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Section 1
Introduction

1.1 Background

Proposed 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. 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. The project site is located immediately east of U.S. Highway 101 and two miles south of the Santa Rosa downtown area as described in more detail in the Initial Study prepared for the project.

The Department of Public Works has proposed a series of traffic and circulation adjustments 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-or-way width.

Environmental Review Under CEQA

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 as noted above 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.


An Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the City of Santa Rosa Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project (Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road), (the project), dated July 2006 was
prepared and circulated to agencies and the public for the required 30 day review period. The State Clearinghouse review period began on July 17, 2006 and closed on August 15, 2006. As indicated in the City’s Public Notice of Availability issued on July 18, 2006, the local agency/public review period began on July 31, 2006 and ended on August 30, 2006.¹

It was determined the widening project could not have a significant effect on the environment as stated in the Preliminary Negative Declaration attached to the Initial Study. This finding was 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 reasons as documented in the CEQA Environmental Checklist of the Initial Study (Sections 1 and 2 inclusive) for the project. Mitigation measures were included in the project to avoid potentially significant effects. Thus, a Mitigated Negative Declaration had been prepared for the project.

While two state agencies submitted comments regarding the Initial Study or Negative Declaration, the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works received ten additional letters of comment from agencies and individuals having an interest in the project. When determining whether to approve a project, the Lead Agency is to consider the comments received during its consultation and review periods together with the Negative Declaration (Public Resources Code Section 21091 (d) (1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15074 (b)). Given the technical aspects of the comments provided in the letters submitted regarding the project and Initial Study, it has been determined that clarifications and explanations be prepared in response to assist the Lead Agency in reviewing the comments in considering project approvals.

Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration of April, 2007.

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

¹ As Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Santa Rosa issued the Public Notice of Availability of the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.
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 these project amendments, the Initial Study text and maps have been revised as of April 2007 and submitted to the State Clearinghouse for state agency review and comment. Letters of comment submitted at the community meeting of September 27, 2006 and subsequent to the community meeting are included in this document to round out the record of public comment on the project. Those letters of comment requiring responses are so noted as indicated previously. For accuracy, all responses to comments in this document reflect changes incorporated into the roadway widening project after the September 27, 2006 community meeting.

1.2 HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT

This document, Responses to Questions and Comments Regarding the Project, Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, addresses the substantive comments as contained in the letters of comment submitted regarding the project, Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration. It should be noted that this document is not required to be prepared under CEQA, but is provided by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works for informational purposes. It is also expected that issues that address the merits of the Santa Rosa Avenue widening project will be heard before the City of Santa Rosa City Council.

This document consists of three sections: 1) Introduction; 2) List of Commenters; and 3) Letters of Comment with Responses.

Those comments that question the design, features or configuration of the project, or the content and/or adequacy of the Initial Study and related issues that require responses are numbered in the left hand margin of each letter of comment as submitted. Comments that offer opinions or discuss matters not directly related to the project or its environmental documentation do not require responses. The letters requiring responses are numbered consecutively 1 through 21. The responses are correlated with the comments by the numbers shown. Each letter of comment requiring responses is followed immediately by responses. For the most part, the responses provide explanations or additional discussion regarding the characteristics and features of the widening project or information contained in the Initial Study. Where two or more comments address the same issue of interest, the reader is referred to the first response addressing the issue of interest.
# Section 2
## List of Commenters

### 2.1 AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS SUBMITTING LETTERS OF COMMENT WITH RESPONSES

Agencies, organizations and individuals submitting comments on the Santa Rosa Avenue widening project, Initial Study and Negative Declaration are identified in this section.

1. State of California, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, Terry Roberts, Director, State Clearinghouse, August 16, 2006 (Comment 1-1)

2. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region, Joan Fleck, Engineering Geologist, August 16, 2006 (Comments 2-1 and 2-2)

3. Helen Hamilton, August 16, 2006 (Comments 3-1 through 3-3)

4. Recreational Equipment, Inc., Marc Abbruzzese, Store Manager, REI August 8, 2006 (Comments 4-1)

5. Santa Rosa Cartunes, Aka Mobile Mike, Michael A. Meza, August 22, 2006 (Comment 5-1)

6. J. Kapolchok + Associates, (no date) (Comments 6-1 through 6-11)

7. Carol Boutelle and Robert Turner, Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park, August 29, 2006 (Comment 7-1)

8. Gillmeister and Gorak, Attorneys at Law, William Gorak, Esq., Managing Partner, August 30, 2006 (Comments 8-1 through 8-8)


11. Petition Opposing the Widening of Santa Rosa Avenue in Front of Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park, August 28 and 29, 2006 (Comments 11-1 through 11-5)


**Correspondence Received During and After the Community Meeting of September 27, 2006**

13. Loraine M. Stickney, Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park, October 9, 2006 (Comments 13-1 and 13-2)

14. Helen Hamilton, Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park, September 27, 2006 (Comment 14-1)

15. Willie Nerison, Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park, September 27, 2006 (Comment 15-1)
16. Carol Boutelle, Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park, September 27, 2006 (Comment 16-1)
17. Jorge Guzman, Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park, September 27, 2006 (Comment 17-1)
18. Maureen Fuller, Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park, September 27, 2006 (Comment 18-1)
19. Daniel Coleman, September 27, 2006 (Comment 19-1)
20. William and Mary Gorak, Gillmeister and Gorak, Attorneys at Law, September 28, 2006 (Comments 20-1 through 20-6)
Section 3

Letters of Comment with Responses
August 16, 2006

Lori Urbanek
City of Santa Rosa, Department of Public Works
69 Stony Circle
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Subject: Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project, Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
SCH#: 2006072078

Dear Lori Urbanek:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on August 15, 2006, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse
**Document Details Report**  
**State Clearinghouse Data Base**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH#</th>
<th>2006072078</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title</strong></td>
<td>Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project, Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Agency</strong></td>
<td>Santa Rosa, Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Neg</th>
<th>Negative Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road (a distance of about 1,180 feet) to include roadway widening; the addition of through and turning movement lanes; the provision of sidewalks, bike lanes, a planter strip, median and restriping right-of-way acquisition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lead Agency Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name</strong></th>
<th>Lori Urbanek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa, Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone</strong></td>
<td>707 543-3854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fax</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>69 Stony Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zip</strong></td>
<td>95401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>County</strong></th>
<th>Sonoma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross Streets</strong></td>
<td>Yolanda Avenue / Kawana Springs Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parcel No.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Township</strong></th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Proximity to:**

- **Highways**: 12
- **Airports**: 
- **Railways**: 
- **Waterways**: 
- **Schools**: 
- **Land Use**: 

**Project Issues**

- Drainage/Absorption; Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Landuse; Other Issues; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality

**Reviewing Agencies**

- Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Caltrans, District 4; California Highway Patrol; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Game, Region 3; Office of Historic Preservation; Native American Heritage Commission; Department of Parks and Recreation; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 1

| **Date Received** | 07/17/2006 |
| **Start of Review** | 07/17/2006 |
| **End of Review**   | 08/15/2006 |

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
Response 1-1

The State Clearinghouse is responsible for receiving and distributing to state agencies for comment environmental documents (Environmental Impact Reports, Initial Studies and Negative Declarations) prepared for projects where such agencies may have jurisdiction by law with respect to the projects. As indicated in the comment, the State Clearinghouse submitted the Negative Declaration to state agencies for review and no state agencies submitted comments regarding the project, Initial Study prepared for the project or Negative Declaration. The City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works had therefore complied with State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as noted in the comment.

As noted previously in the Introduction section of this document, 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, the results of which initiated several amendments to the design of the project. These project amendments are included in a revised Initial Study and Negative Declaration dated April, 2007, which has been submitted to the State Clearinghouse for review to insure that the public and reviewing agencies have been afforded the chance to review the project description as amended.
August 16, 2006

Ms. Lori Urbanek
Assistant Civil Engineer
City of Santa Rosa
Department of Public Works
69 Stony Circle
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Dear Ms. Urbanek:

Subject: Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration
State Clearing House No. 2006072076

Regional Water Board staff has reviewed the Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road, Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration and have the following comments:

- Two petroleum underground storage tank sites are located within the project area. They are located west of Santa Rosa Avenue on the north (Chevron) and south (ARCO) sides of the Baker Avenue on-ramp. We do not expect an encounter with impacted soil and groundwater during project implementation. However, if an encounter occurs in this area or anywhere else within the project area, please notify Jim Tischler with the Regional Water Board at (707) 576-2469 and Ms. Corey Vincent with the Santa Rosa Fire Department at (707) 543-3542.

- A groundwater monitoring well installed for the ARCO investigation is located west of Santa Rosa Avenue and South of Colgan Creek Channel. The well may be located within the project area and would require proper well abandonment prior to the road widening project. If so, please contact Mr. Charles Carmel of Atlantic Richfield Company at (925) 946-1085, or Mr. Jaff Auchtcrionie of SECOR International, the site consultant, at (919) 384 0728.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I can be reached at (707) 576-2675 if there are any questions.

Sincerely,

Joan Fleck
Engineering Geologist

cc: Mr. James Cameron, Santa Rosa Department of Public Works, 69 Stony Circle, Santa Rosa, CA 95401
Fire Inspector Corey Vincent, Santa Rosa Fire Department
Response 2-1

The two underground petroleum storage tank sites noted in the comment are located about 2,200 feet north of Kawana Springs Road, substantially outside the project construction area. An encounter with any impacted soils and groundwater during project construction is not anticipated as noted in the comment. The City would be required to contact the Regional Water Quality Control Board and Fire Department under any encounter of hazardous materials during construction.

Response 2-2

The comment does not confirm the presence of a groundwater monitoring well in the project construction area. Any well abandonment plans would require notification as described in the comment.
Dear Ms Meredith:

I live in the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park at Santa Rosa Avenue and Hearn Avenue. Since we, the tenants, already have some problems getting in and out of the Park I am very concerned about how the city of Santa Rosa will provide for our access to and from the Park while this construction is going on.

I also heard that you are considering taking away part of the front of the Park. Why can’t you just use the east side of Santa Rosa Avenue and push some of the parking lots back to the rear of the buildings there and leave our Park as it is.

Something else I have thought would help the congestion of Santa Rosa Avenue is putting a stop sign at Yolanda Avenue and Petaluma Hill Road. I worked on Yolanda for some years and never understood why a stop sign was not put at that intersection. There are many accidents there and it is very difficult to turn onto Petaluma Hill Road from Yolanda. I think a stop light at that corner would make it easier for more drivers to use Petaluma Hill Road instead of Santa Rosa Avenue when going north/south.

Sincerely,

Helen Hamilton

cc: Sam McMillan
Response 3-1

The following information regarding construction traffic and traffic circulation in the project area during construction is provided in Section 2.3-15 of the Initial Study, Transportation/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.”

In view of the above, Mitigation Measure 2.3-15 is provided in the Initial Study as follows to traffic circulation and property access during the construction period”

“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.”

