exceed national standards.

**Local Regulations:** Local jurisdictions, such as the City of Santa Rosa, have the authority and responsibility to reduce air pollution through its policy power and decision-making authority. Specifically, the City is responsible for the assessment and mitigation of air emissions resulting from its land use decisions. The City of Santa Rosa is also responsible for the implementation of transportation control measures as outlined in the Clean Air Plan. Examples of such measures include bus turnouts, energy-efficient streetlights, and synchronized traffic signals.

City of Santa Rosa environmental plans and policies recognize community goals for air quality. Chapter 7.4 of the Santa Rosa General Plan identifies goals and policies that help the City contribute to regional air quality improvement efforts. The Santa Rosa General Plan is consistent with the Clean Air Plan because of the goals and policies for maintaining and improving air quality as documented in the General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element.

**Project Evaluation**

The Clean Air Plan was prepared to reduce pollutant levels in the Bay Area, and meet federal and state ambient air quality standards. Likewise, Chapter 7.4 of the Santa Rosa General Plan identifies goals and policies that help the City contribute to regional air quality improvement efforts. As noted previously in Section 1.2 of this Initial Study, Need for Project, the completed Santa Rosa Avenue widening project would be consistent with Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Transportation Element Goals and Policies to develop strategies to improve service levels (Policy T-A-2), improve traffic flows and reduce neighborhood traffic impacts (Policy T-C-4), maintain acceptable levels of service (Policy T-D-1), provide full access to transit services (Policy T-H-6), provide safe streets for pedestrians and bicyclists (Goal T-J), among other Goals and Policies as cited in the General Plan.

Correspondingly, Chapter 4 of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines also identifies several measures (including encouraging non-motor vehicle transportation) that can be implemented to reduce air quality impacts. These measures are included in the design of the project and would help to reduce the emissions (see Section 1.3, Project Description). Specific measures recommended that would pertain to the project as well as a broad cross-section of projects include:

- Safe, direct access for bicyclists to adjacent bicycle routes.
- Sidewalks and walking paths to transit stops and other destinations.
- Street trees that provide moderate coverage of the sidewalks and pedestrian paths;

Based on this information, the project would implement and conform to various transportation control and trip reduction measures that are consistent with the BAAQMD’s goals for reducing regional air pollutants. In addition, by improving traffic flow, the project would maintain service levels thereby reducing the level of pollutants contained in exhaust emissions that would otherwise occur with poorer service levels (see item 2.3-15 below, Transportation/Traffic, for additional information regarding
traffic service levels). Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of air quality plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion immediately above regarding pollutants. The project itself would not be a traffic generator that could increase pollutant load, such as may be the case with a large new development proposal that includes housing or commercial development.

Construction–related activities are generally short-term in duration and the BAAQMD does not recommend any thresholds of significance for construction-related emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD bases the determination of significance on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented. At this time, the only construction-related control measures the BAAQMD recommends are those related to dust. If all appropriate emissions control measures recommended by the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines relating to dust are implemented for a project, then construction emissions are considered less than significant level.

**Project Evaluation**

Mitigation Measure 2.3-3 includes all appropriate dust control measures recommended by the BAAQMD. Construction-related air quality impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with respect to a violation of air quality standards.

**MITIGATION MEASURE 2.3-3**

Implement recommended dust control measures: to reduce particulate matter emissions during project pavement removal, excavation and construction phases, the project contractor(s) should comply with the dust control strategies developed by the BAAQMD. The Department of Public Works shall include in construction contracts the following requirements or measures shown to be equally effective.

- Cover all truck hauling soil, sand, and other loose construction and demolition debris from the site, or require all such trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard;
- Water all exposed or disturbed soil surfaces in active construction areas at least twice daily;
- Use watering to control dust generation during demolition of structures or break-up of pavement;
• Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved parking areas and staging areas;
• Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved parking areas and staging areas;
• Provide daily clean-up of mud and dirt carried onto paved streets from the site;
• Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.);
• Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph;
• Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways;
• Install wheel washers for all existing trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site;
• Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour over a 30-minute period or more; and
• To the extent possible, limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other dust-generating construction activity at any one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of 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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The federal and state standards for ozone and particulate matter are different and so are the procedures by which areas within California are determined to be attainment or nonattainment for these pollutants. The Bay Area is currently classified as a nonattainment area for the federal ozone standard. However, 2003 marked the third consecutive year that ambient ozone concentrations throughout the Bay Area did not exceed national standards. This condition does not constitute a formal redesignation of the Bay Area into the attainment category. The next step is for the ARB to submit to the U.S. EPA a plan demonstrating how the area will continue to maintain the national standard for 10 years. Once the plan is submitted, the ARB can request the U.S. EPA to redesignate the Bay Area as an attainment area for ozone. The Bay Area is in attainment or designated as unclassified for all other pollutants under federal standards.

The Bay Area is designated as a nonattainment area for state ozone and PM10 standards and an attainment area for all other pollutants. The recently adopted Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy demonstrates how the Bay Area will achieve compliance with the State one-hour air quality standard...
for ozone as expeditiously as practicable and how the region will reduce transport of ozone and ozone precursors to neighboring air basins.

**Project Evaluation**

Refer to the discussions above under items 2.3-3 a) and b). Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing facility. The project would be consistent with the General Plan Transportation Element. The project would not be a large new development proposal that includes housing or commercial development that would generate operational emissions by both stationary and mobile sources resulting from day-to-day activities. For example, stationary and area source emissions are generated by the consumption of natural gas for space and water heating devices, the operation of maintenance equipment and the use of consumer products. Mobile emissions are generated by motor vehicles. The project would implement and conform to various transportation control and trip reduction measures that are consistent with the BAAQMD’s goals for reducing regional air pollutants (see item 2.3-3 b) above). By improving traffic flow, the project would maintain service levels thereby reducing the level of pollutants contained in exhaust emissions that would otherwise occur with poorer service levels. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussions above under items 2.3-3 a) regarding air quality regulations. Land uses such as primary and secondary schools, hospitals, and convalescent homes are considered to be sensitive receptors to poor air quality because the very young, the old, and the infirm are more susceptible to respiratory infections and other air quality-related health problems than the general public. Residential uses are considered sensitive because people in residential areas are often at home for extended periods of time, so they could be exposed to pollutants for extended periods. Recreational areas are considered moderately sensitive to poor air quality because vigorous exercise associated with recreation places a high demand on the human respiratory function.

**Project Evaluation**

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing facility with urban development located along both sides of the roadway. The project would not be a new regional/arterial introducing pollutants to the community. The project would not be a large new development proposal that includes housing or commercial development that would generate operational emissions by new mobile sources. As a street widening
project to improve circulation, the project would implement and conform to various transportation control and trip reduction measures that are consistent with the BAAQMD’s goals for reducing regional air pollutants (see item 2.3-3 b) above). By improving traffic flow, the project would maintain service levels thereby reducing the level of pollutants contained in exhaust emissions that would otherwise occur with poorer service levels under cumulative (future) development conditions.

Air quality modeling completed for the project area showed that carbon monoxide levels at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park, which fronts Santa Rosa Avenue, were significantly below the ambient standards. This would remain true after the roadway project would be completed. Therefore, the project would not in and of itself expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussions above under items 2.3-3 a) regarding existing air quality regulations.

**Project Evaluation**

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing facility. The road widening project would be consistent with the General Plan Transportation Element. The project would not be a large new development proposal that includes housing, commercial or industrial development that would have any potential to generate odors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3-4 Biological Resources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISSUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The project site is located in a portion of the Santa Rosa Avenue corridor that is distinctly urban and developed. Current commercial/residential/light industrial uses have removed virtually all biological resources. The only vegetation along the roadway (other than ornamental lawn) includes two walnut trees and about 12 pine trees at the northwest corner of the intersection of Hearn Avenue and Santa Rosa Avenue.

Special-status plant and wildlife species are those designated by federal, state, local, or scientific organizations as needing protection because of rarity or threats to their existence. Special-status species include those listed as threatened, endangered, or proposed for listing, candidates for listing, and species of concern to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). The project site is within the general geographic range of several endangered, threatened and sensitive plant and wildlife species.

The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) reports 22 plant and animal species that have 63 occurrences within the Santa Rosa 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle. A query of the surrounding eight quadrangles (Healdsburg, Calistoga, Sebastopol, Mark West Springs, Kenwood, Two Rock, Cotati and Glen Ellen) generates a list of 80 elements that have 437 occurrences. Six of the 80 species reported in the CNDDB (five plant and one animal species) occur within one quarter mile of the project site. (These six species are: Baker’s navarretia (Navarretia leucocephala ssp. Bakeri), California linderiella (Linderiella occidentalis), California tiger salamander (Ambystoma californiense), Jepson’s leptosiphon (Leptosiphon jepsonii), saline clover (Trifolium depauperatuv var. hydrophilum), and white sedge (Carex albida). However, none of these species would be expected on the project site because the area is predominately paved, supports urban development and the required habitat and soil conditions do not occur at the project site.

There are no wetlands of known jurisdiction by the US Army Corps of Engineers adjacent to the roadway in the project area between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road. There are no riparian corridors, important migration routes or sensitive habitat areas known to be frequented by rare or endangered plant or animal species or species candidate for listing (special status species) within close proximity to the roadway. There is no sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by CDFG or the USFWS within the vicinity of the roadway planned for widening between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road.

Project Evaluation

In accordance with the above, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFG or the USFWS.

As a general note regarding the protection of biological resources, tree removal for project construction as indicated further below (see item 2.3-4 (e)) could impact nesting birds. Removal of vegetation could result in a “take” caused by the direct mortality of adult or young birds, nest destruction or
abandonment, or disturbance of nesting native bird species that causes the loss of reproductive effort. This would apply to migratory birds and other non-special-status species. This would be a violation of the Fish and Game Code of California (non-native European starlings and English sparrows are specifically excluded from these regulations). Because no special-status bird species are known to nest within the project area, special-status bird species would not be impacted by the proposed project.

Bird species are protected by both state Fish and Game Code of California Sections 3503 and 3513) and federal (Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918) laws. Fish and Game Code Section 3503 states that it is “unlawful to take, posses, or needlessly destroy the nests or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation made pursuant thereto”. Section 3513 states that it is unlawful to take or possess any migratory nongame bird as designated in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Disturbance that causes nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort (killing or abandonment of eggs or your) is considered “taking”. Under 16 U.S.C 703-711, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act makes it “unlawful to take” any migratory bird listed in 50 C.F.R. Part 10, including “nests, eggs or products”.

The removal of four trees and shrubbery up to about ten feet in height as explained below to allow roadway widening could result in the direct mortality of adult birds or their young, nest destruction, or disturbance of nesting native bird species resulting in nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort. However, the Department of Public Works would be required to comply with applicable CDFG regulations regarding this issue. Prior to tree removal during the breeding season (February through August), the Department would conduct a field survey from 21 to 14 days prior to the commencement of construction activities. A qualified biologist would determine if active nests of native birds are present in the construction zone. In the event an active nest is discovered, removal of the nesting substrate would be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged (typically three to four weeks for small passerines), as determined by the biologist, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts unless the CDFG (and USFWS for migratory birds) authorize otherwise. No surveys are required if vegetation removal would occur outside the nesting season from September 1 to January 31.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-4 a) regarding existing conditions.
Project Evaluation

Because the project site is situated in a developed urban setting, the project would not have an adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-4 a) regarding existing conditions.

Project Evaluation

The project site is situated in a developed urban setting which does not support any federally-protected wetlands. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse effect on any wetland resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-4 a) regarding existing conditions.

Project Evaluation

Because the project site does not support movement or migration corridors, the proposed project would not create new barriers to wildlife movement. Therefore the project would not interfere with the
movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The City of Santa Rosa Tree Ordinance 17-24.030 protects oaks and other native trees as heritage trees. The City of Santa Rosa Tree Ordinance includes seven species of oaks and eight other native tree species (redwood, bay, madrone, buckeye, Douglas fir, red alder, while alder and big leaf maple) of certain trunk diameters in the definition of a Heritage Tree and requires a permit for removal. A “Protected Tree” is defined as any tree designated to be preserved on an approved development plan or as a condition of approval of a tentative map.

Project Evaluation

The road widening project would require the removal of two walnut trees and two pine trees along with some shrubbery up to about ten feet in height in the vicinity of intersection of Hearn Avenue and Santa Rosa Avenue. Each tree has a trunk about 12 to 18 inches in diameter (at breast height). These trees are not designated as Heritage trees and their removal would not be inconsistent with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Refer also to the discussions above under items 2.3-4 (a) through (e).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-4 a) regarding existing conditions.
Project Evaluation

The project site is not located within the boundaries of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Native American archaeological sites in the larger project area (locations extending outward from the project area) tend to be found on or near creeks and occasionally on slightly elevated land surfaces away from current stream alignments but associated with seasonal wetlands. There are no wetlands at the project site and Colgan Creek passes under Santa Rosa Avenue in a culvert north of the project site near Colgan Avenue. A review of records and literature on file at the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University for the property located at the northeast corner of Yolanda Avenue and Santa Rosa Avenue revealed no prehistoric archaeological sites located at that location. There is a low potential for Native American sites to exist within the project area, which is characterized as a flat, alluvial plain.5

On July 22, 2005, a request was made of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to search its sacred lands database to determine if any Native American cultural resources are located on or near the property noted above. In addition, a letter was sent to each tribal contact for Sonoma County identified on the NAHC Native American Contact List6. Each letter contained a map, a description of the location of interest, and a request for any information or input on properties of Native American importance in the area. The search of the sacred lands file revealed no Native American cultural resources in the immediate area of interest.7 No responses were received from tribal representatives indicating the presence of Native American cultural resources in the general project area. However, the absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file or through correspondence with tribal representatives does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in the project area.
Project Evaluation

A building situated at the southeast corner of the intersection of Santa Rosa Avenue and Kawana Springs Road would need to be removed to allow for project construction (2300 Santa Rosa Avenue). The building is a single-story, rectangular structure with a side-gabled roof. The building is of wood frame construction, with about 700 square feet of floor area and consists of and materials and components typical of 1950s construction.

The structure was built in 1955 and is used for commercial (used car sales) purposes. Because of its age, the structure meets the requirement for evaluation as a historic resource. An evaluation of the structure and its history indicates there is no evidence to support a finding of eligibility under any of the National Register of Historic Places criteria. No significant events or people were discovered in connection with the property. The building does not embody the distinct characteristics of an architectural type, period or method of construction. The architect is unknown; however, it is unlikely that the building represents the work of a master. Further, a commercial building of the size under investigation built in the 1950s is also not considered likely to yield any information important respecting historical events (for further information, see Appendix B of this Initial Study, Primary Record, Resource Evaluation). Therefore, there would be no potential loss of historic architectural sites and no substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic architectural site.

