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PROJECT TITLE
Dutton Meadows

PROJECT LOCATION
South of Hearn Avenue, East of Dutton Meadows, Northwest
of Colgan Creek in Southwest Santa Rosa (see Figure 1)

PROPERTY INFORMATION

1. MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN (See Project Description below for details). The Master
   Development Plan encompasses the full project site except for parcel 043-171-028, which is
   included in the Rezoning (see below). Some parcels are also included in the Phase I
   Development Project or the Minoa Project described below. All parcel numbers are shown
   in Figure 2. The following parcels are included only in the Master Development Plan.

- 043-071-029 size: 12.05 acres
   owner: Constance L Lechmanski Tr et al
   site address: none

- 043-191-018 size: 0.21 acres
   owner: Dorothy Caskadon Tr
   site address: 976 Hearn Avenue

- 043-191-019 size: 5.65 acres
   owner: Dorothy Caskadon Tr
   site address: 980 Hearn Avenue

- 043-191-020 size: 0.23 acres
   site address: 1004 Hearn Avenue

- 043-191-021 size: 2.49 acres
   owner: Judith S Peletz, Tr et al
   site address: 1130 Hearn Avenue

- 043-200-004 size: 17.01 acres
   owner: Richard G. Rayburn
   site address: none

Parcel 043-200-004 is referred to in some of the studies as a Peletz property.

2. MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN and PHASE I PROJECT (See Project Description
   below for details). The following parcels are included in the Master Development Plan
   and the Phase I Project (see Figure 3). The Master Development Plan includes
approximately 56.32 acres, of which the Phase I Project represents approximately 12.07 acres. The following three parcels are referred to as the Phase I Project, which is also referred to in supporting documents as Bellevue Ranch Phase 8, the McGill Gould Land Plan, and the Tuxhorn properties.

- 043-071-007  size: 8.00 acres  
  owner: DM Associates LLC  
  site address: 2684 Dutton Meadow

- 043-071-022  size: 3.55 acres  
  owner: DM Associates LLC  
  site address: 2666 Dutton Meadow

- 043-071-023  size: 0.52 acres  
  owner: DM Associates LLC  
  site address: 2650 Dutton Meadow

3. MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN and MINOIA PROJECT (See Project Description below for details). The following parcels are included in the Master Development Plan and the Minoia Project (see Figure 3). The Master Development Plan includes approximately 56.32 acres, of which the Minoia Project represents approximately 6.61 acres. The following two parcels are referred to as the Minoia Project.

- 043-191-016  size: 1.93 acres  
  owner: Frank Minoia  
  site address: 1200 Hearn Avenue

- 043-191-024  size: 4.68 acres  
  owner: Gina Sedie  
  site address: 1112 Hearn Avenue

4. REZONING: In the Master Development Plan, parcels 043-191-018, -019, and -020, approximately half of parcel 043-191-021, and a portion of 043-200-004, representing a total of approximately 10.29 acres, are proposed to be rezoned from various zoning districts to the C-2-PD, Northpoint Parkway Community Commons, General Commercial-Planned Development zoning district (see Figure 4). Parcels 043-191-016 and -024, representing a total of approximately 6.61 acres, are proposed to be rezoned from various zoning districts to either the R-1-2/6, Small Lot, Single-Family Residential zoning district or the C-2-PD zoning district. In addition, parcel 043-071-028 (owner Patrick Curran, site address 2706 Dutton Meadow), representing approximately 1.75 acres, will be included in the rezoning action (see Project Information below).

PROJECT DEVELOPER  Trumark Companies, 4185 Blackhawk Plaza Circle, Danville, CA 94506-4668. (925) 648-8300
Dutton Meadows Initial Study

A. SUMMARY DETERMINATION

( ) Negative Declaration
Posting Period:

( ) Mitigation Measures (included)

(X ) Environmental Impact Report Required.

The proposed project is located within the geographical area of the Southwest Area Plan and the Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Plan, and the proposed land uses are consistent with the land uses designated in these plans. Therefore, the environmental review of the proposed project will tier from the Southwest Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, a Master EIR (referred to in this document as “Master EIR”), certified in 1994 and reviewed for currency in 2000, and the Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Final EIR (referred to in this document as “Redevelopment EIR”), certified in 2000 (these documents are incorporated into this Initial Study by reference).

It is anticipated that the Master EIR and Redevelopment EIR will be determined to have provided sufficient evaluation of some impacts, such as land use and air quality. However, new potentially significant impacts not previously identified in these EIRs, including impacts that could reduce the range or limit the number of California Tiger Salamander and cumulative traffic and water supply impacts through the year 2020, have been identified. These impacts will need evaluation in addition to that provided in the Master EIR and the Redevelopment EIR.

Finally, the reader is advised that copies of the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan EIR, the Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Final EIR, and the resolutions certifying those EIRs adopted by the City Council, and other documents referenced in this initial study, are available at the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3, during non-holiday week days between the hours of 8:30 a.m. to 12 noon and 1:00 to 4:30 p.m.

Levels of Environmental Review in this Initial Study

This Initial Study assesses environmental effects at two levels. One level is the project specific level for the Phase I Project in which project specific studies were conducted. For example, since exact road and building locations are known, the tree report can identify the trees that will be retained and those that are proposed for removal.
The second level of environmental review is for the more conceptual Master Development Plan and Rezoning. Since these actions are not accompanied by specific development plans with building locations, it is unknown, for example, how many trees would be preserved and removed. However, many project specific studies were conducted for the parcels included in the proposed Master Development Plan and Rezoning. These include traffic, cultural resources, Phase I hazardous materials, California Tiger Salamander, and wetlands.

For both the project-specific level of review and the more conceptual level of review, potentially significant impacts not previously evaluated in the Master EIR are summarized. These impacts will be evaluated in greater detail in an EIR.

B. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Description:

The project involves a Master Development Plan, a Phase I Project, the Minoia Project, and a Rezoning. See Figures 1 through 6.

1) Master Development Plan. The purpose of the Master Development Plan is to show the interrelationship of land uses in a pattern that is consistent with the General Plan. The land uses as shown on the Master Development Plan are conceptual in a similar way as a General Plan land use diagram. The Master Development Plan shows the general location of different land uses; it does not show locations of buildings as a specific development plan or a site development plan would show. The adoption of the Master Development Plan does not allow any development. In fact, the Master Development Plan and the zoning for the property do not allow uses without further discretionary approvals. The Master Development Plan specifically states, "District regulations, development standards, and project specific development plans to be established by conditional use permit."

Since building placement and exact road alignments are not known with the development plan, some site-specific impacts can not be addressed; one exception is traffic. A traffic report was prepared on phases of the project plus project buildout.

The Master Development Plan represents eleven parcels and approximately 56.32 acres. Land uses designated by the Santa Rosa General Plan within the Master Development Plan include Mixed Use Retail and Residential Medium Density (8 to 18 units per acre), Residential Medium Low Density (8 to 13 units per acre), Residential Low Density (2 to 8 units per acre), Community Commons (retail with
some civic uses and second floor office or residential uses), Office, and Neighborhood Park.

b) **Phase I Project.** The Phase I Project is a proposed development project within the Master Development Plan area. The specific project includes 160 townhomes in a Residential Medium Density land use designation. Phase I is located east of Meadowview School (See Figure 3).

The Phase I Project involves a conditional use permit, a detailed development plan, design review, and a tentative subdivision map. These approvals plus building and grading permits are entitlements for development.

c) **Minoia Project.** The Minoia Project is a proposed development project within the Master Development Plan area. The specific project includes 65 three-story detached townhomes in Low Density and Medium-Low Density land use designation. The Minoia Project is located south of Hearn Avenue in the northern portion of the Master Development Plan Area (See Figure 3).

The Minoia Project involves a conditional use permit, a detailed development plan, design review, and a tentative subdivision map. These approvals plus building and grading permits are entitlements for development.

d) **Rezoning.** Modify by rezoning action the Policy Statement for the Northpoint-Dutton Community Commons district to include professional office uses and public parks, and simplify the description of residential uses. Most of the project is zoned to the C-2-PD, General Commercial (Northpoint Parkway Community Commons) Planned Development. Many of the parcels are currently zoned to that district. Several parcels (see Property Information above) representing 12.07 acres are not zoned to the C-2-PD district and are proposed to be rezoned to the district (see Figure 4). The C-2-PD District requires the adoption of a Master Development Plan, design review approval, and district regulations, development standards, and a project specific development plan to be established by conditional use permit. In addition, the parcels in the Minoia Project representing 6.61 acres require rezoning to either the R-1-2/6, Small Lot, Single-Family Residential zoning district or the C-2-PD zoning district. Parcel 043-071-028, currently zoned C-2-PD, will also be included in the rezoning action. As a result of the subsequent approvals required, the rezoning does not directly provide any development entitlements.
2. Environmental Setting:

The site is relatively flat. The area and its surroundings are predominantly rural residential in character. The site is predominantly vacant with some rural residences.

Phase I Project

The following description is from Fill Authorization Request for the filling of 0.16 acre of seasonal wetlands at the McGill / Gould (Phase 8) Site, Sonoma County AP Numbers 043-071-023, 043-071-022, and 043-071-007, dated September 7, 1999, prepared by Charles A. Patterson.

The study area contains several small seasonal wetlands in a level hay field. Much of the area was historically orchard, although the trees have been removed. The site has very gently sloping terrain from north to southwest, draining into several small peripheral ditches and eventually to a larger roadside ditch along the adjacent road, Dutton Meadow, which drains south to the Colgan Creek Channel. Mr. Patterson further reports that the project site has been affected by routine and long-term soil ripping, annual discing, hay planting, and harvesting including the 0.16 acre (6,922 square feet) of isolated seasonal wetlands.

Minoia Project

The following description is from Wetland/U.S. Water Delineation for the Minoia Property, Sonoma County, California, July 2003, prepared by Olberding Environmental, Inc.

The northern portion of the Minoia parcels are developed with several homes, garages, shops and barns. Landscape trees and shrubs surround many of the buildings. The Minoia parcel (the smaller of the two parcels) supports a large fenced pasture south of the homes and structures. This pasture is routinely grazed. Other areas of the parcels are grasslands. The parcels slope very gradually to the southwest from Hearn Avenue. There are no natural drainage features on the parcels. Surface runoff is directed onto the adjacent properties, but some water ponds on the surface in the southern area of the Minoia Project after heavy rainfall.

Master Development Plan Area (not including the Phase I and Minoia Projects).

The following description is from Supporting Information Application for a Permit to Discharge Fill into Isolated Seasonal Wetlands, Dutton Meadows Project, Santa Rosa, California, no date, prepared by Laurence P. Stromberg, Ph.D.
The site supports a mosaic of abandoned orchard, non-native annual grassland, and seasonal wetland habitat.

Prune and pear orchards once covered the northern and southwest portions of the site. The trees in the northern part of the site remain but fruit is no longer harvested. The trees were removed from the southwest portion of the site about 14 years ago by shallow excavation, the process leaving a network of small depressions, each indicating the place where a prune tree once stood and a seasonal wetland is present today.

The site has been dissected and used for the production of volunteer hay crops, but the site was never planted and the discing and harvest of hay have been irregular. The site has been dissected and mowed as necessary to control fuels. Sheep are grazed in the northern part of the site, but otherwise no agricultural activities have taken place since 1961.

The site appears to have received fill material from one or more sources but no fill has been placed on the properties in the last 20 years. The soils in the central and southeast portions of the site have been covered with surface and subsurface soils excavated from the Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel when it was widened and deepened prior to 1969. The Sonoma County Water Agency would, therefore, have been responsible for the placement of the fill, but it occurred before the Clean Water Act, which was not passed by Congress until 1972.

Most of the site slopes to the south and southwest except for a narrow strip along the eastern property line that abuts the flood control channel. There are no natural drainage features, but a pair of small ditches have been excavated on the site. One is blocked; the other, constructed in fill soil excavated from the flood control channel, apparently drains the fill and carries concentrated runoff to an inlet for delivery to the flood control channel.

3. Character of Surrounding Area:

The surrounding area is predominantly rural residential in character. Meadowview School is located west of the proposed project. Southwest Community Park is located west of the school. East of the project is the Victoria Drive neighborhood, a county residential pocket. Southeast of the project is Canine Companions and other commercial and light industrial developments. There has also been some home building and road construction on adjacent lands, but no significant wetland fill has occurred on this site or nearby.
C. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Does the project conform to General Plan proposals including the various adopted elements? (Land Use, Circulation, Urban Design, Housing, Open Space/Conservation, Noise, Seismic/Safety, Recreation, Scenic Highways, Community Facilities)(See appropriate impact sections for application of specific elements.) Yes.

General Plan Designation:
Retail/Medium Residential Mixed Use, Community Commons (predominantly retail with civic uses), Medium Low Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Office, and Neighborhood Park.

2. Does the project conform to existing (or proposed) zoning classification? Yes.

Classification:
The proposed zoning for the entire project is C2-PD, General Commercial (Northpoint Parkway Community Commons) except for the Minoia Project, which would be zoned R-1-2/6. Many of the parcels are currently zoned to the C2-PD district. Other properties that are not zoned to the appropriate districts are proposed to be rezoned to these districts as described.

3. Does it appear that any feature of this project, including aesthetics, will generate significant public concern? Potential.

Nature of Concern:
At neighborhood meetings, many neighbors expressed concern that a future grocery store at this location would financially impact Ray's Food Market. Also, residents of Hearn Avenue fear that the ultimate buildout of the project would increase the delay that they currently experience backing out of their driveways onto Hearn Avenue and to make left turns onto Hearn Avenue. Residents of Victoria Drive do not want a road immediately adjacent to their properties, nor do they want a bicycle path to connect from Colgan Creek through their neighborhood. An additional neighborhood meeting for the Minoia Project has been planned for January 2004.

4. Will the project require approval or permits by other than a City Agency? Yes.
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Other Agency:

Drainage plans must be approved by the Sonoma County Water Agency. For wetlands and/or threatened or endangered species that are or may be located on the project site, approval or permits may be required from the following agencies: North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Game, US Army Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and NOAA Fisheries.

D. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS: (Include mitigation measures for significant effects where possible.)

1. EARTH. (Consider the Seismic Safety Element)
   Will the proposal result in or be subject to:
   
   a) Erection of structures within an Alquist-Priolo Act Special Studies Zone? No
   
   b) Grading (consider amount and aesthetics)? Negligible w/Mitigation
   
   c) Slides, liquefaction, or other hazards on or immediately adjoining the site? Negligible w/Mitigation
   
   d) Adverse soil or topographic characteristics (consider soils, slope, slope stability, soils limitations)? Negligible w/Mitigation
   
   e) Wind or water erosion of soils, on site or off? Negligible w/Mitigation

DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: The Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (Master EIR) addressed each of these issues. The Master EIR found that all impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant effect.

Peculiar effects: There are no other effects which are peculiar to this project.
MITIGATION MEASURES:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: The Master EIR identifies several mitigation measures [3.2.1-2, 3.2.1-3, and 3.2.1-4] which will reduce ground shaking, erosion, unsuitable foundation conditions, and seismic risk to population impacts to insignificant levels. These mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project conditions and will be implemented during improvement plans, building permits, and construction through the review of soils reports/studies, plan specifications, and field inspections.

MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa

Shown on Plans: To be shown on building plans and checked by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development Building Division and Engineering Division.

Condition of Project Approval: The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.

2. AIR. Will the project result in:

a) Deterioration of air quality or creation of objectionable odors? Negligible w/Mitigation

b) Exposure of people to existing odors or poor quality air? Negligible

DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: The Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (Master EIR) addressed each of these issues. The Master EIR found that all impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant effect.

Peculiar effects: There are no other effects which are peculiar to this project.
MITIGATION MEASURES:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoa Project and Rezoning: The EIR identifies several mitigation measures [3.2.4-1, 3.2.4-3, and 3.2.4-4] which will reduce construction-related emissions, vehicular, and toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions to an insignificant level. These mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project conditions and will be implemented during improvement plans, building permits, and construction through the review of soils reports/studies, plan specifications, and field inspections.

MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. This is a responsibility of the grading contractor. City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development Engineering Division inspectors will verify compliance.

Shown on Plans: Notes to contractors shall be shown on the improvement plans and grading plans and checked by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development Planning Division.

Condition of Project Approval: The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.

3. WATER. Will the project result in:

   a) Erection of structures within a designated flood (hazard prone) area? No

   b) Contribute cumulative downstream impacts? Negligible w/Mitigation

   c) Reduction of surface or ground water quality or quantity? Negligible w/Mitigation

   d) Alteration of drainage patterns or runoff (consider cumulative downslope areas)? Negligible w/Mitigation
DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: The Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (Master EIR) addressed each of these issues. The Master EIR found that application of specific mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to water bodies, etc. to a less-than-significant effect.

Pollutants. Urban runoff from impervious surfaces constructed under the proposed project, particularly roadways and parking lots, would introduce pollutants into Colgan Creek. Pollutants which build-up on paved surfaces include fuels, grease and oil, and heavy metals (lead, cadmium, and mercury).

The City of Santa Rosa Stormwater Quality Ordinance (commencing with City Code Section 17-12-100) sets forth provisions to protect and enhance the water quality of the City's watercourses pursuant to, and consistent with, the Federal Clean Water Act and to assure compliance with the conditions set forth by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) as requirements of storm water discharge permits. Section 17-12.170 describes reduction of pollutants in storm water. Paragraph H of that section sets forth requirements for compliance with Best Management Practices.

RWQCB Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification

On behalf of Trumark properties, Laurence P. Stromberg, Ph. D., applied for a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification (CWA Certification) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), dated August 8, 2001. On January 25, 2002, the RWQCB denied without prejudice, the request for the CWA Certification (RWQCB File: Dutton Meadows Development, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County; WDID No. 1B01099WNSO). The project causes potential post-construction impacts on storm water. These documents are incorporated into this Initial Study by reference.

Phase I Project:

On February 1, 2002, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region (RWQCB), issued a Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements and Issuance of Clean Water Act Section 401 Conditional Certification for Bellevue Ranch Phase 8, Sonoma County, California (Certification). This Certification is incorporated by reference into this Initial Study.
Study. The Certification states that after construction, discharges of storm water runoff from the site are likely to contain nutrients, pesticides, bacteria, petroleum products, heavy metals, and sediment typically identified with urban runoff.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: The Master EIR identifies several mitigation measures [3.2.2-1 through -5, and 3.2.3-4] which will reduce and/or eliminate impacts from possible erosion and sedimentation in receiving streams, higher surface runoff and high groundwater table. These mitigation measures, as applicable, have been incorporated into the project conditions and will be implemented during improvement plans, building permits, and construction through the review of soils reports/studies, plan specifications, and field inspections.

In addition, the following mitigation measures further reduce the impact to a less-than-significant effect:

3-1) Comply with all conditions of approval of the RWQCB, including but not limited to inclusion of 1) a Best Management Practices for sediment and turbidity control prior to, during and after construction, and 2) a combination of post-construction stormwater runoff Best Management Practices to manage the quantity and improve the quality of storm water runoff from all impervious surfaces equal to the 85th percentile/24 hour precipitation event (0.95 inches).

Phase I Project:

The following mitigation measures further reduce impacts to a less-than-significant effect:

3-2) Comply with all conditions of approval of the RWQCB Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification, dated February 1, 2002, (RWQCB WDID No. 1B01060WNSO) as may be amended by the RWQCB, including but not limited to inclusion of 1) a Best Management Practices for sediment and turbidity control prior to, during and after construction and 2) a combination of post-construction stormwater runoff Best Management Practices to manage the quantity and improve the quality of storm water runoff from all impervious surfaces equal to the 85th percentile/24 hour precipitation event (0.95 inches).

MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa and the Regional Water Quality Control Board North
Coast District. This is a responsibility of the grading contractor. City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development Engineering Division inspectors and RWQCB will verify compliance.

**Shown on Plans:**

To be shown on building plans and checked by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development Building Division.

**Condition of Project Approval:**

The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.

4. **PLANT/ANIMAL LIFE.** Will the project result in:

   a) Changes in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of plants or animals?  
      Negligible with mitigation

   b) Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants or animals?  
      Potentially significant

   c) Introduction of new species of plants or animals to the detriment of existing native species? Creation of a barrier to the normal migration, replenishment, or movement of existing species?  
      Negligible with mitigations

   d) Deterioration or reduction of existing plant or animal habitat?  
      Significant as identified in the Master EIR

**DISCUSSION:**

*Grassland foraging habitat*

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoa Project and Rezoning: The overall loss of grassland foraging habitat in the Southwest
Area due to new development envisioned in the Southwest Area Plan is an unavoidable significant impact. The City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for this significant impact. The Master EIR found that all other impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant effect.

**Trees**

**Master Development Plan (not including Phase I Project or Minoia Project) and Rezoning:**

City Code Chapter 17-24 sets forth mitigations required for impacts to trees. Since a specific development plan is not proposed for the Master Development Plan outside of the Phase I Project or Minoia Project, the precise impact and mitigations can not be determined at this time.

**Phase I Project:**

*Tree Preservation and Mitigation Report, Dutton Meadows, Tuxhorn, Phase I, Santa Rosa, CA,* prepared by Horticultural Associates, dated November 5, 2001, is by reference incorporated into this Initial Study. This report states that 10 of the 47 trees on the site can be preserved, 32 must be removed due to development impacts and 5 must be removed due to poor existing conditions.

**Minoia Project:**

A tree study will be completed for the Minoia Project to determine the number and species of trees to be removed and to be preserved.

**Wetlands, Protected Plants, and California Tiger Salamander**

**Master Development Plan (not including Phase I Project and the Minoia Project) and Rezoning:**

Several studies (see below) prepared by Laurence P. Stromberg, Ph.D., found that 3.69 acres of low quality wetlands exist on the portions of Dutton Meadows excluding the Phase I Project. (The Phase I Project and Minoia Project are discussed below.)

**Habitat Description - Plants**

Stromberg’s studies found that the seasonal wetlands on the site are unlikely to provide habitat for the vernal pool fairy shrimp (*California linderiella*). He indicates that the fairy shrimp and the tadpole shrimp are recognized by the US Fish and Wildlife Service as not occurring on the Santa Rosa Plain. The vernal pool in the north-central part of the site, however, may provide
suitable habitat for vernal pool fairy shrimp and that some of the wetlands meet the criteria for suitable habitat for listed plants and, therefore, meet the criteria for suitable habitat for the fairy shrimp. The site contains no suitable habitat for California freshwater shrimp, California red-legged frog or the western pond turtle.

Stromberg reports that two years of plant surveys have been conducted on the project site with the exception of one parcel (A.P No. 043-191-019) for which a first year survey was conducted. No plant species listed as threatened or endangered by the state or federal government were observed in the surveys. Lobb's aquatic buttercup (*Ranunculus lobbii*) was found in the vernal pool in the north-central part of the site.

Stromberg states that because of the past disturbance of the seasonal wetlands, they are not of a type that would offer opportunities for uncommon aquatic species, floral or faunal, to be present.

Stromberg reports that virtually all rural residential land provides habitat for wildlife. The project site is a mosaic of ruderal annual grassland and seasonal wetlands. Trees are scattered across the site and Himalaya blackberry grows along the eastern project site boundary. Species that typically occupy such habitats are likely present but no wildlife surveys have been conducted. The habitat that would be affected by the project is typical of the region and its loss would not be significant.

Habitat Description - California Tiger Salamander


Studies to determine the extent, if any, of CTS habitat on the Dutton Meadows site (except for the Phase I Project - see below) have not been completed. The assumption is the entire site, approximately 50 acres, provides aestivation habitat for CTS. Therefore, development of the site will impact approximately 50 acres of CTS habitat. There is a known population of breeding CTS approximately 1,250 feet west of the site at the Southwest Community Park. This is discussed more fully under the Phase I Project below.

RWQCB Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification

On behalf of Trumark properties, Laurence P. Stromberg, Ph. D., applied for a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification (CWA
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Certification) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), dated August 8, 2001. On January 25, 2002, the RWQCB denied without prejudice, the request for the CWA Certification (RWQCB File: Dutton Meadows Development, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, WDID No. 1B01099WNSO) because final proof of mitigation measures were still pending at the time. The document states that the Corps has field verified the wetland delineation, but no confirmation has been issued to date.

Studies and Documents

The following studies and documents prepared by Laurence P. Stromberg, Ph.D., Wetlands Consultant, are incorporated into this Initial Study by reference:

1) Supporting Information Application for a Permit to Discharge Fill into Isolated Seasonal Wetlands, Dutton Meadows Project, Santa Rosa, California, no date.


8) 404(b)(1) Alternatives Analysis, Dutton Meadows Project, City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California, dated July 31, 2001.
9) Application for a Permit to Discharge Fill Into Waters of the United States, Dutton Meadows Project, Santa Rosa, California, dated August 3, 2001.

10) Request for Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification or Waiver of Discharge Requirements, Dutton Meadows Project, Santa Rosa, California, dated August 8, 2001.

The following studies prepared by Olberding Environmental, Inc., are incorporated into this Initial Study by reference:

1) Biological Assessment for the Dutton Meadows Development Project, Sonoma County, California, dated June 11, 2003 (prepared jointly with Laurence Stromberg, Ph.D.).