The department of Public Works would be responsible for reviewing the Traffic Control Plan prior to construction, and would approve the Plan if considered acceptable in all respects, including the maintenance of access to properties fronting the roadway corridor during construction. No Plan would be approved that did not allow reasonable and adequate access to properties fronting the roadway corridor during construction.
Response 3-2

The comment questions the need to widen Santa Rosa Avenue in front of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park. The need for the project is discussed on page 1 of the Initial Study, which is to relieve congestion, reduce delay and improve safety for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians along Santa Rosa Avenue. The existing right-of-way limit on the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue would be maintained in its current location. There would be no additional acquisition of right-of-way on the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue. The outside edge of the new sidewalk would be located where the existing right-of-way line is located. 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 the 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.

Response 3-3

It is unlikely that adding STOP signs on Petaluma Hill Road at Yolanda Avenue would help congestion on Santa Rosa Avenue. In fact, by slowing the average speeds on Petaluma Hill Road, it might cause more traffic to cross over to Santa Rosa Avenue. Right now, average traffic delays making the eastbound left turn from Yolanda Avenue to Petaluma Hill Road northbound are long — probably over a minute during peak hours — but drivers also have the option of making the left turn at the signalized intersection of Kawana Springs Road, which is less than a quarter mile to the north.

The use of traffic control devices in California is regulated by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways, widely known as the “MUTCD,” which is collaboratively developed by the U.S. Federal Highway Administration and partner transportation organizations. This document has been adopted (with some additions) by the State of California and is binding upon local governments in California. The MUTCD provides specific criteria, known as “warrants,” for the installation of certain types of traffic control devices, including all-way STOP control (AWSC) and traffic signals.

The Yolanda Avenue/Petaluma Hill Road intersection is planned for signalization in the future, and is included in the City of Santa Rosa’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP Project #8188). The signal will be constructed and paid for by the developer of a large housing project nearby (Kawana Meadows). That subdivision will generate additional traffic at the intersection that requires the signal as a project mitigation measure.

The disadvantages of placing a four-way stop control at Yolanda/Petaluma Hill Road as an interim measure include:
• The existing vehicular delay for turning traffic on Yolanda Avenue would be transferred to Petaluma Hill Road. Analysis indicates that this delay would be LOS F for the Petaluma Hill Road approaches, with queues extending more than 1,000 feet from the intersection at times. The eastbound left turn delays would shorten dramatically, but at the expense of imposing much greater total delay on the other intersection approaches.

• There are considerable safety concerns with placing stop controls on a relatively high-speed street, such as Petaluma Hill Road. The posted speed limit is 40 mph, and the 85th percentile speed is 44 mph. Driver inattention can result in serious, sometimes fatal rear-end crashes, when a long queue forms back of a STOP sign.
August 8, 2006

Marie Meridith
Deputy Director
City of Santa Rosa Community Development Dept.
100 Santa Rosa Ave. / Box 1678
Santa Rosa, CA 95402

Dear Marie,

I recently received a letter describing the widening of Santa Rosa Ave. from Yolanda to Kawana Springs. I think this is a much needed project and will really help improve some of the congestion this area receives. I have only one concern;

This past year our store and employees had adopted an island on Santa Rosa Ave. just south of Yolanda. We have spent a large amount of time, sweat and money trying to beautify this spot and make this end of Santa Rosa Ave look more appealing. All of the work is done on a volunteer basis. To date we’ve laid weed cloth, built dirt mounds, added wood chips, installed drip irrigation and planted plants.

I am relieved to know that the area south of Yolanda is not up for renovation. However, I would like to make sure that this island does not get disturbed during this construction project. We have worked hard on this area and would hate to see it become a dumping ground for construction materials.

Please let me know what your thoughts are regarding this spot.

Thank you for your time and inviting me to share my comments.

Marc Abbruzzese
Store Manager
REI
2715 Santa Rosa Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
(707)540-9025

RECEIVED
AUG 22 2006
CITY OF SANTA ROSA
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT
Response 4-1

The road widening project limits are as noted on Figures 1.3-1 and 1.3-2 in the Initial Study following page 5 entitled Project Plan. Project construction would not extend south of Yolanda Avenue and therefore the island structure noted in the comment would not be affected by the widening project. In fact, beautification efforts as mentioned in the comment would be augmented and enhanced by the widening project itself. As described on pages 18 and 19 of the Initial Study, in many locations within the project area there are no curbs, crumbling sidewalks (or no sidewalks) and the pavement surface appears worn. With project completion, new street paving, new concrete curbs with sidewalks, clearly defined bicycle lanes and the introduction of a planter strip and planter wells with 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.
August 22, 2006

Marie Meredith
Deputy Director
City of Santa Rosa Community Development Department
100 Santa Rosa Avenue /Box 1678
Santa Rosa, CA 95402

Santa Rosa Widening Project Yoland Ave. to Kawana Springs Road

I am a small business owner with a store located at 2450 Santa Rosa Avenue right across from the Heerm Road exit. Currently the only entrance/exit to my business is a shared driveway with the Liano Motel. Two other businesses also share this same driveway and all our business is derived from working on automobiles and trucks. During the construction process it is imperative that the driveway not be blocked at all. Our businesses would suffer greatly from any impediment that would keep customers from accessing our parking lot.

Customers have to come in the driveway, round the back of the building into a limited number of parking spaces. There is no other parking or access available. A direct access from Santa Rosa Avenue is barred by a Water Department Box. If this were to be put elsewhere or below ground it would make more sense to have a driveway directly into our parking lot from the street and have parking behind the buildings. This would eliminate street congestion from customers exiting/entering our communal driveway.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Meza
Response 5-1

Please see Response 3-1 for information regarding construction traffic and the maintenance of traffic circulation in the project area during construction.

The water backflow device in question is required by the health and safety code to be installed above ground. The device could be relocated to a location that would not conflict with a driveway. However, this would require the water service to the affected buildings to be relocated as a separate undertaking.
Comments on the Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the widening of Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road

A review of the Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the widening of Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road reveals that potential impacts associated with the project have been insufficiently addressed. The areas in need of additional consideration are the description of the project setting, rationale of the project’s design, consistency with the city of Santa Rosa General Plan, consistency with the city of Santa Rosa Design Review Guidelines, a physical impact of the project due to a potential economic impact and project segmentation.

On these issues we offer the following:

**Project Description:**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(a) Initial Study states, in part, that the lead agency shall conduct an initial study to determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Under CEQA Section 21065, a project means an activity which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment. Section 21060.5 defines environment as the physical conditions which exist within the area which will be affected by a proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise, objects of historic or aesthetic significance. This being the case, an Initial Study has the responsibility to fully describe the physical environment potentially impacted by the project. The description offered in the Initial Study is incomplete.

Although reduced aerial photographs are included, the reader and decision makers would not know, for example, that by widening the east side of Santa Rosa Avenue by eleven feet beyond the existing right-of-way all of the landscaping in front of Advanced Auto Glass is removed i.e., the sidewalk would adjoin the face of the building, two-thirds of the landscaping including the existing planter strip, a landscaped berm as well as an approved monument sign in front of Barbeque Galore would be removed, driveway approaches and therefore turn movements into parking stalls would be truncated. The Initial Study offers only a “macro” description of the environment. This does not lend itself to adequately assessing the potential impacts of the proposed road-widening project.
It is the author’s prerogative to incorporate this information as part of the description of the environment or address potential impacts within impact categories. However, the information needs to be included.

**Project Design:**

- The project proposes a 5 ft. sidewalk and 8.5 ft. planter strip on the west side of the road widening area and an 8.5 ft. sidewalk on the east side. However, 11 ft. beyond the existing right of way is being acquired on both sides of the street. As addressed below, a continuous sidewalk, i.e., absence of a planter strip, creates inconsistencies with the city's Design Review Guidelines and could significantly impact the ability of commercial businesses to expand in the future. Given the number of businesses on the east side of the roadway and the likelihood of greater pedestrian activity on this side, the project design should be reversed. If this cannot be accommodated, an alternate design of a 4 ft. planter strip and 4.5 ft. sidewalk should be offered.

**Aesthetics**

**Aesthetics 2.3-1c)** Will the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- Under the above referenced section in the Initial Study, the impact of the road widening on the design quality of existing businesses must be examined. This is particularly important on the east side of the roadway given the proposed design of the road section and the number of businesses potentially impacted. Moving the curb line 12 ft. eliminates or removes a significant amount of the landscape buffer between the roadway and the parking lots of the existing businesses.

**Land Use and Planning**

**Land Use and Planning 2.3-9 b)** Will the project result in a 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?

- The land use and planning analysis in the Initial Study fails to address the consistency of the project with the Economic Vitality element of the General Plan, portions of the Transportation element and the project's consistency with the city's Design Review Guidelines.

**Economic Vitality Element:**

- The widening of Santa Rosa Avenue, particularly on the east side of the roadway, may prevent expansion of existing businesses, be detrimental to the on-site circulation and functioning of existing parking lots and diminish the attractiveness of the businesses.
These impacts must be addressed in the Initial Study in order to determine if the project, as proposed, is potentially inconsistent with Guiding Principal #18 and goals EV-A and EV-B of the Economic Vitality Element of the General Plan.

Transportation Element:

- Moving the existing curb line on the east side of Santa Rosa Avenue an additional 12 ft. may result in turning movement conflicts that impede the flow of traffic. This could result in a public safety impact as well as raise consistency issues with goals TB and TD and policy T-C-4 of the Transportation Element. This potentially significant impact must be examined in the Initial Study.

Design Review Guidelines:

- Santa Rosa Avenue is considered a minor or secondary entry to the city of Santa Rosa. As such, the Design Guidelines require a minimum of 20 ft. of landscaping adjacent to the road right-of-way (p. 4.6-3). This requirement would be impossible for existing businesses along the east side of Santa Rosa Avenue to achieve. This, in turn, could prohibit any major remodeling or expansion of those businesses. The Initial Study has failed to address and offer mitigation for this potentially significant impact.

Economics

- According to Section 15131(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, economic or social effects may be used to determine the significance of physical changes caused by the project. Without analyzing the impact of the project on the on-site circulation and the ability to expand or remodel existing businesses along the east side of Santa Rosa Avenue, this effect cannot be determined. We ask that this analysis be done.

Project Segmentation

- The widening of Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road does not appear to be a stand-alone project. Neither does it appear to be Phase One of the future widening of Santa Rosa Avenue to a right-of-way width of 122 ft. The proposed project appears dependant on the improvement of Kawana Springs Road and Yolanda Avenue in order to function efficiently. If this is the case, Section 15378(a) would require the project description to include the improvements to Kawana Springs Road and Yolanda Avenue and for the Initial Study to be done on the "whole of the action".
Response 6-1

The comment specifies that potential impacts associated with the project have been insufficiently addressed in the Initial Study. Areas in need of “additional consideration” are noted in the comment to include 1) the project setting, 2) rational of the project’s design, 3) consistency with the Santa Rosa General Plan, 4) consistency with the Santa Rosa Design Review Guidelines, 5) physical impact of the project due to potential economic impacts, and 6) project segmentation.

Responses 6-2 through 6-11 address the above items in the order as presented in the letter of comment:

Response 6-2

The purpose of the Initial Study as a “preliminary analysis” is described on page 10 of the Initial Study. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063 (a) (3), an “initial study is neither intended nor required to include the level of detail included in an EIR.” Nevertheless, what is incomplete regarding discussions of the setting in the Initial Study is not specified in the comment and therefore a detailed response is neither possible nor required.