Although Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing paved facility, and prehistoric archaeological sensitivity of the project site area is low, it is reasonable to conclude that prehistoric cultural deposits could be found anywhere within or near the project site and could be disturbed or destroyed through excavation and construction activities. Damage to archaeological sites would be considered a potentially significant impact.

MITIGATION MEASURE 2.3-5

Construction specifications for the project should note that operators of site trench excavation equipment be instructed to be observant for unusual or suspect materials that may surface from below during site grading and excavation operations.

In the event that unknown archaeological remains, including paleontological objects, are discovered during subsurface excavation and construction (primarily for utilities), land alteration work in the vicinity of the find should be halted and a qualified archeologist consulted. Prompt evaluations could then be made regarding the find and a resource management plan that is consistent with CEQA requirements could then be implemented. If prehistoric archeological deposits are discovered, local Native American organizations should be consulted and involved in making resource management decisions. All applicable State and local legal requirements concerning the treatment of cultural materials and Native American burials should be enforced.

If subsequent investigations result in the recording of prehistoric archeological sites that cannot be avoided and preserved, and the importance of the cultural deposits cannot be determined from surface evidence, then subsurface testing programs should take place to make such
determinations. Testing procedures should be designed to specifically determine the boundaries of sites, the depositional integrity and the cultural importance of the resources, as per CEQA criteria. These investigations should be conducted by qualified professionals knowledgeable in regional prehistory. The testing programs should be conducted within the context of appropriate research considerations and should result in detailed technical reports that define the exact disturbance implications for important resources and present comprehensive programs for addressing such disturbances. Measures similar to the ones described below would also apply:

1. Avoidance of an archaeological site through modification of the excavation that would allow for the preservation of the resource.

2. Covering or “capping” sites with a protective layer of fill. Archaeological monitoring during the filling process would be recommended.

In circumstances where archaeological deposits cannot be preserved through avoidance or capping, data recovery through excavation would be the mitigation alternative. This measure would consist of excavating those portions of the sites that would be adversely impacted. The work should be accomplished within the context of detailed research and in accordance with current professional standards. The program should result in extraction of sufficient volumes of archaeological data so that important regional research considerations can be addressed. The excavation should be accomplished by qualified professionals and detailed technical reports should result.

Although considered remote, any discovery of a paleontological site would require a qualified paleontologist to survey the site and assess the find. If a fossil find is confirmed, it shall be recorded with the U.S. geological Survey and curated in an appropriate repository.

In considering subsurface testing and excavations of prehistoric archaeological sites, consultation with the local Native American community is essential; all aspects of the programs, including the treatment of cultural materials and particularly the removal, study and reinternment of Native American burials should be addressed. All applicable State and local legal requirements concerning these issues should be strictly adhered to. The implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.3-5 would reduce the potential for causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource to a less than significant level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-5 a) regarding existing conditions.

Project Evaluation

The implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.3-5 would reduce the potential for causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a archaeological resource to a less than significant level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-5 a) regarding existing conditions. The project site area is flat and no unique geologic features are known to exist at the project site or in the immediate area.

Project Evaluation

The implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.3-5 would apply to paleontological objects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-5 a) regarding existing conditions. No human remains are known to exist within the area of project construction.

Project Evaluation

The implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.3-5 would reduce the potential for causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a archaeological resource to a less than significant level.
2.3-6  Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</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?

Discussion

There is a potentially active fault zone passing about 0.5 mile southwest of the project alignment that appears on the General Plan Geologic and Seismic Hazards Map. This appears to be a splinter trace of the Rodgers Creek segment of the Hayward-Rodgers Creek fault system. The feature has been mapped approximately from the intersection of Highway 12 and Stony Point Road southeast to the vicinity of the intersection of Highway 101 and Bellevue Avenue, based on work completed in 1974 for the California Geological Survey (then known as the Division of Mines and Geology) study *Geology for Planning in Sonoma County*. That report showed a “possibly active fault” extending from the Rodgers Creek fault, northwest through Bellevue, and connecting with a previously mapped fault trace east of Trenton. The fault east of Trenton was thought to be a post-Pliocene trace (less than 1.6 million years old). The current California Geological Survey (CGS) map of the Santa Rosa Quadrangle does not show the same connection between the Rodgers Creek fault and the fault east of Trenton, and indicates the existence of a fault trace across this part of the city is highly speculative. The indication is that there is no strong evidence for movement of this fault during the last 1.6 million years. The CGS revised the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning maps in the vicinity of Santa Rosa in 1983, and did not place either of the speculatively located faults in an Earthquake Fault Zone. That decision was based on the lack of evidence of rupture of the geologically young deposits in the area. This does not mean the fault does not exist, only that sufficient information has not been found to confirm or deny fault activity at this location. As a safety precaution, the Santa Rosa General Plan maps and describes this fault as potentially active.

Project Evaluation

The project road alignment is not in a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, nor does any known active fault trend toward it. There would be no impacts related to fault rupture because the
project alignment is not crossed by a known active fault. Thus, the project would have no impact related to exposure of people or structures to adverse effects caused by the rupture of a known fault.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic groundshaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The Sonoma Valley is in the seismically active San Andreas Fault System, and the project road alignment is about 1.6 miles southwest of the Rodgers Creek trace of the Hayward-Rodgers Creek fault. Historically, this fault has produced moderate-sized earthquakes in the Santa Rosa area. The October 1969 earthquakes on the Hayward-Rodgers Creek fault registered M5.6 and M5.7 on the Richter scale. No deaths occurred in Santa Rosa; however, at least fifteen people were injured and about two million dollars damage was done, including numerous breaks in water system pipes. The April 1906 earthquake on the San Andreas fault, estimated at about Moment Magnitude (Mw) 7.9 (M8.3 on the Richter scale), practically destroyed the business district of the City, causing 61 reported deaths.11 More recently, the Mw 6.9 (M7.1) Loma Prieta earthquake of October 1989 on the San Andreas fault, caused severe damage throughout the Bay Area, but not extensively in Santa Rosa. Refer also to the discussion of Existing Conditions under Item a) i) above.

Project Evaluation

The project road alignment would be subjected to at least one major earthquake during its useful economic life.12 The characteristic earthquake for the project area is estimated by the U.S. and California Geological Surveys to be a Mw 7.1 earthquake on the Rodgers Creek-North Hayward segments of the Hayward-Rodgers Creek fault. The resulting vibration could cause damage to the road foundation and surface and to relocated infrastructure (primary effects), and could cause ground failures such as liquefaction or settlement in alluvium and poorly compacted fill (secondary effects). Because the project alignment is 1.6 miles from known traces of the Rodgers Creek fault, seismically induced groundshaking could occur in the project area, but as a road widening project would not represent a new project that would expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death as a result of strong seismic groundshaking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Refer to the discussion above regarding Existing Conditions under items a) i) and ii). In addition, it is noted that the site surface soils are of low liquefaction potential. However, liquefaction can occur at depth if the water table is less than 50 feet below the ground surface in pockets of fine-grained, uniformly sized sand, such as can occur in alluvial deposits. Liquefaction potential needs to be addressed at each construction site because conditions such as depth to water table, uniformity and mix of grain size can vary dramatically within alluvial deposits. In general, areas underlain by poorly sorted older alluvium (see below) are less liquefaction-prone than those underlain by the younger well-sorted finer deposits.

Project Evaluation

Along the project road alignment, as well as in the rest of California, exposure to seismic hazards such as groundshaking and ground failure is unavoidable. Therefore, the State of California has established construction standards and design criteria to safeguard life and property affected by earthquakes. Widening of the roadway would be required to comply with construction standards and seismic design criteria contained in such regulatory codes as Caltrans’ Seismic Design Criteria Version 1.2 (December 2001) and Highway Design Manual, Sections 110.6, Earthquake Consideration (November 2001), and 113, Geotechnical Design Report (November 2001), or similar codes adopted by the City for roadway corridor protection. These criteria deal with pavement and subsurface utility design (flexible joints and couplings, overpass construction, etc.), slope stability (especially slumping, settling, and liquefaction in fills), and alignment modification to reduce exposure to fault rupture, intense groundshaking, and ground failures such as liquefaction.

Because the existing roadway is in the near-source area (less than 15 km [9.3 miles] of a known active fault) of the Rodgers Creek segment of the Hayward-Rodgers Creek fault, appropriate near-source area seismic provisions contained in these design guidelines would be applied to the project. The project would provide for at least the minimum required protection from the anticipated effects of seismic groundshaking. Adherence to these standards of protection would reduce the risk of injury, or death from earthquakes to the maximum extent technically practicable. Based on this information, strong seismic groundshaking is considered a less-than-significant impact associated with construction along the project road alignment.

Because the existing roadway is in a seismically active region, the potential for seismic-related ground failure exists. The Association of Bay Area Governments’ (ABAG) Earthquake Liquefaction Hazard Map for Santa Rosa shows that the potential for liquefaction along the northern half of the alignment is high: along the southern half, it is very low. Because the project would be designed and constructed to modern engineering standards for seismically active areas, the impacts of liquefaction and other ground failures on the project would be reduced to the maximum extent technically practicable as noted above. Because the project would not include structures that house people or attract people to the project site, the proposed project would not alter substantially the current exposure of people or structures in Santa Rosa to potential hazards involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Based on
this information, the risk of liquefaction and other seismic-related ground failures is considered a less-than-significant impact associated with project construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The existing roadway is situated on the broad alluvial Santa Rosa Plain that forms the floor of the Sonoma Valley in the Coast Ranges geomorphic province. The ground surface in the project site area is a nearly level to gently undulating plain that slopes down very gently to the south and southwest: the average gradient is less than one-tenth of one percent. Elevations are between 130 and 145 feet above mean sea level.

Project Evaluation

Based on a comparison of the roadway alignment with existing topographic conditions, landslides would not be a hazard. Thus, the risk of exposing people or structures to landslide hazards would not be an effect associated with project construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

One soil association is represented along the project alignment: the Huichica-Wright-Zamora Soil Association developed on the unconsolidated deposits of flood plains, low terraces and alluvial fans. This soil association covers most of the Santa Rosa Plain. The soil types in this association are somewhat poorly drained to well drained, nearly level, loams to silty clay loams. The Wright loam underlies most of the existing roadway except for the area around the intersection of Santa Rosa and Colgan Avenues, which is underlain by the Clear Lake clay. The Wright loam consists of approximately equal parts of sand, silt, and clay. It is slowly permeable at the ground surface and very slowly permeable in the subsurface, slightly expansive at the ground surface and highly expansive between two and five feet below the ground surface, highly corrosive to untreated steel and concrete,
moderately to slightly prone to settlement, but not prone to liquefaction. The Clear Lake clay is very slowly permeable at the ground surface and in the subsurface, highly expansive, highly corrosive to untreated steel and concrete, moderately prone to settlement, but not prone to liquefaction. In their undisturbed states, erosion hazard for these soils is low because of the nearly level terrain and fine soil textures.

**Project Evaluation**

Grading for the proposed project is expected to be minimal. Up to about three feet of excavation would be needed to lay the roadbase where new right-of-way would be added for additional road surface pavement, sidewalks and curbs. Comparison of the current project engineering drawings with the existing topography indicates there would be little or no change in ground surface elevations.

The project is not expected to create substantial erosion or loss of topsoil because the existing roadway alignment is currently paved and would remain so following the completion of construction. The contractor would be required to comply with the grading standards contained in Section 18.20.070 of the City Code requiring the control of construction-period erosion and sedimentation. Furthermore, the City’s Special Provisions (Section 13) on storm water pollution prevention targets earthwork activities as a source of erosion during construction. Section 13 recommends practices that would reduce erosion. Specifically, the following provisions of Section 13 would apply to the proposed project:

*(b) Activity-Specific Requirements*

*(7) Earthwork*

The Contractor shall maximize the control of erosion and sediment by using the BMPs for erosion and sedimentation in the California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbook-Construction-Activity (published by the Storm Water Quality Task Force) or Manual of Standards for Erosion & Sediment Control Measures (published by ABAG).

Conformance with City grading standards and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (described under Checklist Item VIII, Hydrology and Water Quality would ensure erosion that could occur as a result of construction and implementation of the project would be controlled, thereby reducing erosion potential to a less-than-significant level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The geologic units below the soils along the project alignment are two types of unconsolidated sedimentary deposits: younger fluvial deposits near the intersection of Santa Rosa and Colgan Avenues, and older alluvial fan deposits along the rest of the alignment. The younger fluvial deposits generally are fine-grained (silty clay, silt, fine sand). The older alluvium is coarser material (medium to coarse silt and sand, minor gravel). These unconsolidated sedimentary deposits represent material eroded from the hills to the east and deposited in ancient river channels or as alluvial plains. They are excavated easily, but will not stand long as steep unsupported slopes. The clayey materials are prone to expansion and do not drain easily. The coarser-grained sediments drain more readily and there is a possibility (although a very low one) that some pockets of liquefiable sand exist within these deposits.

Project Evaluation

The existence of compressible, corrosive, and expansive soils along the project roadway alignment makes it necessary to ensure the soils used to support the road are sound. Using unsuitable soils would have the potential to create future liquefaction, subsidence, or collapse problems leading to settlement and/or utility line disruption. When weak soils are re-engineered specifically for stability prior to use these potential effects can be reduced or eliminated. An acceptable degree of soil stability would be achieved for expansive, liquefaction-prone, and compressible soils by the required incorporation of soil treatment programs (replacement, grouting, compaction, drainage control, etc.) in the excavation and construction plans to address site-specific soil conditions. To meet the design requirements described under item VI a) iii), above, a site-specific evaluation of soil conditions would be required by the City and would be required to contain recommendations for ground preparation and earthwork specific to the project that would become an integral part the construction design. Based on this information, the risk of exposing people or structures to unstable geologic units or adverse soil conditions would be a less-than-significant effect associated with project construction along this alignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-A of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-6 b) regarding existing soil conditions in the project area.
Project Evaluation

As explained in paragraph 2.3-6 c), above, expansive soils exist along the project alignment, but are required to be investigated and stabilized as part of the project design. Consequently, the risk of exposing people or structures to expansive soils would be a less-than-significant effect associated with project construction along the roadway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-6 b) regarding existing soil conditions in the project area.

Project Evaluation

The project would not generate wastewater, would not need a wastewater disposal system, and would not include the installation of septic tanks or leach fields. Therefore, there would be no potential impact related to the capability of the soil to support septic tanks or alternative disposal systems. Soil support for the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are not applicable to the project.

2.3-7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project: a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

A number of properties may cause a substance to be considered hazardous, including toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity or reactivity. A substance is defined as hazardous if it appears on a list of
hazardous materials prepared by a federal, State or local regulatory agency, or if it has characteristics defined as hazardous by such agency.

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control defines the term “hazardous material” as a substance or combination of substances that, because its quantity, concentration or physical, chemical or infectious characteristics, may either: 1) cause, or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious, irreversible, or incapacitating illness; or 2) pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, stored, transported or disposed of, or otherwise managed.