The following document is also incorporated by reference into this Initial Study:


Phase I Project:

Habitat Description - Plants

A Fill Authorization Request for the filling of 0.16 acre of seasonal wetlands at the McGill / Gould (Phase 8) Site, Sonoma County AP Numbers 043-071-023, 043-071-022, and 043-071-007, dated September 7, 1999, was prepared by Charles A. Patterson. This request/study is incorporated by reference to this Initial Study. Mr. Patterson reports that the study area contains several small seasonal wetlands in a level hay field. Much of the area was historically orchard, although the trees have been removed. The study area’s vegetation has been completely altered through past and ongoing agricultural activities, specifically hay crop production (annual disking, seeding of ryegrass, clover, and oats, and mowing, plus periodic minor leveling or soil movement as a result of cultivation operations). The result has been the almost 100 percent displacement of native grasses and wildflowers by non-native annual grasses, broadleaved herbs, and weeds. The vast majority of the dominant plants in the study area are introduced. There is no significant native grassland left, and any natural historic wetland topography has been
long ago graded, cultivated, and/or otherwise altered into nearly level hayfields.

Mr. Patterson reports that there are several separate features that represent seasonal wetlands in this study area, all of which have been thoroughly disturbed and invaded by non-native species. Based on the investigation, there is a total of 0.16 acre of wetland. This includes three small isolated depressions of a few hundred feet each, plus the two ditch/swale areas at the south-central and southeastern fencelines.

The site has very gently sloping terrain from north to southwest, draining into several small peripheral ditches and eventually to a larger roadside ditch along the adjacent road, Dutton Meadow, eventually draining south to the Colgan Creek Channel.

In a memorandum dated August, 1999, from Charles A. Patterson to Tux Tuxhom (Appendix A of the above-referenced Fill Authorization Request), Mr. Patterson discusses rare plant surveys of the McGill/Gould site. The site had been investigated on seven occasions between 1992 and 1999 for potential wetlands and/or sensitive plant species. Mr. Patterson summarizes that this site does not represent especially good habitat for any of the regionally known (or expected) sensitive species.

**US Army Corps of Engineers.** On May 8, 2001, prior to the listing of the California Tiger Salamander as an endangered species, the Corps confirmed the delineation and authorized the fill of 0.16 acres of seasonal wetland, subject to specific and general conditions, as it qualifies for a Nationwide Permit 39 pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. This authorization is incorporated by reference to this Initial Study by reference.

**California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region.** On February 1, 2002, prior to the listing of the California Tiger Salamander as an endangered species, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region (RWQCB) issued a Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements and Issuance of Clean Water Act Section 401 Conditional Certification for Bellevue Ranch Phase 8, Sonoma County, California (CWA Certification). This Certification is incorporated by reference into this Initial Study. The Certification certifies that any discharge from Bellevue Ranch Phase 8 (Facility No. 1B0106WNSO) will comply with the applicable provisions of Sections 301, 302, 303, 306 and 307 of the Clean Water Act, as conditioned.

**Habitat Description - California Tiger Salamander**

A letter from Dr. Laurence P. Stromberg, Ph.D., to Frank Kasimov, City Planner, Department of Community Development, dated August 30, 2002,
with the subject heading *California Tiger Salamander Habitat and Mitigation, the Dutton Meadows Project Site*, is incorporated by reference into this Initial Study.

Dr. Stromberg reports that surveys were conducted by Dr. Mark Jennings during the 2001-2002 rainy season in which no California Tiger Salamander (CTS) larvae were observed.

Dr. Stromberg reports that the site offers physically suitable aestivation habitat since the annual grassland offers sites in which adult and juvenile CTS could potentially spend the non-breeding season. No adult or juvenile CTS were observed in small mammal burrows, under debris, in the seasonal wetlands, or in the surrounding roads in spite of the fact that the on-site and road surveys were conducted during optimal conditions. The lack of observations reflects the trend in the surrounding land use and its impact on CTS abundance and movements.

Dr. Stromberg states that several respected biologists familiar with CTS believe that conditions around the breeding pond in Southwest Community Park and in the area around the park have deteriorated to the point where a CTS population cannot survive over the long term. Because of the small size and decline of the Community Park CTS population, the extensive recent development in the surrounding area, divided habitat and many barriers to migration, Dr. Jennings has also concluded that CTS probably no longer use the Dutton Meadows site.

Dr. Stromberg concludes, because conditions are inadequate for the long-term maintenance of the CTS population in the vicinity of the Dutton Meadows site, that it is unlikely that the Department of Fish and Game or the US Fish and Wildlife Service would require that any part of the project site be left undeveloped to retain habitat. Mitigation for the loss of “gross” onsite CTS habitat would take place through preservation of habitat elsewhere on the Santa Rosa Plain, either through acquisition of credits from existing mitigation banks or through acquisition and/or preservation of habitat on other land. The USFWS has yet to establish mitigation requirements.

As reported in the RWQCB CWA Certification (page 2), the California Department of Fish and Game has determined that the entire Phase I site represents CTS aestivation habitat. Consequently, the project will result in the removal of 12.0 acres of CTS habitat in the Phase I Project site.
Minoia Project:

Habitat Description - Plants

As described in the *Biological Assessment for the Dutton Meadows Development Project* (Olberding Environmental and Larry Stromberg, Ph.D.), 0.2 acres of non-jurisdictional (isolated) vernal pool habitat is located along the southern portion of the Minoia property. It is characterized by small topographic depressions that contain annual forbs and grasses that are typically associated with vernal pool areas. The plant species recorded in the pools on the Minoia property consisted of *Downingia concolor*, smooth goldfields (*Lasthenia glaberrima*), popcorn flower (*Plagiobothrys stipitatus*), and curly dock (*Rumex crispus*). These vernal pool plants sparsely vegetate the wetland areas. Some areas within the site were also found to support scattered meadow barley (*Hordeum brachyantherum*). The remainder of the site is dominated by non-native grasslands, as described above. No special-status plant species were observed on the Minoia project parcels during three years of surveys.

Habitat Description - California Tiger Salamander

Adult and juvenile surveys were conducted by Dr. Mark Jennings, Gretchen Flohr, and assistants during the 2001-2002 rainy season. No California Tiger Salamander (CTS) adults or juveniles were observed. In addition, two rainy seasons of larval surveys (2001/2002 and 2002/2003) were completed; no CTS larvae were observed.

As described above for the Phase I Project, the annual grassland offers physically suitable aestivation habitat in which adult and juvenile CTS could potentially spend the non-breeding season. Mitigation for the loss of approximately 6 acres of “gross” onsite CTS habitat would take place through preservation of habitat elsewhere on the Santa Rosa Plain, either through acquisition of credits from existing mitigation banks or through acquisition and/or preservation of habitat on other land.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Trees

The following mitigation measures further reduce impacts to a less-than-significant effect:
Master Development Plan (not including Phase I Project and Minoia Project) and Rezoning:

4-1) Replace all impacted trees in accordance with City Code Chapter 17-24 - Trees.

Phase I Project:

Mitigation replacement is determined by City Code Chapter 17-24 - Trees, which at this time requires replacement of two 15-gallon trees for each 6 inches, or fraction thereof, of trunk diameter of the tree to be removed. The replacement ratio is subject to change.

4-2) Based on the replacement ratio in effect at this time, a total of 190 mitigation replacement trees are required. Native trees shall be replaced with native tree species. Non-native trees may be replaced by either native or non-native tree species.

4-3) The following tree preservation notes shall be on all improvement plans, grading plans and building plans:

"Obtain a copy of and follow the guidelines contained in the General Tree Preservation Guidelines, which is attached to the tree report, Tree Preservation and Mitigation Report, Dutton Meadows, Tuxhorn, Phase I, Santa Rosa, CA, prepared by Horticultural Associates, dated November 5, 2001. Contact Horticultural Associates at (707) 935-3911 or Department of Community Development at (707) 543-3258 for a copy of the Guidelines."

Phase I Project and Minoia Project:

4-4) Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a tree replacement plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Department of Community Development. The plan shall indicate the number of trees to be removed, the number of required replacement trees by native or non-native species, and the on-site location of the replacement trees or payment of cash in-lieu of tree replacement as allowed by City Code Chapter 17-24.

4-5) Show all trees to be preserved and removed on improvement plans, grading plans and building plans.
MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa. Department of Community Development Planning Division and Department of Parks and Recreation will verify compliance.

Shown on Plans: Tree Preservation note to be shown on improvement plans and checked by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development Planning Division. Tree mitigation to be verified by the Parks Department and the Planning Division.

Condition of Project Approval: The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.

Wetlands and Protected Plants

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project and Rezoning: The following mitigation measures are common to the Master Development Plan and the Phase I Project. The Master EIR identifies mitigation measure [3.2.3-3a and 3.2.3-3b] which will reduce and/or eliminate impacts to wetlands.

In addition, the following mitigation measures further reduce impacts to a less-than significant effect:

4-6) Mitigation. (See RWQCB Denial of CWA Certification):

a) Purchase of 37 creation/restoration credits (3.7 acres) at an approved Wetland Mitigation Bank; and

b) Purchase of 37 preservation credits (3.7 acres) at an approved Wetland Mitigation Bank to preserve existing habitat known to support endangered plant species.

4-7) Secure all outside agency approvals. The applicant, its successors, heirs, assigns or transferees, shall secure all authorizations, approvals and permits for impacts to wetlands, habitats or water quality from the resource agencies with jurisdiction prior to approval of the improvement plans or final map, or the issuance of any grading permit or building permit.

4-8) Mitigation requirement. The applicant, its successors, heirs, assigns or transferees, shall comply with the terms, conditions and mitigations set
forth in any permit, approval or authorization issued by resource agencies with jurisdiction, except that any permit condition or mitigation that requires project redesign shall trigger a review by the City of Santa Rosa to determine if the project as redesigned is consistent with the original approval. A project that is determined to be inconsistent with the City approval shall not be granted subsequent entitlements, such as improvement plans, final map, grading permits or building permits. Such a project would have to be resubmitted to the City and reviewed by the City as a new project, including the submittal of new application and fees.

**Phase I Project:**

4-9) Comply with all conditions set forth in the US Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Authorization Permit 39 (Corps File Number 24554N), dated May 8, 2001, as may be amended by the Corps, including:

- **c)** To compensate for the loss of 0.16 acre of seasonal wetlands, fully complete a Banking Enabling Instrument, and have it signed by all applicable resources for the 0.16 acre of seasonal wetlands reserved at the applicant’s Yuba Drive Mitigation Site; and

- **d)** To compensate for the loss of 0.16 acre of endangered species habitat, purchase 0.16 of preservation credits at an approved endangered species preservation bank and provide proof of this purchase to the Corps or have the Yuba Drive Mitigation Site approved for endangered species preservation.

4-10) Comply with all conditions of approval of the RWQCB Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification, dated February 1, 2002, (RWQCB WDID No. 1B01060WNSO) as may be amended by the RWQCB, to mitigate impacts to wetland habitat, suitable habitat for listed plant species, and the CTS habitat, including but not limited to:

- **c)** The creation of 0.16 acre of replacement in-kind seasonal wetland habitat at the Yuba Mitigation Bank; and

- **f)** The preservation of 0.16 acre of high quality wetland habitat at the Yuba Mitigation Bank.

**MITIGATION MONITORING:**

**Monitoring Agency:** City of Santa Rosa and the Regional Water Quality Control Board North
Coast District. City of Santa Rosa
Department of Community
Development Planning Division and
RWQCB will verify compliance of
wetlands mitigation.

Shown on Plans:

Improvement plans will not be
approved until mitigation is completed
or otherwise approved by the state
agencies.

Condition of Project Approval:
The mitigation(s) will be included as a
condition of project approval.

California Tiger Salamander

The following mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to California
Tiger Salamander. Because impacts are potentially significant, they will be
analyzed further in a subsequent EIR, and additional mitigation may be
identified.

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and
Rezoning:

4-11) Prior to approval of any improvement plans, the final map, or the
issuance of any grading permit or building permit, and prior to
conducting any site work, the applicant, its successors, heirs, assigns
or transferees, shall secure all authorizations, approvals and permits
for impacts to the California Tiger Salamander and its habitat from the
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

4-12) This approval is valid only if the applicant, its successors, heirs,
assigns or transferees, comply with the terms, conditions and
mitigations set forth in any permit, approval or authorization issued by
the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, except that any permit condition
or mitigation that requires project redesign shall trigger a review by
the City of Santa Rosa to determine if the project as redesigned is
consistent with the original approval. A revised project which the City
determines is inconsistent with this City approval shall not be granted
subsequent entitlements, such as improvement plans, final map,
grading permits or building permits. Such a project shall be
resubmitted to the City and reviewed by the City as a new project,
including the submittal of a new application and fees.
Phase I Project:

4-13) Comply with all conditions of approval of the RWQCB Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification, dated February 1, 2002, (RWQCB WDID No. 1B01060WNSO) as may be amended by the RWQCB, to mitigate impacts to CTS habitat, including but not limited to implementing any additional mitigation and monitoring measures for CTS which are deemed necessary by the California Department of Fish and Game at a future date.

MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa, Regional Water Quality Control Board North Coast District, and California Department of Fish and Game. City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development Planning Division, RWQCB and CDFG will verify compliance of California Tiger Salamander mitigation.

Shown on Plans: Improvement plans will not be approved until mitigation is completed or otherwise approved by the state and federal agencies.

Condition of Project Approval: The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.

5. NOISE. Will the project result in:

a) Exposure of noise-sensitive land uses to noise levels exceeding 60 dBA? Negligible with mitigations

Noise Source: Traffic noise

b) Increases in existing noise levels? Negligible with mitigations

Noise Source: construction equipment
DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project, and Rezoning: The Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan Final EIR addressed each of these issues. The Master EIR found that all noise impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant effect.

Phase I Project: A noise report entitled *Dutton Meadows Project, Phase I, Santa Rosa, CA Environmental Noise Assessment*, prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., dated July 8, 2002, is incorporated into this Initial Study by reference.

*Future Exterior Noise Environment*

The report states, "Exterior noise levels at the outdoor use areas of residential land uses proposed adjacent to Northpoint Parkway, and near the intersection of Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadow, would exceed 'normally acceptable' noise levels for noise and land use compatibility (60 A-weighted decibel scale [dBA] day/night noise level [Ldn]). Future noise levels at these outdoor activity areas would range from about 65 to 68 dBA Ldn and would be considered by the City of Santa Rosa to be "conditionally acceptable." Exterior noise levels at outdoor activity areas along the greenbelts, areas located between housing rows with limited views of Northpoint Parkway, would be considered "normally acceptable."

*Future Interior Noise Environment*

The report states, "Interior noise levels of units are required by the City of Santa Rosa to be maintained at or below 45 dBA Ldn. In buildings of typical construction, with the windows partially open, interior noise levels are generally 15 dBA Ldn lower than exterior noise levels. With the windows maintained closed, standard residential construction typically provides about 25 decibels of noise reduction. For example, a unit exposed to exterior noise levels of dBA Ldn would be 53 dBA Ldn with the windows partially open and 43 dBA Ldn with the windows maintained closed."

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: The following mitigation measures are common to the Master Development Plan and the Phase I Project. The Master EIR identifies several mitigation measures [3.2.5-1 (a), (b) and (c), 3.2.5-2 and 3.2.5-3] which will reduce construction-related emissions to an insignificant level.
Phase I Project and Minoia Project: The following mitigation measure is specific to the Phase I and Minoia Projects and further reduces impacts to a less-than-significant level:

5-1) Future Indoor Noise Environment. To maintain a habitable interior noise environment, units exposed to noise levels greater than 60 dBA Ldn shall be provided with forced-air mechanical ventilation to adequately ventilate the interior spaces of the units.

MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa. Department of Community Development Code Compliance inspectors or the Police Department will enforce compliance with hours of operation upon complaint.

Shown on Plans: Noise barriers and forced-air ventilation systems to be shown on building plans. Compliance with noise report shall be reviewed and approved by an acoustical consultant.

Condition of Project Approval: The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.

6. NATURAL RESOURCES. Will the project result in an increase in the rate of use of any natural resource, including loss of agricultural lands, energy resources, or the substantial depletion of any nonrenewable resource? Significant as identified in Master EIR

DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: Implementation of the Southwest Area Plan would result in the loss of approximately 848 acres of Farmlands of Local Importance as designated by the State Department of Conservation and Sonoma County. This is a significant unavoidable impact. The City of Santa Rosa has adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) for the loss of important farmland on June 21, 1994 (Resolution 21804), making the appropriate findings as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
The Master EIR evaluated the impacts to other natural resources identified in this section. No other significant impacts were identified.

Peculiar effects: There are no other effects which are peculiar to this project.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoa Project and Rezoning: None required.

7. UTILITIES. Will the project result in the need for new systems or alterations to the following utilities: electricity, natural gas, communication facilities, water, sewers, storm drainage, solid waste disposal? Potentially Significant

DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoa Project and Rezoning: The Master EIR evaluated the infrastructure systems needed to serve development in the Southwest Area. No significant impacts were identified. The Master EIR did, however, recommend mitigation measures to further conserve on water usage and reduce burdens on the Subregional Wastewater treatment system. In addition, more recent information on water supply and water resources indicates that potentially significant cumulative impacts to water supply could occur; this impact will be evaluated further in an EIR.

Peculiar effects: There are no other effects which are peculiar to this project.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoa Project and Rezoning: Mitigation measure 3.1.6-1 is suggested to further reduce and conserve utility resources. These measures are routinely implemented by the City in the review and approval of development projects. Mitigation measure 3.1.6-2 covers cost of the sewer connection.

MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa. Department of Community Development does not issue building permit until the applicant has paid for utility
connections. Drought tolerant landscaping is implemented by the Planning and Building Divisions by verifying that the project complies with the City’s Water Efficient Landscape Policy. Applicants or their landscape architects are required to show compliance with the policy by signing forms.

Shown on Plans: Landscaping and irrigation are shown on plans.

Condition of Project Approval: The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.

8. PUBLIC SERVICES. Will the project result in the need for new or altered services in the following areas: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks or other recreational facilities, roads, flood control or other public works facilities, public transit or other governmental services? Negligible w/Mitigations

DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: The Master EIR addressed all public service impacts. With regard to Fire and Police services, the City Council will consider the appropriate levels of service and allocate funding to provide these services through the annual review of the City budget. The Master EIR found that all impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant effect. Potential cumulative impacts to public services will be re-evaluated in an EIR to be consistent with updated cumulative analysis in the 2020 General Plan EIR.

Peculiar effects: There are no other effects which are peculiar to this project.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: The Master EIR identifies mitigation measures 3.1.7-4 and 3.1.7-5 which will reduce potential public service impacts to a level of insignificance.
MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa. City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development does not issue building permits until school fees and park fees are paid.

Shown on Plans: Not applicable.

Condition of Project Approval: The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.

9. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Will the project result in:

a) Generation of additional vehicular movement with initiation or intensification of circulation problems (consider road design, project access, congestion, hazards to vehicles, pedestrians)? Significant as identified in Master EIR

b) Effects on existing parking facilities or demands for new parking? No

c) Impact on existing rail, air or public transportation systems? No

DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoa Project and Rezoning:

Southwest Area Plan EIR (Master EIR). The Master EIR addresses anticipated traffic and circulation impacts to the City, County, and State circulation network.

The Master EIR also addressed cumulative traffic growth, and found that it would have a significant impact on U.S. Highway 101 even with substantial planned improvements including an additional High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) and auxiliary (acceleration and deceleration) lanes. Caltrans is expected to complete the HOV lanes from Wilfred Avenue to Highway 12 in early 2003.
Even with these improvements, Highway 101 from Wilfred Avenue to Highway 12, US 101 would operate at Level of Service (LOS) "F" through this corridor, assuming the cities and County continue to approve development in accordance with their respective General Plans. The City has adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) for the cumulative traffic impacts on U.S. Highway 101 on June 21, 1994 (Resolution 21804) making the appropriate findings as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The cumulative traffic analysis will be updated in the subsequent EIR to be consistent with updates in traffic projections in the 2020 General Plan EIR.

In response to impacts to circulation on local streets and US 101, the City has two funding programs to finance road improvements. The Southwest Area Development Impact Fee is collected from developers of new projects to pay for infrastructure projects, including road improvements in the Southwest area such as the road improvements identified in Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-1. The Capital Facilities Fee is collected from developers of new projects to pay for infrastructure projects, including new roadways, roadway improvements and freeway interchanges throughout Santa Rosa.

Dutton Meadows Traffic Impact Study. The proposed project is within the range and scope of intensity of development evaluated in the traffic modeling studies conducted for the Southwest Area Plan. In addition, a traffic study entitled Third Revised Traffic Impact Study Dutton Meadows Mixed Use Development in Southwest Santa Rosa, dated August 30, 2002, characterized the traffic impacts of the Phase I Project and buildout of the Master Development Plan.

The traffic impact study states that the project sponsor intends to build several new roadways to serve development traffic and mitigate traffic impacts. These roads are important links in the backbone roadway system of the Southwest Area. As project phases are developed certain road segments will be constructed. In this sense the project is self mitigating with regard to circulation in the project area.

The analysis shows that buildout of the Dutton Meadows project in conjunction with existing, approved and proposed developments, results in arterial\(^1\) level of service (LOS), the measure by which the City of Santa Rosa determines significance of impacts, at or better than the City's threshold of LOS D, except along the Stony Point Road corridor between Bellevue Avenue and Sebastopol Road.

\(^1\) The City of Santa Rosa circulation Level of Service (LOS) standard is based on arterial corridors, not intersections. While intersection LOS is provided in the traffic impact study, this is intended for information purposes only.
The Stony Point corridor is impacted as an existing condition (i.e., LOS E and F) in the northbound direction. In the southbound direction, the Stony Point corridor currently operates at LOS C and D. The Dutton Meadows project does not worsen the northbound level of service on the Stony Point Road corridor. The southbound direction is affected by the project but still maintains a Level of Service D, so the impact is less-than-significant.

The City of Santa Rosa Traffic Engineer approved the inclusion of City-sponsored committed and funded projects on Stony Point Road and Bellevue Avenue in the traffic analysis since these projects are in the “pipeline.” The analysis shows that these committed and funded projects will improve traffic circulation in the Stony Point corridor so that the northbound LOS improves from E and F to C and D, respectively, and southbound LOS improves from LOS D to C with the Dutton Meadow project as well as all of the other existing and pending projects in the study area.

The Stony Point project will add travel lanes to Stony Point Road between Hearn Avenue and Highway 12. The Bellevue Avenue project includes a center turning lane and traffic signals at Bellevue Burgess and Bellevue/Dutton Meadow.

The traffic study assumes that Caltrans improvements, which are under construction and scheduled for completion by spring 2003 at Hearn/Corby and Hearn/Santa Rosa Avenue, are existing since they will be completed prior to project groundbreaking. The Santa Rosa Traffic Engineer concurs with this assumption.

To maintain acceptable Levels of Service, Dutton Meadows Phase 3 requires the Colgan Creek Bridge (Dutton Avenue) connection. This connection is a required project mitigation.

The traffic impact study evaluated potential impacts of the project on school children who might be walking or riding bicycles to school. Some impacts are noted during construction and can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

**Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning:** The Master EIR identifies several mitigation measures [3.1.4-1, 3.1.4-3, 3.1.4-4 and 3.1.4-5] which will reduce potential circulation impacts in the Southwest Area to a level of insignificance. To implement mitigation measure 3.1.4-1, the proposed development will pay the Southwest Area Development Impact Fee for area-wide improvements, thereby mitigating its proportional share of the cumulative traffic impacts on local street systems.
The following additional mitigation measures further reduce impacts to a less-than-significant effect:

9-1) Prior to occupancy of Dutton Meadows Phase 3, construct a bridge across Colgan Creek and connect the extension of Dutton Avenue and Northpoint Parkway to the existing Dutton Avenue south of the bridge.

The following shall be included as notes on the public improvement, grading and building plans:

9-2) Notify Meadow View School in advance of the date of commencement of construction, including starting and ending times.

9-3) Warn construction crews and delivery truck drivers in advance that school-age children may be present nearby, especially near school starting and ending hours.

9-4) Create a temporary construction road access to the site that makes minimal use of the existing street (Dutton Meadow) on which the school fronts.

9-5) To avoid traffic congestion in the area, avoid construction quitting times that coincide with the end of the school day.

MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa. The Department of Community Development does not issue building permits until the Southwest Area Development Impact Fee and the Capital Facilities Fee are paid. Occupancy permits for Dutton Meadows Phase 3 shall not be issued until the Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Avenue are connected to the existing Dutton Avenue over Colgan Creek.

Shown on Plans: Street design, bus turnouts and bicycle lands are to be shown on improvement plans consistent with requirements of the Department of Transit and Parking. The Department of Community Development Engineering and Planning Divisions verify that the bus
turnouts are on the plans. The Public Works Department is the City’s lead department on inspecting that the public improvements are constructed per plan, and consults with other departments in carrying out this task. The school-related impacts shall be included as notes on public improvement, grading and building plans.