Response 6-3

The need (purpose) for the project is discussed on page 1 of the Initial Study, which is to relieve congestion, reduce delay and improve safety for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians along Santa Rosa Avenue.

As noted on page 4 of the Initial Study, the reconfigured face of curb on the east side of the roadway would be located approximately 12 feet east of the existing face of curb and the reconfigured face of curb on the west side of the roadway would vary from zero up to about nine feet west of the existing face of curb, depending on location.

An examination of Figures 1.3-1 and 1.3-2, Project Plan, following page 5 of the Initial Study shows that the east edge of the sidewalk would overlap with much of an existing grass covered earth berm, some of which contains shrubs and several juvenile ornamental trees, in front the Cartunes, Advanced Auto Glass and Bar-B-Que Galore retail establishments without significantly extending into the existing parking areas. Loss of the grass and landscape plantings in this area would be made up for through the City’s installation of planter wells and the planting of street trees in an 8-1/2-foot wide sidewalk in front of the existing businesses. Any signs removed to allow for project construction would be repositioned and secured in place. Continued access to existing parking areas at project completion would be provided by the City.

Response 6-4

Please see Response 6-3 regarding the planting of street trees on the east side of the roadway. The absence of a planter strip on the east side of the street would not be inconsistent with the City’s Design Guidelines Section 1.2, Streets & Public Ways. As a regional/arterial street, the use of either a planter
strip or plant wells for the installation of street trees along Santa Rosa Avenue would be consistent with
the Design Guidelines.

Currently, a pedestrian sidewalk is lacking (does not exist) on portions of the east side of the street and
the installation of sidewalks and bike lanes along the street corridor would improve safety and be
consistent with the Design Guidelines to provide such facilities on regional/arterial streets. A new
sidewalk would enhance pedestrian activity and access to existing businesses on the east side of the
street, given the “likelihood of greater pedestrian activity” as noted in the comment.

Private development at Chapel of the Chimes has been conditioned to install an eight-foot wide planter
and five-foot wide sidewalk along Chapel of the Chimes street frontage. This would be consistent with
the overall Santa Rosa Avenue widening project between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road.
The sidewalk width would allow for the planting of street trees and still meet ADA requirements for
width. A four and one-half foot wide sidewalk would not meet ADA requirements for width.

Business plans for expansion are not required to be studied in an Initial Study or EIR. The criteria for
determining potential environmental impacts of the project are as stated in the Initial Study and are
taken from CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Environmental Checklist Form.

Response 6-5

Please see Responses 6-3 and 6-4 regarding project design and expansion of the roadway on east and
west sides. As noted in Response 6-3, street trees would be installed as part of the project which would
compensate for removal of the grass and landscape plantings in front the Cartunes, Advanced Auto
Glass and Bar-B-Que Galore retail establishments. As described in Section 2.3-1 of the Initial Study,
Aesthetics, in many locations within the project area there are no curbs, crumbling sidewalks (or no
sidewalks) and the pavement surface appears worn. With project completion, new street paving, new
concrete curbs with sidewalks, clearly defined bicycle lanes and the introduction of a planter strip and
planter wells with 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.

See also Response to Comment 3-2 regarding the buffer in front of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home
Park.

Response 6-6

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063 (a) (3), an “initial study is neither intended nor
required to include the level of detail included in an EIR.” It is not required that the Initial Study
provide a detailed evaluation of project consistency with the Economic Vitality Element of the General
Plan, Transportation Element or Design Review Guidelines. An EIR is to discuss any inconsistencies
between a proposed project and the applicable general plans and regional plans (CEQA Guidelines
Section15125 (d)). However, as noted in Response 6-4, as a regional/arterial street, the use of a
planter strip and/or plant wells for the installation of street trees along Santa Rosa Avenue would be consistent with the City’s Design Guidelines.

Economic or social effects of a project are not to be treated as significant effects on the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15131 (a)).

Response 6-7

Please see Response 6-2 through 6-6 regarding issues of widening, business expansion, circulation, conformance with plans and appearances after project completion.

Response 6-8

The purpose of the project as discussed in Response 6-3 is to relieve congestion, reduce delay and improve safety for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians along Santa Rosa Avenue. The comment does not indicate how moving the existing curb line on the east side of Santa Rosa Avenue would impede the flow of traffic. The General Plan Transportation Element goals and policies referenced (but not quoted) in the comment are:

- **Goal T-B**: Provide a safe, efficient, free-flowing circulation system.
- **Goal T-D**: Maintain acceptable traffic flows.
- **Policy T-C-4**: Improve traffic flow and reduce neighborhood traffic impacts in all quadrants of the City by completing needed improvements, such as road widening and traffic calming. Seek innovative funding mechanisms in order to maximize the number of projects completed.

In accordance with the purpose of the project, the project would not conflict with, and would be in conformance with, the goals/policies of the General Plan Transportation Element. For more information regarding traffic and circulation in the project area, refer to the discussions in Section 2.3-15 of the Initial Study, Transportation/Traffic.

Response 6-9

Santa Rosa Avenue is listed in the Design Guidelines (Section 4.6, City Entries), as a minor or secondary entry at the Urban Boundary. The road corridor itself beyond the Urban Boundary is not listed as a City Entry. Santa Rosa Avenue crosses the Urban Boundary approximately three miles south of Yolanda Avenue south of Scenic Avenue near the City of Rohnert Park and therefore would not be considered an entry to the City in the area between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road where the widening project is located. Regardless, twenty feet of landscaping adjacent to the road right-of-way is not proposed as part of the widening project, is not relevant to the concept of entry due to the location of the project at the City interior, and would not be expected to be approved as part of the road widening project due to existing land uses in the project area. No significant adverse environmental impact is identified with respect to the widening project and “minor or secondary entries” at the urban boundary.
Response 6-10

As noted in Response 6-6, economic or social effects of a project are not to be treated as significant effects on the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15131 (a)). See Responses 3-2, 3-3, 6-8, 8-1, 8-2, 8-4 through 8-8 and 9-2 regarding site circulation. No adverse environmental impacts have been identified concerning site circulation. The project is not intended to alter the circulation patterns of existing businesses. Business plans for expansion are not required to be studied in an Initial Study. The criteria for determining potential environmental impacts of the project are as stated in the Initial Study and are taken from CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Environmental Checklist Form. In accordance with the Initial Study Environmental Checklist, no economic or social effects have been determined to result from the project as a consequence of any significance physical changes caused by the project.

Response 6-11

The “whole of the action” is as described on pages 4 through 7 in the Introduction section of the Initial Study. As noted, the project is included in the City’s 2004/2005 adopted Capital Improvement Program. The restriping of Santa Rosa Avenue north of Kawana Springs Road is described on page 10 of the Initial Study. Other road projects are also described on page 9, including the Yolanda Avenue widening project for which an EIR is currently being prepared. A long-term project is the widening of Hearn Avenue as noted on page 10, the Northpoint Parkway Extension, and constructing the US 101/Bellevue Avenue interchange. The Bellevue Avenue interchange and Northpoint Parkway Extension projects are in the early stages of study, analysis and environmental review under CEQA. The City’s anticipated traffic and circulation improvements for the long-term are as noted in the Transportation Element of the City’s General Plan. Environmental review under CEQA for the various traffic circulation projects as they are funded and enter the design stages are considered in the aggregate as far as feasible without committing to undue speculation regarding such improvements or the likelihood of implementing such improvements. There are no current commitments by the City for other modifications of Santa Rosa Avenue in the project area.
Correspondence 7

RECEIVED
AUG 30 2006
CITY OF SANTA ROSA
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT

8/29/06

To Mr. Urbanek,

This is an issue of quality of life. I moved in to this park in 1987, knowing that this home would be permanent. (Mother bought it)

I chose this particular park for its proximity to downtown, and with the feeling of being buffered from the traffic (including foot traffic) by the landscaping, visitors, parking etc.

If a large chunk of the park is carved off, this atmosphere will be lost forever. The people who live in the front of the park will suffer most, with their front doors opening directly onto a busy street.

There are also businesses along this stretch of road who will have their parking completely cut off, and in some cases will no longer be able to function in this location at all.

This area is impacted enough by its proximity to the street, and the freeway. I urge you to reconsider this action for the good of many people and businesses.

Sincerely, Carol Boutelle & Robert Turner

Wayside Gardens mobile home park.
Response 7-1

Issues regarding the removal and replacement of landscaping are discussed in Responses 6-3 and 8-8. See Response 8-8 regarding the removal of plant materials at the entry to the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park and replacement plantings.

The Initial Study discusses issues relating air quality on pages 23 through 28. Aesthetics including any new light sources are discussed on pages 18 through 23. No significant environmental impacts have been identified resulting from the proposed project.

Continued access to existing parking areas at project completion would be provided by the City. See also Response to Comment 3-2 regarding the buffer in front of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park.
CITY OF SANTA ROSA
Utilities Department
69 Stony Circle
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Fax: 707-543-3936

RE: SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT YOLANDA TO KIWANA SPRINGS ROAD

ATTN: LORI URBANEK, Assistant Engineer

Dear Ms Urbanek:

This letter is in regard to the Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project Yolanda Avenue to Kiwana Springs Road.

I am a resident of Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park which is located at the intersection of Santa Rosa and Hearn avenues. I am an attorney and I originally purchased a mobile home here in anticipation of retirement. Many if not most of the residents here are retirees. I have, however, since reactivated my State Bar membership and my legal practice.

I am very seriously concerned about access to, and exiting from, the mobile home park under your proposed plan. One of my neighbors, who called about potential access and egress problems, was told by someone at your offices, “I didn’t even know there was a mobile home park there!” Therefore I am writing to ensure that there is a record that we are here, and the problems for us which will result from your plan.

I have your map, Santa Rosa Widening Project Figure 3-1: Project Plan, which does not show significant details of the situation at the entrances to the mobile home park which are located between Kiwana Springs Road and Hearn Avenue. Before getting to the problems of getting into and out of the park, let me provide some situational context. There are about seventy homes in the park. They are not trailers (something you can hitch to the back of your car). They are peoples’ homes, and legally cognizable as worthy of the respect due other forms of human habitation. Nearly all of them are over 1,000 square feet, which is to say larger than the square footage required by law for low-cost housing.

Many of the approximately 150 residents are elderly or disabled. There are also young families with children. We are a community of peaceful, law-abiding, taxpayers of
Sonoma County. We are not to quote The Economist, "... trailer trash, to use a derogatory America term..." (The Economist is a British magazine).

If you are not aware of us, you should be before proceeding with plans which will negatively impact us, and especially when they will endanger us. Is it naïve of us to think that we deserve as much consideration by our government agencies as customers going in and out of Costco’s driveway?

The problems of traffic on Santa Rosa Avenue are well known to the Planning Commission. When a plan was proposed to put a centralized garbage collection depot in the area, residents who protested were told by the Commission “Everyone knows Santa Rosa Avenue is a parking lot most of the time.” When we informed the Commission of the number of accidents at the intersection just outside our driveway, we were told, “we’ve looked at the police reports, and there are no more accidents than usual at that location.” When we pointed out that we witnessed accidents happen about once a week, but these are very low speed “fender-benders” to which police do not respond, they agreed their figures might be incomplete because of lack of reporting.