A “hazardous waste” is any hazardous material that is abandoned, discarded, or recycled (California Health & Safety Code Section 25124). The same criteria that render a material hazardous make a waste hazardous: toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity or reactivity.

Toxic, ignitable, corrosive and reactive materials are all subsets of hazardous materials and wastes. For example, if a material is toxic, it is hazardous, but not all hazardous materials are toxic. Specific tests for toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity and reactivity are set forth in Title 22, California Code of Regulations, Sections 66693-66708.

Project Evaluation

As an existing roadway, Santa Rosa Avenue would continue to accommodate vehicles that carry hazardous materials. The roadway widening project would not change or alter this function. The U.S. Department of Transportation has developed regulations pertaining to the transport of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes by all modes of transportation. The U.S. Postal Service has developed additional regulations for the transport of hazardous materials by mail. U.S. Department of Transportation regulations specify packaging requirements for different types of materials. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has also promulgated regulations for the transport of hazardous wastes. These more stringent requirements include tracking shipments with manifests to ensure that wastes are delivered to their intended destinations. In California, the California Highway Patrol, the California Department of Transportation, and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control play key roles in enforcing hazardous materials transportation requirements.

The project would not involve the creation of space or location for the generation, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The widening and installation of related modifications (sidewalks, bicycle lanes) to Santa Rosa Avenue would not serve to generate hazardous materials or directly result in the routine use of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project would not create a new or significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.


![Table](image)

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-7 a) regarding the definition of hazardous materials.

**Project Evaluation**

As noted above, the project would not involve the creation of space or location for the generation, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The road widening project as a completed project would not serve to generate hazardous materials or directly result in the routine use of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard through foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

However, the project would require the demolition of one structure about 700 square feet in size (see the previous discussion, item 2.3-5, *Cultural Resources*, for additional information). Structure demolition and removal could disturb hazardous materials in the existing building proposed for removal, should hazardous materials be present, resulting in increased risk of human or environmental exposure to hazardous materials.

Building components in older structures could contain hazardous materials such as asbestos, PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls), lead, or mercury. These materials could pose health and safety hazards to individuals exposed to them, and if released, they could cause environmental degradation and risk to human health.

Asbestos can be found in fire-proofing, sprayed-on acoustic ceiling materials, thermal insulation, wall and ceiling texture, floor tiles, and other materials in existing buildings if constructed in the 1970s or before. Asbestos poses health hazards when inhaled. Government regulations limit asbestos emissions from asbestos-related demolition, and specify precautions and safe work practices that must be followed to minimize the potential release of asbestos fibers. PCBs were once common components of electrical transformers and fluorescent light ballasts and are now regulated under the Federal Toxic Substances Control Act. Also, in sufficient concentrations, lead and mercury are toxic. They are regulated as hazardous wastes.
Applicable health and safety requirements could minimize the risks of handling asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyls, lead, mercury, and other hazardous materials that could be present, unless they fail to be identified adequately prior to demolition. If any unidentified hazardous materials were to remain in existing facilities when demolition occurred, these hazardous materials could create worker health hazards, result in environmental releases of these hazardous materials, or result in inappropriate waste disposal. In this way, a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the mishandling or disposal of hazardous wastes could occur without mitigation. Appropriate hazardous materials surveys and safety precautions would be needed to avoid the potentially significant impact of possible exposure to hazardous materials in existing building components to be demolished.

**MITIGATION MEASURE 2.3-7**

Prior to commencing the demolition or removal an existing building, the City shall retain a qualified environmental specialist (e.g., a Registered Environmental Assessor) to inspect the building to be removed. The specialist shall identify any asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyls, mercury, lead, or other hazardous materials present which would then be tested. If found at levels that would require special handling, these materials would need to be managed as required by law and according to federal and state regulations and guidelines, including those of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the potential hazard to the public or environment to a less than significant level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-7 a) regarding the definition of hazardous materials.

**Project Evaluation**

The road widening project would not serve to generate hazardous materials or directly result in the routine use of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials. In addition, no public schools are identified within one-quarter mile of the project site.
### ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-7 a) regarding the definition of hazardous materials.

**Project Evaluation**

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with California Environmental Quality Act requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List. The Department of Toxic Substances Control is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. The only site in Santa Rosa on the Cortese List is the Santa Rosa Army Airfield now used as the Sonoma County Airport. The former Army Airfield was used to train fighter groups and squadrons from 1942 to 1946. Therefore, item d) as noted above would not apply to the Santa Rosa Avenue road widening project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-7 a) regarding the definition of hazardous materials.
Project Evaluation

The Santa Rosa Avenue widening project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, item e) as noted above would not apply to the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-7 a) regarding the definition of hazardous materials.

Project Evaluation

The Santa Rosa Avenue widening project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, item f) as noted above would not apply to the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a discussion of the project components and purpose of the project.

Project Evaluation

By improving traffic flow and providing greater street width, the Santa Rosa Avenue widening project would facilitate emergency access and/or egress within the project area. Emergency vehicles would be afforded greater opportunity to pass stopped or slow vehicles with completion of the project as compared to conditions if the project were not undertaken due to the reconfiguration of lanes and
turning movements at intersections (for additional information regarding circulation, refer to section 2.3-15 of this Initial Study, *Transportation/Traffic*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a discussion of the project components and purpose of the project.

**Project Evaluation**

The road widening project is not located with a wildland area and item h) above would not apply to the proposed project.

### 2.3-8 Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Would the project:  
  a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Discussion**

Water resources are regulated by a variety of statutes at the local, state, and federal level. Agencies having jurisdiction with respect to water resources in the project vicinity include the City of Santa Rosa, the Sonoma County Water Agency, the State Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The following is a brief and partial summary of water resource regulations.
**City of Santa Rosa:** The City of Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan, Open Space and Conservation Element (OSC) and the Public Services and Facilities Element (PSF) contain policies applicable to water resources, with which proposed developments are required to comply. City policies that relate to hydrology and water quality (other than water supply) are addressed under Goals OSC-F and PSF-I and the Policies that fall under those Goals.

*Water Conservation and Quality*
- Goal OSC-F Conserve water and maintain water quality.

*Stormwater Management*
- Goal PSF-I Manage, maintain, and improve stormwater drainage and capacity.

The City of Santa Rosa, in conjunction with the County of Sonoma and the Sonoma County Water Agency, has developed a Post Construction/Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) to control post-development storm water runoff through source control and treatment control Best Management Practices (BMPs). SUSMP measures are required on new projects that create an acre or more of impervious surface, or are proposed in an environmentally sensitive area. The goals of the SUSMP are to manage storm water runoff from new development for both quality and quantity, as close to the point of origin as possible, and to conserve natural areas of the development site.

**Sonoma County Water Agency:** The Sonoma County Water Agency reviews project plans for proposed on-site drainage systems, as well as for all new or upgraded facilities that may be required off-site in the City of Santa Rosa. The Water Agency reviews projects for conformance with the Agency’s Flood Control Design Criteria. Culverts and drainage systems must be designed to accommodate the runoff from a 25-year storm.

**State Regional Water Quality Control Board/State Water Resources Control Board:** The State Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB – Region 1, North Coast) has jurisdiction over the Russian River and its tributaries, which drain the project area. The RWQCB is required by law to develop, adopt and implement a Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the entire region. A BMP Program, as required by the RWQCB, describes stormwater management practices (structural and operational measures), to control the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff. A Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan is included in the program. If construction is scheduled to occur throughout the year or is unlikely to be restricted to the dry months of the year, the BMPs must be implemented to ensure that sediment is confined to the construction area and not transported off-site. Erosion control is required by the City, County, and the RWQCB through general plan policies and regulatory permits (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit in the case of the RWQCB).

Project Evaluation

Based on existing regulatory requirements regarding the various aspects of water resource and water quality protection as outlined above and further below, project construction would have a less-than-significant potential to violate existing water quality standards or discharge requirements. Each water-related aspect of the project would be controlled by regional or local regulations or policies that monitor and limit the potential effects of project construction on runoff volume and rate, erosion, groundwater recharge, and surface/groundwater quality linked to chemical contaminants or sedimentation. Because the project would be required to meet the standards set by these regulations, the project would have a less-than-significant impact regarding the potential to violate water quality standards (the following subsections b) through j) present brief explanations for each of the thresholds of significance that contribute to the substantiation of this conclusion).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted? (Sources:  )</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The project is located within the Santa Rosa Plain groundwater subbasin. The subbasin contains numerous complex and discontinuous water-bearing formations. This compartmentalization, with both vertical and horizontal barriers, creates a variety of water table elevations and a complicated pattern of groundwater flow and quality. Recharge of groundwater occurs through the percolation of rainfall and seepage from streams or swales, primarily where land slopes are relatively gentle, and soils are permeable. Recharge is limited in much of the Santa Rosa Plain, including the area of the project, by the relatively high clay content of the soils. The roadway alignment overlies a potential recharge area as identified by the Department of Water Resources. Nearly all the existing roadway alignment is paved, consisting of the existing roadway surface and the surfaces of adjacent parking areas which serves to significantly limit groundwater recharge value of the soils within the project area.

Project Evaluation

The project does not include any extraction or injection wells that could affect the quantity or quality of groundwater. Because the existing impermeable surfaces along the existing roadway would remain in place or would be replaced by similar amounts of impermeable surface in added right-of-way portion
south of Kawana Springs Road, there would be no alteration of groundwater recharge value in the project area which for all practicable purposes is negligible. Consequently, there would be no impact on groundwater supplies or recharge as a result of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The nearest watercourse in the project area is Colgan Creek, crossing under Santa Rosa Avenue near Colgan Avenue in a box culvert. Most of the project is in the Colgan Creek watershed. The southern portion of the project is in the Todd Creek watershed. According to the ESRI-FEMA Online Flood Hazard Map for Santa Rosa, the roadway project is not within the 100-year or 500-year flood plain. Consequently, no FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map has been issued for the project area.

The two soil types along the project alignment are the Wright loam and the Clear Lake clay, described in Section VI, Geology and Soils. The soils are prone to saturation (very slowly to slowly permeable), but not prone to liquefaction. In their undisturbed states, erosion hazard for these soils is low because of the nearly level terrain and fine soil textures.

Project Evaluation

Runoff from the project area would continue to flow to the City’s storm-drainage system through existing as well as modified/improved drainage channels and surface drains. Because the amount of impermeable surface along the alignment would be similar to existing condition, there would be no substantial alteration in the volume or rate of stormwater flow and no substantial change to on-site drainage patterns or to the courses of downstream off-site drainage ways.

If construction within the right-of-way to be acquired for the project would involve grading of an area that is larger than one acre, the project would be subject to the conditions of the General Construction Activity Nation Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). This permit requires the development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP is required to identify the sources of sediment and other pollutants on-site, and to ensure the reduction of sediment and other pollutants in stormwater discharged from the project site. A monitoring program is required to aid the implementation of, and assure compliance with, the SWPPP.
As part of the SWPPP, an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan must be prepared for the project prior to grading. An erosion control professional, or landscape architect or civil engineer specializing in erosion control, must design the Erosion and Sediment Transport Control Plan. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) recommends the control plan be designed using concepts similar to those formulated by ABAG, as appropriate, based on the specific erosion and transport control needs of each area in which grading, excavation, and construction is to occur. A few of the most critical techniques to be considered include, but is not limited to, the following types of erosion control methods.

- Whenever feasible, confine grading and activities related to grading (excavation, construction, preparation and use of equipment and material storage) to the dry season (April through September).
- Discharge grading and construction runoff into small drainages at frequent intervals to avoid the buildup of large potentially erosive flows.
- Stabilize disturbed areas as quickly as possible, either by vegetative or mechanical methods.
- Trap sediment before it leaves the project site with such techniques as check dams, sediment ponds, or siltation fences.

During the installation of the erosion and sediment transport control structures, an erosion control professional is required to be on-site to supervise the implementation of the designs and the maintenance of facilities throughout the project site clearing, grading, and construction period.

Implementation of the SWPPP, as required by California law to comply with construction management procedures stipulated in RWQCB’s General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit, the City’s General Plan policies, the Municipal Code, and related policies adopted by the City and the Sonoma County Water Agency would reduce potential water quality effects associated with construction activities (particularly erosion and sedimentation) to a less-than-significant level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-8 c) regarding drainage.
Project Evaluation

As explained in subsection c), above, runoff would continue to flow to the City’s storm-drainage system through existing and modified drainage channels and sub-surface drain pipes. Accordingly, the project would not change the on-site drainage patterns substantially. Because the new impermeable surfaces in the right-of-way acquisition portion of the project between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs road would replace existing impermeable surfaces, there would be no substantial increase in the runoff factor for the roadway widening project. Because the volume and rate of runoff would be unchanged, there would be no need to alter off-site facilities to accommodate larger flood flows. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact regarding substantially altering of drainage patterns and/or increasing flooding potential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-8 a) regarding regulations and item 2.3-8 c) regarding drainage.

Project Evaluation

As explained in subsections c) and d), above, runoff would continue to flow to the City’s storm-drainage system through existing and modified drainage channels and sub-surface drain pipes at the existing rate. The City maintains the storm drainage system of conduits and creeks in the project vicinity. The City’s storm drainage policies require that the combined flood-carrying capacity of the roads and the underground pipes must be adequate to contain 10-year flood flows and that the creeks contain the 100-year flows. Thus, City policies plan for the 10- and 100-year storm flows and would require that the project provide appropriate on-site design to maintain these conditions. Consequently, the project would have a no impact regarding runoff contributions which would cause the capacity of the stormwater drainage system to be exceeded or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff (see the discussion under items c) and d) above.

Concerning the issue of polluted runoff: with any construction project, turbidity (sedimentation in receiving waters) is a major water quality concern during construction activities. Spills or leaks from heavy equipment and machinery (petroleum products and/or heavy metal), staging areas, or building sites (paints, solvents, and cleaning agents) could affect receiving water quality adversely by polluting
runoff during construction. The project construction would include activities such as excavations for roadbeds and trenching for utilities that would disturb soil. If uncontrolled, runoff associated with these activities could contain sediment. The sediment-laden runoff could flow through the City’s storm drainage system and enter receiving waters in the Colgan Creek or Todd Creek watersheds and degrade water quality in the creeks (see below). As explained previously, if construction within the right-of-way to be acquired for the project would involve grading an area larger than one acre, the project would be subject to conditions of the General Construction Activity NPDES permit requiring a SWPPP. Regardless, the City of Santa Rosa requires a pollution prevention plan on all construction projects.

Compliance with the NPDES permit requirements would involve filing a Notice of Intent with RWQCB and preparing, at minimum, a SWPPP prior to construction activities. The SWPPP is required to identify the sources of sediment and other pollutants on-site, and to ensure the reduction of sediment and other pollutants in stormwater discharged from the project site (see item c), above). As part of the SWPPP, an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan must be prepared for the project alignment prior to grading. A monitoring program is required to aid the implementation of, and assure compliance with, the SWPPP. The RWQCB permit requirements must be satisfied prior to proposed project construction. Because sediment and pollutant control procedures are required as part of the conditions of project approval, the project would have a less-than-significant impact regarding the generation of offsite pollutants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-8 a) regarding regulations and item 2.3-8 c) regarding drainage.