**Condition of Project Approval:** The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.

**10. LAND USE.** (Consider the Land Use and Housing Element.) Will the project:

a) Alter the location, distribution, density or growth rate of the human population of an area? **No**

b) Create a demand for additional housing or degrade/displace existing housing? **Negligible**

c) Result in a substantial alteration of the planned use of an area? **No**

**DISCUSSION:**

**Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning:** Land uses designated in the General Plan and Southwest Area Plan for the project site include Retail/Medium Residential Mixed Use, Community Commons (predominantly retail with civic uses), Medium Low Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Office, and Neighborhood Park.

The Master Development Plan implements the General Plan and Southwest Area Plan by articulating where land uses would be located. For example, where the General Plan and Southwest Area Plan designate land use as Retail/Medium Residential Mixed Use, the Master Development Plan shows Neighborhood Parks connecting Medium Density, Medium-Low Density, and Medium-High Density, and the Community Commons as a Mixed Use Community Commons. A Community Commons is described in the Southwest Area Plan as a complex of retail and service enterprises anchored by a supermarket or possibly a super drugstore, or both, and public uses that would serve community clientele.
The Master Development Plan is one step in implementing the General Plan, Southwest Area Plan, and zoning. The Master Development Plan does not allow any land use entitlements to build. Prior to construction, a conditional use permit and design review are required, and a subdivision map approval may be required, for specific development projects.

The Phase I Project, for example, implements the Master Development Plan. It is accompanied by applications for conditional use permit, design review, and tentative map. The conditional use permit includes a specific development plan as well as development standards and district regulations.

The Master Development Plan is consistent with the General Plan and the Southwest Area Plan, and the Phase I Project is consistent with the Master Development Plan. As a result, there are no land use impacts.

Peculiar effects: There are no other effects which are peculiar to this project.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: None required.

11. AESTHETICS. Will the project obstruct or degrade any public scenic vista or view, create an aesthetically offensive site open to public view, produce new light or glare, or be visually incompatible with the surrounding area?

DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: The Master EIR addresses aesthetics in a chapter entitled "Visual Quality and Community Character." The Master EIR found that development will generally convert lands that are currently semi-rural to rural in character to an urban condition, identifying this visual change as a significant unavoidable impact.

The City has adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) for the cumulative aesthetic impacts on June 21, 1994 (Resolution 21804) making the appropriate findings as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
The Phase I Project and the Minoia Project as well as any development that might occur following adoption of the Master Development Plan (and the subsequent approvals required for construction of new structures), are required to comply with the Design Review Guidelines and the Community Design policies of the Southwest Area Plan.

Peculiar effects: There are no other effects which are peculiar to this project.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: The Master EIR identifies two mitigation measures [3.1.5-1, and 3.1.5-2] that will reduce or eliminate potential visual quality impacts.

MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa. The Department of Community Development and the Design Review Board make certain that the project design meets criteria set forth in the General Plan and the Design Guidelines.

Shown on Plans: Site Design elements are shown on plans. Elevations are shown for commercial and multiple family residential developments.

Condition of Project Approval: The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.

12. RECREATION. (Consider the Public Services and Facilities Element.) Will the project affect an existing park, future park/recreational options, or access to a park (including bicycle trails)? No

DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: The Master Development Plan shows a neighborhood park, consistent with the General Plan and Southwest Area Plan. The plan also shows a linear park along Colgan Creek which would provide future recreational opportunities. No park is shown in the Phase I Project or Minoia Projects. Therefore, the obligation toward parks for the Phase I Project and
the Minoia Project would be in the form of a required park fee that is used for park land acquisition and park development. The fees are required pursuant to City Code Chapter 19-70, Park and Recreation Land and Fees.

Peculiar effects: There are no other effects which are peculiar to this project.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

None required.

13. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Will the project:

a) Disrupt or adversely affect a prehistoric or archaeological site? Negligible w/Mitigation

b) Disrupt or adversely affect a property of historic or cultural significance? Negligible

DISCUSSION:

Cultural resource investigations in the southwest area have revealed that high potentials exist for development projects to encounter potentially important cultural resources. The Master EIR proposed mitigation which addresses the varying level of review and documentation required to reduce any potential impacts to a level of insignificance.

Pursuant to Sections 7050.5 and 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code, in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby areas reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. If the coroner recognizes the human remains as those of a Native American, he or she will contact, by telephone, the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.

The following cultural resources studies are made part of this Initial Study by reference:

Phase 1 Project:

This study reflects conditions on the Phase I Project (Tuxhom) parcels: 043-071-007, -022 and -023, 2684, 2666 and 2650 Dutton Meadows, respectively.

This report concludes that archival research with the Northwest Information Center revealed that there are no recorded archaeological sites located within the project area. There are, however, seven recorded historic sites within a half-mile radius of the property. During surface reconnaissance of the subject property, two houses (circa 1910) were noted within the property boundaries. Subsequent studies were conducted on these structures (see reports for 2650 and 2684 Dutton Meadows summarized below).

There were no prehistoric cultural resources noted during the surface reconnaissance; however, visibility of the project area was very poor. Due to the poor surface visibility during surface reconnaissance and the presence of recorded historic cultural resources directly adjacent to the project site, there is a potential for cultural resources to be located on the property.

2) *Historical Evaluation of the Structures at 2650 Dutton Meadow Road in the City of Santa Rosa*, prepared by Archaeological Resource Management, dated June 11, 2002.

This study reflects the condition of the structures located on APN 043-071-023 in the Phase I Project.

This report indicates that the structures present on the property include a single story vernacular residence, a brick outbuilding, a small cottage unit, a pumphouse, a small shed, a barn, and a children's treehouse. The house and barn have an established chronology, having been built circa 1910. The remaining structures appear to have been constructed at later dates. The proposed project calls for the demolition of existing structures to make way for future development.

The report states that none of the structures are historically or archaeologically significant. The structures are not listed on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Resources, and do not appear to be potentially eligible for inclusion in either of these historic registers in that the structures have no association with people or events important to local, state, or national history; the buildings are not noteworthy examples of vernacular architecture, nor is the workmanship and feeling of the structures particularly noteworthy; and the structures do not appear to have the potential to yield important information about prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation. It has, therefore,
been determined by the authors that the proposed project will have no impact on significant cultural resources. Therefore, no further recommendations have been made.

3) *Historical Evaluation of the Structures at 2684 Dutton Meadow Road in the City of Santa Rosa,* prepared by Archaeological Resource Management, dated April 24, 2002.

This study reflects the condition of the structures located on APN 043-071-007 in the Phase I Project.

This report indicates that the structures present on the property include a single-story vernacular residence which appears to have been built circa 1910. It is of balloon frame construction with wooden shingle siding. The roof is surfaced with composition shingles. It is moderately pitched and cross gabled in the front of the structure and includes a hipped portion to the rear. The structure has been significantly remodeled from its original form. The home has been reconfigured so that the original entry is now a side door, and an addition has been added to the rear of the house. The shingle siding is not original to the home, and the roof has been resurfaced. The interior of the structure is in good condition. It has been significantly remodeled and modernized. In addition to the main structure, a large chicken coop is also present on the property. The interior of the chicken coop is in fair to poor condition. The flooring has been removed, thereby exposing the wooden cross beams on raised posts.

The proposed project calls for the demolition of the existing structure to make way for future development. The report states that the residence and other structures are not historically or archaeologically significant. The structures are not listed on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Resources, and do not appear to be potentially eligible for inclusion in either of these historic registers in that the structures have no association with people or events important to local, state, or national history; the building is not a noteworthy examples of vernacular architecture, nor is the workmanship and feeling of the structures particularly noteworthy; and the structure does not appear to have the potential to yield important information about prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation. It has, therefore, been determined by the authors that the proposed project will have no impact on significant cultural resources. Therefore, no further recommendations have been made.
Minoia Project:


This report concludes that archival research with the Northwest Information Center revealed that there are no recorded archaeological sites located within the project area. There are, however, six recorded historic structures within a half-mile radius of the property. The closest prehistoric site is located at a distance of one mile. There were no prehistoric cultural resources noted during the surface reconnaissance; however, visibility of the project area was very poor due to dense grasses. Due to the poor surface visibility during surface reconnaissance, there is a potential for cultural resources to be located on the property.

The report noted that several previous studies for the area determined that the residential structures on these properties, including a vernacular structure built in 1949 at 1112 Hearn Avenue, a 1954 home at 1112 Hearn Avenue, and the 1914 bungalow and barn at 1200 Hearn Avenue, they are ineligible for the National Register. The report author evaluated the properties for local importance, and concluded that none of the structures present are locally important. Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed project, which would include demolition of the existing residences, will have no impact on historical resources.

Rezoning:


This study reflects conditions on parcels: 043-200-004, 043-071-029 and 043-191-021. These are the Rayburn, Lechmanski, and Peletz properties.

This report concludes that archival research with the Northwest Information Center revealed that there are no recorded archaeological sites located within the project area. There are, however, seven recorded historic sites within a half-mile radius of the property. The closest of these recorded sites are located directly adjacent to the northeastern-most corner of the proposed project area. The four recorded sites consist of residential structures and their associated...
outbuildings ranging in age between 1885 and 1950. During surface reconnaissance of the subject property, a simple house (circa 1910-1920) was noted within the property boundaries. The home did not appear to be historically significant.

There were no prehistoric cultural resources noted during the surface reconnaissance; however, visibility of the project area was very poor. Due to the poor surface visibility during surface reconnaissance and the presence of recorded historic cultural resources directly adjacent to the project site, there is a potential for cultural resources to be located on the property.


The text of this study indicates that the report reflects conditions on parcel 043-191-019. The graphic indicates that parcels 043-191-018 and -020 were also included in the study. The text also indicates that the property is approximately 10 acres in size that is larger than all three parcels together.

This report concludes that archival research with the Northwest Information Center revealed that there are no recorded archaeological sites located within the project area. There are, however, seven recorded historic sites within a half-mile radius of the property. The closest of these recorded sites are located 1/4 mile south of the proposed project area. The four recorded sites consist of residential structures and their associated outbuildings ranging in age between 1885 and the 1950s. Two single family residences and associated outbuildings are present on the property. One of the homes is over 100 years old. Poor condition and extensive remodeling have severely diminished its integrity. The second house is approximately 60 years old. In addition, several outbuildings, such as chicken coops and equipment sheds, were present. None of the structures appear to be historically significant. No traces of prehistoric cultural resources were noted during surface reconnaissance. Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed project, which would include demolition of the existing residences, will have no impact on cultural resources.

Master Development Plan: The reports prepared for the Phase I Project and the Rezoning above also included all of the parcels for the Master Development Plan.
Dutton Meadows Initial Study

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoa Project and Rezoning: The Master EIR mitigation measure [3.1.9-1] will reduce these impacts to a level of insignificance. A qualified archaeologist shall be consulted if archaeological indicators are uncovered during project development. Work shall be stopped at the location of the discovery until the archaeologist completes a significance evaluation. If deemed necessary by the archaeologist, further work in the discovery area shall be monitored by an archaeologist.

The following additional mitigation measures further reduce any potential impacts to a level of insignificance.

13-1) The public improvement and grading plans shall include the following note:

“The grading contractor shall conduct operations only under the direction of an archaeological spot-checking to be conducted by a qualified archaeologist. The archaeological spot-checker shall conduct inspections during initial grading with an evaluation at that time regarding the need for further archaeological monitoring for the project. The spot-checker shall contact Frank Kasimov, Department of Community Development, at (707) 543-3258 when he/she begins the inspection. The spot checker shall submit a report of findings to Frank Kasimov, Department of Community Development”

The archaeological spotchecking shall be carried out as described.

13-2) The public improvement and grading plans shall include the following note:

“In the event that any remains of prehistoric or historic human activities, features (such as culturally modified soil deposits) or artifacts are encountered during project-related activities, work in the immediate vicinity of the finds shall halt and the contractor shall immediately notify the project superintendent and the City of Santa Rosa liaison. The project superintendent shall immediately contact the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development ("Department"). The superintendent shall also immediately retain the services of a qualified cultural resource specialist, as approved by the Department, to evaluate the situation. If warranted by the discovery of a concentration of artifacts or soil deposits that may represent a site, further work in the discovery area should be monitored by an archaeologist. If human burials are encountered, the contractor must also contact the County Coroner. If the remains are deemed to be
Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted so that a ‘Most Likely Descendant’ can be designated.

Project personnel shall not disturb or collect cultural resources. Work may not resume until the Department has indicated that work may resume. The resumption of work will be permitted after site has been evaluated, a plan of action has been approved by the Department, and the plan has been carried out to the satisfaction of the Department.”

Rezoning and Master Development Plan: The following mitigation measure will further reduce potential impacts to a level of insignificance.

13-3) Prior to demolition of any structures with historic value, prepare an historic structures evaluation for review and approval by the Santa Rosa Department of Community Development.

MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa. The Department of Community Development Planning Division will verify the notes are included on the improvement plans. The contractor or applicant is responsible for arranging for the spot checker to be on-site during grading in compliance with the mitigation. Department of Community Development inspectors will make certain that the archeological spot checker is on site. The Department of Community Development will not issue a demolition permit for any structures with historic value until an historic structures evaluation has been prepared and approved.

Shown on Plans: Public Improvement plans shall contain the notes identified in the mitigation measures.

Condition of Project Approval: The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.
14. HAZARD. (Consider the Safety Element.)
Will the project:

a) Create a risk of explosion, release of hazardous substances or other dangers to public health or safety? Negligible with mitigations

b) Locate people on or adjacent to a potential health or safety risk? Negligible with mitigations

DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoa Project and Rezoning: The Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report addressed each of these issues. The Master EIR found that all impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant effect.

Phase I Project:

The following reports are incorporated into this Initial Study by reference:

1) *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, McGill [Tuxhorn] Property*, prepared by Giblin Associates, dated September 27, 1991:

This assessment evaluated Assessor’s parcel Number 043-071-007 and found no evidence to suggest the presence of contamination from hazardous materials at the site. Therefore, no further investigation was recommended.

The Santa Rosa Fire Department reviewed this report and had no further issues.

2) *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Gould [Tuxhorn] Property*, prepared by Giblin Associates, dated September 27, 1991:

This assessment evaluated Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 043-071-022 and 043-071-023. The report found oil-stained soil and dead vegetation in the area of the shed and barn and recommend it be excavated and chemical analysis performed for the presence of motor oil. The report also recommended that the underlying soils be sampled and analyzed to determine the vertical extent of contamination, if any.
Special handling of the excavated soils may be necessary, depending on the results of the analysis.

The Santa Rosa Fire Department reviewed this report and required a Phase II environmental site assessment (analytical characterization) to be submitted to the Fire Department to address the soil contamination identified in the areas of the shed/barn. Conduct Phase III remediation if necessary.


This report served as a review of the 1991 reports identified above and a supplemental site reconnaissance of the three parcels (043-071-007, -022 and -023). It acknowledged the 1991 recommendations identified above, but did not find any evidence of soil staining or distressed vegetation during the site visit. The report did recommend, however, that an asbestos and a lead-based paint survey be conducted prior to site renovation or demolition.

The Santa Rosa Fire Department reviewed this report and referenced its comments for the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Gould Property, above. The Fire Department also concurred with the report's recommendation to conduct asbestos and lead-based paint surveys.

4) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by AEI Consultants, dated August 23, 2001. This assessment reviewed the above three parcels (043-071-007, -022 and -023) and found no evidence of recognized environmental conditions associated with the subject property or nearby properties. This report also identified that potential asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paint are present due to the age of the subject property residence.

The Santa Rosa Fire Department reviewed this report and referenced its comments for the Environmental Review Gould and McGill Property study above.

5) Soil Sampling Investigation, 2684 Dutton Meadow, Santa Rosa, California, prepared by AEI Consultants, dated April 12, 2002. The parcel's APN is 043-071-007. The report concludes that minor concentrations of petroleum oil and grease were detected from 1 foot below ground surface (bgs) in front of the storage shed. There were no detectable concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons in the sample collected at 4 feet bgs. It is likely that the concentration of oil and grease was the result of leaks from parked cars. The property was overgrown with weeds and there were no signs of stressed vegetation.
Based on the analytical results and the visual observations of the property, the concentration of petroleum hydrocarbons in the upper layers of soil was not a significant environmental concern. The pesticide investigation indicated that the subject property had not been impacted by previous agricultural activities at the subject property.

6) Soil Sampling Investigation, 2650 Dutton Meadow, Santa Rosa, California, prepared by AEI Consultants, dated April 12, 2002. The parcel's APN is 043-071-023. The report concludes that minor concentrations of petroleum oil and grease were detected from 1 foot bgs in front of the storage shed. There were no detectable concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons in the sample collected at 4 feet bgs. It is likely that the concentration of oil and grease was the result of leaks from parked cars. There were no signs of stressed vegetation or soil staining. Based on the analytical results and the visual observations of the property, the concentration of petroleum hydrocarbons in the upper layers of soil was not believed to be a significant environmental concern.

7) Asbestos & Lead Based Paint Survey, 2650 Dutton Meadow, Santa Rosa, California, prepared by AEI Consultants, dated June 11, 2002. This report summarizes the analysis of the asbestos and lead-based paint survey performed by AEI consultants for AP No. 043-071-023.

The analysis documents presence of lead in seven samples, two of which had concentrations at levels greater than or equal to 5,000 parts per million, and are therefore defined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development as lead-based paint.

The analysis also documents the presence of asbestos containing materials in 5 of 21 samples. The Environmental Protection Agency defines asbestos containing material as any material that contains asbestos greater than or equal to 1 percent. The following materials contain asbestos at or above 1 percent and must be properly abated prior to the renovation and/or demolition of the building: Acoustical ceiling texture (popcorn ceiling) - located through the front house (approximately 700 square feet); Grey roof mastic - located around the penetration on the roof (approximately one square foot); and Black roof patch compound - located in various locations on the roof of the front house (approximately 100 square feet).

8) Asbestos & Lead Based Paint Survey, 2684 Dutton Meadow, Santa Rosa, California, prepared by AEI Consultants, dated June 11, 2002. This report summarizes the analysis of the asbestos and lead-based paint survey performed by AEI consultants for AP No. 043-071-007.
The analysis documents the presence of lead in six samples, one of which had concentrations at levels greater than or equal to 5,000 parts per million, and are therefore defined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development as lead-based paint.

The analysis also documents the presence of asbestos containing materials in 2 of 13 samples. The Environmental Protection Agency defines asbestos containing material as any material that contains asbestos greater than or equal to 1 percent. The following materials contain asbestos at or above 1 percent and must be properly abated prior to the renovation and/or demolition of the building: Black mastic - located around the vent penetration on the roof (approximately one square foot); and Beige linoleum - located on the kitchen floor (approximately 250 square feet).

Minoia Project:

The following report is incorporated into this Initial Study by reference:

9) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 1112 and 1200 Hearn Avenue, Santa Rosa, California, APNs 043-191-016 and 043-191-024 (also known as Minoia Property), prepared by AEI Consultants, dated October 10, 2003

   a) No on-site recognized environmental conditions or historical recognized conditions were identified during the course of the investigation.

   b) Due to the age of the subject property buildings, there is a potential that asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paint are present.

Master Development Plan (not including Phase I and Minoia Projects) and Rezoning:


   a) Sampling and testing of the near-surface (3 to 9 inches below the surface) showed organochlorine pesticides at concentrations above the Preliminary Remediation Goals, for the area contained by the orchards.

   b) An asbestos and lead survey are needed prior to renovation or demolition of the existing structures.
Other than the possible presence of pesticides, asbestos and lead as identified above, no significant environmental concerns are noted.

11) *Agricultural Impact Assessment* dated July 27, 2000, by Engeo Incorporated for the Lechmanski property, APN 043-071-029: The property does not appear to have been significantly impacted as a result of past agricultural use. The site would be considered suitable for residential development with regard to agrochemical health risk. The assessment was intended to address only surface soils and potential impacts from organochlorine pesticides.

The Fire Department comments state that this is a Phase II site assessment, and there are no environmental issues.

12) *Environmental Site Assessment Update*, Lechmanski and Peletz properties, APNs 043-191-021 [formerly 043-191-005], 043-071-029 and 043-200-004, prepared by Engeo Incorporated dated June 28, 2000, Revised October 16, 2001: this assessment provided a review of previous reports, an update of off-site records regarding documented hazardous waste sites, and findings of a supplemental site reconnaissance of the property:

a) No evidence of hazardous materials related issues were found to be associated with the site, with the exception of potential asbestos-containing materials.

b) It is conceivable that detectable levels of persistent pesticides from the cultivation of the former prune orchards could be found in the soils. As a prudent measure, selected samples should be recovered from the former orchard areas to address the potential agrochemical impacts to future site development.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

**Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning:** The Master EIR identifies several mitigation measures [3.1.8-1 and 3.1.8-2] which will reduce potential impacts due to hazardous materials to an insignificant level.

The following additional mitigation measures will further reduce any potential impacts to an insignificant level:

**Phase I Project and Minoia Project:**
14-1) OSHA standards required protection for the worker when working with paint containing lead regardless of the concentration. A contractor performing paint removal work shall follow the OSHA lead standard for the construction industry. The lead content of the paint should be considered to remove the paint, as proper waste disposal requirements and worker protection measures must be taken.

14-2) Prior to the renovation and/or demolition of the building, asbestos-containing materials must be properly abated by a licensed asbestos contractor. Regulations require that proper safety procedures be followed while removing, repairing, and disposing of the asbestos containing materials.

Phase I Project:

14-3) A Phase III remediation is required to remove the contaminated soils on APNs 043-071-007 and -023. A permit is required from the Fire Department. The soils shall be remediated to the satisfaction of the Fire Department prior to grading in the vicinity of the contaminated soils. Grading on other parts of the properties may proceed prior to the completion of the remediation with a grading permit and approval from the Fire Department.

14-4) The following note shall be on the grading and improvement plans: "No grading shall commence prior to Fire Department clearance. Areas that have contaminated soils shall not be graded until a Phase III cleanup has been completed to the satisfaction of the Fire Department. Areas not near the contaminated soils may be graded with approval from the Fire Department."

Master Development Plan and Rezoning:

14-5) Caskadon [and Nelson] properties, APNs 043-191-018, -019 and -020

a) Prior to approval of a development project, prepare a Phase II investigation (soil sampling and analysis) for the contaminated areas near the above-ground fuel tank and the 55-gallon drums. The Phase II shall also include soil sampling in the area of the irrigation well/pump for organochlorine pesticides. The report shall be submitted to the Fire Department and the Department of Community Development for review and approval.

b) Prior to approval of public improvement plans or prior to issuance of any building permits, obtain a Fire Department permit to close/decontaminate and remove the aboveground fuel tank. The Fire Department also requires the oils in the 55-
gallon drums to be removed and properly disposed to an appropriate location, with proper documentation of disposition.

c) If a Phase III (remediation) is required, this shall be completed with Fire Department permits and approvals prior to the approval of public improvement plans or prior to issuance of any building permits.

14-6) Lechmanski and Peletz properties, APNs 043-191-021 [formerly 043-191-005], 043-071-029 and 043-200-004.

a) Prior to approval of a development project, prepare a Phase II soil investigation (soil sampling and analysis) for of the identified oil staining in the driveway(s). In addition, conduct asbestos and lead-based paint surveys. The reports shall be submitted to the Fire Department and the Department of Community Development for review and approval.

b) If a Phase III (remediation) is required, this shall be completed with Fire Department permits and approvals prior to the approval of public improvement plans or prior to issuance of any building permits.

MITIGATION MONITORING:

Monitoring Agency: City of Santa Rosa. Phase III remediation requires a permit from the Fire Department. Phase II reports shall be completed prior to approval of a development project on those properties. The Department of Community Development issues a permit for demolition. Prior to issuance of a demolition permit, the Department of Community Development verifies that the contractor has received approval from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Notes on the plans will be verified by the Department of Community Development Planning Division.

Shown on Plans: Notes shall be shown on the grading and improvement plans.
Condition of Project Approval: The mitigation(s) will be included as a condition of project approval.

15. OTHER. (Consider the Open Space and Conservation Element.) Will the project result in other significant effects on the environment? None

DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: No additional impacts were identified.

Peculiar effects: There are no other effects which are peculiar to this project.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: None required.

16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. (A "significant" check on any of the following questions requires preparation of an EIR.)

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, or curtail the diversity in the environment? Significant as identified in Master EIR

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? Negligible w/Mitigation

c) Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? Significant as identified in Master EIR

d) Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Negligible w/Mitigation
DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: As discussed in this initial study and in Southwest Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, there are some impacts which will remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation. In some instances, there is no feasible mitigation (cumulative noise, loss of grassland foraging areas, and visual impacts), and in others implementation of the mitigation measure is in the jurisdiction of another agency (i.e. Caltrans Highway 101 improvements). In such instances, the City has adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for these unavoidable impacts. In addition, new potentially significant impacts not previously identified in the Southwest Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, including impacts that could reduce the range or limit the number of California Tiger Salamander and cumulative traffic and water supply impacts through the year 2020, have been identified and need to be evaluated in an EIR. Other potential significant impacts have been shown to be reduced to levels of insignificance with mitigations set forth in the Southwest Area Plan Master EIR (and incorporated herein) and with additional mitigation measures as set forth in this Initial Study.