It took more than a year to get the North driveway marked with “Keep Clear” striping. That has helped a lot because it allows park residents to drive across traffic to the traffic safety island. Now, however, your plan proposes to eliminate that safety island. How, exactly, do you expect us to get in and out of the park safely?

Eliminating left (northbound) turns from the north driveway will force residents to drive south on Santa Rosa Avenue, then make a U-turn at MacDonald’s, two traffic signals south. Imagine that in the ordinary “parking lot” conditions “everybody” is aware of. The only other alternative is to proceed south, then right (west) over the freeway, then north at the next signal, through the residential area past the DMV, a route of about 1-1/2 miles just to get across the street to the Council On Aging. Any possibility of doing business with any of the businesses on Santa Rosa Avenue from about Hearn to Baker, which includes Costco, The Council on Aging, The Grog Shop (our local convenience store) and many others, would be circumscribed.

On the other hand, the alternative South driveway is almost continuously blocked by cross-traffic in the right-turn lane on to Hearn because the driveway is only three car lengths from the corner. When 3 cars are waiting to turn (which is most of the time), the South driveway is completely blocked. You should note however, that the turn lane is rarely completely full, which means that the North driveway is rarely blocked by the turn-lane, but only by the southbound through-lanes. (This is the problem which is solved by the “Keep Clear” striping and the Safety Island, which would be undone by your plan.)

It is clear that the elimination of the safety island referred to above would seriously endanger residents of the park. This would be more than tragic because it is not necessary to eliminate the safety island.
Elimination of the island is only necessitated by the addition of the second right-turn lane on to Hearn at the South driveway. This is completely unnecessary. The existing turn-lane is more than adequate. This lane, by itself, as noted above is rarely ever filled. Without this second right turn-lane at Hearn there would be room in the center for the safety island, which in turn eliminates all the access and egress problems created by the current plan. In addition you should notice that these two proposed right turn lanes merge into one lane just a few feet after the turn around the corner on to (Yolanda). In addition, two turning lanes from the other direction are merging into the same area, making a total of four turning lanes merging into one on the freeway overpass which will readily back up through the Santa Rosa Avenue intersection, making it into a gridlocked parking lot. So why bother to add this unneeded turn-lane, given the problems it creates for the residents and for merging traffic just around the corner?

By not adding this additional southbound right turn-lane it might be possible to preserve the walnut trees, pine trees and shrubbery which contribute significantly to the character of the park, which is after all called Wayside Gardens: it has been called this for more than forty years. Wayside Gardens is a very special place. The garden-like beauty of the park contributes significantly to the quality of life of the residents of the park, especially the elderly who seem to have a special affinity for these “old friends.” The unnecessary removal of these trees and shrubs would be a tragedy and a shame, and a confirmation of public perceptions of bureaucratic insensitivity and shortsightedness.

Would it be too much to ask that someone actually go out and look at the situation at the Wayside Gardens Park? Even better, it would be good community relations, (and you might learn some things about the situation you might not otherwise learn) if you scheduled a meeting at the park clubhouse with residents, as the Water Department did when they were planning to tear up the street a couple of years ago. Many of the elderly and disabled residents would have extreme difficulty getting to a meeting at City Offices, and I think you should take this into account in fulfilling your public notice requirement even though it is not statutorily required, simply because these people are directly impacted by your proposed widening project.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM GORAK, Esq.
Managing Partner
Response 8-1

The Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park is identified as shown on Initial Study Figure 1.3-2, *Project Plan*. The Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park is specifically identified and analyzed as an existing land use fronting Santa Rosa Avenue in Initial Study sections 2.3-1, *Aesthetics*; 2.3-3, *Air Quality*; 2.3-9, *Land Use and Planning*; and 2.3-11, *Noise*. Section 2.3-15, *Transportation/Traffic*, addresses traffic and circulation conditions with and without the road improvements between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road with the Wayside Gardens as an existing land use.

The EIR traffic analysts performed a complete walk through of the project study area, and review conditions at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park.

Residents can minimize their delay by using the more northerly of the two driveways (near Kawana Springs Road) to avoid queues that back up from Hearn Avenue. Today, traffic wishing to travel north must cross three southbound lanes plus a bike lane. In the future, traffic headed northbound would have to cross three southbound lanes plus a bike lane. Overall, compared to no project in which there would be much more congestion at the Santa Rosa Avenue/Hearn Avenue intersection, traffic and circulation conditions would improve for Wayside Gardens residents.

As explained in the *Introduction* section of this document, as a result of the community meeting held on September 27, 2006, 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.

Response 8-2

Initial Study Section 2.3-15(d) notes that the project would not substantially increase hazards because of a design feature or incompatible uses. By improving traffic flow, the project would increase safety to motorists and pedestrians, which would be a beneficial result of the road widening project.

The low-speed, unreported collisions referred to in the comment are often a result of traffic congestion (e.g., stop-and-go traffic). The project would reduce congestion, and therefore should reduce the number of such collisions, by providing smoother more orderly traffic flow in the area. It is true that, at least on a statewide level, that minor property damage-only incidents, especially where the property damage is less than $750, go unreported. However, the project is anticipated to have a neutral to favorable impact on reducing such collisions.

See also Response 8-1.
Response 8-3

See Response 8-1 regarding Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park access. See also Response 8-4 below, and Responses 8-5, 8-6 and 8-7 regarding traffic and circulation issues.

Response 8-4

See Response 8-1. Signal timing improvements will allow residents of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park complex to exit the north egress, turn left and head north on Santa Rosa Avenue.

Response 8-5

A single southbound right-turn lane to the Hearn Avenue US 101 freeway overcrossing is an existing condition and would not be changed by the project.

Response 8-6

The median island referred to in the comment is to be eliminated in order to minimize the need for acquiring new right of way. It is necessary to provide an additional travel lane.

Response 8-7

Please see Responses 8-4, 8-5 and 8-6 regarding the southbound right-turn lane on to Hearn Avenue, left-turns on to northbound Santa Rosa Avenue and the median.

Response 8-8

As noted on pages 19 and 20 of the Initial Study under the title Aesthetics, there are shrubs and trees located between the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park 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 including 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.

Field inspections and a review of the project drawings indicate the project would require the removal of portions of the established shrubbery that exists between the Wayside Gardens complex and Santa Rosa Avenue. In addition, two walnut trees and two pine trees would be expected to be removed as a result of project construction.

The project would more than compensate for the removal of these plant materials through enhancement of the existing buffer (see Response 3-2) and the installation of ornamental street trees in planter wells within a new eight and one-half foot wide sidewalk. Additionally, new street paving, new concrete
curbs with sidewalks, clearly defined bicycle lanes and the introduction of a planter strip at other locations with 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.

While some of the visual screen and privacy the existing plant materials currently provide would be removed, this condition would be temporary until such time as buffer enhancement and street tree planting are complete. Overall, 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 under the evaluation of the impact criterion as listed (item 2.3-1 b) in the Initial Study.
August 30, 2006

Ms. Lori Urbanek
Assistant Engineer
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Dept.
69 Stony Circle
Santa Rosa, CA. 95401-9506
(707) 543-3854
lurbanek@srcity.org

Dear Ms. Urbanek:

Subject: Santa Rosa Ave. Widening Project_Yolanda Ave to Kawana Springs Rd.

As per your instructions from our phone conversation yesterday, I am putting into writing our deep and grave concerns regarding the Santa Rosa Ave. Widening Project_Yolanda Ave to Kawana Springs Rd. I was unaware of the deadline for the submission of this statement of our concerns until yesterday. Due to the limited time I had to compose this letter, I shall be emailing the letter to you today in order to meet the deadline. The signatory hard copy of this letter shall be delivered to your office tomorrow, as some of the signatories of this letter were unavailable to sign, until after 7:00 p.m. this evening. I have also called Ken at the number you gave me and given him my address so that I shall have timely notification of all future developments regarding this issue.

Mr. George Dib and I have made our home, and have raised our three children in Santa Rosa since 1981. We made the decision to start our own used car business in 1983. Over the course of time, we have built our business "Dib's Auto Sales" up from scratch. From it, we have made a decent, honorable living for our family all of these years, and we have served Santa Rosa with integrity.

From 1985 to 1997, we have had the need to relocate our business several times due to landlord and rent issues. It was not good for business to keep moving our location. In 1996, the lot we had been leasing, changed hands, and our rent was raised again. It was no longer affordable for us. We were faced with having to move the business yet once again. We had finally had it with being at the mercy of landlords, and need to relocate our business because of them.

In 1997 we made the decision to buy our own property for our business. We searched everywhere and finally found a place we could just barely afford at 2300 Santa Rosa Ave. It was perfect for us. The corner location and high traffic volume of this location afforded us the kind of exposure our type of small business greatly needs. Our business is just a small; family owned and operated one. We cannot really afford the luxury of advertising costs. We had been scrimping and saving for quite a while, and managed to secure the private funding needed to make our dreams finally come true. In November of 1997, our dream became a reality, "Dib's Auto Sales", at 2300 Santa Rosa Avenue! We were so proud of ourselves, and nervous. We did pretty well.

As I mentioned, our business is just a small family one. It is and has been the sole support of our family for these many years. All of our children still live at home, as the cost of living is beyond their means yet. Our oldest son, Justin, has been learning the business since he was 9 years old. He has been working full time at the business now since he was 18. This is what he has trained to do for his living. This is to be his future life occupation, when George eventually retires. Last year, we finally paid off the last of what we owed on the Santa Rosa Ave. property when we refinanced our house. It was the most wonderful feeling in the world!

When the Moose Lodge decided to sell their property, they approached us about selling our property to them. They said that they could not sell their property without ours. They said that their buyers required access to Santa Rosa Ave. We informed them at that time, that we had no interest in selling it now or ever. They then proceeded to take us to court in regards to a property line dispute. From that incident, we lost approximately a 10' x 60'
portion of the south side of our lot. We could not afford to hire our own surveyor at that time. The attorney cost us a great deal and we lost much.

9-1

We have worked long and hard to finally achieve our little piece of the American dream. Now we are being told that the City of Santa Rosa wants to take our land from us to simply widen an already wide road. We cannot afford to lose any more of our land. It will destroy our business, er, our sole livelihood. Our lot on Santa Rosa Ave. is a prime property location for our type of business. There is nowhere else affordable that we could go that is as good as or better, than where we are right now.

9-2

I have to ask. Just why is this right turn lane so absolutely necessary anyway? Who is it that will truly benefit from its creation? Traffic seems to flow just fine without it right now. As the Shopping Center already has access from Santa Rosa Ave. in several places, they don’t necessarily require another access. Other than the Shopping area, there is not that much located up behind us on Kawana Springs Rd at this time. A few small housing areas, the former Moose Lodge property and a couple of small businesses like us. As far as I can determine then, it will primarily be for the benefit and needs of future private development that you want to take our land and viable livelihood from us.

Tell me, who is going to support us and make our mortgage and healthcare payments when our business is destroyed and our income deteriorates due to the large loss of business we will suffer when we lose our prime location? The used car business is a very competitive one. Due to our small size, our only competitive business edge is our location! Over the years, we have been situated at two locations other than on Santa Rosa Ave. Our business struggled hard to survive at those times. We never did as well, as when we were situated on a Santa Rosa Ave. location north of Hearn Ave.