**Project Evaluation**

The major contributor of contaminants to runoff and infiltrating groundwater is the land surface over which the water passes. In developed areas, roads, parking lots, sidewalks, and gutters are connected directly to storm drains that collect and transport stormwater runoff. Between rainstorms materials accumulate on these surfaces from debris dropped or scattered by individuals, street sweeping, debris and other particulate matter washed into roadways from adjacent areas, waste and dirt from demolition, excavation, and reconstruction, fecal droppings from animals, remnants of household refuse dropped during collection or scattered by animals or wind, oil and various residues contributed by automobiles, and fallout of air-borne particles. This accumulation rate and type of urban pollutants on Santa Rosa
Avenue would not change substantially with implementation of the project, because there would be a less than substantial alteration of the amount and type of impervious surfacing along Santa Rosa Avenue. Consequently, the pollutant load in the project area would not be altered significantly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-8 a) regarding regulations and item 2.3-8 c) regarding drainage.

**Project Evaluation**

The project does not include housing, nor is the project located with a 100-year flood zone. Therefore, the project would have no impact on risks to life or property associated with placing new housing in a 100-year flood hazard area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-8 c) regarding drainage.

**Project Evaluation**

The project is not in a 100-year flood zone. Therefore, the proposed project would not redirect or impede flood waters associated with new structures in a 100-year flood hazard area.
**ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-8 c) regarding drainage.

**Project Evaluation**

As indicated by the Association of Bay Area Governments’ Dam Failure Inundation Hazard Map for Santa Rosa, the project road alignment enters the dam failure inundation hazard area for Matanzas Creek Reservoir\textsuperscript{14} at the intersection of Santa Rosa and Colgan Avenues, near the extreme downstream end of the inundation hazard area. The Matanzas Creek Reservoir dam is under the jurisdiction of the California Division of Safety of Dams, which imposes strict standards for the design, maintenance, and monitoring of such structures. The Santa Rosa General Plan establishes a further requirement for the inspection of such structures following major earthquakes.\textsuperscript{15} Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing facility, and there would be no right-of-way acquisition north of Kawana Springs road in the Colgan Avenue area. Consequently, the project would not generate a significant impact regarding the exposure of people or structures to potential levee or dam failure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Tsunamis are large sea waves generated by submarine earthquakes, or similar large-scale short-duration phenomena, such as volcanic eruptions, that can cause considerable damage to low-lying coastal areas. Seiches are waves caused by large-scale short-duration phenomena: they are the oscillations of confined bodies of water, such as in San Francisco Bay. Seiches may damage low-lying coastal areas although not as severely as tsunami.
Project Evaluation

The project area is not near the base of foothills or landforms that could be susceptible to mudflows, nor are there any large bodies of water in the vicinity of the alignment in which a seiche could be generated. Because the lowest point of the alignment is about 130 feet above mean sea level, and is about 23 miles from the Bay shore, there is no likelihood the project would be inundated during a 100-year or 500-year tsunami even during extreme high tide storm-crest conditions. The project area is separated from the Pacific Ocean by about 21 miles of mountainous ridges rising to more than 900 feet above mean sea level. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

2.3-9 Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Past residential development in southeast Santa Rosa, as well as within the region as a whole, appears to have supported the development of retail and business serving enterprises in the southeast portion of the City, particularly in the vicinity of Santa Rosa Avenue including the project area. There are two regional shopping centers with direct access to Santa Rosa Avenue close to the project site: the Santa Rosa Marketplace fronts Kawana Springs Road, where nationally known retail businesses are located and new stores are currently under construction; at the southwest corner of the intersection of Santa Rosa Avenue and Yolanda Avenue is the Southside Shopping Center covering an estimated six to ten square block area.

Other commercial development surrounds the project site. A recently constructed McDonald’s Restaurant is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Yolanda Avenue and Santa Rosa Avenue. Similarly, a recently constructed (within the last several years) Citgo gas station and 7-Eleven store are located opposite McDonald’s on the south side of Yolanda Avenue. On the north side of McDonald’s is located Volvo Quality Motors, Cartronics and the Advantage Manufactured Housing sales outlet. Immediately north of Advantage Manufactured Housing on the east side of Santa Rosa Avenue opposite the Hearn Avenue/U.S. 101 overcrossing is a single commercial structure housing the Paper Zone, Mattress Discounters and BBQ Galore. Advanced Auto Glass and Cartunes is located north of BBQ Galore, and the Carriage Court Mobile Home Park is located immediately to the east with access to Kawana Springs Road opposite the Santa Rosa Market Place Shopping Center. The Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park is located on the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue opposite the
Advanced Auto Glass and Cartunes retail establishments. One block south is located the Chapel of the Chimes Mortuary fronting Santa Rosa Avenue just north of Yolanda Avenue.

In sum, the project roadway and its surroundings is dominated by commercial land uses with several mobile home parks and a few scattered residences located nearby.

**Project Evaluation**

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing facility. As a regional (arterial) street in southeast Santa Rosa, Santa Rosa Avenue serves as a major transportation artery. The project would require an additional 11 to 22 feet of right-of-way on the east and west sides of the existing roadway at differing locations. The need for additional right-of-way to allow for full project implementation would require the acquisition of portions of commercial properties between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road fronting Santa Rosa Avenue, primarily along the east side of the road. Frontage property acquisitions would lead to the removal of existing parking space fronting Santa Rosa Avenue at four properties, and the removal of curbside lawn/landscape development at five properties. Also, an existing commercial structure (about 700 square feet) at the southeast corner of Santa Rosa Avenue and Kawana Springs Road would need to be removed to allow for project completion (see Figure 1.3-2, Project Plan).

As noted previously, the Chapel of the Chimes property at 2601 Santa Rosa Avenue would complete sidewalk and planter strip improvements in accordance with City design and construction requirements as part of site and building renovations planned for the property. Similarly, driveways and curbs would be constructed to a point about 250 feet east of Santa Rosa Avenue on Kawana Springs road in accordance with City design and construction requirements as part of property improvements proposed by the Council on Aging located at 2350 Santa Rosa Avenue. Other driveway curb cuts would provided for the remaining properties fronting Santa Rosa Avenue by the Department of Public Works as part of the project as proposed.

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing transportation facility around which commercial land uses fronting the roadway have developed over the years. Therefore, in view of the above and as a roadway widening project, the widening of Santa Rosa Avenue as proposed would not represent a new transportation corridor that could otherwise divide and separate existing land uses, and the project would not physically divide an established community. As noted in section 1.2, Need for Project, the widening project would be consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan to improve and enhance traffic flows and improve safety.
**ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The Goals and Policies of the Transportation Element of the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan would apply to the project (see section 1.2 of this Initial Study, *Need for Project*, for additional information). The project site area is not located within the coastal zone or within the configuration of an Area Plan or Specific Plan.

**Project Evaluation**

The Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan Transportation Element lists Santa Rosa Avenue as an existing four lane regional/arterial street (page 5-29) with two travel lanes in each direction. Santa Rosa Avenue currently has two travel lanes in each direction and the widening project as proposed to add turning lanes would be in full accordance with the General Plan Transportation Element. The project does not involve a zoning change or General Plan amendment. There is no specific plan in effect that includes the project area and is not located within the coastal zone involving a local coastal program. As described in section 1.2 of this Initial Study, the completed project would be consistent with Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Transportation Element Goals and Policies to develop strategies to improve service levels (Policy T-A-2), improve traffic flows and reduce neighborhood traffic impacts (Policy T-C-4), maintain acceptable levels of service (Policy T-D-1), provide full access to transit services (Policy T-H-6), provide safe streets for pedestrians and bicyclists (Goal T-J), among other Goals and Policies as cited in the General Plan. In view of the above, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of the City of Santa Rosa.

**ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Biological resources are discussed in item 2.3-4 above.

Project Evaluation

No habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan is in effect that includes the project site area between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3-10 Mineral Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISSUES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Quarrying activities in California are regulated by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA). This Act provides for the rehabilitation of mined lands and directs the State Geologist to classify (identify and map) the non-fuel mineral resources of the State. Classification of sand, gravel, and stone deposits is used to indicate where economically significant mineral resources occur and where they are likely to occur, based on the best available scientific data. The California Geological Survey (CGS) uses a two-tiered system to identify Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) and Mineral Resource Sectors in MRZ 2. MRZs are numbered according to the absence (MRZ 1) or presence (MRZ 2) of significant mineral resources, the presence of mineral resources of undetermined significance (MRZ 3), or the absence of known mineral occurrences where geologic information does not rule out the presence or absence of significant mineral resources (MRZ 4). Mineral Resource Sectors have been established in MRZ 2 where existing land uses are compatible with mining.

Another purpose of the act is to transmit the classification information to local governments which regulate land use in each region of the State. Local governments are responsible for designating lands that contain regionally significant mineral resources in the local General Plans to assure resource conservation in areas of intensive competing land uses.

Project Evaluation

The project alignment is in MRZ 1, defined as an area where there is adequate information to indicate that no significant mineral deposits are present. The closest Mineral Resource Sector identified by the
CGS mapping is Sector K, approximately 11 miles east of Santa Rosa Avenue in the ranges east of the Valley of the Moon.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(b)</em> 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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

Refer to the discussion under 2.3-9 a) above.

**Project Evaluation**

Refer to the discussion under item 2.3-9 a) above. The project would not affect or cause the loss of mineral resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3-11 Noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(a)</em> Result in 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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The City of Santa Rosa has adopted a Noise Ordinance (Chapter 17-16.030 of the Santa Rosa Municipal Code), which identifies ambient base noise levels, noise standards for various sources, specific noise restrictions, exemptions, and variances for sources of noise within the City. The noise levels are used as baseline criteria for noise levels for different land use categories (i.e., residential, office, commercial). The Noise Ordinance applies to all noise sources with the exception of any
vehicle that is operated upon any public highway, street or right-of-way, or to the operation of any off-highway vehicle, to the extent that it is regulated in the State Vehicle Code.

Existing short-term daytime noise levels were measured in the parking lot of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park fronting Santa Rosa Avenue, 67 feet from the curb near the first trailer setback, at 3:40 PM on July 18, 2005. The average, minimum, and maximum noise levels measured at this location was 63.2 $L_{eq}^{16}$, 54.8 $L_{min}$ and 75.6 $L_{max}$. This noise measurement was used as a noise reference level to calibrate the traffic noise computer model (i.e., developed by the Federal Highway Administration and called “Traffic Noise Model” or TNM) to determine the existing 24-hour traffic noise levels ($L_{dn}^{17}$) for a weekday at the setback of the residences where the noise measurement was taken. It was determined that the weekday traffic-induced $L_{dn}$ was 64.9 dBA at the noise measurement location which is above the City’s 60 dBA $L_{dn}$ standard for residential land uses.

This analysis uses the following Federal Transit Administration’s traffic noise impact criteria: where the baseline $L_{dn}$ is less than 60 dBA, a permanent increase in roadway traffic noise levels of 3 dBA over baseline ambient noise levels is considered to be substantial and, therefore, significant; where the baseline $L_{dn}$ is between 60 dBA and 65 dBA, a permanent increase in roadway traffic noise levels of 2 dBA over baseline ambient noise levels is considered to be substantial and, therefore, significant; where the baseline $L_{dn}$ is between 65 dBA and 70 dBA, a permanent increase in roadway traffic noise levels of 1 dBA over baseline ambient noise levels is considered to be substantial and, therefore, significant.

**Project Evaluation**

Traffic noise increases due to cumulative development to the year 2020 would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways. Therefore, cumulative traffic-generated noise impacts have been assessed based on the contribution of cumulative development traffic to the existing 2005 base traffic volumes in the project vicinity. The weekday 24-hour average noise levels associated with cumulative traffic volumes to the year 2020 would increase from 64.9 $L_{dn}$ (dBA) to 66.1 $L_{dn}$ (dBA) without the proposed road widening project, an increase of 1.2 $L_{dn}$ (dBA). Thus, traffic levels due to cumulative development would increase along Santa Rosa Avenue more than 1.0 dBA, thus exceeding the significance threshold. This would not be a result of the road widening project.

As indicated in section 2.3-15 of this Initial Study, Transportation/ Traffic, with land development projected to occur through the year 2020 in both the City and surrounding areas, Santa Rosa Avenue within the project limits would operate at an unacceptable level of service F in the northbound direction during the PM peak hour without the project. This is below the City’s standard and would compound the noise impact noted above. With the project, however, the LOS would improve to LOS D, which would represent an acceptable LOS. With the project, the weekday 24-hour average noise levels at the Mobile Home Park units would not perceptably increase. The Wayside Gardens units would continue to experience traffic noise levels in excess of those established in the General Plan, but the project would not worsen the noise exposure. The project, in and of itself, would not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan.
ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Vibrating objects in contact with the ground radiate energy through that medium; if a vibrating object is massive enough and/or close enough to the observer, its vibrations are perceptible. The rumbling sound caused by the vibration of room surfaces is called ground-borne noise. The ground motion caused by vibration is measured as particle velocity in inches per second and in the U.S. is referenced as vibration decibels (VdB).

The background vibration velocity level in residential and educational areas is usually around 50 VdB. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Most perceptible indoor vibration is caused by sources within buildings such as the operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people, or the slamming of doors. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible groundborne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. If a roadway is smooth, the groundborne vibration from traffic is rarely perceptible. The range of interest is from approximately 50 VdB, which is the typical background vibration velocity level, and 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings.

The general human response to different levels of groundborne vibration velocity levels is described in Table 2.3-11A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 VdB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 VdB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 VdB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Evaluation

Project construction activities would have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration. Table 2.3-11B identifies various vibration velocity levels for the types of construction equipment that would operate at the project site during construction.

Construction activities would primarily affect the residents of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park, whose nearest trailers would be located more than 50 feet west of the proposed sidewalk edge.

Table 2.3-11B
Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vibration Source</th>
<th>Approximate VdB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Based on the information presented in Table 2.3-11B, vibration levels would not exceed about 80 VdB at the nearest residential structures located west of the project site. Further, the construction activities and their associated noise levels would be limited to the daytime hours (see Mitigation Measure 2.3-11). Therefore, higher vibration levels would not occur during recognized sleep hours for residents. This would be a less-than-significant noise impact and project construction would not result in the in exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion in section 2.3-11 a) above.
Project Evaluation

Refer to the discussion of impact potential in section 2.3-11 a) above. The road widening project would not in and of itself generate increased traffic volumes resulting in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above existing levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Project construction would require the use of heavy equipment for pavement removal, surface grading, the installation of utilities and paving installation. Construction activities would also involve the use of smaller power tools, generators, mechanical equipment and other noise sources. During each construction stage, there would be a different mix of equipment operating and noise levels would vary based on the amount of equipment in operation and the location of construction activity.