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this evaluation:

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

I find that the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), a Master EIR, identified many impacts for which mitigations are set forth in the EIR. Additional impacts mitigation measures are documented in this Initial Study. Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.

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

Date February 3, 2004

Frank Kasimov, City Planner
DISCUSSION:

Master Development Plan, Phase I Project, Minoia Project and Rezoning: As discussed in this initial study and in Southwest Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, there are some impacts which will remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation. In some instances, there is no feasible mitigation (cumulative noise, loss of grassland foraging areas, and visual impacts), and in others implementation of the mitigation measure is in the jurisdiction of another agency (i.e. Caltrans Highway 101 improvements). In such instances, the City has adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for these unavoidable impacts. In addition, new potentially significant impacts not previously identified in the Southwest Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, including impacts that could reduce the range or limit the number of California Tiger Salamander and cumulative traffic and water supply impacts through the year 2020, have been identified and need to be evaluated in an EIR. Other potential significant impacts have been shown to be reduced to levels of insignificance with mitigations set forth in the Southwest Area Plan Master EIR (and incorporated herein) and with additional mitigation measures as set forth in this Initial Study.

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this evaluation:

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

- I find that the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), a Master EIR, identified many impacts for which mitigations are set forth in the EIR. Additional impacts mitigation measures are documented in this Initial Study. Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.

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

Date February 3, 2004

Frank Kasimov, City Planner
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3.1.4 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

3.1.4-1 Vehicle Circulation Improvements: The following improvement projects, or portions thereof, may be appropriate as conditions of approval for various projects. Alternatively, they may be implemented through the Basic Infrastructure Program (Capital Improvement Plan for southwest area projects). See EIR Table 3.1.4-7 for intersection LOS with and without mitigation. See EIR Table 3.1.4-8 for mitigated LOS, and EIR Figure 3.1.4-10 for intersection diagrams.

(a) Northpoint Parkway/Stony Point Road: Add NBT, SBT and SBL, EBT lanes. Convert existing EBR lane to shared through/right movements. Two WBT lanes on Northpoint Parkway extension. This improves the LOS from "F" with the existing lane configuration, to "D" (39 seconds).

(b) Sebastopol Road/Stony Point Road: Add NBT, WBR, SBT, SBR, and EBL lanes to this intersection. There is room at this intersection (with right of way acquisition) to make this substantial improvement to the intersection. This improves the LOS from "F" (unmitigated) to "E" (42 seconds)— actually very close to the "D/E" range threshold (40 seconds).

(c) Hearne Avenue/Stony Point Road: Signalize the present two-way stop intersection. Add NBL, NBT, NBR, WBL, SBL, SBT/R lanes to the intersection. This makes a substantial improvement in the intersection LOS, from "F" to "C" (15 seconds).

(d) Bellevue Avenue/Stony Point Road: Convert traffic control from existing two-way stop to signalized. Add NBL, NBT, WBT/L, WBR, SBL, SBT lanes; to the Ludwig Avenue approach (with realignment of the intersection), add an EBR lane. This improves the intersection LOS from "F" to "E" (42 seconds).

(e) Highway 12/Dutton Avenue Eastbound ramps: Signalize. No change to existing lane configuration. Improves the sidestreet LOS from "F" to "B" (7 seconds).

(f) Highway 12/Dutton Avenue Westbound ramps: Signalize. No change to existing lane configuration, although existing NBL turn pocket may require lengthening. Improves LOS from "F" to "C" (18 seconds).

(g) Dutton Avenue/Sebastopol Road: Add NBT, WBT, SBT/R, EBL, and EBT lanes to this intersection. There are heavy turning volumes to and from Highway 12 at this location. This improvement causes LOS to go from "F" to "D/E" (40 seconds).
(h) Hearn Avenue/Dutton Avenue: Signalize this presently two-way STOP controlled intersection. New approach on Dutton Extension shall have a NBT/L lane, NBT, NBR lanes; Hearn will need to have added WBL, WBT, and WBR lanes; the existing southbound Dutton approach widened by adding a SBT lane, and the existing Hearn eastbound approach widened by including an EBL lane. This improves the LOS from "F" to "D" (26 seconds).

(i) Dutton Avenue/Bellevue Avenue: Signalize this two-way STOP controlled intersection. Add NBL, NBT, NBR, WBL, WBT, WBR, SBL, SBT, and EBL and EBT lanes. This improves intersection LOS from "F" to "D" (36 seconds).

(j) Hearn Avenue/Corby Avenue: Add NBL, WBT, WBR, SBL, SBR, EBL, and EBT lanes. This improves the LOS from "F" to "D" (39 seconds).

(k) Todd Road/Stony Point Road: The County of Sonoma has begun a project to improve this intersection by signalizing it, adding a WBL turn lane (on Todd Road), and adding shoulders and lane channelization. The additional lanes required after this improvement will be: NBL, NBT, SBL and SBT lanes. This improves the LOS from "F" to "C" (20 seconds).

(l) Wright Road/Sebastopol Road: Signalize this presently all-way STOP controlled intersection. Add a NBT, two WBR, a SBL, and a SBT lane to the intersection. This improves the LOS from "F" to "B" (14 seconds).

(m) Highway 12/Wright-Fulton Roads: Construct full freeway type interchange, with signalized ramp junctions. The exact configuration of the ramps will need to be determined in order to minimize environmental impacts and cost. Tentatively, a diamond type interchange has been used for analysis, which would have PM peak LOS of C (22 seconds) in the eastbound direction, and "D" (30 seconds) in the westbound direction. This project is part of the Southwest Area Plan, so is actually not a mitigation (it was originally proposed in 1958).

(n) Corporate Center Parkway/Sebastopol Road: Add a NBT/L, WBL, and EBT lanes to the existing streets. Add a southbound approach to serve land development north of this intersection, which will have a SBT and SBL lane. Intersection LOS would be "E" (42 seconds) in the future, compared to "F" without mitigation.

(o) Corporate Center Parkway/Northpoint Parkway: Convert existing flashing red (effectively, all way STOP) operation to normal signal operation. No additional physical improvements required. Future LOS improves from "F" to "A" (3 seconds).

(p) Baker Avenue/Corby Avenue: Add NBR and SBL lanes to accommodate increased traffic travelling to and from US 101 (and the east side of the freeway). Signalize intersection and provide appropriate turn lane lengths. This improves LOS from "F" to "C" (24 seconds).

(q) Bellevue Avenue Interchange at US 101: This interchange is included in the Southwest and Southeast plans, so is not actually a mitigation. By providing the intersection lane configurations shown in Figure 3.1.4-10, the future intersection LOS will be "D" or better during peak hours.
Northpoint Parkway/Dutton Avenue: This future intersection warrants signalization and should have the intersection geometries shown in Figure 3.1.4-10c.

3.1.4-3 **Transit Service improvements could include:**

(a) Bus turnouts along major (arterial) streets with existing/potential bus service in the Southwest Area. Bus stop locations shall be coordinated with CityBus and SCT staff.

(b) Reasonable and justified reductions in parking requirements where an aggressive transit or TSM program is agreed to by the developer.

(c) Implementation of the City's Long Range Transit Plan.

(d) Encourage use of shared parking facilities where multi-use sites are developed.

(e) Encourage site plans with buildings located close to streets (and thus bus stops), rather than traditional developments where buildings are set back many hundreds of feet and surrounding by a "sea" of parking.

(f) Encourage site plans that provide clear and convenient pedestrian access between major activity centers and nearby bus stops. Discourage artificial barriers to pedestrian circulation, such as walls or fences. These barriers inhibit both walking and transit travel.

3.1.4-4 **Improved Residential Street Environment:** Several techniques are available for improving the residential street environment.

(a) **Street Design.** Incorporation of good street designs is by far the best way to reduce traffic speeds on local streets and improve the residential environment. This can be done by avoiding long, straight streets that encourage high speeds; liberal use of "T" intersections (to reduce speeds and the number of conflicts at intersections); and providing a street system that encourages people to use collector and arterial streets, rather than local streets, for longer trips. Other techniques (usually involving a traffic control device, or road undulations or "chokers") can be used to mitigate problems on existing streets, but are often not as effective. Good transportation planning makes it unattractive for pass-through traffic to enter a neighborhood.

(b) **Neighborhood Traffic Management.** Techniques that can be used on both existing and proposed streets include:

1. Traffic chokers at intersections. These create a "bulbed" effect at intersections, and so reduces pedestrian crossing distance of streets, and tend to reduce vehicle speeds. These should be used primarily on residential and minor collector streets.

2. Speed humps, or "undulations." These differ from more traditional "speed bumps" in that they have a longer cross-section (typically 12-14 feet). They have been proven to be...
more effective in slowing traffic than speed bumps, and also create less noise. Modest
creductions in average speed can sometimes be achieved with speed humps, typically 5
MPH. Advanced signage shall be placed in conjunction with the humps. The cross-
section length can be adjusted to accommodate different speeds of traffic (longer cross-
sections for higher speeds).

3. The use of all-way STOP signs for speed control shall only be used as a last resort.
Numerous studies have indicated that these devices are ineffective at controlling overall
speeds, and may actually cause people to speed up between intersections (although they
reduce speeds near the intersection). Where not required to stop by traffic, studies have
shown that 40-60% of all vehicles will only come to a rolling stop (below 5 MPH), and
20-40% will pass through at higher speeds. STOP signs shall be used where warranted
by high traffic volumes, or where sight lines are restricted enough to create a potential
safety hazard.

3.1.4-5 Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel

The pedestrian needs have been addressed through the policies of the Area Plan including:

(a) A well connected internal circulation system, that, to the extent possible, minimizes pedestrian
crossings at major streets.
(b) Mixed land uses that minimize distances for daily trip activities, and thus promote walking and
cycling as alternatives to the auto.
(c) Providing sidewalks on streets.

3.1.5 VISUAL QUALITY AND COMMUNITY CHARACTER

3.1.5-1 Overall Project Design: Comply with the Goals, Objectives and Policies for Community Design
in the Community Design Chapter of the Southwest Area Plan. Conformance review shall occur
with each development decision utilizing the General Plan Urban Design Element, the
Community Design Program of the Southwest Area Plan, and the City’s Subdivision Design
Guidelines to make decisions regarding proposed developments. Conformance review shall also
occur during the City’s Design Review process prior to the issuance of grading and construction
permits.

3.1.5-2 Construction Phase:

(a) Minimize the stockpiling of sewer and water supply equipment the extent practicable prior to
installation of the infrastructure. Only materials required for several days of construction should
be stockpiled at any given site at one time.
(b) Compensate for the removal of trees necessary to install infrastructure consistent with the Street Design Standard Policies contained in the Community Design Program Chapter of the Southwest Area Plan.

3.1.6 UTILITIES

3.1.6-1 Water Conservation:

Incorporate drought-tolerant landscaping, and low-flow plumbing fixtures to minimize water use.

3.1.6-2 Wastewater Collection and Treatment

Current and future project sponsors would be required to pay the wastewater connection fee prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.

3.1.7 PUBLIC SERVICES

3.1.7-4 School Facilities:

To the extent allowed by State law, the City Council shall not adopt a legislative act which allows residential development within the boundaries of the Southwest Area Plan unless the City Council first finds (1) that the impact of the development on the elementary school and middle school facilities which will serve the development has been mitigated, or (2) that there is no feasible method to reduce such impact and the benefits of the development outweigh its impact on the affected school facilities. A letter to the City from an affected school district stating that the impact of the development on the district's facilities has been mitigated shall be conclusive evidence that the impact has been mitigated as to that district's facilities.

3.1.7-5 Parks:

Prior to issuance of a building permit, require that each project sponsor in the Southwest area provide adequate park land dedication in their project proposals or the pay in-lieu Land Dedication Fees, and pay the Park Development Fees.

3.1.8 HAZARDOUS MATERIAL

3.1.8-1 Construction in areas of Contamination or Potential Contamination:

(a) Develop a Site Safety Plan in accordance with OSHA regulations, outlining procedures for worker safety, personnel protective equipment, and handling of materials.

(b) Conduct a site specific investigation prior to start of work in the potential problem areas (Figure 3.1.8-4 of EIR). The site investigation, funded and implemented by the respective project sponsor shall include reviewing agency files and reports to determine the current status of the project in terms of cleanup and remediation. If the investigation reveals contamination on the site under investigation, and if construction work is to start prior to the completion of cleanup and A-5
remediation under the oversight of lead regulatory agencies, NCRWQCB, SCPHD or DTSC, the respective project sponsor shall initiate measures to speed up the remediation process on the project site. Those measures shall be developed and evaluated in collaboration with the lead regulatory agencies on a case by case basis, and will need to be in conformance with the requirements of the lead regulatory agencies. Such measures may include identifying the responsible parties, negotiating for immediate cleanup and remediation, or installing a remediation system and getting reimbursed by the responsible parties.

(c) A plan to manage and handle contaminated soil and groundwater shall be developed. The Plan shall contain provisions for removal of contaminated materials (soil and groundwater), transport, and treatment or disposal.

(d) The NCRWQCB, DTSC, SCDEH and SRFD shall be contacted immediately if contamination is encountered during construction activities.

3.1.8-2 Handling/Disposal of Hazardous Wastes

Comply with all applicable laws and regulations for proper handling and disposal of hazardous wastes.

3.1.9 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3.1.9-1 Archaeological Resources: Development-related impacts to important prehistoric archaeological sites could be mitigated by the following alternatives.

(b) Avoidance of archaeological sites through modification of development plans that shall allow for the preservation of the resources. Incorporation of site locations into protected open space or parklands would serve this purpose.

(c) Covering or "capping" sites with a protective layer of fill. This could be a very good way of mitigating potential impacts in situations where public access may be increased as a result of development. Archaeological monitoring during the filling process is recommended.

(d) In circumstances where archaeological deposits cannot be preserved through avoidance or capping, data recovery through excavation is recommended. This measure shall consist of excavating those portions of the sites that will be adversely impacted. The work shall be accomplished within the context of a detailed research design and in accordance with current professional standards. The program shall result in the extraction of sufficient volumes of archaeological data so that important regional research considerations can be addressed. The excavations shall be accomplished by qualified professionals and detailed technical reports shall be prepared.
3.2.1 SOILS, GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY

3.2.1-2 Seismic Requirements: Incorporate seismic-restraint criteria in the design of slopes, foundations and structures for projects within the Plan Area as outlined in the measures listed below:

(a) The minimum seismic-resistant design standards for all proposed facilities shall conform to the CUBC Seismic Zone 4 Standards.
(b) Additional seismic-resistant earthwork and construction design criteria shall be incorporated as necessary, based on the site-specific recommendations of California-registered geotechnical and structural engineering professionals, recommended to be in cooperation with a California Certified Engineering Geologist.
(c) During site preparation, the registered geotechnical professional shall be on the site to supervise implementation of the recommended criteria.
(e) The California-registered Geotechnical Engineer consultant shall prepare an "as built" map/report, to be filed with the City, showing details of the site geology, the location and type of seismic-restraint facilities, and documenting the following requirements, as appropriate.

1. Engineering analyses shall demonstrate satisfactory performance of alluvium and fill where they form part or all of the support for structures.
2. Analysis of soil expansion potential and appropriate remediation (compaction, removal, etc.) shall be completed prior to using expansive soils for foundation support.
3. Roads, foundations and underground utilities in fill or alluvium shall be designed to accommodate settlement or compaction estimated by the site-specific investigations of the geotechnical consultant.

3.2.1-3 Erosion Control - Grading during Wet Season:

If grading or construction are to occur during the wet season, require an erosion and sediment transport control plan, designed by an erosion control professional, or landscape architect or civil engineer specializing in erosion control, that shall meet the following objectives for the grading and construction period of projects proposed for the Southwest Plan Area.

(a) The erosion and sediment transport control plan shall be submitted, reviewed, implemented and inspected as part of the approval process for the grading plans for each project.
(b) The plan shall be designed by the developers' erosion control consultant, using concepts similar to those developed by the Association of Bay Area Governments, as appropriate, based on the specific erosion and sediment transport control needs of each area in which grading and construction is to occur. Those concepts include some which apply generally to the Southwest Plan Area (see bullet items on list below), and some that would be appropriate only for specific sites. The possible methods are not necessarily limited to the following items.
1. Confine grading and activities related to grading (demolition, construction, preparation and use of equipment and material storage areas (staging areas), preparation of access roads,) to the dry season, whenever possible.

2. If grading or activities related to grading need to be scheduled for the wet season, ensure that structural erosion and sediment transport control measures are ready for implementation prior to the onset of the first major storm of the season.

3. Locate staging areas outside major streams and drainage ways.

   Keep the lengths and gradients of constructed slopes (cut or fill) as low as possible.

   Discharge grading and construction runoff into small drainages at frequent intervals to avoid buildup of large potentially erosive flows.

   Prevent runoff from flowing over unprotected slopes.

4. Keep disturbed areas (areas of grading and related activities) to the minimum necessary for demolition or construction.

5. Keep runoff away from disturbed areas during grading and related activities.

   Stabilize disturbed areas as quickly as possible, either by vegetative or mechanical methods.

6. Direct runoff over vegetated areas prior to discharge into public storm drainage systems, whenever possible.

7. Trap sediment before it leaves the site with such techniques as check dams, sediment ponds, or siltation fences.

8. Make the contractor responsible for the removal and disposal of all sedimentation in off-site retention ponds, that is generated by grading and related activities of the project.

   Use landscaping and grading methods that lower the potential for down-stream sedimentation. Modified drainage patterns, longer flow paths, encouraging infiltration into the ground, and slower storm-water conveyance velocities are examples of effective methods.

9. Control landscaping activities carefully with regard to the application of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides or other hazardous substances. Provide proper instruction to all landscaping personnel on the construction team.

(c) During the installation of the erosion and sediment transport control structures, the erosion control professional shall be on the site to supervise the implementation of the designs, and the maintenance of the facilities throughout the demolition, grading and construction period.
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(d) The erosion control professional shall prepare an "as built" erosion and sediment control facility map, to be filed with the City, showing details of the structural elements of the plan and providing an operating and maintenance schedule throughout the operational period of the project.

3.2.1-4 Construction where soil suitability is in question:

Requirement site-specific soil suitability analysis and stabilization procedures, and design criteria for foundations, as recommended by a California-registered soil engineer during the design phase for each site where the existence of unsuitable soil conditions is known or suspected.

(a) During the design phase for each site where the existence of unsuitable soil conditions is known or suspected, the developer's registered soil engineering consultant shall provide documentation to the City that:

1. site-specific soil suitability analyses has been conducted in the area of the proposed foundation to establish the design criteria for appropriate foundation type and support, and
2. the recommended criteria have been incorporated in the design of foundation.

(b) During grading for these sites, the registered soils professional shall be on the site:

1. to observe areas of potential soil unsuitability,
2. to supervise the implementation of soil remediation programs, and
3. to verify final soil conditions prior to setting the foundations.

(c) The registered soils engineering consultant shall prepare an "as built" map, to be filed with the City, showing details of the site soils, the location of foundations, sub-drains and clean-outs, the results of suitability analyses and compaction tests.

3.2.2 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

3.2.2-1 Drainage Improvements:

(a) The Colgan Creek channel west of U.S. 101 shall be enlarged and modified if necessary for a length of 2,450 feet so that it can convey the design storm runoff from the Southeast and Southwest Plan Areas. This improvement shall be undertaken under the direction of the Sonoma County Water Agency.

(b) The Roseland Creek channel, and portions of the Naval Creek channel in the vicinity of the Air Center, shall be widened and reconfigured to accommodate the design storm runoff, under the direction of the Sonoma County Water Agency.
(c) Improvements which may be necessary to the natural drainages which cross or are downstream from the Southwest Plan Area shall be undertaken with the approval of the Sonoma County Water Agency and to the design standards specified in the Sonoma County Flood Control Design Manual. These improvements shall take the form of a naturalized channel to the specifications of the City of Santa Rosa. (See also Section 3.2.3, Vegetation and Wildlife, for additional information regarding stream modification.)

3.2.2-2 Water Quality - Grading:

(a) Construction shall be scheduled for the dry season.

(b) Any projects that result in grading of an area greater 5 acres shall be subject to an NPDES permit from the RWQCB. This permit requires that the applicant develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. The permit requirements of the RWQCB shall be satisfied prior to granting of a building permit by the City of Santa Rosa.

(c) A soil erosion and sedimentation control plan shall be submitted to the City of Santa Rosa by the applicant for individual projects proposed under the Southwest Area Plan prior to grading. This plan may include, but not limited to, the following erosion control methods:

1. During construction, soil on graded areas shall be revegetated as soon as possible following disruption

2. Use of interceptor ditches or drainage swales to intercept storm runoff from transporting sediment into drainages and to prevent sediment-laden runoff from leaving the disturbed area.

3. Construction shall be restricted in the months of November through April.

4. Silt fences shall be constructed to prevent sheet flow across adjacent areas and down gradient into drainages. These and further measures shall be designed through the use of the Universal Soil Loss Equation to calculate the proper storage capacity required of silt fences or gravel bags, and shall be implemented by the contractor prior to mass grading and other soil disturbing construction activities on-site.

(d) Disturbed areas, that have been graded for construction, shall be replanted as soon as feasible after the completion of construction. Plantings shall be used on surfaces of cut and fill areas to collect surface runoff and reduce erosion.
3.2.2-3 **Water Quality:**

Easily cleanable catch-basins, debris screens, and grease separators or similar water quality protection devices shall be installed in the channels and drainage facilities serving the Plan area. Maintenance of the facilities shall be ensured through in-lieu fees paid to the City, or the establishment of homeowner associations.

3.2.2-4 **Construction Standards for areas with High Groundwater:**

Projects proposed within the Southwest Santa Rosa Plan within areas of high groundwater shall submit a geotechnical report which designates specific groundwater conditions and subdrain requirements and incorporates them in the project design.

3.2.2-5 **Groundwater Recharge:**

The City shall encourage the use of detention ponds to partially offset the loss of groundwater recharge area within the Plan Area. Such artificial recharge programs shall be coordinated through the Sonoma County Water Agency to ensure a rational, consistent and systematic approach. Maintenance of the detention ponds and potential for long-term accumulation of pollutants in the ponds shall be considered in the design of mitigation programs that includes ponds.

3.2.3 **VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE**

**Wetland Resources**

3.2.3-3a

Impacts to wetland resources shall be avoided or minimized by:

1. Relocation of all site improvements from wetlands subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to portions of the property without such wetlands;
2. Minimizing or reducing the size and area of site improvements within such wetland areas;
3. Restricting the size and areas of construction sites within such wetland areas; or

3.2.3-3b

For wetland impacts that cannot be avoided or minimized, project developers will:

1. Prepare a mitigation and monitoring plan in consultation with USFWS and CDFG to replace or restore lost wetland according to Corps guidelines, and either obtain
   
   i. A 1603 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFG or
   ii. A Section 404 permit to place fill in wetlands from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
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3.2.3-4 Implement the NPDES permit requirements regarding the implementation of non-point pollution source control of stormwater runoff through the application of Best Management Practices would reduce vernal pool/wetland pollution and sedimentation impacts to a level of insignificance.

3.2.4 AIR QUALITY

3.2.4-1 Each project proponent is responsible for ensuring that the contractor reduces particulate, ROC, NOx, and CO emissions by complying with the air pollution control strategies developed by the Bay Area AQMD. The developer shall include in construction contracts the following requirements:

(a) The contractor shall water on a continuous as-needed basis all earth surfaces during clearing, grading, earthmoving, and other site preparation activities.

(b) The contractor shall use tarpaulins or other effective covers for haul trucks that travel on public streets.

(c) The contractor shall sweep streets adjacent to the project at the end of the day.

(d) The contractor shall schedule clearing, grading, and earthmoving activities during periods of low wind speeds and restrict those construction activities during high wind conditions with wind speeds greater than 20 mph average during an hour.

(e) The contractor shall control construction and site vehicle speed to 15 mph on unpaved roads.

(f) The contractor shall minimize open burning of wood/vegetative waste materials from both construction and operation of the project. No open burning shall occur unless it can be demonstrated to the Bay Area AQMD that alternatives have been explored. These alternatives may include, but are not limited to, chipping, mulching, and conversion to biomass fuel. For any open burning, an AQMD permit must be obtained and done in conformance with AQMD regulations.

3.2.4-3 Each developer is responsible prior to Final Map approval for developing tree planting programs, improving the thermal integrity of buildings, and reducing the thermal load with automated time clocks or occupant sensors, and landscaping with native drought-resistant species to reduce water consumption and to provide passive solar benefits. Developers shall only install gas-burning (or any other clean fuel burning) fireplaces in new Southwest Area Plan residential dwellings. New fireplaces for existing residential dwellings in the Southwest Area shall only be gas-burning (or any other clean fuel burning) fireplaces.