George is 62 years old and I am 51. I have not worked outside the home since 1986 and my health is not very good at this time. Our business is our sole means of support. My becoming employed to earn an income is not a viable option that I have, if my health continues as it is. I am a very long way from receiving Social Security. I do not collect any kind of disability benefits. Our business is to be our retirement income when George either retires or can no longer work, and Justin takes over the day to day operation of it. We simply cannot lose our land. To lose our land is to lose our business. No amount of compensation will ever replace what the city of Santa Rosa wishes to take from us, or the amount of business we will lose because of it! We do not want to sell our land or any portion thereof. We do not want to have to start all over again somewhere else. That is why we bought our own land in the first place. So we would never have to again.

9-3

I should sincerely hope that we still have the rights as American Citizens, to have and hold onto our small piece of the American Dream. The dream that we have worked for so long and hard, and sacrificed so much, to achieve. It is neither justifiable nor right of the City of Santa Rosa to take our land away from us against our will for the benefits of Private development! Thank you for hearing our concerns.

Sincerely yours,

George M. Dib
Karen Jurling-Dib
Justin Dib
Chalen Dib
Cameron Dib
Response 9-1

The Dib’s Auto Sales building at the southeast corner of the intersection of Kawana Springs Road and Santa Rosa Avenue would need to be removed to make way for project construction. When street widening and street improvement projects are being discussed, the issue of Eminent Domain is recognized as an important concern to land and business owners. Any real property acquisition necessary for the project must be done in accordance with Eminent Domain Law and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act. The City would appraise the property to be acquired, make an offer to the property owner and assist in relocation where required. In addition, as necessary, the City would relocate, adjust, and/or reconstruct any existing fences, mailboxes, driveway aprons or other business/commercial front or side-yard minor site appurtenances located in the area of construction.

The City would offer a fair market price for the property and assist in the relocation of the business to a comparable area. The widening of Kawana Springs Road and Santa Rosa Avenue is necessary to accommodate the increase in traffic generated by increased growth in housing and businesses in the southeast and southwest areas of the City. The need for the project is discussed further on page 1 of the Initial Study.

Response 9-2

The northbound right turn volume at Kawana Springs Road and Santa Rosa Avenue is heavy today, and is currently served by a lane shared with through traffic. In the future, traffic projections indicate that as the southeast Santa Rosa area develops, intersection traffic volumes will increase substantially, perhaps by three-fold or more. The traffic analysis indicates that without constructing the project, intersection of Kawana Springs Road and Santa Rosa Avenue would operate at LOS F without improvements, with an average delay per vehicle of more than 2½ minutes. Thus, providing a separate right turn lane has benefits in terms of reducing overall vehicle delay at the intersection, while enhancing safety by reducing the potential for through vehicles rear-ending a right-turning vehicle. It also makes it possible to do what is known as a “right turn overlap”, in which northbound right turn movements and westbound left turn movements can occur simultaneously; which can greatly improve the efficiency of the intersection.

Response 9-3

There would be no acquisition of property without just compensation under the law. Please see Response 9-1 regarding the issue of Eminent Domain.
August 30, 2006

Via Hand Delivery

Marie Meredith  
Deputy Director  
Community Development Department  
City of Santa Rosa  
100 Santa Rosa Avenue  
Santa Rosa, CA 95402

Re: Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project; Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road

Dear Ms. Meredith:

Please accept this letter, and the accompanying Detailed Response, as a formal response, on behalf of Fox Partners, LP, to the report prepared by EIP Associates, dated July 18, 2006, regarding the above-referenced widening project. Fox Partners, LP, owns the real property located at 2510 Santa Rosa Avenue (currently occupied by Barbeques Galore and Mattress Discounters, and containing one unoccupied space).

The Draft Initial Study is inadequate and problematic in two fundamental respects: 1) It does not adequately address potential impacts, problems and issues that may result from the project; and 2) specific recommendations in the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration conflict with CEQA guidelines, the Santa Rosa General Plan, and Santa Rosa Design Review Guidelines.

In summary, the accompanying Detailed Response addresses the following issues:

I. Inadequacy of Draft Initial Study

A. The Initial Study does not adequately examine the significant effects that the project may have on the environment. As more specifically addressed in the accompanying Detailed Response, the Initial Study offers only a “macro” description of the environment, and does not examine, in any meaningful way, the impact that will
result from widening the east side of Santa Rosa (as compared, for example, with widening the west side of that thoroughfare).

B. The Initial Study does not sufficiently address potential inconsistencies with Santa Rosa design review guidelines. For example, the project as proposed would have numerous and significant impacts on the landscaping that was required under existing design review guidelines, and presently exists, in front of the various affected properties along Santa Rosa Avenue. These effects are not addressed in either the Initial Study or the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

C. Neither the Initial Study nor the Mitigated Negative Declaration addresses the impact that the project will have on the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

D. The Initial Study fails to address whether the proposed project is consistent with the economic vitality element of the general plan, portions of the transportation and circulation element of the general plan, and design review guidelines as related to the status of Santa Rosa Avenue as a minor or secondary entry to the City of Santa Rosa.

E. The Initial Study does not address the economic or social effects that the proposed project may have on the existing businesses along the affected portion of Santa Rosa Avenue, as required by applicable CEQA guidelines.

F. The Initial Study fails to address the larger project relating to improvement of Kawana Springs Road and Yolanda Avenue, notwithstanding the fact that this larger project is closely related to the proposed project. As such, the Initial Study has not considered the “whole of the action,” as required under applicable CEQA guidelines.

II. Potential Conflicts With Applicable Rules and Guidelines

The proposed project appears to be in conflict with applicable provisions of CEQA, the Santa Rosa General Plan, and Santa Rosa Design Review Guidelines, in, among others, the following respects:

A. The significant impact on and reduction to the landscaping in front of various affected properties along Santa Rosa Avenue are in conflict with applicable requirements under Santa Rosa Design Review Guidelines.
B. The widening project appears to conflict with Guiding Principle No. 18 and Goals EV-8 and EV-B of the Economic Vitality Element of the General Plan in that it may prevent expansion of existing businesses, diminish the attractiveness of such businesses, and be detrimental to the onsite circulation and functioning of existing parking lots.

C. Moving the existing curb line on the east side of Santa Rosa Avenue appears to conflict with Goals TB and TD and Policy T-C-4 of the Transportation Element of the General Plan in that it may result in an impendence of the flow of traffic.

D. Scheduling work during the day, rather than at night, will likely have a significant negative economic affect on businesses along the affected portion of Santa Rosa Avenue, in violation of applicable CEQA guidelines.

E. Examining the widening project, without taking into account the future proposed improvement of Kawana Springs Road and Yolanda Avenue, conflicts with applicable CEQA guidelines which require that the Initial Study address the “whole of the action.”

My client was particularly disappointed that no attempt, whatsoever, was made to contact him before the Initial Study was completed. It is sincerely hoped and respectfully requested that before a revised Initial Study is completed and any further work is done, that the owners of the various affected properties along Santa Rosa Avenue be contacted so that their input and comments can be provided and considered.

If you have any questions regarding the foregoing, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Lewis R. Warren

LRW:lk
Encl.
cc: Client
Response 10-1

The comment is not specific as to how the Initial Study is inadequate or how the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration conflicts with CEQA Guidelines. Therefore a response is neither possible or required with respect to Comment 10-1. For additional information, see Responses 10-2 through 10-13.

Response 10-2

The purpose of the Initial Study as a “preliminary analysis” is described on page 10 of the Initial Study. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063 (a) (3), an “initial study is neither intended nor required to include the level of detail included in an EIR.” Nevertheless, what is incomplete regarding discussions of potential impact in the Initial Study is not specified in the comment and therefore a detailed response is neither possible nor required.

See also Response 3-2 and 6-3 regarding existing and proposed landscaping on the west and east sides of the road.

Response 10-3

See Responses 3-2, 6-3, and 8-8 regarding existing and proposed landscaping on the west and east sides of the road respectively. No significant impacts are noted resulting from the removal of existing vegetation. The project would more than compensate for the removal of existing vegetation along the roadway edge through the installation of ornamental street trees in planter wells within a new eight and one-half foot wide sidewalk.

As described on page 20 of the Initial Study, in many locations within the project area there are no curbs, crumbling sidewalks (or no sidewalks) and the pavement surface appears worn. With project completion, new street paving, new concrete curbs with sidewalks, clearly defined bicycle lanes and the introduction of a planter strip with 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.

It is not required that the Initial Study provide a detailed evaluation of project consistency with the City’s Design Review Guidelines. An EIR is to discuss any inconsistencies between a proposed project and the applicable general plans and regional plans (CEQA Guidelines Section15125 (d)). However, as noted in Response 6-4, as a regional/arterial street, the use of a planter strip and/or plant wells for the installation of street trees along Santa Rosa Avenue would be consistent with the City’s Design Guidelines.

Response 10-4

See Response 10-3 above regarding visual impact.
Response 10-5

As noted in previous responses, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063 (a) (3), an “initial study is neither intended nor required to include the level of detail included in an EIR.” It is not required that the Initial Study provide a detailed evaluation of project consistency with the Economic Vitality Element of the General Plan, Transportation Element or Design Review Guidelines. An EIR is to discuss any inconsistencies between a proposed project and the applicable general plans and regional plans (CEQA Guidelines Section15125 (d)).

Response 10-6

Economic or social effects of a project are not to be treated as significant effects on the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15131 (a)). The criteria for determining potential environmental impacts of the project are as stated in the Initial Study and are taken from CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Environmental Checklist Form. In accordance with the Initial Study Environmental Checklist, no economic or social effects have been determined to result from the project as a consequence of any significance physical changes caused by the project.

Response 10-7

See Response 6-11 regarding “the whole of the action” and other road projects in Santa Rosa.

Response 10-8

See Responses 3-2, 6-3, and 8-8 regarding existing and proposed landscaping on the west and east sides of the road respectively. No significant impacts are noted for the removal of existing vegetation. The project would more than compensate for the removal of existing vegetation along the roadway edge through the installation of planter strip with ornamental street trees and ornamental street trees in planter wells within a new eight and one-half foot wide sidewalk. See Response 10-3 for further information regarding appearances.

See also Response 10-3 for information regarding consistency with the City’s Design Review Guidelines.

Response 10-9

See Responses 3-2 and 6-6 regarding the General Plan Economic Vitality Element. By improving traffic circulation and enhancing pedestrian movement in the project area through the provision of new sidewalks (in many cases where no sidewalks currently exist), the project would be expected to facilitate access to existing businesses within the project area and thus improve business opportunities for the public and business owners. See also Responses 4-1 and 6-5 regarding appearances of the project area after project completion. No adverse environmental impacts have been identified concerning site circulation. The project is not intended to alter the circulation patterns of existing businesses.
Response 10-10

Please see Response 6-8.

Response 10-11

See Response 10-6 regarding economic effects. No reference to a specific section of the CEQA Guidelines is made in the comment and therefore the comment cannot be addressed in detail. See Response 3-1 regarding construction traffic. Nighttime construction is anticipated to minimize the potential for daytime construction interference with traffic circulation.

Response 10-12

See Response 6-11 regarding “the whole of the action” and other road projects in Santa Rosa.