The U.S. EPA has compiled data regarding the noise generating characteristics of specific types of construction equipment and typical construction activities, which are presented in Tables 2.3-11C and 2.3-11D, respectively. These noise levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance. For example, a noise level of 84 dBA measured at 50 feet from the noise source to the receptor would reduce to 78 dBA at 100 feet from the noise source to the receptor, and reduce by another 6 dBA to 72 dBA at 200 feet from the noise source to the receptor.

The nearest noise sensitive receptor that would be subject to construction-related noise would be the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park immediately west of the project site.

Project Evaluation

Construction activities could generate substantial temporary or periodic increases in noise levels, thus annoying adjacent residents and business workers/patrons. Construction activities would generate typical noise levels of up to 82 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the Wayside Gardens residences during ground clearing, and 86 dBA $L_{eq}$ at these residences during pavement removal, surface grading excavation and concrete finishing. Therefore, noise levels would be more than 5 dBA above the City’s 55 dBA daytime standard as specified in the Noise Ordinance.
Table 2.3-11C
Noise Ranges of Typical Construction Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Equipment</th>
<th>Noise Levels in dBA Leq at 50 feet(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Loader</td>
<td>73–86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td>82–95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes (moveable)</td>
<td>75–88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrator</td>
<td>68–82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saws</td>
<td>72–82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Impact Equipment</td>
<td>83–88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammers</td>
<td>81–98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>68–72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generators</td>
<td>71–83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressors</td>
<td>75–87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixers</td>
<td>75–88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pumps</td>
<td>81–85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Hoe</td>
<td>73–95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor</td>
<td>77–98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper/Grader</td>
<td>80–93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paver</td>
<td>85–88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes:
\(^1\) Machinery equipped with noise-control devices or other noise-reducing design features do not generate the same level of noise emissions as that shown in this table.

Table 2.3-11D
Typical Outdoor Construction Noise Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Noise Levels at 50 Feet (dBA Leq)</th>
<th>Noise Levels at 50 Feet with Mufflers (dBA Leq)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground Clearing</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation, Grading</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishing</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


MITIGATION MEASURE 2.3-11

The following actions shall be implemented during construction:

a) To minimize construction noise impacts on nearby residents and businesses, limit construction hours to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on non-holiday weekdays or as allowed by City Municipal Code. Any work outside of these hours by the construction
contractors should require a special permit from the City Engineer. There should be compelling reasons for permitting construction outside of these designated hours.

b) Construction equipment should be properly muffled and maintained with noise reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise.

c) Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.

d) The contractor should locate stationary noise sources away from residents and businesses, and require the use of acoustic shielding with such equipment when feasible and appropriate.

e) Notify residents and businesses within 500 feet of the construction site of the construction scheduling in writing.

f) The construction contractor should designate a “noise disturbance coordinator” for construction activities. The coordinator would be responsible for responding to any local complaints regarding construction noise. The coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (i.e., starting too early, bad muffler, no shielding), and would require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem would be implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors and businesses regarding the construction schedule.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.3-11, the potential for the road widening project to result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels would be reduced to a less than significant level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>- For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The project site is not located with the configuration of an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport.

**Project Evaluation**

In view of the discussion immediately above, there would be no adverse noise impact with respect to airport use.
Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-11 e) regarding airports.

Project Evaluation

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-11 e) regarding airports.

2.3-12 Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project: a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extensions of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing regional (arterial) street serving southeast Santa Rosa and environs. Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, Project Description, for a complete description of the project.

Project Evaluation

Because the project is a road widening and lane reconfiguration project, the project would not directly induce substantial population growth in the area. The project would not involve creating a new road or extending an existing road into undeveloped territory and therefore would not induce new development in an undeveloped area. The project would be consistent with General Plan Transportation Element Goals and Policies to develop strategies to improve service levels, improve traffic flows and reduce neighborhood traffic impacts, provide access to transit services, provide safe streets for pedestrians and bicyclists, among other Goals and Policies as cited in the General Plan.
ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing regional (arterial) street serving southeast Santa Rosa and environs. Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a complete description of the project.

Project Evaluation

Because the project is a road widening and lane reconfiguration project of limited extent to an existing facility, the project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing. No housing would be removed to allow for project construction.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing regional (arterial) street serving southeast Santa Rosa and environs. Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a complete description of the project.

Project Evaluation

Because the project is a road widening and lane reconfiguration project of limited extent to an existing facility, the project would not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing.
### 2.3-13 Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing regional (arterial) street serving southeast Santa Rosa and environs. Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a complete description of the project.

**Project Evaluation**

As a road widening project, the project would not directly require new or physically altered governmental facilities. No governmental facilities would be removed or altered to allow for project construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-13 a) regarding Santa Rosa Avenue as an existing facility.

**Project Evaluation**

With project implementation, emergency vehicles would be afforded greater opportunity to pass stopped or slow moving vehicles as compared to conditions if the project were not undertaken due to
the reconfiguration of lanes and turning movements at intersections (for additional information regarding circulation, refer to section 2.3-15 of this Initial Study, *Transportation/Traffic*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-13 a) regarding Santa Rosa Avenue as an existing facility.

**Project Evaluation**

With project implementation, emergency vehicles would be afforded greater opportunity to pass stopped or slow moving vehicles as compared to conditions if the project were not undertaken due to the reconfiguration of lanes and turning movements at intersections (for additional information regarding circulation, refer to section 2.3-15 of this Initial Study, *Transportation/Traffic*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-13 a) regarding Santa Rosa Avenue as an existing facility.

**Project Evaluation**

As the widening of an existing roadway, the project would not be growth inducing, would not require the provision of new schools, and would be in conformance with the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan Transportation Element. Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-12, *Population and Housing* for additional information and commentary.
### Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-13 a) regarding Santa Rosa Avenue as an existing facility.

### Project Evaluation

As a road widening project, the project would not be a growth inducing undertaking inconsistent with the General Plan, would not require the provision of new parks, and would be in conformance with the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan Transportation Element. Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-12, *Population and Housing* for additional information and commentary.

### Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-13 a) regarding Santa Rosa Avenue as an existing facility.

### Project Evaluation

As a road widening project, the project would not directly require new or physically altered governmental facilities. No governmental facilities would be removed or altered to allow for project construction.
2.3-14 Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project: a) Would the project 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? (Sources: )</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing regional (arterial) street serving southeast Santa Rosa and environs. Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a complete description of the project.

Project Evaluation

As a road widening project, the project would not directly require new or physically altered governmental facilities, nor would the project be growth inducing such that it could lead to a direct increase in use of recreational facilities. No recreational facilities would be removed or altered to allow for project construction. See also the discussion under items 2.3-12, *Population and Housing*, and 2.3-13, *Public Services*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing regional (arterial) street serving southeast Santa Rosa and environs. Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a complete description of the project.
Project Evaluation

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-14 a). The project is a road widening project and does not include the need for or require the construction of recreation facilities.

### 2.3-15 Transportation/Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

**Street Classifications and Programmed Street Improvements**

The City’s current adopted General Plan classifies streets into four categories: freeways (including highways and expressways), regional/arterial streets, transitional/collector streets, and local streets. As shown in Figure 2.3-15A, U.S. Highway 101 is a freeway (highway) in the vicinity of the project site; it has three lanes in each direction, one of which is restricted to high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) use only during weekday commute hours. Streets classified as regional/arterial streets include Santa Rosa Avenue, Yolanda Avenue, Kawana Springs Road, Petaluma Hill Road, Hearn Avenue (Dutton Avenue to Santa Rosa Avenue), and the proposed Farmers Lane Extension (see Figure 2.3-15A). Streets classified as collector/transitional streets include: Hearn Avenue (west of Dutton Avenue) and Colgan-Baker Avenue.

**Traffic Volumes and Levels of Service**

Average Daily Traffic Volumes

Average daily traffic (ADT) counts using machine traffic counters were obtained from the City of Santa Rosa’s publication, “Current Traffic Volumes,” available on the City’s website. Counts are rounded to the nearest hundred. The highest volumes on Santa Rosa Avenue are between Petaluma Hill Road and Bennett Valley Road, and between the Colgan Avenue/US 101 northbound ramps and the Baker Avenue overcrossing.
FIGURE 2.3-15A: AREA STREETS AND CLASSIFICATIONS

SOURCE: Dowling Associates, Inc.
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FIGURE 2.3-15A: AREA STREETS AND CLASSIFICATIONS
Traffic counts were also available from recent documentation, which included Friday and Saturday traffic (see Table 2.3-15A below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Tuesday 3/9/04</th>
<th>Friday 5/13/05</th>
<th>Saturday 5/14/05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just south of Yolanda Avenue</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>15,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>32,800</td>
<td>31,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>15,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just north of Yolanda Avenue</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>19,850</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>36,850</td>
<td>33,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Santa Rosa (2004 count) and Dowling Associates, Inc. (2005 counts)

Note: Volumes have been rounded.

Project Evaluation

The Santa Rosa Avenue widening project is intended to improve traffic flow in the area. The project is not a residential or commercial project that would generate traffic. Because of the travel time savings that could be facilitated by the project, the project would be expected to absorb some, but a less than significant amount, of traffic from paralleling and adjacent streets such as Petaluma Hill Road, U.S. 101, Corby Avenue or Dutton Avenue. Accordingly, the project, as a road improvement project with the objective of accommodating existing and future traffic conditions in the area, would not be expected to directly 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). See also the discussion and analysis below regarding levels of service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

**Peak Hour Traffic Flows**

Existing peak hour intersection traffic movements and volumes (generally 7:30-8:30 AM and 4:30-5:30 PM) are shown in Figure 2.3-15B. Traffic counts used in this Initial Study were taken in 2004 and 2005. Throughout the project area, the PM peak hour traffic volume occurring between 4:30 and 5:30 PM is generally greater than the AM peak hour.

As might be expected, peak hour traffic flows are not always directionally balanced, nor does the peak 60 minutes of traffic always occur during the same period at every intersection. Traffic on U.S. 101 northbound can be stop-and-go from Rohnert Park to Steele Lane. According to Caltrans’ surveys\(^{20}\) congestion on U.S. 101 south of Highway 12 occurs between 6:25 and 9:20 AM in the southbound direction, and from Wilfred Avenue to Highway 12 between 7:10 and 9:15 AM in the northbound direction. In the afternoon, congestion typically begins at 2:30 PM and ends near 6:45 PM, in the northbound direction between South Santa Rosa Avenue and Steele Lane.

U.S. 101 was widened to add peak hour HOV lanes between Wilfred Avenue and Highway 12 in November 2002. These lanes are restricted to carpools (two or more persons) and buses between 7 and 9 AM and 3 and 6:30 PM on weekdays, in both directions.

**Intersection and Urban Street (Corridor) Levels of Service**

The peak hour traffic volumes, along with intersection lane configuration (“geometric”) and signal timing information were used to compute the intersection level of service (LOS). The level of service on urban streets is generally governed by the level of service of the intervening intersections along the street.

There are two different analysis techniques used to compute level of service for city streets: signalized intersections and urban street systems. All computations are based upon the *2000 Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM 2000) using software developed by Trafficware Corporation (Synchro 6 and SimTraffic).

Tables 2.3-15B and 2.3-15C provide an interpretation of the level of service results. All of the techniques share a common feature: they portray the estimated level of service in terms of a letter “grade,” which ranges from “A” (no delay/excellent conditions) to “F” (major delays/poorest conditions).

Intersection and urban street (arterial) levels of service based on counts in this study are shown in Tables 2.3-15D and 2.3-15E.
FIGURE 2.3-15B: EXISTING WEEKDAY PEAK TRAFFIC VOLUMES

SOURCE: Dowling Associates, Inc.
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### Table 2.3-15B
#### Level of Service Definitions - Signalized Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Total Control Delay (secs.)</th>
<th>Description of General Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>( \leq 10.00 )</td>
<td><strong>Free Flow/Insignificant Delays:</strong> No approach phase is fully utilized by traffic and no vehicle waits longer than one red indication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.1 – 20.0</td>
<td><strong>Stable Operation/Minimal Delays:</strong> An occasional approach phase is fully utilized. Many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within platoons of vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.1 - 35.0</td>
<td><strong>Stable Operation/Acceptable Delays:</strong> Major approach phases fully utilized. Most drivers feel somewhat restricted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.1 – 55.0</td>
<td><strong>Approaching Unstable/Tolerable Delays:</strong> Drivers may have to wait through more than one red signal indication. Queues may develop but dissipate rapidly, without excessive delays. Effective coordination of traffic signals becomes difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55.1 - 80.0</td>
<td><strong>Unstable Operation/Significant Delays:</strong> Assuming proper signal timing, volumes are at or near capacity. Vehicles may wait though several signal cycles. Long queues form upstream from intersection. Effective coordinate of traffic signals can be very difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt; 80.0</td>
<td><strong>Forced Flow/Excessive Delays:</strong> Represents unacceptable conditions. Intersection operates below capacity with low volumes. Queues may block upstream intersections. Coordination of progressive traffic signals is usually useless; signals may be set to go ‘green’ at the same time to facilitate traffic flow at low speeds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 2.3-15C
#### Level of Service Definitions for Urban Streets (HCM Chapter 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
<th>Class IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&gt; 35</td>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>&gt; 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt;28-35</td>
<td>&gt;24-30</td>
<td>&gt;19-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt;22-28</td>
<td>&gt;18-24</td>
<td>&gt;13-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt;17-22</td>
<td>&gt;14-18</td>
<td>&gt;9-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt;13-17</td>
<td>&gt;10-14</td>
<td>&gt;7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 13</td>
<td>( \leq 10 )</td>
<td>( \leq 7 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note: Street types are based on the degree of access control, speed limits, the presence of parking, and the posted speed limits. Class I has been omitted because it does not apply to any situations in the study area. Class II (suburban) streets typically have widely spaced driveways, posted speed limits of 35-45 MPH, turn lane channelization, and no parking. Class III represents intermediate streets; and Class IV urban streets.*
### Table 2.3-15D

Existing (2003/05) Intersection Traffic Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak Delay (secs.)</th>
<th>AM Peak LOS</th>
<th>PM Peak Delay (secs.)</th>
<th>PM Peak LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda Ave</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Ave</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawana Springs Rd</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Market Place main entry</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgan Ave</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The City of Santa Rosa circulation level of service standard is based on urban street corridors, not intersections. Therefore, tables in this study providing intersection level of service are for informational purposes only, and are not used in determining whether a significant impact exists.

Table 2.3-15E presents the analysis of the urban street (arterial) level of service. The calculated values were determined from the Synchro software, accounting for traffic volumes, link travel times and delays due to congestion. Intersection levels of service, including detailed calculation sheets, are contained in the traffic and circulation appendix in the project files and are available for public inspection at the offices of the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works, 69 Stony Circle, Santa Rosa, Calif. 95401.