3.2.4-4 The potential air quality impacts from toxic air emissions from construction equipment and operations will be reduced with compliance with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District air pollution control strategies. Construction firms shall be contracted to post signs of possible health risk during construction. The developer is responsible for compliance with the Bay Area AQMD rule regarding cutback and emulsified asphalt paving materials.
3.2.5 NOISE

3.2.5-1

(a) To minimize construction noise impacts of nearby residents, limit construction hours to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekends for projects within 1,600 feet of inhabited dwelling unit(s). Any work outside of these hours shall require a special permit from the City of Santa Rosa. There shall be compelling reasons for permitting construction outside of the designated hours.

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

(c) The contractor shall locate stationary noise sources away from residents and developed areas, and require use of acoustic shielding with such equipment when feasible and appropriate.

3.2.5-2

Project developers shall propose noise mitigation consistent with General Plan Noise and Area Plan Community Design Policies to reduce year 2010 exterior noise levels on proposed residential and school land uses to 60 L_{dn} or below, on proposed playgrounds and neighborhood park land uses to 70 L_{dn} or below, and on proposed office buildings and commercial areas to 65 L_{dn} or below.

3.2.5-3

(a) Retrofit existing residential land uses with acoustical attenuation materials, or relocate residences, to reduce interior noise levels for the year 2010 to below 45 L_{dn}.

(b) Construct sound walls with moveable sound attenuating gates, or berms to reduce exterior noise levels of existing residential land uses for the year 2010 to 60 L_{dn} or below.

(c) Construct soundwalls or berms at playgrounds and neighborhood parks to reduce noise levels for the year 2010 to 70 L_{dn} or below.

(d) Construct soundwalls or berms at office buildings and commercial areas to reduce noise levels for the year 2010 to 65 L_{dn} or below.
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NOTICE OF PREPARATION

PROJECT TITLE: Dutton Meadows

PROJECT LOCATION: South of Hearn Avenue, East of Dutton Meadow, Northwest of Colgan Creek in Southwest Santa Rosa.


PROJECT DEVELOPER: Trumark Companies, 4285 Blackhawk Plaza Circle, Danville, Ca. 94506. (925) 648-8300

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project involves a Master Development Plan, a Phase I Project, the Minoia Project, and a Rezoning.

- **Master Development Plan**: The purpose of the Master Development Plan is to show the interrelationship and general location of land uses in a pattern that is consistent with the Santa Rosa General Plan. The Master Development Plan represents eleven parcels and approximately 56.32 acres. Land uses designated by the Santa Rosa General Plan within the Master Development Plan include Mixed Use Retail and Residential Medium Density (8 to 18 units per acre), Residential Medium Low Density (8 to 13 units per acre), Residential Low Density (2 to 8 units per acre), Community Commons (retail with some civic uses and second floor office or residential uses), Office, and Neighborhood Park. The adoption of the Master Development Plan does not allow any development; additional permitting is required.

- **Phase I Project**: The Phase I Project is a 12.1-acre proposed development project within the Master Development Plan area, on parcels 043-071-007, 043-071-022, and 043-071-023. The specific project includes 160 townhomes in a Residential Medium Density land use designation. Phase I is located east of Meadowview School. The Phase I Project involves a conditional use permit, a detailed development plan, design review, and a tentative subdivision map.

- **Minoia Project**: The Minoia Project is a 6.61-acre proposed development project within the Master Development Plan area, on parcels 043-191-016 and 043-191-24. The specific project includes 65 three-story detached townhomes in Low Density and Medium-Low Density land use designations. The Minoia Project is located south of Hearn Avenue in the northern portion of the Master Development Plan Area. The Minoia Project involves a conditional use permit, a detailed development plan, design review, and a tentative subdivision map.

- **Rezoning**: Modify by rezoning action the Policy Statement for the Northpoint-Dutton Community Commons district to include professional office uses and public parks, and simplify the description of residential uses. Several parcels representing 12.07 acres are not zoned to the C-2-PD district and are proposed to be rezoned to the district. The C-2-PD District requires the
adoption of a Master Development Plan, design review approval, and district regulations, development standards, and a project specific development plan to be established by conditional use permit. In addition, the parcels in the Minoia Project representing 6.61 acres require rezoning to either the C-2-PD zoning district or the R-1-2/6, Small Lot, Single-Family Residential zoning district. Parcel 043-071-028, currently zoned C-2-PD, will also be included in the rezoning action. As a result of the subsequent approvals required, the rezoning does not directly provide any development entitlements.

AREAS OF PROBABLE IMPACT: Potentially significant impacts include the following:

- Reduction in the range or number of California Tiger Salamander (CTS), especially through impacts to aestivation habitat
- Impacts to trees, wetlands, and other biological resources
- Localized impacts to traffic and circulation
- Cumulative traffic impacts through the year 2020
- Cumulative water supply impacts through the year 2020
- Cumulative impacts to public services through the year 2020

The City of Santa Rosa will be the lead agency and will prepare an Environmental Impact Report for the above project. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information, which is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project. Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but no later than March 12, 2004.

Please send your response to:

Frank Kasimov, City Planner
Department of Community Development
Santa Rosa City Hall, Room 3
P.O. Box 1678
Santa Rosa, California 95402

e-mail: fkasimov@ci.santa-rosa.ca.us

Telephone: (707) 543-3258

Date: February 3, 2004
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Notice of Preparation

February 6, 2004

To: Reviewing Agencies
Re: Dutton Meadows
SCH# 2002092016

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Dutton Meadows draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Frank Kasimov
City of Santa Rosa
PO Box 1678
Santa Rosa, CA 95407

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Associate Planner, State Clearinghouse

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency
**Document Details Report**

**State Clearinghouse Data Base**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH#</th>
<th>2002092016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Dutton Meadows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Santa Rosa, City of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>JD Joint Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Master development plan for eleven parcels on 55.32 acres; two specific proposed development projects (12.1 acres and 6.61 acres) within the Plan area; modify Northpoint-Dutton Community Commons zoning district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lead Agency Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Frank Kasimov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>707 543-3258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>PO Box 1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>95407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Sonoma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Streets</td>
<td>Hearn Avenue and Dutton Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No.</td>
<td>043-071-007, 022, 023, 028, 029; 043-191-016, 018, 019, 020, 021, 024; 043-200-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>7N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>9W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proximity to:**

- Highways: 12 & US101
- Airports: NWPRR
- Waterways: Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel
- Schools: Meadowview School
- Land Use: Rural Residential, agricultural, open space / C-2-PD Northpoint Parkway Community Commons, General Commercial-Planned Development / Mixed Use Retail, Medium Density Residential, Residential Medium Low Density, Residential Low Density, Community Commons, office; neighborhood park

**Project Issues**

- Aesthetic/Visual
- Agricultural Land
- Air Quality
- Archaeologic-Historic
- Cumulative Effects
- Drainage/Absorption
- Geologic/Seismic
- Growth Inducing
- Landuse
- Noise
- Public Services
- Recreation/Parks
- Solid Waste
- Toxic/Hazardous
- Traffic/Circulation
- Water Quality
- Water Supply
- Wetland/Riparian
- Wildlife

**Reviewing Agencies**

- Resources Agency
- Department of Conservation
- Office of Historic Preservation
- Department of Parks and Recreation
- Department of Water Resources
- Native American Heritage Commission
- Office of Emergency Services
- Department of Fish and Game, Region 3
- Caltrans, District 4
- California Highway Patrol
- Department of Housing and Community Development
- Department of Toxic Substances Control
- Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 1

**Date Received**: 02/06/2004  
**Start of Review**: 02/06/2004  
**End of Review**: 03/08/2004

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources Agency</th>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Sch#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Floarke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Ladehnk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Chadwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrina Gatchel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Isaac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Departments

- Dept. of Parks & Recreation
  - B. Noah Tillinghast
  - Environmental Stewardship Section

- Reclamation Board
  - Lori Buord

  - Steve McAdam

- Dept. of Water Resources
  - Resources Agency
  - Nadell Gayou

Fish and Game

- Dept. of Fish & Game
  - Scott Flint
- Environmental Services Division

- Dept. of Fish & Game 1
  - Donald Koch
  - Region 1

- Dept. of Fish & Game 2
  - Benjy Curtis
  - Region 2

Independent Commissions, Boards

- Delta Protection Commission
  - Debby Eddy

- Office of Emergency Services
  - John Rowan, Manager

- Governor's Office of Planning & Research
  - State Clearinghouse

- Native American Heritage Comm.
  - Debbie Treadway

Business, Trans & Housing

- Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics
  - Sandy Hesnard

- Caltrans - Planning
  - Ron Helgason

- California Highway Patrol
  - John Ojelnik

- Office of Special Projects

- Housing & Community Development
  - Cathy Crenwel

- Housing Policy Division

Dept. of Transportation

- Dept. of Transportation 1
  - Mike Eagan
  - District 1

- Dept. of Transportation 2
  - Don Anderson
  - District 2

- Dept. of Transportation 3
  - Jeff Pulverman
  - District 3

- Dept. of Transportation 4
  - Tim Sable
  - District 4

- Dept. of Transportation 5
  - David Murray
  - District 5

- Dept. of Transportation 6
  - Marc Bimbaim
  - District 6

- Dept. of Transportation 7
  - Stephen J. Buswell
  - District 7

- Dept. of Transportation 8
  - Linda Grimes
  - District 8

- Dept. of Transportation 9
  - Gayle Rosander
  - District 9

- Dept. of Transportation 10
  - Tom Dumas
  - District 10

- Dept. of Transportation 11
  - Bill Pigge
  - District 11

- Dept. of Transportation 12
  - Bob Joseph
  - District 12

Cal EPA

- Air Resources Board
  - Airport Projects
    - Jim Lemer
  - Transportation Projects
    - Kurt Karpers
  - Industrial Projects
    - Mike Tolesrup

- California Integrated Waste Management Board
  - Sue O'Leary

- State Water Resources Control Board
  - Division of Financial Assistance
  - Student Intern.

- Student Intern.
  - 401 Water Quality Certification Unit

- State Water Resources Control Board
  - Division of Water Rights
  - CEQA Tracking Center

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)

- RWQCB 1
  - Gethleen Hudson
  - North Coast Region (1)

- RWQCB 2
  - Environmental Document Coordinator
  - San Francisco Bay Region (2)

- RWQCB 3
  - Central Coast Region (3)

- RWQCB 4
  - Jonathan Bishop
  - Los Angeles Region (4)

- RWQCB 5S
  - Central Valley Region (5)

- RWQCB 5F
  - Fresno Branch Office

- RWQCB 5R
  - Redding Branch Office

- RWQCB 6
  - Lahontan Region (6)

- RWQCB 6V
  - Lahontan Region (6)

- RWQCB 7
  - Colorado River Basin Region (7)

- RWQCB 8
  - Santa Ana Region (8)

- RWQCB 9
  - San Diego Region (9)

- Other

Last Updated on 01/12/04
Kasimov, Frank

From: Vaughn Filer [Vaughn@wdswine.net]
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2004 4:52 PM
To: Kasimov, Frank
Subject: Dutton Meadows

Dear Mr. Kasimov

My biggest concern for Santa Rosa is the fact that we are currently facing a waste water overage that we currently can’t control and developers want to continue to ignore the problem and build more houses. I feel that I can barely afford my water bill now and we are looking at another 10% raise in the bill.

I don’t travel on the 101 anymore due to congestion. The stop light at Hearn and Corby to get on the freeway or across the freeway to Santa Rosa Ave, at almost any time of the day is a horrible bottleneck. How can building homes on the 56 acres not add a bigger mess to the one already there.

I am assuming that the developer isn’t going to build one house per acre. In my little development of 99 homes each family has a minimum of two cars. Many families have 3 or 4. How on earth is Belleview and Hearn going to be able to handle all the cars trying to get to and from work. Never mind that Stony Point has now become a parking lot at peak traffic time.

I am sure you have heard all of this and more, I just feel that we need to solve our current problems before we make them worse.

Sincerely

Vaughn J. Filer

03/01/2004
Hi Bruce:

I recently received copy of the Notice of Preparation for a Master Development Plan for the Dutton Meadows project. I do not have any comments on behalf of Sonoma County Transit. However, Exhibit "A" section 3.1.4-5 regarding Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel seems very weak in addressing bicycle travel. Isn't there an opportunity here to develop the Colgan Creek Class I bikeway on the west side adjacent to this project? What about the need for Class II bike lanes along Dutton Meadow? I hope your committee will be reviewing this project and making appropriate comments.

Hope you had a good weekend!

Steven Schmitz
Sonoma Co. Bike/Ped. Advisory Committee

cc: Frank Kasimov
    Mike Eunice
September 26, 2003

Frank Kasimov, City Planner
Dept. of Community Development
P.O. Box 1678
Santa Rosa, CA 95402-1678


PROJECT NAME: Dutton Meadows - South of Hearn Ave., East of Dutton Meadow, Northwest of Colgan Creek in Southwest Santa Rosa

Dear Frank:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed major project/rezoning for subject project. After reviewing the plans you provided, it is our position that this project would produce a negative impact on our schools’ facilities. This proposed project is subject to an existing mitigation agreement with the Santa Rosa High School District (Grades 7-12), which will mitigate impacts to our schools’ facilities.

A mitigation fee of $1.15 (effective 2-1-02; next subject to change 2-1-04) per square foot of habitable space has been justified.

Commercial development is charged at $.33 (effective 2-1-00; next subject to change 2004) per square foot where applicable.

This project also lies within the boundary of the Bellevue Union School District (Grades K-6). To mitigate impacts on the elementary schools, please contact the Bellevue Union School District, 3223 Primrose Ave., Santa Rosa, CA 95407.

On behalf of Santa Rosa City Schools, I request that we continue to be notified of future public meetings at which this project will be discussed.

Thank you for your assistance. Please contact District Consultant Gary Freshley at 838-7243 should you or the applicant have questions regarding this letter. For actual fee payment information, please contact Janene Benway at 528-5206.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS R. BOWER
Associate Superintendent, Business

DRB:II
cc: Gary Freshley, Janene Benway

BETTER SCHOOLS BUILD BETTER COMMUNITIES
March 9, 2004

Mr. Frank Kasimov  
City of Santa Rosa  
Community Development Department  
P.O. Box 1678  
Santa Rosa, CA 95402

Dear Mr. Kasimov:

Dutton Meadows – Notice of Preparation (NOP)

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation in the environmental review process for the proposed project. We have reviewed the NOP and have the following comments to offer:

1. Please provide two copies of the Third Revised Traffic Impact Study, titled Dutton Meadows Mixed Use Development in Southwest Santa Rosa, dated August 30, 2002 for our review, so that we can determine what impacts, if any, the proposed project will have on State transportation facilities. The traffic report should include an analysis of the project’s impacts to mainline traffic congestion on U.S. 101 and State Route 12, as well as impacts to the operations of ramps on these highways (particularly the U.S. 101/ Hearn Avenue ramps).

2. The Initial Study describes two types of fees that are regularly collected from developers to finance projects that mitigate transportation impacts. The Capital Facilities Fee is collected to pay for infrastructure projects, including freeway interchanges throughout Santa Rosa. The Initial Study states that the developer of the Dutton Meadows projects will pay the Southwest Area Development Impact Fee to implement Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-1 of the Southwest Area Plan Master EIR, but does not specifically state that the developer will pay the Capital Facilities Fee.

Since this fee will be used towards financing the construction of new or modified interchanges at U.S. 101/ Bellevue Avenue and State Route 12/ Wright-Fulton Roads, we recommend the City require the developer of the Dutton Meadows projects to pay the Capital Facilities Fee. Please clarify whether or not the City will require the developer to pay this fee.
3. Page 31 of the May 29, 2002 traffic impact study for Dutton Meadows indicates that the Year 2020 traffic scenario assumes widening the Hearn Avenue bridge over U.S. 101 to four lanes. In addition, the 2001 Sonoma Countywide Transportation Plan lists the modification of the U.S. 101/ Hearn Avenue interchange as a future project. However, this project is not included in mitigation measure 3.1.4-1. Please explain why modification of the U.S. 101/ Hearn Avenue interchange was not included in Mitigation 3.1.4-1. If the traffic impact study indicates that significant impacts to this interchange will occur due to the proposed project, mitigation will need to be proposed and implemented since this interchange will serve as the primary access to the project site from U.S. 101.

We look forward to reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Report, traffic impact study, and technical appendices to the traffic study for this project. We do expect to receive a copy from the State Clearinghouse, but in order to expedite our review please send two copies in advance to:

Maija Cottle  
Office of Transit and Community Planning  
Department of Transportation, District 4  
P.O. Box 23660  
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Should you require further information or have any questions regarding this letter, please call Maija Cottle of my staff at (510) 286-5737.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY C. SABLE  
District Branch Chief  
IGR/CEQA

c: State Clearinghouse
February 26, 2004

Mr. Frank Kasimov  
City of Santa Rosa  
Department of Community Development  
P.O. Box 1678  
Santa Rosa, CA 95402-1678  

RE: DUTTON MEADOWS NOP

Dear Mr. Kasimov:

The Sonoma County Water Agency (Agency) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation for the above-mentioned project. In response, the Agency submits the following responses to your questions.

1. For site-specific improvements, Agency staff recommends that the drainage design for the project be in compliance with the Agency’s Flood Control Design Criteria and that the sanitation design for the project be in compliance with the Agency’s Design and Construction Standards for Sanitation Facilities and Sanitation Code.

2. A Revocable License will be required for access or construction work within the Agency’s property located along Colgan Creek. For questions on obtaining a Revocable License, please contact Mike Tovani at (707) 547-1070.

3. The Agency is concerned with any activity that may affect the operation and maintenance of our facilities located at Colgan Creek. Please provide design plans for Agency review, which show detail of the development in or adjacent to the Agency’s facilities.

4. For all projects, the environmental document should address whether water supply demands generated by the project are consistent with what the city is able to deliver under existing agreements with the Agency. In planning for water supply, please be aware that there are several constraints regarding the implementation of the Agency’s Water Supply and Transmission System Project (WSTSP). Under the WSTSP, the Agency’s water rights would be expanded from the current permit limit of 75,000 acre-feet per year (afy) to up to 101,000 afy. However, due to various constraints, the Agency cannot implement the WSTSP at this time. For further information regarding this issue, please refer to the letters sent to the Agency’s water contractors, customers, and water diverters under the Agency’s water rights, on August 11 and August 28, 2003. These letters are attached for your reference and use.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. For specific information regarding flood, drainage, and sanitation issues, please contact Dave Grundman at 547-1946. For other questions regarding Agency comments, I can be contacted at 547-1948 or emailed at annec@scwa.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Anne Crealock  
Environmental Specialist

P.O. Box 11628 - Santa Rosa, CA 95406 - 2150 W. College Avenue - Santa Rosa, CA 95401 - (707) 526-5370 - Fax (707) 544-6123
August 11, 2003

TO: All Contractors, Customers, and Water Diverters under Agency Rights

RE: STATUS UPDATE REGARDING RUSSIAN RIVER DIVERSIONS REPORTED UNDER SONOMA COUNTY WATER AGENCY DIVERSION/REDIVERSION RIGHTS (1993 - 2002) AND LIMITATIONS ON THESE RIGHTS

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with current information regarding the Sonoma County Water Agency’s (Agency) Russian River water supply and offer the Agency’s assistance in compiling the data necessary to evaluate and track the adequacy of the remaining supply. We hope the information will assist you in preparing the water supply assessments and CBQA analysis now required by state law and in complying with Section 8(a) of the Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Water Transmission System Capacity Allocation among the Agency’s water contractors, Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD), and the Town of Windsor (MOU).

The Sonoma County Water Agency’s state water rights permits limit the Agency’s Russian River diversions and rediversions to 75,000 acre feet per year. The Agency’s Water Supply and Transmission System Project (“WSTSP”) had contemplated an increase in diversions and rediversions to 101,000 afy. However, with the Court of Appeal decision in the Friends of the Eel River litigation, the Agency cannot implement the WSTSP at this time. Thus, it would be inappropriate for water suppliers relying on water diverted under the Agency’s water rights to anticipate water deliveries based upon diversions of 101,000 afy, or to rely on the delivery estimates in the Agency’s Urban Water Management Plan 2000 (which indicated that water supplies available to the Agency’s water transmission customers would be adequate over the next 20 years.) However, the analysis contained in the Urban Water Management Plan of the quantity of water available for diversion and rediversion remains valid.

Last year the Agency reported diversions and rediversions of 63,841 acre-feet, well below the Agency’s current 75,000 afy limit. However, the additional amount of water that will be used by projects within the Agency’s customers’ service areas that have been approved but not yet completed is unknown. This information must be compiled in order to determine how much of the 75,000 afy remains available for projects that have yet to be approved.

The Agency’s water supply and transmission facilities provide a primary water supply to a number of public water suppliers. In addition, other public water suppliers divert water directly from the Russian River under the Agency’s water rights but do not use the Agency’s water supply and transmission system. The enclosed table lists the public water suppliers that receive Russian River water under the Agency’s water rights. The Agency’s water supply facilities include five collector wells and seven conventional wells along the Russian River near Forestville. A sixth collector well is under construction and should be...
completed in the summer of 2004. In addition, the Agency operates three wells in the Santa Rosa Plain to augment production capacity of the Russian River water supply facilities. The Agency’s diversion of water from the Russian River is regulated by appropriative water right permits administered by the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The Agency developed the WSTSP to meet the future water demand that is contemplated by approved general plans governing the service areas of the Agency’s contractors and customers. A component of the WSTSP consists of increasing the authorized total annual limit on diversions under the Agency’s water rights from the currently approved 75,000 afy to the 101,000 afy discussed above. In the *Friends of the Eel River* litigation, the Court of Appeal concluded that the Agency’s Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the WSTSP was inadequate because it did not adequately consider the potential effects on the Russian River of potential reductions in diversions by PG&E’s Potter Valley Project from the Eel River into the Russian River. Consequently, the WSTSP EIR must be supplemented to address the issues raised in the Court of Appeal ruling, and the Agency’s Board of Directors must then reconsider the WSTSP. Until these issues are resolved and the SWRCB approves an increase in the annual limit in the Agency’s water-right permits, the Agency’s Russian River water supply will be subject to the existing limit of 75,000 afy.

In addition, as you are aware, coho salmon, steelhead, and Chinook salmon in the Russian River and its tributaries have been listed as “threatened species” under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). In response to these listings, the Agency, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Mendocino County Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District are involved in a Section 7 Consultation under the ESA with NOAA Fisheries (formerly National Marine Fisheries Service). One of the objectives of the Section 7 consultation is to ensure compliance of the Agency’s operation of its current and future facilities with the ESA. The Agency does not expect to be able to seek approval from the SWRCB for any permanent increase in the 75,000 afy limit until the consultation has been completed.

The enclosed chart presents the past 10 years (1993 through 2002) of Russian River diversions under the Agency’s water rights entitlement. The total diversions for water year 2002 from the Russian River under the Agency’s water rights were 63,841 acre-feet. These diversions include: (1) water diverted to the Agency’s transmission system for its contractors and customers (59,803 acre-feet in 2002); and (2) water diverted by other entities (4,038 acre-feet in 2002) under the Agency’s water rights (i.e., the Russian River County Water District and the Town of Windsor) as authorized by contracts with the Agency. The enclosed chart does not include water that may in the future be diverted (but is not currently diverted) under the Agency’s water rights by the City of Healdsburg, the Occidental Community Services District, and the Camp Meeker Parks and Recreation District under their contracts with the Agency. The petitions that would amend the Agency’s water-rights permits to authorize these diversions are pending before but have not been acted on, by the SWRCB.

As previously mentioned, the Agency is providing this information to assist in the planning and CEQA activities of all public water suppliers that receive water from the Agency’s water supply and transmission system facilities and those suppliers that report some of their diversions under the Agency’s water rights. These planning efforts include complying with recent legislation requiring that public water suppliers with 3,000 or more service connections prepare water supply assessments (SB610) or verification of sufficient water supply (SB 221) for certain development projects. Because there may be substantial delays before the Agency completes the supplemental WSTSP EIR and the Board of Directors reconsiders the WSTSP, managers of all public water systems relying on water diverted under the Agency’s water rights must work together with local planning agencies to determine the extent to which additional supplies are available to each system for proposed new developments, given existing demand, existing approved development, the

---

1 The MOU was signed by the Cities of Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Cotati, Sonoma, and Petaluma; the Valley of the Moon Water District, the Forestville Water District, the North Marin Water District, the Town of Windsor, the Marin Municipal Water District, and the Sonoma County Water Agency.
water remaining available under the Agency’s 75,000 afy limit and other supplies that each public water supplier may have available. While the Agency is in a position to monitor the amount of water that it delivers and is diverted under its water rights and provide that information to you, the Agency does not monitor either the amount of water you obtain from non-Agency sources or the planning and development within the service areas of each public water supplier.

As you know, Section 8(a) of the MOU, copy enclosed, specifies that the parties to the MOU will “consult with agencies that have planning and zoning powers within their water service territories.” To provide a meaningful assessment and monitoring of water demand, the Agency urges your organization to undertake the coordination efforts outlined below. These activities should be coordinated with all water suppliers using Russian River water diverted under the Agency’s water rights and their respective land use planning agencies. The MOU will expire on September 30, 2005 and the coordination outlined below will provide a basis for renegotiation of a successor agreement.