Response 10-13

As noted in the Introduction section of this Responses to Questions and Comments document, 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 as discussed previously in the Introduction section to this document. Prior to the meeting, properties owners were contacted announcing the meeting and their input and comments have been provided and considered.
PETITION OPPOSING THE WIDENING OF SANTA ROSA AVENUE IN FRONT OF WAYSIDE GARDENS MOBILE HOME PARK

1. Entering and exiting the mobile home park will be severely impacted for resident, emergency, and service vehicles.

2. Removal of the present landscape will create more exposure to road dust, fumes, noise, and lights negatively effecting the health of residents and their quality of life.

3. Required business and guest parking would be eliminated.

4. This action will reduce the value of the residents' mobile homes. Many residents are elderly and have fixed or low income.

5. The current distance and present landscape berm between Santa Rosa Avenue and residents provide privacy and security from street vehicles and unwanted walking intruders.
1. James R. Pohl
   (PRINT NAME)
   Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   James R. Pohl
   (SIGN) 8-28-06 Date

2. Louise Pohl
   (PRINT NAME)
   Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   Louise Pohl
   (SIGN) Aug 28, 06 Date

3. James Pohl
   (PRINT NAME)
   Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   June Pohl
   (SIGN) Aug 28, 06 Date

4. Evelia Castillo
   (PRINT NAME)
   Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   Evelia Castillo
   (SIGN) Aug 28, 06 Date

5. William Gonski
   (PRINT NAME)
   Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   William Gonski
   (SIGN) Date

6. Mary V. Gonski
   (PRINT NAME)
   Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   Mary V. Gonski
   (SIGN) Date

7. Heidi Voss
   (PRINT NAME)
   Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   Heidi Voss
   (SIGN) 8-28-06 Date

8. Norma Voss
   (PRINT NAME)
   Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   Norma Voss
   (SIGN) 8-28-06 Date

9. Diane Rooney
   (PRINT NAME)
   Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   Diane Rooney
   (SIGN) 8-28-06 Date

10. Alberto Jimenez
    (PRINT NAME)
    Wayside Dr.
    (ADDRESS)
    Alberto Jimenez
    (SIGN) 8-28-06 Date
11. Lorraine M. Stichney  
(Print Name) Lorraine M. Stichney  
(Sign)  
(Address) 43 Wayside Dr, Santa Rosa CA 8-28-06 Date  

12. Maureen Fuller  
(Print Name) Maureen Fuller  
(Sign)  
(Address) 49 Wayside Drive, Santa Rosa CA 9-5-07 Date  

13. Ethel Mason  
(Print Name) Ethel Mason  
(Sign)  
(Address) 40 Wayside Dr, Santa Rosa CA 8-28-06  

14. Dan Bushness  
(Print Name) Dan Bushness  
(Sign)  
(Address) 39 Wayside Dr, Santa Rosa CA 8-28-06  

15. Jan Bushness  
(Print Name) Jan Bushness  
(Sign)  
(Address) 39 Wayside Dr, Santa Rosa CA 8-28-06  

16. John Orton  
(Print Name) John Orton  
(Sign)  
(Address) 34 Wayside Drive, Santa Rosa CA 8-28-06 Date  

17. Douglas Orton  
(Print Name) Douglas Orton  
(Sign)  
(Address) 34 Wayside Dr, Santa Rosa CA 8-28-06 Date  

18. Rita Jimenez  
(Print Name) Rita Jimenez  
(Sign)  
(Address) 32 Wayside Dr, Santa Rosa CA 8-28-06 Date  

19. Lyle Green  
(Print Name) Lyle Green  
(Sign)  
(Address) 32 Wayside Dr, Santa Rosa CA August 28, 2006  

20. Patricia Dickerson  
(Print Name) Patricia Dickerson  
(Sign)  
(Address) 28 Wayside Dr, Santa Rosa CA 8-28-06 Date
11. Lorraine M. Stickney
   (SIGN)
   43 Wayside Dr, Santa Rosa CA 8-28-06 Date
   (ADDRESS)
12. Maureen Fuller
   (SIGN)
   42 Wayside Drive, Santa Rosa CA 9-5-06 Date
   (ADDRESS)
13. Eric Mason
   (SIGN)
   40 Wayside Dr
   Santa Rosa CA Date 8-28-06
   (ADDRESS)
14. Dan Bushnell
   (SIGN)
   39 Wayside Dr
   Santa Rosa CA Date 8-28-06
   (ADDRESS)
15. Jon Bushnell
   (SIGN)
   39 Wayside Dr
   Santa Rosa CA Date 8-28-06
   (ADDRESS)
16. John Orton
   (SIGN)
   34 Wayside Drive Date 8-28/2006
   (ADDRESS)
17. Douglas Orton
   (SIGN)
   34 Wayside Dr
   August 28, 2006 Date
   (ADDRESS)
18. Rita Jiminez
   (SIGN)
   32 Wayside Dr Date 8/28/06
   (ADDRESS)
19. Fred Cain
   (SIGN)
   32 Wayside Dr SRCA August 28/2006
   (ADDRESS)
20. Patricia Dickerson
   (SIGN)
   28 Wayside Dr, Santa Rosa CA 8-28-06 Date
   (ADDRESS)
31. Randall S. Freeman
   (PRINT NAME)
   13 Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   (SIGN) 8/28/06 Date

32. Joseph M. Mello
   (PRINT NAME)
   18 Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   (SIGN) 8-28-06 Date

33. Carol Reid
   (PRINT NAME)
   38 Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   (SIGN) 8-28-06 Date

34. Dennis Reid
   (PRINT NAME)
   38 Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   (SIGN) 8-28-06 Date

35. Mary Miles
   (PRINT NAME)
   24 Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   (SIGN) 8-28-06 Date

36. Robert
   (PRINT NAME)
   24 Wayside Dr.
   (ADDRESS)
   (SIGN) Aug 28, 06 Date

37. Steven Bravo
   (PRINT NAME)
   14 Wayside Drive
   (ADDRESS)
   (SIGN) 8/28/06 Date

38. Carole Hill
   (PRINT NAME)
   9 Wayside Drive SR 95407
   (ADDRESS)
   (SIGN) 8/28/06 Date

39. Anthony Avelette
   (PRINT NAME)
   10 Wayside Dr. Santa Rosa
   (ADDRESS)
   (SIGN) Aug 28, 06 Date

40. Sabino Hernandez
   (PRINT NAME)
   57 Wayside Dr. Santa Rosa
   (ADDRESS)
   (SIGN) Aug 28, 06 Date
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
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<tr>
<th>SIGN</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SIGN</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SIGN</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SIGN</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response 11-1

See Response 8-1 regarding Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park access. See also Responses 8-2, 8-4, 8-5, 8-6 and 8-7 regarding traffic and circulation issues in the project area.

Response 11-2

Issues regarding the removal, replacement, and enhancement of landscaping are discussed in Responses 3-2, 6-3, and 8-8.

The Initial Study discusses issues relating air quality on pages 23 through 28. Aesthetics including any new light sources are discussed on pages 18 through 23. Replacement plantings for the loss of existing plant materials are discussed in Response 3-2 and 8-8.

Response 11-3

See Response 6-3 regarding existing business parking. The existing right-of-way along the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue would remain in place and no parking spaces would be removed at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park complex to allow for project construction.

Response 11-4

See Response 11-3. There is no evidence to indicate the value of residents’ mobile homes at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park would decrease as a result of the road widening project. Economic or social effects of a project are not to be treated as significant effects on the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15131 (a)). It is considered that the project would enhance appearances in the project area upon project completion as explained in Responses 4-1, 6-5 and 10-3. Enhanced appearances are not expected to decrease property values.

Response 11-5

Issues regarding the removal, replacement, and enhancement of landscaping are discussed in Responses 3-2, 6-3, and 8-8.
Correspondence 12
CITY OF SANTA ROSA
P.O. Box 1678
Santa Rosa, CA 95402

AUG 30 2006
DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

August 30, 2006

City of Santa Rosa Community Development Dept.
100 Santa Rosa Avenue / Box 1678
Santa Rosa, CA 95402

Attention: Marie Meredith
Deputy Director

The following is in response to your letter of July 25, 2006 regarding the Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project. While we, too, are concerned about traffic congestion on Santa Rosa Avenue, the project specifically in front of Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park at 2389 Santa Rosa Avenue would by the project’s own evaluation do little to improve the situation. Yet it would be of tremendous negative impact on the residents of the Park.

1. Access to and from the Park would be severely impeded for the some ninety residents, emergency, and service vehicles. Two “stacking” lanes would have to be negotiated to go south or four lanes to go north. The only option would be to go right over the Hearn Avenue overpass.

2. Cars would not need to be stacked on Santa Rosa Avenue if the Corby Avenue stoplight at Hearn Avenue, the overpass, and the south bound 101 on ramp were redesigned.

3. The project would remove existing landscape that has served as a buffer between the Park and the Avenue. There would be more exposure to road dust, fume, noise, and lights negatively effecting the health and quality of life of the residents. The Park is in a tiger salamander designated area having quail, raccoons, birds, and even fox and deer. The landscape has been in place and maintained for 45 years!
4. The present landscape and distance between Santa Rosa Avenue and the Park residents provides privacy and security from unwanted intruders.

5. Contrary to comments on page 89 of the report about “no impact” on parking, it would appear to eliminate our front required business and guest parking. Likewise the parking strip for the mobile home at 2365 Santa Rosa Avenue is only 11 feet from the existing curb and the home itself is 21 feet away.

6. What impact will this encroachment have on the value of the mobile homes owned by our residents, many of whom are elderly and on fixed or low incomes?

7. One might consider eliminating the left turning lane from Kawana Spring to Santa Rosa Avenue south. There would be no need to stop north bound traffic on Santa Rosa Avenue at Kawana and north bound could simply go right as needed on Kawana. Kawana traffic west could only turn right going north on Santa Rosa Avenue. South bound Santa Rosa Avenue would not need a stop and “stacking” could extent as ended.

The courtesy of earlier notification might have answered some of our concerns and questions. Our property has been in the family since 1922. The west side was carved by 101 and again by the new sound wall. The south bisected by the widening of Hearn Avenue and the east by the widening of Santa Rosa Avenue. To us this project is hardly of “no impact” or “less than significant impact” as touted in the project evaluation.

Sincerely,

Samuel McMillan  
Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park  
2389 Santa Rosa Avenue  
Santa Rosa, CA. 95407.
Response 12-1

As explained in the Introduction section of this document, as a result of the community meeting held on September 27, 2006, 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 improved controlled access at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park northern driveway.

Response 12-2

It is unclear in the comment what is meant by “redesigned.” Today, the Corby Avenue/Hearn Avenue signal is sometimes the cause of traffic backing up (“queuing”) over the two-lane overcrossing. That intersection is busy with many turn movements, because it is near the “hook” ramp to southbound US 101. That intersection cannot be “redesigned” without widening the overcrossing (in fact, the City requested Caltrans provide as much widening as possible without modifying the overcrossing structure when work was completed on the US 101 widening, circa 2003). When the Hearn Avenue overcrossing (bridge) is widened in the future, it will no longer be a constraint. Traffic modeling indicates that the Hearn Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue intersection will be the constraint, not Corby/Hearn. Sonoma County’s Transportation sales tax, Measure M, contains future funding (approximately half) for a newly redesigned Hearn Avenue interchange, which is to include improvements to Hearn/Corby, although there is no date certain for such improvements. The City is also developing plans for a Bellevue Avenue interchange that would help relieve some of the heavy traffic demand on the Hearn Avenue overcrossing.