### Table 2.3-15E

Existing (2004/05) Urban Street Level of Service (speeds are in mph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Street Class</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Avenue</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda Ave to Colgan Ave</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** There are small differences in the speeds calculated in this table compared to other EIRs. The reasons are due to the beginning and ending limits of the section analyzed, and the software used. However, the letter LOS grades are the same.

Typically, level of service “D” or better is considered acceptable in urban areas during peak hours. Since the General Plan Update of 1991 was adopted, Santa Rosa bases its traffic level of service standard on the urban street (corridor) level of service, using level of service “D” as the standard (Policy TD-1 of General Plan, 2020). This standard is based upon traffic movement along a corridor, which may include several signalized intersections. This approach focuses on the overall flow and speed of traffic, and not the delays at individual intersections. It therefore represents an averaging of the travel speed/time along an urban street. As indicated in Tables 2.3-15D and 2.3-15E, all the study intersections and Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue and Colgan Avenue operate at acceptable service levels on weekdays.
Table 2.3-15F shows the mainline levels of service on US 101. It paints a better picture of traffic conditions than reality, because a bottleneck caused by the portion of US 101 north of Highway 12 creates a “spillback” of traffic into the project area. This problem has been improved, but not eliminated, by the addition of the HOV lanes in late-2002, which currently end near Highway 12. The construction of additional HOV lanes from Highway 12 north to Steele Lane began in early 2006 and is scheduled for completion in late 2008, which will greatly alleviate this problem. Caltrans attempts, as a desired goal, to maintain peak hour traffic operations at the transition between LOS C and D.

## Table 2.3-15F

**US 101 Freeway Mainline Level of Service, Mixed Flow Lanes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Segment</th>
<th>Dir-</th>
<th>V/c Ratio</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Volume (vph)</th>
<th>V/c Ratio</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Road to Yolanda Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>3,281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda Avenue to Baker Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>4,097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Road to Yolanda Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>3,632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Parsons Transportation Group, 2003 and Caltrans, 2005. Caltrans data are for 5-6 PM, however, the difference in volumes on US 101 between 4-5 PM and 5-6 PM are very small.

*Note:* The volumes shown include the recommended HCM 2000 adjustment for trucks, which constitute approximately 6.3 percent of all vehicles on this portion of US 101. The volumes shown are in passenger-car equivalents (pce). Level of service calculated per Caltrans’ “Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies,” which predicts a level freeway with two lanes in each direction has a capacity of 4,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction.

The contract for widening US 101 between Highway 12 and Steele Lane has been awarded and construction is underway. A separate contract has been awarded for widening US 101 at the Steele Lane undercrossing.

### Queuing

An analysis of the available queuing (i.e., storage or “stacking”) distances is shown in Table 2.3-15G. This table compares the currently available storage distances with the predicted length of the vehicle queues 95% of the time. The table shows that in three locations in the AM peak, and five locations in the PM peak, the estimated queue length exceeds the available storage capacity at some time in at least five percent of the signal cycles. For example, if there are 40 cycles per hour, then during two cycles the 95th percentile queue length would be exceeded.
Table 2.3-15G
Intersection Queuing Analysis Results for Existing Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Intersection)</th>
<th>95th Percentile AM Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Spillback?</th>
<th>95th Percentile PM Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Spillback?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Ave Yolanda Ave</td>
<td>NB - Left * 160</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB - Left * 150</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB - Thru 730</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Ave Hearn Ave</td>
<td>NB - Left * 110</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB - Thru 730</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB - Left * 100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB - Thru 480</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB - Left 300</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB - Thru 1165</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Ave Kawana Springs Rd</td>
<td>NB - Thru 480</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB - Left * 90</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB - Thru 760</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Ave Corby Ave</td>
<td>WB - Left 150</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB - Thru 1165</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

NB= northbound direction; SB=southbound direction; etc.

* The actual storage may be longer when cars occupy the median left turn lane, as the queue extends beyond the striping.

** 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

*** Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.
Project Evaluation

Existing conditions and cumulative development conditions to the year 2020 have been analyzed both without and with the project fully implemented. The analysis involved the following steps:

- Constructing a Synchro 6 model of the study area using traffic counts provided by the City, supplemented with counts collected by Dowling Associates.

- Testing the impact of the widening project on level of service and queue lengths.

- Forecasting 2020 cumulative traffic volumes; this includes all land developments expected to be built by 2020 that conform to the General Plan. The cumulative analysis (year 2020) was based on the City’s most recently adopted General Plan land development potential. The traffic forecast includes all project land development through 2020, proposed traffic circulation improvement projects as noted in the Santa Rosa General Plan (refer to the Project Description in Section 1 for additional information regarding planned street improvements), as well as a proposed Lowe’s home improvement store near the northeast corner of the intersection of Yolanda Avenue and Santa Rosa Avenue. The Lowe’s store was included per City staff’s request, and is assumed to contain approximately 157,075 gross square feet of floor area. Cumulative development outside the City was considered using data from the Sonoma County General Plan and the Association of Bay Area Governments.

- Level of service was analyzed using techniques in the latest Highway Capacity Manual (the HCM 2000) using the Synchro 6/SimTraffic software programs.

The 2020 projected cumulative traffic volumes during the PM peak hour are shown in Figure 2.3-15C. These are based on General Plan forecasts of the actual market (not buildout) land uses in 2020. The City does not have a traffic model for projecting AM peak hour traffic, but as was shown in Table 2.3-15D, the AM peak hour levels of service are generally better than the PM peak hour levels of service.

Level of Service

As shown in Table 2.3-15H, under existing conditions, the level of service in the AM and PM peak hours would be C with or without the project, with a slight (less than significant) increase in vehicle speeds with the project implemented.

With land development projected to occur through the year 2020 in both the City and surrounding areas, Santa Rosa Avenue within the project limits would operate at an unacceptable level of service F in the northbound direction during the PM peak hour without the project. This is below the City’s standard. With the project, however, the LOS would improve to LOS D, which would represent an acceptable LOS. This would be a beneficial result of the widening project.
Volumes at adjacent intersections may not be conserved due to intermediate driveways.

SOURCE: Dowling Associates, Inc.
### Table 2.3-15H
Existing and Future Urban Street Peak Level of Service –
Yolanda Avenue to Colgan Avenue
(Speeds are in mph—bolded entries do not meet the City’s LOS standard)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street (Limits)</th>
<th>Street Class</th>
<th>Dir.</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AM cumulative scenarios were not evaluated because the City’s traffic model predicts PM peak hour volumes only. Results assume optimizing offsets and splits using the Synchro model. On Santa Rosa Avenue a 120 second fixed cycle has been assumed to permit coordination of signals.

The Santa Rosa widening project’s impact on the LOS of U.S. 101 in the project vicinity would generally assist in lessening freeway congestion. This is because the project would provide additional traffic capacity on a route closely parallel to U.S. 101. Existing congestion on Santa Rosa Avenue encourages motorists making relatively short trips to use U.S. 101. With the Santa Rosa Avenue widening project and resulting reduced congestion on Santa Rosa Avenue, some of these trips could be made more efficiently (i.e., with less delay and fewer vehicle miles of travel, or VMT) using Santa Rosa Avenue rather than the freeway. This would be beneficial to users of the freeway. However, cumulative development traffic is likely to yield less than LOS C/D conditions on US 101 in the future, but would not be a direct result of the Santa Rosa Avenue road widening project.

### Queuing (Stacking) Distance

A queue length analysis was also done with and without the project, with the results shown in Tables 2.3-15I and 2.3-15J. The queues assumed optimized signal timings, as requested by Santa Rosa Traffic Engineering Division staff. Although the project would not solve every queue length exceedance, the tables show that in several places it would shorten the queue, or makes it possible to store queues within the designated area. The freeway off-ramp movements at Yolanda Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue were also checked, and are well within the 850 foot storage distance available on the ramp.22
## Table 2.3-15I
### Existing Conditions with Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Available Storage (ft)</th>
<th>AM Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Spillback?</th>
<th>PM Queue (ft)</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Spillback?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Ave Yolanda Ave NB - Left *</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB – Left *</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB – Thru</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>No</td>
<td><strong>/</strong>*</td>
<td>569</td>
<td><strong>/</strong>*</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Ave Hearn Ave NB - Left *</td>
<td>330x2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB – Thru</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB – Left *</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB – Thru</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB – Left</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB – Thru</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Ave Kawana Spring Rd NB – Thru</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>498</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB – Left *</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>151</td>
<td><strong>/</strong>*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB – Thru</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Ave Corby Ave WB – Left</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB – Thru</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Table 2.3-15G for explanation of notes.
Table 2.3-15J
2020 Conditions With and Without the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Available Storage (ft)</th>
<th>No Project</th>
<th>Plus Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queue (ft)</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Ave Yolanda Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB - Left *</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB - Left *</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>324</td>
<td><strong>/</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB – Thru</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Ave Hearn Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB - Left *</td>
<td>110/330x2</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB - Left *</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB – Thru</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB – Right</td>
<td>100/350</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB – Left</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>565</td>
<td><strong>/</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB – Thru</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>451</td>
<td><strong>/</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Ave Kawana Spring Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB – Thru</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB - Left *</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>170</td>
<td><strong>/</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB – Thru</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Ave Corby Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB – Left</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB – Thru</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Available Storage, where a slash is used the first figure represents the length under No Project conditions, and the second figure is the length with the proposed project. E.g., “100/200” would indicate the lane is 100 feet long under No Project (existing) conditions, and 200 feet under project conditions. For other notes, see Table 2.3-15G.
With the project improvements proposed in the General Plan, the 95th percentile vehicle queues would be within the available storage distances, except:

- Yolanda Avenue northbound left (2005 PM with project, 2020 with project/no project).
- Yolanda Avenue southbound left (2020 with project/no project).
- Hearn Avenue northbound thru (2020 no project).
- Hearn Avenue southbound thru (2020 no project).
- Kawana Springs Road northbound thru (2005 PM with project; 2020 with project/no project).
- Kawana Springs Road southbound left (2005 PM with project, 2020 with project/no project).

The Project would not solve all queue spillback problems in the area, due to the short distances and high volumes between intersections. In some of the cases above, even though the with-project scenario queues may exceed the available storage, the 95th percentile queue is shorter with the project than without. Extending storage distances to fully meet the 95th percentile queue requirements may not always be possible due to the close spacing of intersections and the high peak hour traffic volumes.

The inability to meet the desired queuing lengths in the project area would not be a result of the Santa Rosa Avenue widening project. The short distances and high volumes between intersections is an existing condition as indicated above, and although the project would improve the queuing situation, the need for additional queuing lengths would be the result of further development in the project area as indicated.

Construction-Period Traffic

The road widening project between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs road would require the use of heavy machinery for demolition of the existing curb, gutter, and other pavement portions; surface grading; utility relocation; paving and related construction activities. However, minimal (less than significant) grading is expected because the project area is flat. Construction would also require the delivery of construction materials and construction workers would need to travel to and from the project site on a daily basis throughout the construction period; typically, the estimated construction period for this type of improvement is 18 to 24 months and during this time, some lane closures would be required, leading to short-term increases in traffic congestion. Most lane closures would probably occur during mid-day and evenings (i.e., not during peak hours) or during the night if authorized. The City’s Public Works Department policy is that construction be minimized or suspended during the holiday shopping season (Thanksgiving to Christmas), to minimize the potential for traffic disruption. Much of the project construction traffic, especially trucks and equipment delivery vehicles, would be expected to travel via U.S. 101 in lieu of local roadways, which would minimize potential congestion on the local street system. However, project construction would temporarily and intermittently be expected to adversely affect service levels in the immediate project area during the construction period unless mitigation were incorporated into the project.
**MITIGATION MEASURE 2.3-15**

Prior to demolition and construction, the selected contractor shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan that identifies the timing and routing of all major construction equipment and trucking to the project site to avoid potential traffic congestion and delays on the local street network, and encourage the use of U.S. 101. This plan shall be developed so as to be acceptable by the Santa Rosa Department of Public Works. It may be necessary to limit construction activities and materials delivery to off-peak hours or determine access to particular areas of construction that would not conflict with local traffic circulation.

In view of the above, and with the full incorporation of Mitigation Measure 2.3-15 into the widening project, the project would not 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>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The project is not located near an airport.

**Project Evaluation**

As a road widening project, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns resulting in safety risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Santa Rosa Avenue in the project area contains no curves. No new intersections would be created as a result of the project.

Project Evaluation

By improving traffic flow, the project would also increase safety to motorists and pedestrians. By providing standard sidewalks throughout the project limits, including a buffer (parkway) strip between the curb face and sidewalk, the project would enhance pedestrian safety compared to existing conditions. This would be a beneficial result of the road widening project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to Section 1 of this Initial Study, Project Description, for a discussion of the purpose of the project.

Project Evaluation

By improving traffic flow and providing greater street width, the Santa Rosa Avenue widening project would facilitate emergency access in the project area. Emergency vehicles would be afforded greater opportunity to pass stopped or slow vehicles with completion of the project as compared to conditions if the project were not undertaken due to the reconfiguration of lanes and turning movements at intersections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to Section 1 of this Initial Study, Project Description, for a discussion of the purpose of the project.
Project Evaluation

There is currently no parking allowed along Santa Rosa Avenue at any time. The project would not change this situation. Business and residential uses along Santa Rosa Avenue are expected to provide sufficient parking on-site, based on the City’s zoning code requirement. Therefore, the project would not result in inadequate parking capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Transit

Several bus routes currently operate along Santa Rosa Avenue. Santa Rosa CityBus offers transit service along Santa Rosa Avenue and Yolanda Avenue, as shown in Figure 2.3-15D. The Santa Rosa Department of Transit and Parking operates CityBus, and routes provide service within the City of Santa Rosa plus some areas immediately adjacent to the City. Most routes converge on the Second Street Transit Mall (between B Street and Santa Rosa Avenue) in the downtown, where connections can be made with other CityBus routes, as well as intercity and inter-regional transit services.

The two CityBus routes in the project study area include:

- **Route 5 – South Park.** This route connects the southwest and southeast portions of the City with the downtown, using Petaluma Hill Road, Kawana Springs Road, and Santa Rosa Avenue south to Court Street. Route 5 terminates at Elsa Drive and Santa Rosa Avenue. The route also circulates through the downtown, and connects to the 2nd Street Transit Mall. Service is provided every 30 minutes Monday through Friday, from 6:20 AM to 7:45 PM, and every 60 minutes on Saturdays and Sundays. On Saturdays, service is operated 6:50 AM to 6:45 PM, and on Sundays from 10:45 AM to 4:45 PM. The route takes 40 minutes to make a complete loop, and carries approximately 790 passenger-trips per day.