So that the Agency may assist you in the needed assessment, we recommend the following:

1. All water suppliers relying (entirely or in part) on water diverted under the Agency’s water rights should immediately evaluate the expected future water demands for existing and approved development projects and provide the Agency and each other with that information. You should also identify the source of water for the projects (from the Agency, recycled, or other);

2. The Agency will compile the information and prepare a report for you so that you will be aware of how much of the 75,000 afy remains available for projects not yet authorized and approved;

3. All water suppliers should then evaluate the future water demands anticipated from proposed, but not yet approved, development projects. Again, upon receipt of the information, the Agency will compile the information into a report for each of you.

4. Staff of the Agency and water suppliers should meet at least every 6 months to review the information and monitor the status of proposed projects and identify other steps as may be necessary.

In the future, the Agency will also be able to compare actual diversions with previous estimates to track actual demand relative to estimated demand. Effective planning coordination activities will ensure our continued ability to provide a safe and reliable water supply. Should you have any questions regarding this matter please call either Pam Jeane or Jay Jasperse of my staff.

Sincerely,

Randy D. Poole
General Manager/Chief Engineer

Encs

c George Hicks, Jim FIugum – City of Healdsburg
Pete Parkinson – PRMD
Board of Directors
Pam Jeane, Jay Jasperse, Chris Murray, Bill Keene - SCWA

/admgt/agency/ldp@russianriver diversions.doc
Total River Diversions (Water Year) Counted Against Agency Water Rights
2. Add one operator shift at Stafford Treatment Plant during the summer months or make improvements to the plant to permit 24 hour per day operation to increase peak month production capacity of the plant.

VOMWD:

1. Accelerate implementation of BMP 5 to July 1, 2001 as it pertains to: (1) offering water use surveys to customers with large landscapes; and (2), providing ET\(\text{\text{not}}\) based water use budget information to customers having dedicated irrigation meters.

2. In cooperation with Sonoma, undertake a demonstration project of the feasibility of a service that efficiently operates irrigation time clocks at residential sites.

MMWD:

1. In cooperation with Las Galinas Sanitary District and subject to all applicable laws, codes and regulations, evaluate the feasibility of expanding the advanced wastewater treatment plant and recycled water transmission and distribution system to deliver approximately 3.0 mgd of recycled water that will offset potable water use.

Windsor:

1. Accelerate implementation of BMP 5 to July 1, 2001 as it pertains to: (1) offering water use surveys to customers with large landscapes; and (2), providing ET\(\text{\text{not}}\) based water use budget information to customers having dedicated irrigation meters.

The obligations set forth in this section may be amended in the same manner as set forth in Section 4 (d) of this MOU.

SECTION 8 - BUILDING REGULATION AND PLANNING COORDINATION

(a) The parties to this MOU agree to consult with agencies that have planning and zoning powers within their water service territories in the manner set forth in California Government Code Section 65352.5 in order to promote close coordination and consultation between water supply agencies and land use approval agencies to ensure that proper water supply planning occurs in order to accommodate projects that will result in increased demands on water supplies.

(b) The parties to this MOU agree to consult with agencies that have building regulatory powers pursuant to the Government Code and Health and Safety Code to promote use of water conservation equipment, fixtures, appliances, devices and techniques.

SECTION 9 - SURPLUS WATER DELIVERIES

(a) Effective the date of this MOU, the Agency has determined that surplus water shall only be made available to water contractors for their direct use or for delivery to their surplus water use customers at rates and on such terms said water contractors shall solely determine.
Public Water Suppliers Receiving Russian River Water Under Sonoma County Water Agency Water Rights

Transmission System Contractors
City of Petaluma
City of Cotati
City of Rohnert Park
City of Santa Rosa
City of Sonoma
Valley of the Moon Water District
North Marin Water District
Forestville Water District

Transmission System Customers
Town of Windsor
Kenwood Village Water Company
Penngrove Water Company
Marin Municipal Water District
Lawndale Mutual Water Company
California American Water Company

Non-Transmission System Public Water Suppliers(1)
Town of Windsor
Russian River County Water District

(1) Does not include water suppliers with agreements with the Agency that do not yet have approval from the State Water Resources Control Board to divert water under the Agency's water rights.
August 28, 2003

TO: All Contractors, Customers, and Water Diverters under Agency Water Rights

RE: COORDINATION ACTIVITIES REGARDING RUSSIAN RIVER WATER SUPPLY DIVERSIONS

This letter serves as a follow-up to the August 11, 2003 letter we sent to all Agency contractors, customers, and other diverters under the Agency's water rights (water suppliers). That letter (see attached) reiterated that the Agency's existing water rights for diversion/redistribution of Russian River water is currently limited to 75,000 acre-feet per year (afy). Additionally, as I have discussed with many of you, the letter emphasized that all water suppliers need to coordinate with the appropriate planning and zoning agencies and each other to monitor and assess water demand\(^1\) to ensure a continued safe and reliable water supply. We request that you each provide the Agency the information identified in the previous letter and summarized below by the end of this water year, September 30, 2003.

Specifically, all water suppliers that rely (entirely or in part) on water diverted under the Agency's water rights are requested to:

1. Evaluate the expected future water demands for the existing and approved development projects and also identify the source of water for the projects (i.e., Agency supplied water, recycled water, conserved water, groundwater, or other).

2. Estimate future water demands anticipated from proposed, but not yet approved, development projects and also identify the source of water for those projects. This estimate will not be the entire future demand contemplated by your general plan but will be based on development proposals or applications that are not yet approved but for which there is an identified project.

\(^1\) Consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Water Transmission System Capacity Allocation signed by the Agency's contractors, Marin Municipal Water District, the Town of Windsor, and the Agency.

P.O. Box 11628 - Santa Rosa, CA 95406 - 2150 W. College Avenue - Santa Rosa, CA 95401 - (707) 526-5370 - Fax (707) 544-6123
Because the 75,000 acre-foot annual limit is based on water year (October 1 through September 30), we request that you provide this information by September 30, 2003 so that we can provide an update for the current water year ending September 30th. Once we receive this information, we will compile it into an assessment containing:

- The total amount of actual water diverted during the latest water year based on records of Agency diversions and records received from non-transmission system water suppliers that divert under Agency water rights.

- The anticipated future water demand based on approved development projects from all the water suppliers.

- The estimated future water demand based on proposed but not approved projects.

Once the Agency’s assessment is distributed, we will schedule a coordinating meeting with the water suppliers and the Agency to discuss the evaluation, projections of future water demands, and whether any modifications to this approach are appropriate. We appreciate your prompt attention to this request. If you have any questions regarding this matter or would like to meet and discuss the requested information, please call me at (707) 547-1959.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James L. Jaspersd, P.E.
Deputy Chief Engineer

Enc

c Jim Flugum, George Hicks - City of Healdsburg
Randy Poole, Pam Jeane, Chris Murray, Bill Keene - Sonoma County Water Agency
Board of Supervisor
Meeting Notes for Public Scoping Meeting for Dutton Meadows Project EIR

ATTENDEES: See Attached List

COPIES: Frank Kasimov/City of Santa Rosa

FROM: Andrea Gardner/CH2M HILL

DATE: March 5, 2004

Introduction

A public meeting was held on March 4, 2004 at the Finley Community Center in Santa Rosa to solicit public comments on the Initial Study for the Dutton Meadows Project. Fifteen persons attended the meeting, and names and addresses are provided in the table at the end of this memo. Attachments to this memorandum include:

- Copy of the original sign-in sheets
- Copies of the figures used for poster boards (three figures)
- Meeting agenda (provided as a handout at the meeting)

After an introduction by Chuck Regalia/City of Santa Rosa and a brief description of the EIR process and the proposed project by Andrea Gardner/CH2M HILL, the public provided comments on their issues and concerns regarding the project. Steve Smith/CH2M HILL recorded the comments on flip charts. Most comments were requests for specific information or clarifications. Comments are grouped into five categories below: Project Description, Traffic, Biological, Hydrology/Water Quality, and EIR Process.

Comments

Project Description

- Describe what will be included in the project on the northwest corner (parcel 043-191-018).
- Evaluate including a library in the project, because there is no library currently in southwest Santa Rosa.
- Identify the timeframe to begin the project.
- Identify when the Community Commons will be constructed.
Traffic
- State whether the access from the project to Hearn Avenue will have a traffic signal.
- Identify whether the intersection of Dutton and Hearn will be signalized.
- Describe any changes to Dutton Meadow from the project.
- Evaluate issues for traffic on Hearn Avenue.
- Describe how traffic will flow from the new Northpoint Parkway onto Hearn.
- Evaluate issues for traffic at Highway 12 and Santa Rosa Avenue. [Though this is not in the project area, it may be addressed in cumulative traffic impacts.]
- Identify in general where traffic signals will be added.
- Describe how traffic infrastructure will be phased (e.g. will certain roads come before or after particular housing developments).
- Describe why the Tuxhorn Drive alignment was placed where it is shown on the Master Development Plan, and not further south.
- Address alternative transportation, including the bike path in the southeast portion of the project.
- Clarify whether the bike path will run through the development or stay on Victoria Drive.
- Identify site access routes that will be used by construction equipment.
- New traffic counts and traffic reports are recommended for this EIR.

Biological
- Identify where the California tiger salamander was found on the project site.
- Identify how many tiger salamanders are present on the project site, and how this number is determined.
- Describe the purpose of saving the tiger salamander.
- Describe the effects that the City/County lawsuit regarding tiger salamander and/or changes in listed status (threatened vs. endangered) may have on the EIR or EIR process.
- Describe how tiger salamander impacts affect decision-making about the project.
- Evaluate options for onsite mitigation for tiger salamander.
- Provide location of vernal pools, include ones that may have been present on the west side of the site prior to 2003.
- Describe how long a wetland must have water to be a vernal pool.
- Evaluate options for onsite vernal pool mitigation.
Hydrology/Water Quality
- Evaluate project effects on the groundwater table, including well water quantity and quality.
- Evaluate the potential for flooding at the project site following construction (e.g. on Northpoint Parkway).
- Evaluate consistency with the conceptual plan for Colgan Creek.

EIR Process
- Identify where the EIR will be available for review.
- Identify when the Draft EIR will be completed.
- Clarify whether or not impact conclusions can "stop a project."

Comments Not in the Scope of the EIR
- It appears that someone may have bulldozed vernal pools near Dutton Meadow on the Phase 1 site to create drainage.
Appendix D
Cumulative Traffic Study
TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION
SOUTHWEST AREA CUMULATIVE DEVELOPMENT EIR

SETTING

Transportation Network Description and Classification

Street Classifications: Streets are classified as either highways (freeways), regional streets (arterials), transitional streets (collectors), and local streets (the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan provides definitions of these facilities). Regional streets may be subclassified as either boulevards or parkways. Transitional streets may be subclassified as either avenues or main streets. Local streets consist of trails, alleys, lanes, neighborhood streets, or minor streets. The discussion below focuses on streets within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in the Southwest Area.

US 101 and Highway 12 are classified as highways in the vicinity of the southwest area. They are fully grade-separated, access-controlled facilities with design speeds of 60 mph or greater. Presently, Highway 12 is a four-lane freeway as far west as Stony Point Road, where the freeway ends and Highway 12 becomes a four lane divided expressway to approximately Llano Road. From Llano Road west, Highway 12 is an undivided two-lane highway with access control.

Streets classified as regional in the Southwest Area include Stony Point Road, Dutton Avenue, Bellevue Avenue, Corby Avenue (between Hearn Avenue and Baker Avenue), Hearn Avenue (from Dutton Avenue to Santa Rosa Avenue), Todd Road, Sebastopol Road (west of the Northwestern Pacific Railroad tracks), Corporate Center Parkway, and Northpoint Parkway (see Figure 1). Transitional streets include Barham Avenue, Brittan Lane, South Wright Road, Dowd Drive, Leo Drive, West Avenue, Burbank Avenue, Fresno Avenue, Finley Avenue, Hearn Avenue west of Dutton Avenue, Lazzini Avenue, Giffen Avenue, Ludwig Avenue, Campbell Drive, Burbank Avenue, West Avenue, Dutton Meadow, Yuba Drive, Pyle Drive, Burgess Drive, Dutton Meadow, Moorland Avenue, W. Robles Avenue, Corby Avenue (except Hearn to Baker), Moorland Avenue, Chico Avenue, and Price Avenue.

Transit Services: Santa Rosa CityBus is the primary transit provider in the Southwest Area (see Figure 2). CityBus is operated by the Santa Rosa Department of Transit and Parking, and its routes provide service within the City of Santa Rosa plus some areas immediately adjacent to the City. Most routes converge on the Second Street Transit Mall (between B Street and Santa Rosa Avenue) in downtown, where connections can be made with other CityBus routes, as well as inter-city and inter-regional transit services.

1. Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan prepared by the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development, adopted by the City Council June 18, 2002.
Southwest Santa Rosa Plan Area

Dowling Associates, Inc.

- **Highway**
- **Regional/Arterial**
- **Transitional/Collector**
- **Conceptual Local Street**

**Figure 1**
Roadway Classifications from General Plan, Adopted 2002
Figure 2
EXISTING TRANSIT SERVICE

Source: City of Santa Rosa
Schedules of August 2002

The diagram shows the existing transit service in the Southwest Plan Area. Key routes include:
- SONOMA COUNTY TRANSIT
  - Route 22k
  - Route 42
- Other Golden Gate and Sonoma County Transit Service

Key locations include:
- 5 South Park
- 9 Corporate Center Parkway
- 12 Roseland
- 15 Stony Point Road
- 12 Rose!and
- 15 Stony Point Road

The map is credited to Dowling Associates, Inc., City of Santa Rosa, and the schedules of August 2002.
The four CityBus routes serving the southwest include:

**Route 5 - South Park.** The number 5 bus has a short segment in the southwest along Hearn Avenue, between the Southwest Transit Center at Hearn and Burbank Avenue, and the downtown transit center. It also serves the Petaluma Hill Road/South Park neighborhoods. Route 5 operates every half-hour, from 6:15 AM to 7:45 PM on weekdays, and hourly on Saturdays and Sundays. Saturday service operates 6:45 AM to 6:45 PM, and Sunday service is from 10:45 AM to 4:45 PM.

**Route 9 - Corporate Center Parkway.** This route serves the Corporate Center area and the Sebastopol Road commercial/retail district, and it connects to the 2nd Street Transit Mall in downtown Santa Rosa. Service is provided every 30 minutes Monday through Friday, from 6:00 AM to 7:30 PM, and every 60 minutes on Saturdays and Sundays. Saturday service operates from 6:30 AM to 6:30 PM, and Sunday service is from 10:30 AM to 4:30 PM.

**Route 12 - Roseland.** This route provides a one-way clockwise loop that serves Corby Avenue (just north of auto row), Hearn Avenue, West Avenue, and Sebastopol Road. This route also serves the Southwest Community Park. Buses run every 30 minutes from approximately 6:15 AM to 7:45 PM Monday-Friday, with hourly service on Saturdays and Sundays. Saturday service is from 6:45 AM to 7:45 PM, and Sunday service is from 9:45 AM to 3:45 PM.

**Route 15 - Stony Point Road.** This route has been added since the Southwest Area Plan was prepared. It travels between the Westside Transfer Facility (adjacent to the Coddingtown Shopping Center) south on Stony Point Road, and makes two loops off of Stony Point Road: the first using Sebastopol Road, Corporate Center Parkway, and Northpoint Parkway; the second using Hearn, Dutton Meadow, and Bellevue Avenue. Service is half-hourly on weekdays, and generally hourly on Saturdays. There is a service gap on Saturdays between 11:45 AM and 2:45 PM, and no Sunday service.

Inter-city transit service within the county is provided by Sonoma County Transit. Route 22X (Route 20) also operates nearby on Highway 12. These routes connect Santa Rosa (2nd Street Transit Mall) to Sebastopol (22X) and Occidental (20). Routes operate daily, with limited service on weekends. Route 42 provides service from the 2nd Street Transit Mall along West Third Street, Dutton Avenue, Hearn Avenue, Corby Avenue, Todd Road, and Standish Avenue. Six trips per weekday are provided in each direction.

Inter-regional (i.e., inter-county) transit service is provided by Golden Gate Transit (GGT), a division of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District. The nearest routes operate on Santa Rosa Avenue, and are not within easy walking distance of the Southwest Area.

**Bikeways:** Existing bikeways in the area include the following:

- **Sebastopol Road**
  Bike lanes (class II) between Corporate Center Parkway and Dutton Avenue.

- **Corporate Center Parkway**
  Bike lanes (class II) between Sebastopol Road and Northpoint Parkway.

---

2 Services provided under the most recent schedules, effective August 2002.
Traffic Levels of Service (LOS)

Tables 1, 2, and 3 provide a description of traffic level of service methodologies. All of the techniques portray the estimated LOS in terms of a letter "grade," which ranges from "A" (no delay/excellent conditions) to "F" (major delays/poorer conditions). At intersections, stopped delay per vehicle (in seconds) is used as the "measure of effectiveness".

Arterial (corridor) level of service is defined in terms of average travel speed of all through vehicles on the arterial. It is strongly influenced by the number of signals per mile and the average intersection delay. Each additional signal per mile typically decreases average travel speed of straight through movements by two miles per hour.

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of Santa Rosa's TRANPLAN traffic model was used to analyze the impacts of the project. This model, in its current version developed for the most recent General Plan update (2002), contains 502 traffic analysis zones (TAZ). The geographic areas covered by each TAZ in the Southwest Area are shown in Figure 3. Land use data were provided by the City of Santa Rosa, its consultants, and project proponents (or their representatives). Some of this information is included in the appendix to this document.

This section documents the results of the traffic model run based on specific development plans as of June 2004 for a number of projects in the southwest area, and the Santa Rosa: 2020 General Plan land uses for remaining areas in the southwest. For the latter areas, the midpoint density as defined in the General Plan was assumed. This work involved the following steps:

- Converting the land use information from the General Plan into the trip generation format developed by the City's Community Development Department.
- Applying the trip generation model
- Distributing trips to destinations, using a gravity trip distribution model
- Applying a factor to convert daily trips to peak-hour factoring (i.e., conversion of daily trips to 4:30-5:30 PM trips)
- Modifying the highway network to reflect year 2020 conditions, per the City’s and County’s circulation elements, as well as improvements proposed by Caltrans
- Assigning future trips to the future network
- Calculating the PM peak hour (4:30-5:30 PM) level of service resulting from this traffic

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Control Delay (seconds)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≤10</td>
<td><strong>Free Flow/Insignificant Delays</strong>: No approach phase is fully utilized by traffic and no vehicle waits longer than one red indication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.1 – 20.0</td>
<td><strong>Stable Operation/Minimal Delays</strong>: An occasional approach phase is fully utilized. Many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within platoons of vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.1 – 35.0</td>
<td><strong>Stable Operation/Acceptable Delays</strong>: Major approach phases fully utilized. Most drivers feel somewhat restricted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.1 – 55.0</td>
<td><strong>Approaching Unstable/Tolerable Delays</strong>: Drivers may have to wait through more than one red signal indication. Queues may develop but dissipate rapidly, without excessive delays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55.1 – 80.0</td>
<td><strong>Unstable Operation/Significant Delays</strong>: Volumes at or near capacity. Vehicles may wait through several signal cycles. Long queues form upstream from intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;80.0</td>
<td><strong>Excessive Delays</strong>: Represents long delays, but not necessarily “gridlock”. Intersections operate below capacity with low volumes. Queues may block upstream intersections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

**Level of Service Definitions for Stop Sign Controlled Intersections**

Average vehicle delay in seconds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Control Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.1-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25.1-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>35.1-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE 3

**Urban Street Level of Service Definitions by Class (HCM Chapter 15)**

_Speeds in MPH_  
_(figures indicate average speeds, in MPH)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
<th>Class IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range of free-flow speeds</td>
<td>35-45 mph</td>
<td>30-35 mph</td>
<td>25-35 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&gt; 35</td>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>&gt; 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt;28-35</td>
<td>&gt;24-30</td>
<td>&gt;19-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt;22-28</td>
<td>&gt;18-24</td>
<td>&gt;13-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt;17-22</td>
<td>&gt;14-18</td>
<td>&gt;9-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt;13-17</td>
<td>&gt;10-14</td>
<td>&gt;7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 13</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**NOTE:** Class I streets are not shown because there are none in the study area. The only street having a higher speed limit is one segment of Stony Point Road between Todd and Butler Avenue (in Sonoma County’s jurisdiction), which is posted at 50 mph. Street types are based on the degree of access control, speed limits, the presence of parking, and the posted speed limits.
Road Improvements Included in the Traffic Model

City Streets: City street improvements were based upon projects included in the Southwest Area Plan and the 2002 General Plan Update. For purposes of modeling future traffic flows, assumptions regarding the number of mid-block lanes on streets needed to be made prior to running the model. The principal improvements in the Southwest Area are shown in Figures 4a and 4b. These improvements were included in the Southwest Area Plan EIR as mitigation measures required to reduce impacts from traffic growth to insignificant levels. Future weekday traffic projections are shown in Figure 5.

Highways: For modeling purposes, Highway 12 was assumed to be a four-lane expressway from Wright-Fulton Road to Llano Road, and a two-lane arterial highway from Llano Road to central Sebastopol. Improvements to Highways 101 and 12 have also been considered in the analysis. The projections were for the year 2020, as it was for the General Plan, except that 2030 traffic volumes were used for the US 101 analysis, for consistency with the Caltrans/Sonoma County Transportation Authority’s (SCTA) US 101 Project Approval/Environmental Documentation study. The road improvements included in the traffic model are as follows:

US-101

- Six lanes with HOV lanes through Santa Rosa (2 "mixed flow" lanes and 1 HOV lane, plus one auxiliary lane for merging traffic between interchanges, in each direction). The HOV lanes were assumed to operate in the same manner as they do today in south Santa Rosa: restricted to vehicles with two or more persons, and operated during peak in both directions.

- The Baker Avenue bridge widened to 4 lanes.

- Hearn Avenue: location of existing northbound ramps is unchanged; southbound ramps relocated to about 700' north of the existing bridge; bridge widened to four lanes.

- Todd Road interchange rebuilt as a partial cloverleaf ("par clo"). Entry loops are in northwest and southeast quadrants. Todd Road widened to four lanes between Standish and US 101.

- Full interchange with bridge over US 101 at Bellevue Avenue.

Highway 12

- Auxiliary lanes added in both directions between Stony Point and Dutton Avenue.

- Full freeway-type interchange at Highway 12 and Wright-Fulton Roads.
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PM PEAK HOUR (4:30-5:30)
Traffic Volumes – Year 2020
With Plan (to nearest 100)

Source: SWSR2020.LOD (6-24-04)
Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance have been used in this analysis:

- For City streets, the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan (2002) sets a goal (I-D-1) of maintaining level of service of "D" or better along all major corridors. Exceptions to meeting the standard are: the Core Area (downtown); situations where attainment of the standard would result in significant environmental degradation; situations where topography or environment impacts makes the improvement impossible; and situations where meeting the standard would ensure loss of an area's unique character. The LOS is to be calculated using the average traffic demand over the highest 60-minute period.

- For freeways, Caltrans endeavors to maintain a target LOS at the transition between LOS "C" and "D", with a maximum flow rate of 1,680 vph per lane, and a maximum density of 26 vehicles/mile/ lane.

Transportation Impacts

Impact 1

Assuming that development in the Southwest Area occurs consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan, cumulative traffic growth would have no significant level of service impacts (i.e., result in conditions below City standard) on City streets (see Table 4). Some reduction in the existing travel speeds may occur in certain area as the result of additional traffic and new traffic signal or stop sign installations, but will not result in speeds dropping below the City's adopted level of service threshold. Intersection LOS information is provided in Table 5. While these data were not used for determining the significance of impacts, they illustrate that intersection operations are predicted to be acceptable in 2020.