Response 12-3

Issues regarding the removal, enhancement and replacement of landscaping are discussed in Responses 3-2, 6-3, and 8-8.

The Initial Study discusses issues relating air quality on pages 23 through 28. Aesthetics including any new light sources are discussed on pages 18 through 23. Biological resources are evaluated on pages 28 through 32. It is concluded 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 pans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
Response 12-4

Replacement and enhancement plantings would be provided to compensate for the removal of any existing plant materials. Issues regarding the removal, enhancement, and replacement of landscaping are discussed in Responses 3-2, 6-3, and 8-8.

Response 12-5

The existing right-of-way along the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue would remain in place and no parking spaces would be removed at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park complex to allow for project construction.

Response 12-6

See Response 11-4 regarding property values.

Response 12-7

The left turn movement from Kawana Springs Road westbound to Santa Rosa Avenue southbound is very heavy today, particularly in the mid-day and PM periods. The existing PM peak hour left turn volume is approximately 500 vehicles per hour. This turning movement provides a connection to the Hearn Avenue overcrossing and ramps to the south, and is especially heavily used by traffic from the Santa Rosa Marketplace to access US 101 southbound. The comment seems to imply that the left turn movement could be prohibited and a free right turn provided instead. This would likely have several negative impacts, including: shifting left turns to the existing signal at the Marketplace; non-Marketplace traffic from Kawana Springs Road cutting through the shopping center to use the Marketplace signal; and a heavy volume of U-turns for Kawana Springs right turn traffic who would want to travel southbound. Furthermore, free (i.e., uncontrolled) right turns can be unfriendly to pedestrians attempting to cross either Kawana Springs Road or Santa Rosa Avenue. Consequently, the change proposed in the comment is considered undesirable.

Response 12-8

The purpose of this document is to address the substantive comments as contained in the letters of comment submitted regarding the project, Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration. It should be noted that this document is not required to be prepared under CEQA, but is provided by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works for informational purposes. See also Response 10-13 regarding public notification and changes to the project.
Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project

Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road

*****

Community Meeting of September 27, 2006

- Sign-In Sheets
- Comments and Correspondence
# SIGN-IN PLEASE

**SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT**  
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road  
Community Meeting September 27, 2006  
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Les Körber</td>
<td></td>
<td>43 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>542-7670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Buskett</td>
<td></td>
<td>39 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>545-7411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Burtello</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>527-0828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>57 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>575-3044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J. R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>57 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>576-0758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Loeck</td>
<td></td>
<td>55 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>486-4609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Locke</td>
<td></td>
<td>55 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>486-4609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine</td>
<td></td>
<td>57 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>576-0758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Loeck</td>
<td></td>
<td>55 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>486-4609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Jeffers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2365 Santa Rosa Ave.</td>
<td>508-3728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Loeck</td>
<td></td>
<td>2365 Santa Rosa Ave.</td>
<td>508-3728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Dave Loeck</td>
<td></td>
<td>44 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>546-2652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Loeck</td>
<td></td>
<td>2371 Santa Rosa Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie Loeck</td>
<td></td>
<td>2371 Santa Rosa Ave.</td>
<td>546-7325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>526-9874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise &amp; Jim Loeck</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>526-4912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Wayside Dr.</td>
<td>544-4933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SIGN-IN PLEASE

**SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT**  
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road  
Community Meeting September 27, 2006  
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott McMillan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2160 Riesling Way, Santa Rosa, CA</td>
<td>707-573-6969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McMillan</td>
<td>Wayside Gardens</td>
<td>2428 Durango Dr, Santa Rosa</td>
<td>528-2303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer McMillan</td>
<td></td>
<td>750 Riesling Way, SR</td>
<td>573-4264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam McMillan</td>
<td>Wayside Gardens</td>
<td>2428 Durango Dr, SR</td>
<td>528-2303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Pelletti</td>
<td>McDonalds</td>
<td>2442 Santa Rosa Ave, SR</td>
<td>869-9222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA SCHENK</td>
<td></td>
<td>2510 Santa Rosa Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Ocean</td>
<td>Wayside Garden</td>
<td>34 Wayside Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>2475 Dana Springs Rd, Ellery, CA</td>
<td>946-7758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SIGN-IN PLEASE

**SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT**  
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road  
Community Meeting September 27, 2006  
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dianna fuller</td>
<td></td>
<td>42 wingside Dr 442</td>
<td>533-1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jean kipolchol</td>
<td></td>
<td>3245 Montgomery Dr St Rd 95405</td>
<td>524-8989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jae stickney</td>
<td></td>
<td>103 vista view dr cinderale ca 95405</td>
<td>524-8104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ira schoenick</td>
<td></td>
<td>65 inverness dr san rafael 94901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana-Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name: [Handwritten]
Address: 43 Wayside Dr., Santa Rosa 95407-6227
Phone No. (optional): (207) 542-7690
Comments: [Handwritten]
I would like to comment on the proposed widening of SR Ave.
Wedns. nite we all looked at the map and photo, but all I can say is, you can look all day at a map, but being there in person!!!!!! is a different story. To live here and try to enter and exit now is horrendous. If it is widened to a bike lane, sidewalk, 2 southbound right turn lanes, when I exit here to go south, I would have to cross all those lanes to get into the direct southbound lane. I go to Roehnert Park, once a week, and occasionally to the shopping centers, such as: Toys "R Us, Bed, Bath and Beyond, etc. I use SR Ave. rather than the freeway, as it is much easier.

Yes, we could go around a few block which amounts of easily a half mile or more, even to get to Target is a challenge, plus the gas.

A signal, sensor activated, would shut down traffic in 3 directions, and I don't think that would be feasible. Also, we need that parking in the front of the park. I have family, and friends, that visit often, and don't want to discourage those visits because there is no place to park. My family is important to me.

Thank you. Sincerely,

Lorraine M. Stickney

707-542-7690

Mrs. Lorraine Stickney
43 Wayside Dr.
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
Response 13-1

A single southbound right-turn lane to the Hearn Avenue US 101 freeway overcrossing is an existing condition and would not be changed by the project. The signal at Kawana Springs Road would be modified to provide controlled access at the northern driveway of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park located at 2389 Santa Rosa Avenue.

Response 13-2

See Response 13-1. The existing right-of-way along the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue would remain in place and no parking spaces would be removed at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park complex to allow for project construction.
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name: Helen Hamilton
Address: 29 Wayside Dr
Phone No. (optional): 707-575-3544

Comments: I definitely oppose the right turn lanes from Santa Rose Ave onto Farm Ave. and the taking of property from Wayside Gardens. The right to let us out of Wayside Gardens would be an improvement.

Please notify me in writing of any other meetings.
Response 14-1

Please see Responses 13-1 and 13-2.
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name  Y. LAFLAMME

Address  44 WAYSIDE Dr.

Phone No. (optional)  546-2552

Comments:  I oppose the widening of Santa Rosa Ave.
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name: Eric Reiner
Address: 2371 Santa Rosa

Comments: We do not like the Plan of Widening in front of Wayide Gardens. We live in the front of the Park and need the Parking.
Response 15-1

The existing right-of-way along the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue would remain in place and no parking spaces would be removed at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park complex to allow for project construction.
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name: Carol Boutsell
Address: 27 Wayside Dr.
Phone No. (optional): 527-0828

Comments: Two words - Quality of life. There may not be many of us (Wayside Gardens) but we will be heard. Keep the light I leave the park alone. Simple minded maybe, but people do live there.
Response 16-1

Please see Responses 13-1 and 13-2.
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name: Jorge Guzman
Address: 2265 Santa Rosa Ave, Wayside Gardens
Phone No. (optional): 407 568 7728

Comments: I am not in favor of the widening of Santa Rosa Ave and the taking of a portion of the front of the place my wife and my family live at Wayside Park, Home Park. I am further concerned that the taking of any land from Wayside Gardens mobile home park will cause a loss in value of my mobile home. Jorge Guzman 9/27/06
Response 17-1

See Response 13-1. The existing right-of-way along the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue would remain in place and no parking spaces would be removed at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park complex to allow for project construction. See also Responses 3-2 and 8-8 regarding enhancement of the buffer in front of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park.
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name: Teresa Looe
Address: 2360 Cima Rosa Ave
Phone No. (optional): 562-872-8

Comments:

Thank you!

My comment: May 2006. I've moved a lot of times, this has been the only one I've been in contact with at all. So please don't take our response personally. I have raised a child that is very happy here now. So from the standpoint of a mom regarding your plans, don't move us.
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name: Jim & Louise Pohl
Address: 2 Wayside Dr
Phone No. (optional): 524-4912
Comments: The widening project is a very bad idea, until you widen Herm Ave. things will not change. Turn Kawana Springs Rd into a 1 way.
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name: Maureen Fuller
Address: 42 WAYSIDE DR. 95407
Phone No. (optional)

Comments: We need a light - We do not need the road widened near the Separk Avenue overpass is widened.
Response 18-1

Please see Response 6-11 regarding other projects in the area, including the widening of Hearn Avenue. A single southbound right-turn lane to the Hearn Avenue US 101 freeway overcrossing is an existing condition and would not be changed by the project.
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name: VERNIFRED DAVIS

Address: 30 Wayside Dr

Phone No. (optional) 545-9874

Comments: Because of heavy traffic on SR are even now, we sometimes drive over Warren, drive N on Corby & cross over 101 on Baker. Both deep pot holes on Corby. Fix them please.
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name: David Stroman
Address: 2675 West Springs Rd
Phone No. (optional): 946-7758

Comments: I am adamantly opposed to any taking of land at the front of Wayside Gardens at State Park. It is an ill-conceived project as suggested, and will only cause more problems than may be good in its intentions. A height for the point my help, but not the taking of any land at the Park. Paul Glenn, Member, Wayne Lakes

2/8/06
Response 19-1

The existing right-of-way along the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue would remain in place and no parking spaces would be removed at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park complex to allow for project construction. See also Responses 3-2 and 8-8 regarding enhancement of the buffer in front of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park.
SANTA ROSA AVENUE WIDENING PROJECT
Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road
Community Meeting September 27, 2006
City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department

Name: WILLIAM & MARY J. GORAK

Address: 55 Wayside Drive, Santa Rosa, CA 95407
726 College Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Phone No. (optional) 707-527-8339

Comments: Please see memo attached (Sept 28), and letter of Aug 30.
MEMO RE: SEPT 27 MEETING W/WAYSIDES GARDENS RESIDENTS
(WIDENING OF SANTA ROSA AVE)

From what was said at the meeting on September 27, it appears to me that most of your traffic flow problems would be eliminated by posting a sign at the end of Kiwana Springs road: NO LEFT TURN _ PM TO _ PM, like the ones to be found all over San Francisco, or a sign like the one at the intersection of 4th and Mendocino that can be turned on or off as necessary. That might not fit the engineering approach, but your solution by comparison seems like the proverbial surgical approach to a headache.