- **Route 18 – Southeast Circulator.** This route operates in a north-south direction along Santa Rosa Avenue, making a clockwise loop using Kawana Springs Road, Petaluma Hill Road, and Yolanda Avenue. Buses run hourly from 6:55 AM to 5:50 PM Monday-Friday, and from 9:55 AM to 3:50 PM on Saturdays and Sundays (except there is no 12:50 departure on weekends). The route takes 55 minutes to make a complete loop and carries approximately 190 passenger-trips per day.
A recent study\(^{25}\) notes schedule adherence problems on both routes 5 and 18, much of it caused by traffic congestion. Both routes had only 33 to 35% of bus trips “on-time” (measured at the Transit Mall) when checked on two days in April 2005. “On-time” is defined as no more than five minutes late.

Sonoma County Transit (SCT), a division of the Sonoma County Transportation and Public Works Department, operates three intercity bus lines on Santa Rosa Avenue: Routes 42, 44 and 48. Route 42 travels between the Industry West business park in southwest Santa Rosa and the Second Street Transit Mall, using Dowd, Hearn, and Santa Rosa Avenue. This service is provided weekdays only at approximately hourly intervals, beginning approximately at 6:20 AM, with the last southbound trip leaving the Transit Mall at 6:45 PM. Route 44 uses Petaluma Hill Road, and serves Penngrove and Petaluma’s eastside; while Route 48 travels on Old Redwood Highway, serving Cotati and Petaluma’s westside. Service frequency is irregular, but on a weekday the combined 44/48 service has 22 buses in each direction, from approximately 6 AM to 10 PM. On weekends, there are eight southbound and nine northbound buses in each direction.

Golden Gate Transit (GGT), a division of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District, provides regional (i.e., inter-county) bus service on Santa Rosa Avenue. There are three routes that currently operate on Santa Rosa Avenue (Routes 72, 73, and 75),\(^{26}\) with the schedules oriented toward the inter-county commuters, i.e., to those traveling southbound early in the morning and returning northbound in the evening, to jobs in Marin and San Francisco County.

The bus stop locations within the Project area are shown in Table 2.3-15K below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-street</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Route Numbers Served</th>
<th>Special Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda Ave. (in front of Car Tunes)</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>Bench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At proposed Council on Aging (just north of above stop)</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Marketplace (at signalized entry)</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>Bench Bus pull-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgan Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Marketplace</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Marketplace</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Direction codes are NB for Northbound and SB for Southbound.
- Location codes are FS for “Far Side,” i.e., beyond or downstream of the intersection; NS for “Near Side,” i.e., before or upstream of the cross-street intersection.
- Information based on field data collection conducted 1/6/06 and transit operator schedules.
**Bikeways and Pedestrians**

Existing bikeways in the project study area\textsuperscript{27} are shown graphically on Figure 2.3-15E. Santa Rosa Avenue bike lanes extend from the City limits on Santa Rosa Avenue in the south to Colgan Avenue. North of Colgan Avenue to downtown, Santa Rosa Avenue is a signed (Class III) bike route. The City’s bicycle plan\textsuperscript{28} calls for bike lanes to be extended into the downtown. Most of the traffic signals on Santa Rosa Avenue have been equipped with bicycle-sensitive detection loops. As noted previously, the project would reconstruct and replace existing sidewalks with ADA-compliant ramps along Santa Rosa Avenue, including the construction of sidewalks where no sidewalks currently exist.

**Project Evaluation**

**Transit**

As a result of the street widening project, transit routes presently on Santa Rosa Avenue would be expected, along with private vehicles, to experience a decrease in travel delay and improvement in travel speeds at all hours, but especially during peak hours. However, no direct increase in ridership is expected as a result of the project. Bus stops at designated locations would be retained as part of the project and would support General Plan Goal TH to expand the existing transit network to provide convenient and efficient public transportation to workplaces, shopping, and other destinations.

**Bikeways and Pedestrians**

The project would add striped, Class II bike lanes to Santa Rosa Avenue, and as such, would make it easier and safer to use as a bicycle route. The bike lanes would connect to other intersecting bike lanes and routes. The bike lanes would facilitate bicycle travel throughout the southeast portion of the City, and would allow for connectivity to other existing or planned bicycle facilities.

In addition, because the project would retain or reconstruct and replace existing sidewalks along Santa Rosa Avenue, or provide new sidewalks where no sidewalks currently exist, pedestrian travel and the pedestrian environment would be enhanced and made safer by the project in accordance with the goals and policies of the General Plan Transportation Element. Therefore, no conflicts with the use of busses, bicycles or pedestrian travel as alternative transportation modes are identified with respect to the project and there would be no conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation modes.
2.3-16 Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project: a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing regional (arterial) street serving southeast Santa Rosa and environs. Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a complete description of the project.

Project Evaluation

As a road widening project, the project would not directly require new or physically altered governmental facilities, nor would the project involve the generation of wastewater or wastewater requiring treatment. See also the discussion under items 2.3-12, *Population and Housing*, and 2.3-13, *Public Services*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing regional (arterial) street serving southeast Santa Rosa and environs. Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a complete description of the project.

Project Evaluation

As a road widening project, the project would not require new or physically altered water or wastewater treatment facilities, nor would the project involve the consumption of water or the
generation of wastewater or wastewater requiring treatment. See also the discussion under items 2.3-12, *Population and Housing*, and 2.3-13, *Public Services* for additional information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, section c) regarding drainage.

Project Evaluation

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, section c) regarding drainage. Construction activities are as addressed in this Initial Study including 2.3-3, *Air Quality*, 2.3-6, *Geology and Soils*, 2.3-11, *Noise*, 2.3-15, *Transportation/Traffic* as well as other sections as enumerated in this Initial Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing regional (arterial) street serving southeast Santa Rosa and environs. Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a complete description of the project.

Project Evaluation

As a road widening project, the project would not require new or physically altered water or water treatment facilities because the project would not involve the consumption of water.
### Discussion

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing regional (arterial) street serving southeast Santa Rosa and environs. Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a complete description of the project.

### Project Evaluation

As a road widening project, the project would not require new or physically altered wastewater treatment facilities, nor would the project involve the consumption of water or the generation of wastewater or wastewater requiring treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

Santa Rosa Avenue is an existing regional (arterial) street serving southeast Santa Rosa and environs. Refer to section 1.3 of this Initial Study, *Project Description*, for a complete description of the project.

### Project Evaluation

As a road widening project, the project would not generate solid waste or the need for solid waste disposal. Pavement surfaces removed for the installation of utilities or repaving during construction would be recycled as crushed aggregate for future use as a road base material or similar use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-16 f) regarding solid waste.

---

### Project Evaluation

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-16 f) regarding solid waste.

---

### 2.3-17 Mandatory Findings of Significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

As found through preparation of this Initial Study and as indicated above, because mitigation measures are being factored into the proposed Santa Rosa Avenue widening project, the potential impacts of project construction and operation, both individually and cumulatively, would be eliminated or reduced to less than significant levels. No potentially significant impacts have been identified for the following subject areas: 2.3-1, Aesthetics; 2.3-2, Agricultural Resources; 2.3-4, Biological Resources; 2.3-6, Geology and soils; 2.3-8, Hydrology and Water Quality; 2.3-9, Land Use and Planning; 2.3-10, Mineral Resources; 2.3-12, Population and Housing; 2.3-13, Public Services; 2.3-14, Recreation; and 2.3-16, Utilities and Service Systems.
For other subject areas, it was determined that potentially significant impacts could occur without mitigation incorporated into the project. Therefore, mitigation is provided to reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels for the following subject areas: 2.3-3, Air Quality; 2.3-5, Cultural Resources; 2.3-7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; 2.3-11, Noise, and 2.3-15, Transportation/Traffic. Mitigation measures are further described in Appendix A, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under item 2.3-17 a). Because there would be no significant impacts as listed above for the specified subject areas, the project would not contribute to potentially cumulative considerable adverse impacts for the subject areas indicated. The potential impacts regarding air quality, cultural resources, noise and traffic that could result from the proposed project can be mitigated to less than significant levels as indicated. Consequently the impacts of project implementation within the subject areas of air quality, cultural resources, noise and traffic would not contribute to potentially cumulatively considerable adverse impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Refer to the discussion above under items 2.3-17 a) and 2.3-17 b).
Endnotes

3 Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan, adopted by the City Council on June 18, 2002, Transportation Element, page 5-8. The General Plan notes: “A scenic road is a highway, road, drive or street that, in addition to its transportation function, provides opportunities for the enjoyment of natural and man-made scenic resources. Scenic roads direct views to areas of exceptional beauty, natural resources or landmarks, or historic or cultural interest. The aesthetic values of scenic routes can be protected and enhanced by regulations governing the development of property and the placement of outdoor advertising.”

4 For additional information regarding the Farmers Lane Extension project, refer to: Farmers Lane Extension, Subsequent Draft Environmental Impact Report, prepared for the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development by EIP Associates, May, 2003.

5 Northwest Information Center, letter from Brad Much, Re: Record Search Results for the Proposed Santa Rosa Home Depot Project, to Amber Grady, EIP Associates, July 11, 2005.


9 Travis, 1952, page 24 and Plate 1, map scale 1:62 500.

10 Wagner and Bortugno, 1982, Sheet 5, scale 1:250 000.


13 City of Santa Rosa, County of Sonoma, Sonoma County Water Agency, Santa Rosa Area Urban Runoff and Storm Water NPDES Permit, Part VI Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan, September 4, 2002.


15 Santa Rosa General Plan 2020, Policy NS-C-7: “Require inspection for structural integrity of water storage facilities, water conveyance facilities, electricity transmission lines, roadways, water detention facilities, levees, and other utilities after a major seismic event, especially on the San Andreas or Rodgers Creek faults.”

16 Leq, the Equivalent energy noise source level, is the average acoustic energy content of noise over any chosen exposure time. The Leq is the constant noise level that would deliver the same acoustic energy to the ear as the actual time-varying noise over the same exposure time. Leq does not depend on the time of day during which the noise occurs.

17 Ldn, the day-night average noise level, is a 24-hour average Leq with a 10 dBA “penalty” added to noise during the hours of 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM to account for increased nighttime noise sensitivity. Because of this penalty, the Ldn would always be higher than its corresponding 24-hour Leq (i.e., a constant 60 dBA noise over 24 hours would have a 60 dBA Leq, but a 66.4 dBA Ldn).

18 Classifications are shown on the “General Plan Land Use Diagram” accompanying the General Plan, adopted by the City Council June 18, 2002. Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan.

19 At present, Monday – Friday, 7:00-9:00 am and 3:00-6:30 pm in both directions.

20 Caltrans. “Information Memorandum: Year 2002 Bay Area Freeway Congestion Data,” District 4 Office of Highway Operations, no date except cover. This is the latest report that is currently available, and does not reflect the benefits of the widening between Wilfred Avenue and Highway 12.

21 Because it is not approved project, the proposed Home Depot store at Yolanda Avenue and Hearn Avenue was not included in the analysis. This assumption was confirmed with the City’s Traffic Engineering Division.

22 As per Caltrans Highway Design Manual (Figure 504.2A), this distance excludes 270 feet of deceleration distance on the ramp, and does not include the present auxiliary ramp as queuing area.

24 Based on published schedule, effective August 2002.
26 Based on Summer 2005 timetables.
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BACKGROUND

All public agencies are required to adopt mitigation monitoring or reporting programs when approving projects with Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) or Negative Declarations that identify significant or potentially significant environmental impacts. The reporting and monitoring program must be adopted when a public agency makes its findings under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Chapter 2.6, Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code so that the program can be made a condition of project approval. The program must be designed to ensure project compliance with mitigation measures during project implementation. If certain project impacts extend beyond the project implementation phase, long-term mitigation monitoring is to be provided in the monitoring program.

PURPOSE

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Santa Rosa Avenue widening project (the project) in the City of Santa Rosa, is to ensure that all required mitigation measures are completed as part of implementing the project, and that the required mitigation measures are maintained in a satisfactory manner during and after implementing the project.

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is designed in a checklist format for ease of use by the responsible parties. The checklist identifies the individual mitigation measures and the time frame for implementation, and assigns a party responsible to monitor and confirm the implementation of each mitigation measure. The checklist will be used by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works to verify that all required mitigation measures are incorporated into the project and will provide a convenient tool to determine whether required mitigation measures have been fulfilled.
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

MANAGEMENT

The City of Santa Rosa will be responsible for overall implementation and administration of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Santa Rosa Avenue widening project. Duties would include the following:

- Conducting routine inspections, plan checking, and reporting activities.
- Serving as a liaison between the City, project sponsors as applicable and construction contractors regarding mitigation and/or mitigation monitoring issues.
- Coordinating activities of any consultants hired by the City and/or project sponsors when such expertise and qualifications are necessary to implement and monitor mitigation measures.
- Coordinating with agencies having jurisdiction over environmental resources and/or public service and utility facilities and mitigation monitoring responsibilities.
- Assuring follow-up and responding to any public complaints.
- Completing forms and checklists for reporting. Maintaining reports and other records and documents generated by the monitoring program.
- Coordinating and assuring corrective actions or enforcement measures are taken, if and as necessary.

BASELINE DATA

The baseline data for each of the environmental impact mitigation measures to be implemented and monitored is contained in the Initial Study, Section 2 CEQA Environmental Checklist prepared for the Santa Rosa Avenue widening project (April, 2006).

ENFORCEMENT

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be incorporated as a condition of project approval, should the project be approved for implementation. Therefore, all mitigation measures must be complied with in order to fulfill the requirements of the approval. In addition, a number of the mitigation measures will be incorporated into the design and contract specifications of the project as the project progresses. These measures will be checked on project plans, in construction specifications and technical reports, and in the field prior to and during project construction. If compliance is not found, work will either be halted through a stop-work order or as otherwise modified in the area of investigation so that the specified mitigation measures may be fully implemented.
Mitigation measures and monitoring actions are provided in the Checklist. In addition to identifying the monitoring and reporting actions, the Checklist provides specific penalties for non-compliance. Mitigation measure numbers (i.e., 2.3-3) are the same as documented in the Initial Study.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING**

The monitoring and reporting program identifies each mitigation measure for a potentially significant or significant environmental impact and specifies the following:

- mitigation monitoring implementation action(s) required and the timing of mitigation action(s)
- the criteria or performance standard established for each mitigation measure
- responsible party or agency to conduct the monitoring and reporting
- the frequency of monitoring and reporting the outcome of monitoring activities, and
- sanctions to be imposed for noncompliance with required mitigation measures.

The Santa Rosa Department of Public Works will serve in an oversight role for insuring the implementation of all mitigation measures. Other agencies such as the Regional Water Quality Control Board and other agencies responsible for environmental resources, public health and safety, and/or permitting will collaborate with the Department as needed or as otherwise identified in this Program.

**FUNDING**

The requirements for mitigation monitoring and reporting do not provide a specific funding mechanism for implementation of mitigation monitoring and reporting programs. Funding for the Santa Rosa Avenue widening project, as a municipal project, will be provided by the City of Santa Rosa.
2.3-3 AIR QUALITY

Mitigation Measure 2.3-3

Implement recommended dust control measures: to reduce particulate matter emissions during project pavement removal, excavation and construction phases, the project contractor(s) shall comply with the dust control strategies developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The Department of Public Works shall include in construction contracts the following requirements or measures shown to be equally effective.