Impact 1 is insignificant with the traffic improvement mitigation measures included in the Southwest Area Plan EIR. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are necessary at the Southwest Plan Area scope of analysis (individual projects could require site-specific mitigation, e.g., left turn pockets, for localized impacts). (I)

TABLE 4
Year 2020 Arterial Levels of Service, PM Peak Hour
(Type facility in parentheses. See Table 3 for definitions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road (Class II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 12 Westbound - Hearn Ave.</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Ave - Todd Road</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue (Class III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road - US 101</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Avenue (Class II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road – Corby Ave.</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol Road (Class II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Wright Road – NWPRR Tracks</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton Avenue (Class III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 12 - Hearn Avenue</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northpoint Parkway &amp; Extension(Class II)</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Center Parkway - Stony Point Road</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road – Dutton Extension</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Road (Class II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road—Moorland</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby Avenue (Class III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Street - Hearn Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue - Bellevue Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Chapter 15 method.
TABLE 5
Future Intersection Levels of Service with Southwest Area Plan Improvements
(average control delay per vehicle, in seconds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>2020 Level Of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northpoint Pkwy/Stony Point Road</td>
<td>D (39.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol Rd/Stony Point Rd</td>
<td>D (45.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Ave/Stony Point Rd</td>
<td>C (20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Ave/Stony Pt. Road</td>
<td>C (34.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Rd/Stony Point Rd</td>
<td>C (26.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright-Fulton Rd/Hwy 12 EB ramp</td>
<td>B (14.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright Rd/Sebastopol Rd</td>
<td>D (38.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Center Pkwy/Sebastopol Rd</td>
<td>B (15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Center Pkwy/Northpoint Pkwy</td>
<td>A (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton Ave/Hwy 12 EB ramps</td>
<td>B (14.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton Ave/Hwy 12 WB ramps</td>
<td>C (22.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton Ave/Sebastopol Rd</td>
<td>C (20.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Ave/Dutton Ave</td>
<td>C (20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton Ave/Bellevue Ave</td>
<td>C (25.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Ave/Corby Ave</td>
<td>B (16.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Ave/Corby Ave</td>
<td>A (9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Rd/ Hwy 12 EB ramps</td>
<td>C (23.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Rd/ Hwy 12 WB ramps</td>
<td>D (37.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Ave/101 SB ramps (Moorland Ave)</td>
<td>B (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Ave/ US 101 NB ramps (Santa Rosa Ave)</td>
<td>C (24.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Overcrossing US 101/Santa Rosa Ave</td>
<td>D (40.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton Ave Extension/Northpoint Pkwy</td>
<td>B (10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright-Fulton Rd/Hwy 12 WB ramps</td>
<td>C (30.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue Overcrossing/Santa Rosa Avenue</td>
<td>D (42.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue/Dowd Drive</td>
<td>B (12.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-4-Less Shopping Center/Stony Point Rd</td>
<td>C (29.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue/Burbank/Northpoint Pkwy Extension</td>
<td>C (31.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Santa Rosa circulation level of service standard is based on arterial corridors, not individual intersections.

Therefore, this table providing intersection level of service data is for informational purposes only, not for the purpose of determining whether a traffic impact is significant.
Impact 2
No significant impact is expected on Highway 12 if auxiliary lanes are added between the Stony Point Road and Dutton Avenue interchanges. But the project, along with cumulative traffic growth, would have a significant impact (LOS "D" or worse) on US 101 at certain areas from Wilfred Avenue to Highway 12 (See Table 6). Average travel speeds would be as low as 43 MPH during the PM peak hour. This is an unavoidable significant impact (S).

The level of service on the freeway mainline has been analyzed based on ongoing work for the US 101 widening project. This information has been used for consistency. The general modeling framework of the two studies is generally similar, although the US 101 study has analyzed in greater detail the impacts of high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and actual traffic operations on US 101 freeway. The US 101 widening study is based on the year 2030 in the area of the project. The analysis results are shown in Table 6. The results for Highway 12 are based on 2020 conditions from the Santa Rosa City Traffic Model.

The table shows that traffic conditions along Highway 12 would generally be good, even during peak hours. Traffic LOS on US 101 would be metered by upstream and downstream bottlenecks. Some of these bottlenecks exist today (e.g., through downtown Santa Rosa), and others would develop in the future (e.g., in the northbound direction at the Golf Course Drive interchange in Rohnert Park). These bottlenecks generally keep traffic flow to LOS “C” or “D”, although the southbound traffic between Highway 12 and Baker would experience “E” and “F” conditions. Segments bolded in the table do not meet Caltrans desired standard of LOS “C/D” operation.

Because of changes in land uses (especially increased job and retailing opportunities in Santa Rosa), the predominant directionality of traffic during peak hours will shift. The predominant traffic flow between Todd Road and Highway 12 will be northbound in the morning, and southbound in the evening.

Mitigation Measure 2 (S)
Add auxiliary lanes in both directions between Stony Point Road and Dutton Avenue. These lanes would be needed as a result both of cumulative traffic growth in western Sonoma County and Santa Rosa, as well as the Southwest Area.

The cumulative impact of traffic volumes would cause the US 101 freeway in the area to operate below Caltrans’ level of service standard during the peak hours. Possible mitigation options include:

- Removing HOV lane restriction on US 101 (added lanes open to all traffic).
- Widening US 101 to 8 basic lanes in critical areas (Wilfred Avenue-Golf Course Drive to Highway 12).
- Implementing SMART proposals for light rail or commuter rail services on the Northwestern Pacific Railroad line.
- Activating ramp metering installed as part of the widening projects.

*This EIR, to be consistent with the US 101 traffic projections in the Sonoma County US 101 PA/ED, uses 2030 traffic projections. The US 101 study considers only 2010 and 2030, and the 2030 projections were considered to better reflect long range/build out traffic.*
### TABLE 6

**Year 2020 Freeway Mainline Levels of Service with Southwest Area Plan Improvements, 4:30-5:30 PM**

Volumes expressed in vehicles per hour (VPH), rounded  
m=volume in mixed-flow (unrestricted) lanes, h= volume in HOV lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Dir</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Todd-Bellevue**</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>4,200m 975h</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3,850m 1,200h</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Bellevue-Hearn (Yolanda)*</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>3,700m 850h</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3,700m 1,075h</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Hearn Ave.-Baker Ave.</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>4,150m 1,100h</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3,700m 1,200h</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Baker Ave – Highway 12</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>4,900m 925h</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>4,400m 1,200h</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>US 101-Dutton</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>C/D</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dutton-Stony Point Road*</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>C/D</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stony Point Road to Wright-Fulton Road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**  
Assumes HOV lanes on US 101 would be operative during peak hours in both directions. Bolded entries do not meet Caltrans' standard. * Assumes addition of auxiliary lanes between adjacent on and off ramps.

**Sources:** For US 101, Parsons Transportation Group, "Year 2030 Traffic Operations Analysis- Measures of Effectiveness, CORSIM Analysis Results, 3/23/04." For Highway 12, based on Dowling Associates' analysis of 2020 traffic demand.
Because there is presently no commitment by Caltrans or SCTA to implement these mitigation measures, because they may be contrary to current adopted policies, and because of their uncertainty, Impact 2, as described above, would remain significant and unavoidable. This impact has been noted in the General Plan and other planning studies done for the Southwest Area. (S)

**Impact 3**
The demand for transit trips in the area would increase. Existing transit services in the area have available capacity, so the extent of the impact would depend upon how much services were expanded to serve new demand. The City's Transit and Parking Department has expressed concern that it may not be able to expand service unless additional funding is found. This is not a significant impact (I).

**Mitigation Measure 3 (I)**

Although impacts to transit are not expected to be significant, several measures to improve transit services could be implemented to further reduce impacts. The measures described below were included in the Southwest Area Plan EIR.

The City's *Long Range Transit Plan* (June 1990) provides for an array of bus service improvements based on public input and technical analysis. These improvements include:

- Additional routes and route extension building on the current system;
- Additional weekday and Saturday night service until 11 PM;
- New commute-oriented bus service during weekday peak hours only;
- Additional Sunday service (an hour earlier and later); and
- Expansion of transportation systems management programs citywide.

The *Long Range Transit Plan* proposes expansion areas in the quadrant bounded by S. Wright Road, Ludwig Avenue, and the existing Route 20; and the area bounded by Hearn, South Dutton Avenue, Bellevue Avenue, and Corby Avenue. These are identified as long-term service need areas. This plan notes that, "beyond the baseline system, additional revenue sources are needed to implement most of the short term improvements and all of the long term improvements" (page 2-13). However, the added population and retail activity in the Southwest Area will contribute sales tax revenues (transportation development act money) that will provide operating support to CityBus.

The Northwestern Pacific Railroad right-of-way provides a significant opportunity for providing a high-capacity, high-quality transit service in the Southwest Area. The Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) authority is currently studying various options for using the NWP for transit purposes in the future. The Southwest Area Plan notes that the NWP tracks at Bellevue Avenue would be a logical location for a transit station.
Even if no rail transit is operated on the NWP for many years, the sites could be used as bus transfer centers and/or park-and-ride lots for commuters on Highway 101. Early identification of sites would enhance the facilities' compatibility with neighbors, and denser uses should be considered around these future station locations.

There has been discussion of providing express (commuter-oriented) bus service along Stony Point Road in the future, at least as far south as Rohnert Park, and possibly to Petaluma. Other measures to promote transit service could include:

- Locating bus turnouts along major (arterial) streets with existing/potential bus service in the Southwest Area; bus stop locations should be coordinated with CityBus and SCT staff.
- Making reasonable and justified reductions in parking requirements where an aggressive transit or TSM program is agreed to by the developer.
- Implementing the City's Long Range Transit Plan.
- Use of shared parking facilities where multi-use sites are developed.
- Encouraging site plans with buildings located close to streets (and thus bus stops), rather than traditional developments where buildings are set back many hundreds of feet and surrounded by a "sea" of parking.
- Encouraging site plans that provide clear and convenient pedestrian access between major activity centers and nearby bus stops. Discourage artificial barriers to pedestrian circulation, such as walls or fences. These barriers inhibit both walking and transit travel.

**Impact 4**

The project would increase vehicular traffic, including use of local and collector streets in developed portions of the Southwest area. This is a potentially significant impact. (PS)

**Mitigation Measure 4 (I)**

Several techniques are available for improving the residential street environment.

**Street Design.** Incorporation of good street designs is by far the best way to reduce traffic speeds on local streets and improve the residential environment. This can be done by avoiding long, straight streets that encourage high speeds; liberal use of "T" intersections (to reduce speeds and the number of conflicts at intersections); and providing a street system that encourages people to use collector and arterial streets, rather than local streets, for longer trips. Other techniques (usually involving a traffic control device, or road undulations or "chokers") can be used to mitigate problems on existing streets, but are often not as effective. Good transportation planning makes it unattractive for pass-through traffic to enter a neighborhood.
Neighborhood Traffic Management. Techniques that can be used on both existing and proposed streets include:

- Traffic chokers at intersections. These create a "bulbed" effect at intersections, and so reduce pedestrian crossing distance of streets, and tend to reduce vehicle speeds. These should be used primarily on residential and minor collector streets.

- Speed humps, or "undulations." These differ from more traditional "speed bumps" in that they have a longer cross-section (typically 12-14 feet). Modest reductions in average speed can sometimes be achieved with speed humps, typically 5 MPH. Advanced signage should be placed in conjunction with the humps. The cross-section length can be adjusted to accommodate different speeds of traffic (longer cross-sections for higher speeds).

The use of all-way STOP signs for speed control should only be used as a last resort. Numerous studies have indicated that these devices are ineffective at controlling overall speeds, and may actually cause people to speed up between intersections (although they reduce speeds near the intersection). Where not required to stop by traffic, studies have shown that 40-60% of all vehicles will only come to a rolling stop (below 5 MPH), and 20-40% will pass through at higher speeds. STOP signs should be used where warranted by high traffic volumes, or where sight lines are restricted enough to create a potential safety hazard.

Street connections should be provided between adjacent subdivisions wherever topography permits and the connection would not encourage "cut through" traffic in one (or both) subdivisions. Street connections should allow local, short distance trips (such as between home and school) to avoid use of busy arterial streets, thereby reducing vehicle-miles of travel and congestion. They also provide shorter paths for pedestrians and cyclists, and also facilitate emergency vehicle access.

Impact 5
The project would increase the demand for non-motorized transportation in the area, i.e., bicycle and pedestrian travel. This is not a significant impact (I).

The major pedestrian and bicycle attractors in the Southwest would be:

- Public parks located throughout the area
- Public schools (shown in Figure 6)
- Shopping/commercial areas, such as the Sebastopol Road shopping district and the proposed new community/neighborhood center in Dutton Meadows


Mitigation Measure 5.1

The pedestrian needs have been addressed through the policies of the Southwest Area Plan, which include:

- A well-connected internal circulation system that minimizes pedestrian crossings of major streets to the extent possible
- Mixed land uses that minimize distances for daily trip activities and thus promote walking and cycling as alternatives to driving
- Provision of sidewalks on streets

Proposed bikeway routes would include the Petaluma & Santa Rosa Railroad right-of-way (Joe Rodota Trail) to Sebastopol; Santa Rosa Creek bikeway; Colgan and Roseland Creek Trails; and Class II bike lanes along S. Wright Road, Corporate Center Parkway, Fresno Avenue, Stony Point Road, Dutton Avenue, Sebastopol Road, Northpoint Parkway (and extensions), and Bellevue-Ludwig Avenue. This would provide an extensive grid of bicycle routes to serve the major attractions for bicycle trips in the area.
Southwest Santa Rosa Plan Area
Dowling Associates, Inc.

Proposed Elementary School
Proposed Middle School
Existing School Locations

The proposed locations are not specific; they merely indicate that a school is needed in the vicinity.

Figure 6: Existing and Proposed School Locations

Existing and Proposed School Locations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIR Project #</th>
<th>Assessor’s Parcel No. (APN)</th>
<th>TAZ #</th>
<th>Number of Acres in Project Parcel</th>
<th>City General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Density Per General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Total Allowable Units</th>
<th>General Plan Mid-Point Density</th>
<th>Proposed Density of Projects</th>
<th>Density Difference (new units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>043072014 043072015</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.2 ac = MDR 3.2 ac = MLDR</td>
<td>33.6-75.6 units 25.6-41.8 units</td>
<td>59.2-117.2 units</td>
<td>85.6 units</td>
<td>66 single-family detached</td>
<td>53.4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74 multi-family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>043072017</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>MLDR</td>
<td>46.4-75.4 units 46.4-75.4 units</td>
<td>58 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 single-family detached</td>
<td>4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 single-family attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>043071010</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>MLDR</td>
<td>23.2-37.7 units 23.2-37.7 units</td>
<td>29 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 units</td>
<td>3 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>134022007</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>14.82-59.28 units 14.82-59.28 units</td>
<td>37.05 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>43 single-family detached</td>
<td>15.95 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 multi-family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>043111005 043111006</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>22.64-90.56 units 22.64-90.56 units</td>
<td>56.8 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 single-family detached</td>
<td>25.4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>134042025</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>6.47 ac = MDR 6.47 ac = LD/OS</td>
<td>51.76-116.46 units 12.94-51.76 units</td>
<td>64.7-168.22 units</td>
<td>109.99 units</td>
<td>54 single-family detached</td>
<td>(0.99 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55 multi-family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>043121010</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>2-8 units 2-8 units</td>
<td>5 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 units</td>
<td>3 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>043121006</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>64-144 units 64-144 units</td>
<td>104 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>102 single-family detached</td>
<td>2 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 common parcels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>043121007</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>42.8-96.3 units 42.8-96.3 units</td>
<td>69.55 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>72 single-family attached</td>
<td>20.45 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 multi-family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>043122011</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>49.52-111.42 units 49.52-111.42 units</td>
<td>80.47 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>84 multi-family</td>
<td>3.53 units +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR Project #</td>
<td>Assessor's Parcel No. (APN)</td>
<td>TAZ #</td>
<td>Number of Acres in Project Parcel</td>
<td>City General Plan Designation</td>
<td>Density Per General Plan Designation</td>
<td>Total Allowable Units</td>
<td>General Plan Mid-Point Density</td>
<td>Proposed Density of Projects</td>
<td>Density Difference (new units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>125551016 125551018</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>39.2-88.2 units</td>
<td>39.2-88.2 units</td>
<td>63.7 units</td>
<td>64 single-family detached</td>
<td>0.3 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.8 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>134042043 134042041 134042010</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>LD/OS</td>
<td>16.6-66.4 units</td>
<td>16.6-66.4 units</td>
<td>33.2 units</td>
<td>64 units</td>
<td>30.8 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>134042041 134042010</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>23.86-95.44 units</td>
<td>23.86-95.44 units</td>
<td>59.65 units</td>
<td>95 units</td>
<td>35.35 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>035063028 125551018</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>8-32 units</td>
<td>8-32 units</td>
<td>20 units</td>
<td>24 single-family detached</td>
<td>20 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 multi-family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>134022049</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>MLDR</td>
<td>40-65 units</td>
<td>40-65 units</td>
<td>50 units</td>
<td>72 multi-family</td>
<td>23.4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>125521003 125521004</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.6 ac = MDR 0.36 ac = LDR</td>
<td>28.8-64.8 units 0.72-2.88 units</td>
<td>29.52-67.88 units</td>
<td>48.6 units</td>
<td>72 multi-family</td>
<td>(5 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>043121001</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>8-32 units</td>
<td>8-32 units</td>
<td>20 units</td>
<td>34 single-family detached</td>
<td>7.55 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>043111007</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>2.3 ac = LD/OS 3.45 ac = LDR</td>
<td>4.6-19.4 units 6.9-27.6 units</td>
<td>11.5-46 units</td>
<td>26.45 units</td>
<td>34 single-family detached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>043071027 043071035 043071036</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>7.58-30.32 units</td>
<td>7.58-30.32 units</td>
<td>16.95 units</td>
<td>9 single-family detached</td>
<td>(5.95 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 multi-family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>035102036 035102037</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>3-12 units</td>
<td>3-12 units</td>
<td>7.5 units</td>
<td>12 single-family detached</td>
<td>4.5 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>043121011</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>4.04-16.16 units</td>
<td>4.04-16.16 units</td>
<td>10.10 units</td>
<td>16 units</td>
<td>5.9 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>035101004</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>13.74-54.96 units</td>
<td>13.74-54.96 units</td>
<td>34.35 units</td>
<td>39 single-family detached</td>
<td>4.65 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR Project #</td>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel No. (APN)</td>
<td>TAZ #</td>
<td>Number of Acres in Project Parcel</td>
<td>City General Plan Designation</td>
<td>Density Per General Plan Designation</td>
<td>Total Allowable Units</td>
<td>General Plan Mid-Point Density</td>
<td>Proposed Density of Projects</td>
<td>Density Difference (new units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>035063003</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.9 ac = LDR, 1.6 ac = LD/OS 2.2 ac = Retail and Business Services</td>
<td>11.8-47.2 units</td>
<td>15-60 units</td>
<td>35.9 units</td>
<td>110 condos</td>
<td>74.1 units + 7,459 sf Retail/Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>035063004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2-12.8 units</td>
<td>33,541 sf Retail/Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000 sf retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>035063005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,541 sf Retail/Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000 sf office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>035063006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,541 sf Retail/Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>666 sf Light Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>134042017</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>LD/OS</td>
<td>5.4-21.6 units</td>
<td>5.4-21.6 units</td>
<td>10.8 units</td>
<td>Unknown—assume 21.6 units</td>
<td>10.8 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134042042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134042048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>134042011</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>LD/OS</td>
<td>14.8-59.2 units</td>
<td>14.8-59.2 units</td>
<td>29.6 units</td>
<td>Unknown — assume 59.2 units</td>
<td>29.6 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>134042049</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>LD/OS</td>
<td>2-8 units</td>
<td>2-8 units</td>
<td>6 units</td>
<td>4 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134042049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>043260001</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>6,534 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>6,534 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>7,200 sf (1,440 sf office + 5,760 sf whse)</td>
<td>666 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>666 sf Light Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>043260002</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>6,534 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>6,534 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>7,200 sf (1,440 sf office + 5,760 sf whse)</td>
<td>666 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>666 sf Light Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>043260010</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>25,483 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>25,483 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>32,775 sf (5,555 sf office +6,220 sf whse) (0.385 FAR)</td>
<td>7,292 sf Light Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>043260009</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>13,852 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>13,852 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>17,488 sf (3,498 sf office +13,990 sf whse) (0.375 FAR)</td>
<td>3,636 sf Light Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>043260008</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>6,534 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>6,534 sf Light Industry</td>
<td>7,200 sf (1,440 sf office + 5,760 sf whse)</td>
<td>686 sf Light Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR Project #</td>
<td>Assessor's Parcel No. (APN)</td>
<td>TAZ #</td>
<td>Number of Acres in Project Parcel</td>
<td>City General Plan Designation</td>
<td>Density Per General Plan Designation</td>
<td>Total Allowable Units</td>
<td>General Plan Mid-Point Density</td>
<td>Proposed Density of Projects</td>
<td>Density Difference (new units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LDR = 2-6 units/acre
LD/OS = 2-8 units/acre
MLDR = 8-13 units/acre
MDR = 8-18 units/acre
Retail Business Services (FAR = 0.35)
LI = Light Industrial (FAR = 0.30)
Appendix E

Water Supply Assessment
CITY OF SANTA ROSA
Water Supply Assessment
Pursuant to SB 610 for
Dutton Meadows

December 9, 2004
Acronyms

AFY – Acre-feet per year
CDFG – California Department of Fish and Game
CFR – Code of Federal Regulations
COE – Corps of Engineers
DOI – Department of Interior
EIR – Environmental Impact Report
EIS – Environmental Impact Statement
ESA – Endangered Species Act
ESU – Evolutionarily Significant Unit
FERC – Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
MGD – Million Gallons per Day
MOU – Memorandum of Understanding
NMFS – National Marine Fisheries Service
PVP – Potter Valley Project
SB – Senate Bill
SCWA – Sonoma County Water Agency
SWRCB – State Water Resources Control Board
USFWA – United States Fish and Wildlife Service
WSA – Water Supply Assessment
WSTSP – Water Supply and Transmission System Project
WYA – West Yost & Associates
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3.0 REFERENCES
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Senate Bill 610 of 2001 (SB 610) requires that water suppliers provide a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) to planning agencies for any proposed projects which, among other triggers, have more than 500 residential units. The Dutton Meadows Project (Project) will have as many as 614 residential units; a maximum non-residential development of 97,000 square feet including 84,000 square feet of retail, 3,000 square feet of public/institutional, 10,000 square feet of office; and a 4 acre park. Therefore the Project is subject to SB 610.

The WSA addresses the current water demand of the water supplier, the projected demand of the proposed project, the current and future water supply of the water supplier, and makes a determination of availability of supply for the project.

The water demand for the Project is projected to be a maximum of 266 acre-feet per year. The density and land use of the Project is consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan (General Plan), and the water demand associated for this project is included in the General Plan evaluation of water supply. The water demands for this project were also included in Sonoma County Water Agency’s (SCWA) Urban Water Management Plan 2000, which is also Santa Rosa’s Urban Water Management Plan. The City’s water supplies are currently sufficient to meet the present and future demand associated with this Project. Only a portion of the development anticipated in the City’s General Plan has occurred.

The City’s current water supply for the growth projected in the General Plan is met from a combination of sources. The primary source of supply is contractual entitlement from SCWA as defined in the Eleventh Amended Agreement for Water Supply. Additional supply is provided from Santa Rosa’s own groundwater sources. If added supply is needed before 2020, it will be provided by any combination of the following sources: possible further utilization of the City’s own groundwater resources, additional entitlement from SCWA, the City’s recycled water supplies, and conservation efforts. If all or part of the Project is developed after 2018, the demand may be met with existing supply sources, or it may be met with the combination of sources noted above.
2.0 ASSESSMENT

2.1 Introduction
The City of Santa Rosa (City) has prepared this Water Supply Assessment (WSA) pursuant to Water Code sections 10910-10915.

The proposed project is entitled The Dutton Meadows Project (Project). It involves development of as many as 614 residential units; a maximum non-residential development of 97,000 square feet including 84,000 square feet of retail, 3,000 square feet of public/institutional, 10,000 square feet of office; and a 4 acre park.

The purpose of this WSA is to perform the evaluation required by 2001 Senate Bill 610 (SB 610) in connection with the Project. It is not to reserve water, or to function as a “will serve” letter or any other form of commitment to supply water (per Water Code section 10914.) The provision of water service will continue to be undertaken in a manner consistent with applicable City policies and procedures, consistent with existing law.

2.2 Project Description

2.2.1 Description.
The Project is described in the Dutton Meadows Draft Environmental Impact Report. Because the Project is projected to have as many as 614 residential units; a maximum non-residential development of 97,000 square feet including 84,000 square feet of retail, 3,000 square feet of public/institutional, 10,000 square feet of office; and a 4 acre park, this WSA has been prepared pursuant to SB 610.

2.2.2 Water Demand
The water demand for the Project is projected to be a maximum of 266 acre-feet per year (afy). This density and land use is consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan (General Plan).

2.3 Sonoma County Water Agency
The City currently receives all of its potable water supply from the Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA). SCWA is authorized to produce and deliver potable water for municipal and industrial purposes; prevent the waste or diminution of water supplies; control and conserve flood and storm waters to reduce potential damage to life and property; provide sanitary sewage services; and provide recreational services in connection with flood control and water conservation activities. SCWA operates under direction of a Board of Directors that, for governance of the water system, consists of the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors.

SCWA delivers water, on a wholesale basis, to customers through its water transmission system. The primary water customers, collectively known as the water contractors, consist of the cities of Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Petaluma, Cotati, and Sonoma; and the North Marin, Valley of the Moon, and the Forestville Water Districts.

1 The discussion in this section is primarily based on information contained in the Sonoma County Water Agency Urban Water Management Plan 2000, in combination with other sources of information cited in the List of References attached to this WSA, including the Agency’s August 11, 2003 letter described herein.
The responsibility for supplying water to the water contractors is entrusted to SCWA under the agreement entitled Eleventh Amended Agreement for Water Supply, originally executed in 1974 and most recently amended in 2001 (Eleventh Amended Agreement). SCWA also provides water on a wholesale basis to and/or has authorized the exercise of its water rights by additional water purveyors, including but not limited to Marin Municipal Water District; the Town of Windsor; and Lawndale Mutual, Penngrove, and Kenwood Water Companies.