Not taking into account that the elimination of twelve of eighteen visitor parking spaces in a community with no on-street parking is a major disaster for that community, is just one of the many problems with your engineering approach, particularly for our many elderly who rely on visiting help from family and agencies. Not to mention the simple solace of social visiting. Are we to be restricted to six visitors at a time for the entire park?

Your engineering approach proposes to eliminate these spaces because of your need to accommodate traffic flow by installing another turn lane which will feed four turn lanes into one lane going over the freeway, which you admit will be a bottleneck for at least "five or ten years."

You also propose to install a nine foot sidewalk for perhaps five pedestrians a day, and a wide bicycle lane to accommodate perhaps five cyclists each week, at a cost of imposing all these hardships on the residents. Does this sound like a reasonable balancing of needs to you? Have you done any measurements of pedestrian or bicycle traffic? How much trouble is it to set up a camera?

Furthermore, the buffer function of the trees and greenery which are eliminated by your widening solution is crucial to park residents. You did not seem to understand what Sam McMillen, the owner of the park, was referring to when he said he had to climb through the dirt under those bushes and came out “black all over.” He meant he was covered with the black soot kicked up by the wear of rubber tires on the roadway. Not only would you eliminate this buffer, but you are going to move the road closer at the same time! Do your mathematical projections tell you how many elderly will die of black lung?
You agreed that the rules requiring both the sidewalk and the bike lane are
generalizations and sometimes are not applicable to specific real world situations, but I
did not hear any acknowledgement or recognition that ours might be such a situation, or
how to establish a situation-specific exception to the general rule. You should note that
the sidewalk in front of Smothers Auto Parts is only five feet wide.

Please take us and our needs seriously into consideration. As I left the meeting on
September 27th, I overheard a resident say, “They’re not listening to us. We’re just
“trailer trash” to them.” I think what they were referring to is this: listening is not simply
the passive act of hearing, nor is it the aggressive act of debate, which is hearing with the
competitive intention of finding a rhetorical weakness to exploit. Listening means pro-
actively taking something seriously into consideration from the point of view of the
speaker before accepting or rejecting it. The self-test of “serious consideration” is “did I,
even for a moment, honestly think ‘They are right!’ before deciding?” Of course, this
still means we have to trust our officials to be honest, but this should not be confused
with blind faith.

Finally, why not try the NO LEFT TURN AT PEAK HOURS sign just to see how it
works out for a year or two. Isn’t that better than spending millions and having to say
“oops” in “five or ten years,” or worse yet, endangering or causing the deaths of elderly
residents, and the legal tangles that will generate?

Sincerely,

WILLIAM GORAK
Managing Partner
Response 20-1

Oral comments at the community meeting of September 27, 2006 questioned why left turns could not be prohibited on the westbound approach of Kawana Springs Road at Santa Rosa Avenue (i.e., traffic turning into southbound Santa Rosa Avenue from Kawana Springs Road). The assertion was made that even a part-time (peak period) prohibition would reduce the need for widening Santa Rosa Avenue between Yolanda Avenue and Kawana Springs Road as well as the Hearn Avenue overcrossing of US 101.

The current left-turn volume is high at almost 500 vehicles per hour (VPH) in the PM peak period, and is likely to increase as the southeast and southwest areas of the City develop in the future.

Left-turn prohibitions are used in many cities, including Santa Rosa, as a safety enhancement measure, and sometimes to improve traffic flow. However, left-turn prohibitions are almost always used in areas where there are alternative means of making left turns at other intersections or by “around the block” movements. This usually requires reasonably short block lengths so that a left-turn movement can effectively be replaced by making three successive right-turn movements. This is the case in San Francisco’s Park Presidio Boulevard, where a succession of left-turn prohibitions are in place, or 4th Street and Mendocino Avenue in Santa Rosa.

There are no reasonable alternative routes for prohibiting a left-turn on westbound Kawana Springs Road at Santa Rosa Avenue. The block length is approximately one-half mile between Petaluma Hill Road and Santa Rosa Avenue and there are no north-south through streets between Petaluma Hill Road and Santa Rosa Avenue connecting to Kawana Springs Road. Compliance with a part-time left-turn prohibition would likely be low. Motorists might unwittingly approach the intersection, find themselves unable to turn left, and then either make the left turn illegally, which would be potentially hazardous, or would turn right and make a U-turn at the Marketplace entrance on Santa Rosa Avenue.

A full-time left-turn prohibition would also generate congestion in the area. Besides the U-turn movement noted above, some westbound motorists would be expected to cut through the Marketplace in order to make a left-turn southbound at the Santa Rosa Avenue driveway to the Marketplace. Any traffic using this signal would increase southbound traffic volumes on Santa Rosa Avenue in front of the Marketplace. Some traffic would be diverted to Yolanda Avenue with a subsequent right-turn going north on Santa Rosa Avenue, and then weaving to the left to use the Hearn Avenue freeway overcrossing. This would generate increased congestion because Yolanda Avenue volumes are expected to increase significantly in the future, and because the additional Santa Rosa Avenue northbound left-turn volume at the Hearn Avenue freeway overcrossing would add to delays for the southbound through movement on Santa Rosa Avenue — the very problem the proposed change is attempting to help.

As a result of the above considerations, the left-turn prohibition on the westbound approach of Kawana Springs Road at Santa Rosa Avenue was not included in the road widening project.
Response 20-2

The existing right-of-way along the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue would remain in place and no parking spaces would be removed at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park complex to allow for project construction. A single southbound right-turn lane to the Hearn Avenue US 101 freeway overcrossing is an existing condition and would not be changed by the project. See also Responses 3-2 and 8-8 regarding enhancement of the buffer in front of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park.

Response 20-3

Please see Response 20-2. An eight and one-half foot wide sidewalk would allow for the planting of street trees along the street and still meet ADA requirements for width. A four and one-half foot wide sidewalk would not meet ADA requirements for width.

Response 20-4

See Responses 3-2 and 8-8 regarding enhancement of the existing buffer in front of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park.

Response 20-5

Please see Responses 20-2 and 20-3 regarding parking and buffer enhancements for the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Court. The project does not include expanding the right-of-way on the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue or the acquisition of property to expand the right-of-way on the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue. The back of sidewalk (outside edge away from the street) would correspond with the existing right-of-way on the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue.

Response 20-6

Please see Response 20-1 regarding a left-turn prohibition on the westbound approach of Kawana Springs Road at Santa Rosa Avenue.
November 8, 2006

Marie Meredith
Deputy Director
Community Development Department
City of Santa Rosa,
100 Santa Rosa Avenue
Santa Rosa, California 95402

Re: Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for Santa Rosa Avenue Widening Project, Yolanda Avenue to Kawana Springs Road

Dear Ms. Meredith:

Please be advised that this firm has been retained by Mr. Scholnick to represent him regarding the above-referenced matter. I have reviewed a number of documents, including the initial study. The purpose of this letter is to reaffirm the position conveyed to the City by Mr. Scholnick’s planning consultant, Jean Kapolchok. I specifically refer to her letter of August 30, 2006, wherein she outlined a variety of issues, all of which lead to the conclusion that the initial study and, therefore, any mitigated negative declaration, being inadequate.

Perhaps the most glaring inadequacy of the environmental review undertaken to date is the failure to address and analyze the conflicts this project raises with important city policies contained in the general plan and design guidelines. Design guidelines are, by their very nature, directly related to potential environmental impacts and must be folded into the environmental review process, especially at this critical juncture. It is not possible to make a reasoned decision regarding potential impacts without considering these environmental policies. All of this relates directly to visual impacts and the ultimate vitality and success of Santa Rosa Avenue.

I am further advised by Ms. Kapolchok that additional information was forthcoming at a recent neighborhood meeting that undermines the environmental review. These issues relate directly to the existing mobile home park and included removal of a number of legal, non-conforming parking spaces, removal of a significant amount of landscape screening, impact of increased noise and odors and interference with existing circulation patterns. Also raised at the neighborhood meeting was the impact of the proposed Lowes Store and its relationship to this project.
There are many CEQA cases discussing the importance of an initial study. It was recently addressed in *Lighthouse Field Beach Rescue v. City of Santa Cruz* (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 1170, 1196. “Yet, the City never indicated in its initial study that it had considered the potential environmental impact of the policy change regarding leashes.” at page 1197. Likewise here, the initial study does not consider the impact of this project on its policies. (See also, *City of Redlands v. County of San Bernardino* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 398 at pp. 407-408)

Since it is fundamental to an adequate environmental impact report that potential inconsistencies with adopted plans be discussed, an initial study that fails to even mention applicable policies is defective. Guidelines §15125(d); *Chaparral Greens v. City of Chula Vista* (1996) 50 Cal.App.4th 1134, 1145 fn. 2.

Again, the specific deficiencies that have been addressed to the City all are fatal to the state of the environmental review. This is a project with broad implications, worthy of careful planning and review.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

LESLIE R. PERRY

LRP: ao

cc: Ira Scholnick
Response 21-1

The purpose of the Initial Study as a “preliminary analysis” is described on page 10 of the Initial Study. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063 (a) (3), an “initial study is neither intended nor required to include the level of detail included in an EIR.” It is not required that the Initial Study provide a detailed evaluation of project consistency with the General Plan, Transportation Element or Design Review Guidelines. An EIR is to discuss any inconsistencies between a proposed project and the applicable general plans and regional plans (CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 (d)).

Nevertheless, as pointed out on page 1 of the Initial Study, 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 would be in full accordance with the General Plan Transportation Element. The project does not involve a zoning change or General Plan amendment. As described on page 1 of the 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), and provide safe streets for pedestrians and bicyclists (Goal T-J).

As further information, the absence of a planter strip on the east side of the street would not be inconsistent with the City’s Design Guidelines Section 1.2, Streets & Public Ways. As a regional/arterial street, the use of either a planter strip or plant wells for the installation of street trees along Santa Rosa Avenue would be consistent with the Design Guidelines. See also Response 6-3 regarding the planting of street trees on the east side of the roadway.

Regarding visual quality, see also Responses 3-2 and 8-8. Visual quality issues are discussed on pages 16 through 19 of the Initial Study.

Response 21-2

The existing right-of-way along the west side of Santa Rosa Avenue would remain in place and no parking spaces would be removed at the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park complex to allow for project construction. A single southbound right-turn lane to the Hearn Avenue US 101 freeway overcrossing is an existing condition and would not be changed by the project. See also Responses 3-2 and 8-8 regarding enhancement of the buffer in front of the Wayside Gardens Mobile Home Park.

Air quality and noise issues are discussed on pages 23 through 28 and 62 through 68 of the Initial Study respectively. No significant adverse air quality or noise impacts are identified for the project. The proposed Lowe’s home improvement center noted in the comment was considered in the year 2020 cumulative development traffic analysis as discussed on page 84 of the Initial Study.
Response 21-3

See response 21-1 regarding conformance with City policies.

Response 21-4

No inconsistencies with General Plan policies have been identified for the project. As noted previously, the 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), and provide safe streets for pedestrians and bicyclists (Goal T-J).

---

i 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.

ii The 85th percentile speed is the speed at which 85% of vehicles are traveling at or below. In other words, 15% of the vehicles are traveling faster than this speed.