- Cover all truck hauling soil, sand, and other loose construction and demolition debris from the site, or require all such trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard;
- Water all exposed or disturbed soil surfaces in active construction areas at least twice daily;
- Use watering to control dust generation during demolition of structures or break-up of pavement;
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved parking areas and staging areas;
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved parking areas and staging areas;
- Provide daily clean-up of mud and dirt carried onto paved streets from the site;
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.);
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph;
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways;
- Install wheel washers for all existing trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site;
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour over a 30-minute period or more; and
- To the extent possible, limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other dust-generating construction activity at any one time.
Implementation
Mitigation to be implemented per City criteria in collaboration with the project Contractor(s).

Evaluation Criteria/Performance Standards
Conformance with Mitigation Measure 2.3-3.

Agency/Party Responsible for Monitoring and Reporting
City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works.

Monitoring and Reporting Frequency
As determined by City of Santa Rosa (will include field inspections).

Noncompliance Sanction
As determined by City of Santa Rosa.

2.3-5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

MITIGATION MEASURE 2.3-5

Construction specifications for the project shall note that operators of site trench excavation equipment be instructed to be observant for unusual or suspect materials that may surface from below during site grading and excavation operations. In the event that unknown archaeological remains, including paleontological objects, are discovered during subsurface excavation and construction (primarily for utilities), land alteration work in the vicinity of the find shall be halted and a qualified archeologist consulted. Prompt evaluations could then be made regarding the find and a resource management plan that is consistent with CEQA requirements could then be implemented. If prehistoric archeological deposits are discovered, local Native American organizations shall be consulted and involved in making resource management decisions. All applicable State and local legal requirements concerning the treatment of cultural materials and Native American burials shall be enforced.

If subsequent investigations result in the recording of prehistoric archeological sites that cannot be avoided and preserved, and the importance of the cultural deposits cannot be determined from surface evidence, then subsurface testing programs should take place to make such determinations. Testing procedures shall be designed to specifically determine the boundaries of sites, the depositional integrity and the cultural importance of the resources, as per CEQA criteria. These investigations shall be conducted by qualified professionals knowledgeable in regional prehistory. The testing programs shall be conducted within the context of appropriate research considerations and shall result in detailed technical reports that define the exact disturbance implications for important resources and present comprehensive programs for addressing such disturbances. Measures similar to the ones described below would also apply:

1. Avoidance of an archeological site through modification of the excavation that would allow for the preservation of the resource.

2. Covering or “capping” sites with a protective layer of fill. Archaeological monitoring during the filling process would be recommended.
In circumstances where archaeological deposits cannot be preserved through avoidance or capping, data recovery through excavation would be the mitigation alternative. This measure shall consist of excavating those portions of the sites that would be adversely impacted. The work shall be accomplished within the context of detailed research and in accordance with current professional standards. The program should result in extraction of sufficient volumes of archaeological data so that important regional research considerations can be addressed. The excavation shall be accomplished by qualified professionals and detailed technical reports should result.

Although considered remote, any discovery of a paleontological site would require a qualified paleontologist to survey the site and assess the find. If a fossil find is confirmed, it shall be recorded with the U.S. geological Survey and curated in an appropriate repository.

Implementation
Include mitigation measure in plans and specifications (bid documents) as required/approved by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works.

Evaluation Criteria/Performance Standards
Conformance with Mitigation Measure 2.3-5.

Agency/Party Responsible for Monitoring and Reporting
City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works.

Monitoring and Reporting Frequency
Upon City approval of plans and specifications prior to issuance for bid.

Noncompliance Sanction
Stop work order during construction.

2.3-7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

MITIGATION MEASURE 2.3-7

Prior to commencing the demolition or removal of an existing building, the City shall retain a qualified environmental specialist (e.g., a Registered Environmental Assessor) to inspect the building to be removed. The specialist shall identify any asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyls, mercury, lead, or other hazardous materials present which would then be tested. If found at levels that would require special handling, these materials shall be managed as required by law and according to federal and state regulations and guidelines, including those of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control.
Implementation
Include mitigation measure in plans and specifications (bid documents) as required/approved by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works.

Evaluation Criteria/Performance Standards
Conformance with Mitigation Measure 2.3-7.

Agency/Party Responsible for Monitoring and Reporting
City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works.

Monitoring and Reporting Frequency
Upon City approval of plans and specifications prior to issuance for bid.

Noncompliance Sanction
Stop work order during building demolition.

2.3-11 NOISE

MITIGATION MEASURE 2.3-11

- The following actions shall be implemented during construction:
  
a) To minimize construction noise impacts on nearby residents and businesses, limit construction hours to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on non-holiday weekdays or as allowed by City Municipal Code. Any work outside of these hours by the construction contractors should require a special permit from the City Engineer. There should be compelling reasons for permitting construction outside of these designated hours.

b) Construction equipment shall be properly muffled and maintained with noise reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise.

c) Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.

d) The contractor shall locate stationary noise sources away from residents and businesses, and require the use of acoustic shielding with such equipment when feasible and appropriate.

e) Notify residents and businesses within 500 feet of the construction site of the construction scheduling in writing.

f) The construction contractor shall designate a “noise disturbance coordinator” for construction activities. The coordinator will be responsible for responding to any local complaints regarding construction noise. The coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (i.e., starting too early, bad muffler, no shielding), and will require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem are implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors and businesses regarding the construction schedule.
Implementation
Include mitigation measure in plans and specifications (bid documents) as required/approved by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works.

Evaluation Criteria/Performance Standards
Conformance with Mitigation Measure 2.3-11.

Agency/Party Responsible for Monitoring and Reporting
City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works.

Monitoring and Reporting Frequency
Prior to issuance for bid and thereafter as determined in the field.

Noncompliance Sanction
Stop work order.

**2.3-15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

Mitigation Measure 2.3-15
Prior to demolition and construction, the selected contractor shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan that identifies the timing and routing of all major construction equipment and trucking to the project site to avoid potential traffic congestion and delays on the local street network, and encourage the use of U.S. 101. This plan shall be developed so as to be acceptable by the Santa Rosa Department of Public Works. It may be necessary to limit construction activities and materials delivery to off-peak hours or determine access to particular areas of construction that would not conflict with local traffic circulation.

Implementation
Include mitigation measure in plans and specifications (bid documents) as required/approved by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works.

Evaluation Criteria/Performance Standards
Conformance with Mitigation Measure 2.3-15.

Agency/Party Responsible for Monitoring and Reporting
City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works.

Monitoring and Reporting Frequency
Upon City approval of plans and specifications prior to issuance for bid, and thereafter in the field at periodic intervals.

Noncompliance Sanction
Stop work order during construction.
**PROCEDURE**

The suggested forms on the following pages are provided to establish a system of mitigation monitoring and reporting. The forms are developed for the following purposes:

1. To allow for transferring mitigation measures as established in the Program in recognition of subsequent stages of project planning and construction activities.
2. To track each mitigation measure throughout the construction process to insure implementation.
3. To document each mitigation measure conformance with Program objectives upon the completion of construction.
4. To tailor the Mitigation Monitoring Program to the requirements of the project. To avoid over-simplifying or over-complicating the monitoring effort.
5. To evaluate the effectiveness of in-place mitigation measures and implement revisions as appropriate to insure the ongoing effectiveness of each mitigation measure.
6. To develop remedial actions as required to insure mitigation effectiveness.
7. To maintain complete records where substantiation of mitigation monitoring is warranted.

**MITIGATION MONITORING REPORT**

The Mitigation Monitoring Report form serves as a cover sheet for a project mitigation report. This form identifies the project, project sponsor and provides a checklist of the subject areas where mitigation monitoring and reporting is required for the project. This form provides an overview of the general aspects of the monitoring program.

**MITIGATION MONITORING COMPLIANCE**

The Mitigation Monitoring Compliance Report form identifies whether the mitigation is derived from an EIR or Negative Declaration. This form also provides space for the statement of a mitigation measure, the performance standards for mitigation compliance, details about site inspections and whether the mitigation measure when implemented is acceptable or unacceptable. The form also allows for specifying who is responsible for determining compliance and the timing (scheduling) for compliance determination.
A separate form is used for each mitigation measure. If the implemented mitigation measure is not achieving its intended purpose, or was not successfully implemented, the specific actions required for compliance may be noted on the form.

**MITIGATION MONITORING VERIFICATION**

The Mitigation Monitoring Verification form provides for a statement of findings that a previously unacceptable mitigation attempt when modified through further action is, in fact, acceptable as modified or altered. This form is filled out after the specific actions for mitigation compliance have been completed and are found acceptable. The completed package with a memorandum may then be entered into the project files at the conclusion of the mitigation monitoring and reporting program.
**Mitigation Monitoring Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Mitigation Required</th>
<th>* Mitigation Completed and Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic/Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils, Geology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Compliance Report

Sheet ________________
CITY OF SANTA ROSA, SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
MITIGATION MONITORING COMPLIANCE REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.:</th>
<th>Project:</th>
<th>A.P. No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Category:</th>
<th>EIR Sch. No.:</th>
<th>Neg. Dec.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Mitigation:</th>
<th>Project Design</th>
<th>Project Ongoing</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Statement:**

**Mitigation Performance Standard:**

Responsibility to Implement Mitigation:

Responsibility to Assess Compliance:

Date of Inspection: ________________

By: ____________________________  __________________________

Consultant  City

Compliance: Acceptable  Unacceptable

(Further Action Required - See Below)

**Action Required for Compliance (Describe):**

(Attach Mitigation Monitoring Verification Report)

Responsibility for Compliance Determination: __________________________

Timing for Compliance Determination: __________________________

Signed: __________________________  Date: __________________________

Sheet No.: __________________________
CITY OF SANTA ROSA, SANTA ROSA WIDENING PROJECT
MITIGATION MONITORING VERIFICATION

File Date:____________________________________________________________________________

Project: _____________________________________ A.P. No.:______________________________

Subject Category: _____________________________________________________________________

Date of Inspection:________________________

By:  ___________________________________________ ____________________________

Consultant                                                                 City

Verification of Findings (To be filled out after Action Required for Compliance is completed).

Signed: ________________________________         Date: _______________________  

Attach to Sheet No.: __________________________
City of Santa Rosa

Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project

Appendix B

Primary Record, Resource Evaluation
**P1. Other Identifier:** none

**P2. Location:** □ Not for Publication  □ Unrestricted  □ Sonoma

- **a. County:** Sonoma
- **b. USGS 7.5' Quad:** Santa Rosa, Calif.  **Date:** 1954 (Photorevised 1980)  **T** 7N;  **R** 8W;  **¼ of ¼ of Sec** ;  **M.D.**  **B.M.**
- **c. Address:** 2300 Santa Rosa Avenue  **City:** Santa Rosa  **Zip:** 95407-7641
- **d. UTM:** Zone: 10 ;  mE/  mN (G.P.S.)
- **e. Other Locational Data:** (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)  **APN #044-041-001-000**

**P3a. Description:** (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

The subject property is an approximately 6,555-square-foot commercial parcel at the southeast corner of Santa Rosa Avenue and Kawana Springs Road, which contains a used car business. The surrounding area along Santa Rosa Avenue consists primarily of commercial uses.

There are two buildings on the subject property. The main building is a small, single-story, rectangular building with a side-gabled roof. According to the Sonoma County Assessor’s Records the building is 700 square feet. The shingle roofing is a modern, composite material. Vents are located at each of the gable ends under the eaves at the peak of the roof. The west façade of the building fronts Santa Rosa Avenue. All remaining windows appear to be modern aluminum, typical of 1950s construction. A full length porch stretches across the west façade. Simple square posts support the roof as it continues over the porch. The front, or west, façade is sheathed in board-and-batten siding above what appears to be a faux-stone siding. This façade also contains two doors and one window. The window has three panes; one large center pane flanked by single panes. The center pane appears to be fixed with the other two as functional openings. The north, south, and east facades are all sheathed in stucco with no decorative features. The north façade contains one door and a boarded up opening that appears to have been a window. The east façade contains one small window as well as two boarded up openings that appear to have also been windows. The south façade contains one large window. A small wooden shed is located at the southeast corner of the property.

The main building is in good condition overall. The level of integrity is somewhat hard to assess due to the similarity of some of the building materials that were used in the 1950s to those used today. It is likely that at least the roof has been replaced. The shed is in fair condition.

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes)

- **HP6:** 1-3 story commercial building

**P4. Resources Present:**  □ Building  □ Structure  □ Object  □ Site  □ District  □ Element of District  □ Other (Isolates, etc.)

**P5a. Photo or Drawing:** (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

**P5b. Description of Photo:** (View, date, accession #)

View from the southwest corner of the subject parcel.

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**  □ Historic  □ Prehistoric  □ Both

1955, Sonoma County Assessor’s Records

**P7. Owner and Address:**

George & Karen Dib
2300 Santa Rosa Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA  95407

**P8. Recorded by:** (Name, affiliation, and address)

Amber Grady, EIP/PBS&J
1200 Second Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA  95814

**P9. Date Recorded:** June 26, 2006

**P10. Survey Type:** (Describe)

Wind shield survey
**NRHP Status Code**

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Dib’s Auto Sales

| B1. Historic Name: | none |
| B2. Common Name:   | Dib’s Auto Sales |
| B3. Original Use:  | Unknown |
| B4. Present Use:   | Used Car Lot |

**B5. Architectural Style:** Ranch

**B6. Construction History:**
Built in 1955. No known additions or major alterations. Roof was most likely replaced at some point.

**B7. Moved?** ☒ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown
**Original Location:** n/a

**B8. Related Features:** Small shed at the southeast corner of the site.

**B9a. Architect:** Unknown
**b. Builder:** Unknown

**B10. Significance:**
| Theme: Commercial development |
| Area: City of Santa Rosa |

| Period of Significance: none |
| Property Type: Commercial |
| Applicable Criteria: none |

(The discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

The area around the subject property is a mixture of commercial, light industrial, and residential. As evidence by the mixture of uses, building types, and building styles and materials the area has been steadily evolving for the past half century. While this small commercial structure, built in 1955, meets the age requirement for evaluation as a historic resource there is no evidence to support a finding of eligibility under any of the NRHP criteria. No significant events or people were discovered in connection with the property. This small commercial building with Ranch style elements does not embody the distinct characteristics of an architectural type, period, or method of construction. The architect is unknown; however, it is unlikely that it represents the work of a master. A commercial building of this size from the 1950s is also unlikely to yield any information important about history.

**B11. Additional Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes) none

**B12. References:**
Sonoma County Assessor’s Records for APN 044-041-001-000

**B13. Remarks:**
None

**B14. Evaluator:** Amber Grady

**Date of Evaluation:** June 26, 2006
*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Dib's Auto Sales

*Recorded by: Amber Grady

*Date: June 26, 2006  □ Continuation  □ Update

DPR 523L (1/95)  *Required information