SCWA’s primary source of supply is the Russian River. Water is collected from the Russian River at two sites, both located near Forestville, through two Ranney collectors at Wohler and three Ranney collectors plus seven production wells at Mirabel. A sixth Ranney collector, at the Wohler site, is currently under construction and is projected to be operational in spring 2005. SCWA has constructed several infiltration ponds that surround the collectors. An inflatable dam on the Russian River raises the water level of the Russian River during periods of low flow, and diverts water through a dike into a system of ditches that supply the infiltration ponds that surround the Mirabel collectors. The backwater created by the dam also raises the upstream water level, which increases the rate of infiltration to the Wohler collectors. Permanent fish ladders provide fish passage around the dam when it is raised.

SCWA holds appropriative water rights to Russian River and Dry Creek water by virtue of an assignment to SCWA of Sonoma County’s portion of the 1949 application to the State of California for the Coyote Valley Dam Project appropriative water rights, and SCWA’s 1960 application for the Warm Springs Dam Project appropriative water rights. The combined limit on SCWA’s annual diversions under its water rights permits (Permit Nos. 12947A, 12949, 12950, and 16596) is currently 75,000 afy, with a maximum diversion rate of 180 cubic feet per second. In 2002, approximately 64,000 afy of demand was reported under these water rights permits.

SCWA has submitted petitions to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to increase its annual diversions from 75,000 afy to 101,000 afy. The financing and authorization to construct the facilities to achieve the increased diversions is in the Eleventh Amended Agreement.

SCWA also has three deep-water wells that provide additional supply. They are located near the Laguna de Santa Rosa and feed directly into SCWA’s Russian River-Cotati Intertie Pipeline. Two of these wells are permitted as active production sources, and SCWA is currently working with the California Department of Health Services to change the status of the third well from “standby” to “active” by blending well water with water pumped from SCWA’s Wohler and Mirabel facilities, resulting in a reduction of taste and odor problems. The SCWA Urban Water Management Plan 2000 (UWMP 2000) estimates the production capacity of these wells at 3,025 afy.

In 1998, SCWA’s Board of Directors certified an environmental impact report (EIR) for the Agency’s Water Supply and Transmission System Project (WSTSP) and approved the project. The objective of the WSTSP was to provide a safe, economical, and reliable water supply to meet the defined future needs of SCWA’s service area, which includes providing for the future water supply needs of the City. The WSTSP was expected to increase the amount of water SCWA diverts from the Russian River to 101,000 afy and increase SCWA’s water transmission system average-day peak month delivery capacity from 92 to 149 mgd.
In 1999, a lawsuit was filed challenging the WSTSP EIR. In 2000, the trial court found the EIR to be adequate. On May 16, 2003, however, the Court of Appeals reversed the trial court’s decision, concluding that the EIR was inadequate because it did not contain adequate cumulative impacts and alternatives analyses, and its description of the project’s environmental setting was deficient. On November 9, 2004 the SCWA adopted a resolution directing the preparation of a new EIR, the Water Supply, Transmission, and Reliability Project EIR (Water Supply EIR) to address the inadequacies of the WSTSP and to more closely reflect current water supply circumstances. The draft Water Supply EIR is scheduled to be released for public review in May 2006.

On August 11, 2003, SCWA sent a letter to its contractors, customers, and water diverters reporting under the SCWA Russian River water rights permits stating that, due to the 2003 decision of the Court of Appeals, it would be inappropriate for water suppliers to anticipate water deliveries based on diversions of 101,000 afy, or to rely on the delivery estimates of the SCWA UWMP 2000. The letter further states that SCWA reported 63,841 afy in 2002 under their current secure rights to 75,000 afy. Section 2.7 of this WSA includes a discussion of how SCWA would proceed if the 75,000 afy limit were exceeded before SCWA is able to secure additional diversion rights.

This lawsuit and other changes in regulatory and environmental requirements may delay or impact the ability of SCWA to provide the water supply specified in the Eleventh Amended Agreement. Section 2.6.1 of this WSA discusses these requirements further.

2.4 Urban Water Management Plan Review

In accordance with the California Urban Water Management Planning Act, SCWA adopted UWMP 2000 on April 17, 2001. SCWA’s UWMP 2000 is a regional plan that includes reporting for all of SCWA’s prime water contractors, including the City. SCWA incorporated data and program descriptions developed by the City into the UWMP 2000. As required by law, SCWA’s UWMP 2000 includes projected water supplies required to meet future demands through 2020. On March 6, 2001, the City adopted SCWA’s UWMP 2000 (City Resolution No. 24766). SCWA’s August 2003 letter, referenced in Section 2.3 of this WSA, states that water suppliers should not rely on the delivery estimates of UWMP 2000. It further states that the quantity of water available for diversion and rediversion, and the demand projections of the UWMP 2000, remain valid.

The water demands associated with the proposed Project were included in SCWA’s UWMP 2000 and are covered in the future demand projections as described in Section 2.5 below. In accordance with Water Code section 10910(c)(2), information from SCWA’s UWMP 2000 and SCWA’s August 2003 letter, along with updated supplemental information from the General Plan and the City of Santa Rosa Water Supply Analysis developed by West Yost and Associates (WYA) in March 2002 (Water Supply Analysis) were used to prepare this WSA.

2.5 Demand Analysis

The City’s water demand consists of approximately 72 percent residential and 28 percent non-residential (which includes commercial, industrial, institutional and semi-
public) use. Total average day water demands have increased over the last ten years at an average annual rate of approximately 1.1 percent from 19.1 mgd (21,400 afa) to 21.5 mgd (23,990 afa). The highest annual water use over the last ten-year period occurred in 2001, at 21.5 mgd (23,990 afa), and the highest average-day peak month demand over the last ten-year period occurred in July 1997 at 32.7 mgd.

The relatively slow increase in water use is most likely caused by a number of factors, including the success of an aggressive water conservation effort by the City which has resulted in a 1,900 afa reduction in water use since 1992. The General Plan provides the framework for future development within the City's Urban Boundary. The General Plan estimates a total population of 195,300 by the year 2020 (which is the planning horizon for the General Plan), and a buildout population of approximately 210,100.

The City's Water Supply Analysis estimates short term and long-term water demands. This analysis evaluated two scenarios: a high water demand with conservation, above average weather conditions, and service to private systems (systems now deriving water supply from private wells); and a low water demand with conservation, moderate weather conditions, and no service to private systems. Under the first scenario, Santa Rosa's 2020 demand would be about 35,300 afa; under the second scenario, water demand would be 30,500 afa. At buildout (approximately 2027 if an average of 950 dwelling units are built annually), under the first scenario, water demand would be about 37,750 afa; under the second scenario, water demand would be about 32,700 afa. The General Plan assumes that the midpoint of the high and low scenarios, or 32,900 afa, will be Santa Rosa's 2020 water demand. For planning purposes, Santa Rosa's Utilities Department is pursuing development of additional water supply for the high demand scenario because it seems likely that the City may need to provide water service for sites currently served by private wells if known groundwater contamination migrates. The City has also requested that the Sonoma County Water Agency augment the City's annual entitlement, and is working with the Agency to this end. This additional supply is expected to be needed in 2024 if the low demand scenario is realized, in 2018 if the midpoint is realized, and in 2011 if the high demand scenario is realized.

2.6 Summary of City's Water Supplies

Santa Rosa's currently receives all of its potable water supply from SCWA. In November 2004, Santa Rosa approved a plan use some of its own groundwater supply to meet future demands. It is expected that both sources of supply will ultimately be used to supply the Project.

In accordance with Water Code section 10910, the City of Santa Rosa presents the following summary of its water supply:

2.6.1 Existing surface water supply

Table 1 shows the actual volume of water delivered to the City in 2000, and projected volumes of water available for use by the City in a normal year, by source of supply. This table, from the SCWA UWMP illustrates Santa Rosa's supply sources through 2020.
Table 1 - Quantity of water available in normal year (acre-feet) - actual and projecteda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCWA</td>
<td>23,312</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>29,100</td>
<td>29,100</td>
<td>29,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherb</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23,337</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td>34,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the Eleventh Amended Agreement, the City's water entitlement from SCWA is an average-day peak month supply of 56.6 mgd and a volume of 29,100 afy. The Eleventh Amended Agreement contains cutback provisions to manage water allocation in the event of either a water or transmission capacity shortage. These cutback provisions are discussed further in Section 2.7 of this WSA.

The following conditions, which are discussed in more detail below or in other sections of this WSA, could affect the City's long term sustainable water supply available from SCWA: results of a Section 7 consultation being undertaken on the Russian River; the temporary impairment condition on the SCWA transmission system; seasonal hydrologic constraints on the Russian River diversion facilities; future operation of the Potter Valley Project; and completion of SCWA's Water Supply EIR. The following is a discussion of these conditions, with the exception of the Water Supply EIR, which was discussed in Section 2.3 of this WSA.

Section 7 Consultation. On October 31, 1996, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) published a final notice of determination listing Coho Salmon as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) within the Central California Coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU), which includes the Russian River. On August 18, 1997, NMFS published a final notice of determination listing steelhead as threatened under the ESA within the Central California Coast ESU, also including the Russian River. On September 16, 1999, the California Coast ESU of Chinook Salmon was listed by NMFS as threatened.

In accordance with Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, federal agencies must consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or NMFS (depending on the species) to "insure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by such agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of

---

a From SCWA UWMP, Table 3-2.
b From a variety of sources: City's groundwater, SCWA supply defined to be available in Chapter 3 of the UWMP, and additional reuse and conservation. Calculated as the difference between total and sum of water purchased from SCWA and recycled water. Chapter 3 of the UWMP identifies natural flow of Dry Creek and the Russian River, diversions from the Eel River made by PG&E's Potter Valley Project, and groundwater as the sources of SCWA's water supply. Deliver to the City of "other" water from SCWA assumes the execution of additional contract(s) that would increase the City's annual delivery entitlement. Such additional contract(s) would require the completion of additional environmental documentation and application(s) to the SWRCB for additional water diversion or rediversion rights, as appropriate.
designated critical habitat..." (50 CFR §402). The operation of Warm Springs and Coyote Valley dams and SCWA’s rubber dam and fish screens all fall within the provisions of Section 7. Operation of facilities provided in SCWA’s proposed WSTSP is also subject to Section 7 consultation.

In December 1997, the Corps of Engineers (COE), as the federal sponsor of the above two flood control and water supply projects, and SCWA, as the local sponsor, entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with NMFS to begin the Section 7 consultation process. As part of the Section 7 consultation, a Biological Assessment was prepared to study the impact of current and potential future operations of facilities on the listed species in the Russian River. The final Biological Assessment was completed in September 2004. A Biological Opinion expected late 2005. Conditions included in the Biological Opinion may require further environmental compliance. It is anticipated that compliance with conditions in the Biological Opinion and any necessary further environmental review could take up to two years from the date of the Biological Opinion to complete.

The outcome of the Section 7 consultation could result in modifications to SCWA’s current operation. The potential impact of the Section 7 consultation on future SCWA water supply yield and reliability is unknown at this time.

Temporary Impairment Condition. On December 7, 1999, SCWA’s Board of Directors adopted a resolution finding that the reliable summertime (June – September) water production capacity of the existing water transmission system is currently limited to an average monthly delivery capacity of 84 mgd. Based on this finding, the Agency’s Board of Directors declared that the water transmission system is temporarily impaired due to litigation and regulatory constraints which have delayed the construction of Collector No. 6 that was authorized by the Tenth Amended Agreement.

Allocation of the 84 mgd is addressed in a MOU between SCWA and its water customers. The MOU (dated June 19, 2000) provides the City with the average-day peak month delivery rates listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: City’s Allocation of SCWA Supply During June through September Months Pursuant to Temporary Impairment MOU(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average-Day Peak Month Delivery Rate, mgd(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Adapted from Table 6 of City of Santa Water Supply Analysis (March 21, 2002).

Though the MOU establishes the peak month average day goals in the table above, the MOU allows the City to use water in excess of the MOU allocation, without penalty, as long as the amount of water used does not exceed the entitlement of 50 mgd in the Tenth Amended Agreement. Therefore, although the MOU may seem to be limiting the City’s water supply until 2005, the City does have the ability to use up to its full Tenth Amendment entitlement if actual increases in water demand exceed the MOU allocation. Given that the City’s
highest peak month average demand was 32.7 mgd, and the cooperative rather than regulatory nature of the MOU, the conditions of the MOU do not present a constraint on the City’s ability to deliver water to current and future demands on the City’s water system.

**Seasonal Constraint.** The ability of the Russian River to produce water is generally limited by the rate of recharge to the aquifer through the streambed. To augment this recharge capacity, SCWA has constructed several infiltration ponds that surround the SCWA collectors as described in Section 2.2 of this WSA.

SCWA's water production capacity is complex and will vary from year to year based on a number of factors. In any given year, SCWA's production needs depend on demands, which are a function of temperature, precipitation and growth; and hydrologic conditions, which are a function of groundwater levels and the permeability of the river bed, that vary based on the number and duration of storm events. A SCWA analysis of water trends from 1997 to 1999 concluded that stressed hydrologic conditions occurred in the fall/early winter, followed by non-stressed conditions in the winter, and stressed conditions again in the spring, prior to the rubber dam being raised (Robert Beach and Jay Jasperse, SCWA, 9/00). Stressed hydrologic conditions are determined by monitoring groundwater levels and noting the decline in water levels as SCWA pumps water to meet demands.

SCWA staff is continuing to analyze the seasonal constraint and its potential impact on the ability to provide water to its customers. As non-peak demands continue to rise, SCWA will increasingly rely on using the inflatable dam more continuously throughout the year. Should SCWA be precluded from using the dam due to mechanical or environmental constraints, the production capacity of SCWA’s transmission system could be temporarily impaired.

**Future Operation of the Potter Valley Project.** Since 1908, an estimated 160,000 afy has been diverted from the Eel River to the Russian River as a result of the operation of the PG&E Potter Valley Project (PVP). The Eel River water is diverted through an inter-watershed tunnel to PG&E’s hydroelectric facility in Potter Valley. Thereafter, the water is stored in Lake Mendocino and released to augment summer flows and maintain minimum streamflow requirements in the Russian River.

A new license issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to PG&E for the PVP in 1983 required PG&E, in cooperation with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and USFWS, to carry out a 10-year fish monitoring study in cooperation with NMFS. After completion of the study, a proposed flow schedule reducing Eel River diversions to the Russian River by approximately 15 percent (in an effort to improve Eel River fisheries) was submitted to FERC. PG&E has been voluntarily implementing the recommended flow schedule since the summer of 1999. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that presented the impacts of two proposed flow schedules was released in 1999. Since that time, other proposals have been submitted for FERC’s consideration.

In April 1999, as an alternative to the PG&E/FERC proposal, the Department of Interior (DOI)/NMFS jointly submitted a flow proposal which would
result in lower PVP imports to the Russian River. In May 2000, FERC issued its final EIS recommending the PG&E flow proposal with PVP Irrigation District modifications. In January 2004, FERC issued its final order on the flow regime. The FERC order supports an approximately 15% reduction in summer flows, and is close to the voluntary flow schedule that has been in place since the summer of 1999. This reflects the current condition of the Potter Valley Project diversion.

2.6.2 Groundwater supply

Santa Rosa has received all its potable water supply from SCWA for over 25 years. Prior to the availability of SCWA supplies, local groundwater was the primary water supply source for Santa Rosa. Since the mid 1990's, Santa Rosa has had an adopted Capital Improvement Program for the development of the City's groundwater resources to provide an 8.7 mgd emergency groundwater supply suitable for potable use by the City. In 2004, Santa Rosa began to evaluate the use of some of its groundwater for regular supply to both add diversity to Santa Rosa's supply sources and to provide the supply needed for the growth anticipated in the General Plan.

On August 5, 2004, the Santa Rosa Board of Public Utilities accepted the study Evaluation of Potential Impacts Associated with Increased Groundwater Production from Farmers Lane Wells, W41 and W4-2 (WYA, 2004), and directed staff to proceed with an initial study pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act on converting these two wells from standby to production. On November 4, 2004 the Santa Rosa Board of Public Utilities adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation and Monitoring Program for conversion of the Farmers Lane Wells from standby to active status. Application to the California Department of Health Services for the conversion will be made in early 2005. It is expected that this water supply will become part of Santa Rosa's regular supply within the period covered by the General Plan.

A detailed description of the groundwater basin from which the Farmers Lane wells are supplied, as well as the determination of reliable yield and recharge potential is presented in the study Evaluation of Potential Impacts Associated with Increased Groundwater Production from Farmers Lane Wells, W41 and W4-2 noted above. The following summary from that study is presented in accordance with Water Code section 10910:

Santa Rosa's Farmers Lane wells are located near the mouth of Bennett Valley on the east side of the Santa Rosa Plain. The major geologic formations underlying the vicinity of the Farmers Lane wells include the Younger Alluvium, the Older Alluvium, the Glen Ellen and Huichica Formations, the Sonoma Volcanics, the Wilson Grove Formation and the Petaluma Formation. The wells are located within a major regional fault zone comprised of the Rodgers Creek and Healdsburg fault zones. The wells are 800 and 1000 feet deep and draw from the deep aquifer which is predominately Sonoma Volcanics. This basin is not adjudicated nor has it been identified as overdrafted or to become overdrafted by the Department of Water Resources.

Review of groundwater level data from Farmers Lane wells and six nearby California Department of Water Resources monitoring wells (1/2 to one mile from
the Farmers Lane wells) show no change in groundwater levels over the 15 years which were reviewed. The Farmers Lane wells have been in an artesian condition for years. Recharge to the basin is estimated to be at least 2,500 acre feet annually. Santa Rosa intends to utilize between 1,700 and 2,300 acre feet annually from this source.

The Mitigation and Monitoring Program for this project includes groundwater level monitoring and modified pumping if any decline in groundwater levels is detected.

2.7 Water Supply Sufficiency Determination

Analysis of projected water supply from SCWA during normal, single dry year and multiple dry year conditions in SCWA's UWMP indicates that at no time between now and 2020 does SCWA expect to enter into a water shortage due to water availability. This conclusion by SCWA is based on modeling 1962 as the average water year, 1977 as the single driest water year, and 1990-92 as the multiple dry water years. This analysis indicates that Santa Rosa should not experience a drought-related water shortage from SCWA supplies from the present time to 2020.

As mentioned in Section 2.3, SCWA presently has surface water rights to 75,000 afy, and has filed to increase that amount to 101,000 afy as part of the WSTSP. Though diversion under these water rights is currently 64,000 afy, it is possible that diversions will reach 75,000 afy before SCWA is able to secure additional diversion rights. If demand exceeds 75,000 afy, taking into account other local supplies available to contractors, before those filings are approved, water supply reductions will be administered in accordance with applicable contract provisions or other arrangements where applicable. For the City and the other parties to the Eleventh Amended Agreement, the shortage provisions are defined in section 3.5 of that agreement. The shortage apportionment methodology relies, in large part, on peak month entitlement, and Santa Rosa currently holds entitlement to 42% of the collective peak month entitlement of the parties to the Eleventh Amended Agreement.

Because certain factors in the shortage apportionment language in the Eleventh Amended Agreement are not defined, in September, 2003, the Santa Rosa City Council approved a resolution recommending to the SCWA Board the adoption of a plan for implementing section 3.5 of the Eleventh Amended Agreement that takes into account the varying levels of water conservation efforts among the water contractors served by SCWA. The goal of this recommendation is to assure that agencies that have had aggressive conservation programs are not penalized by the use of “percentage reduction from historic consumption” to determine shortage allocations, and to not create a disincentive for future conservation savings.

To support this recommendation, the City contracted with WYA to perform an illustrative analysis consistent with the shortage provisions of the Eleventh Amended Agreement. This analysis, Methodology for Implementation of Shortage Provisions in the Eleventh Amended Agreement for Water Supply and Related Agreements (WYA, September, 2003), shows that if SCWA uses an average per capita methodology for determining the allocation of water under a shortage, the City, and others agencies with low per capita use, will have the full annual volume of the Eleventh Amended Agreement available under a scenario where SCWA has 75,000 afy. The City requested
that SCWA adopt this plan and is working with SCWA and the parties to the Eleventh Amended Agreement to refine the methodology and have it adopted by the SCWA Board.

With regards to transmission system capacity, as discussed in Section 2.6 of this WSA, the temporary impairment found by SCWA's Board of Directors in December 1999 resulted in a request by SCWA that all water contractors reduce their demands on the transmission system according to projected peak month demand projections during the months of June through September in years 2001 through 2005. SCWA expects this impairment to be temporary.

In 2001, the City undertook the Incremental Recycled Water Program, which includes plans for recycled water urban reuse efforts. The Program outlines a water recycling alternative that can replace Santa Rosa potable water sources (not including private groundwater supply sources) up to a maximum of 2,200 afy upon implementation and 4,400 afy by 2020. In November 2003 the program EIR was certified, and in March 2004 the Final Master Plan was adopted. During 2004 and 2005, the City will begin designing individual projects that are consistent with the Final Master Plan, with operation beginning prior to 2010.

Currently the City has adequate supply to meet existing demands plus the maximum anticipated demand associated with Project. The City’s current water supply for the growth projected in the General Plan is met from a combination of sources. The primary source of supply is contractual entitlement from SCWA as defined in the Eleventh Amended Agreement for Water Supply. Additional supply is provided from Santa Rosa’s own groundwater sources. If added supply is needed before 2020, it will be provided by any combination of the following sources: possible further utilization of the City’s own groundwater resources, additional entitlement from SCWA, the City’s recycled water supplies, and conservation efforts. If all or part of the Project is developed after 2018, the demand may be met with existing supply sources, or it may be met with the combination of sources noted above.
2.8 Conclusions

The City is the public water supplier under SB 610 for the Dutton Meadows Project.

The water demands for this project were included in SCWA's UWMP 2000 and the City's General Plan.

At this time, the City finds that its water supplies are sufficient to meet the present and future demand associated with this Project, as that demand is estimated in Section 2.2.2 and as discussed in Section 2.7 of this WSA.

This WSA is valid as of the date approved by the City Council. This WSA is applicable only to the project described in this assessment.
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Note to Readers: The Biological Assessment (BA) was prepared to initiate consultation with US Fish and Wildlife Service. For the purposed of this Draft EIR, it was used as a source of information for vegetation, habitat, and wildlife resources present onsite and for evaluation of potential impacts to these resources; this information is current and accurate. Since completion of the BA, the mitigation for impacts to vegetation, habitat, and wildlife resources has been updated and revised through consultation with US Fish and Wildlife Service. Information in the BA on mitigation is no longer applicable. The revised mitigation measures are included in the text of the Draft SEIR in Section 3.6.3.
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1.0 Introduction

Trumark Companies proposes to develop approximately 55.88 acres for residential and commercial development within the southwestern section of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California. Development activities would result in the fill of 4.37 acres of seasonal wetlands and drainage ditch habitat identified by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) within the boundaries of the Dutton Meadows properties. Corps permits/authorizations are currently being sought by Trumark Companies to authorize phased development of the Dutton Meadows project (File No.'s 26341N, 25336N, and 26342N). Previous Corps authorization was obtained under Nationwide Permit 39 (File No. 24554N) allowing the discharge of fill into 0.16 acres of waters of the United States on the DM Associates, LLC (a.k.a. Bellevue Ranch Phase – 8) on May 8, 2001. Wetland and species mitigation required for Permit 24554N has been completed.

Material presented in this document has been prepared to assist the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in evaluating potential project related impacts and proposed mitigation measures for the Dutton Meadows project (“the project”). The purpose of this biological assessment (BA) is to review the proposed Dutton Meadows project site in sufficient detail to determine to what extent the proposed action may affect any threatened, endangered, proposed, or sensitive species that may occur.

More specifically, this document focuses on impacts the proposed development project may have on potential California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*) habitat. There have been no recorded sightings of California tiger salamanders on the Dutton Meadows project site during California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) protocol surveys performed in 2001 and 2002 and a breeding habitat survey conducted during the spring 2003 breeding season. Based on the negative findings obtained during these surveys, it has been assumed that the species could potentially utilize portions of the Property as aestivation habitat. Since the California tiger salamander is presumed to be absent from the Property, the project would not result in the degradation or elimination of occupied habitat, reduce the number or restrict the range of the species and will not directly contribute to a loss of an individual.

Based on assumed presence, development activities would result in the elimination of 42.03 acres of potential California tiger salamander aestivation habitat at the Dutton Meadows development site. Proposed mitigation includes the creation of breeding ponds and the preservation of known occupied habitat within a large preserve setting. It has therefore been determined that all potential impacts to California tiger salamander, with the implementation of the above-mentioned mitigation, have been mitigated to a level of non-significance.

This BA is prepared in accordance with legal requirements set forth under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1536(c)), and follows the standards established in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Corps is the lead federal agency for the proposed project and will oversee compliance with federal laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards required for the project, as well as any mitigation and protection measures for sensitive biological resources.
The City of Santa Rosa is the lead agency responsible for project compliance with CEQA. The City of Santa Rosa will also oversee compliance with state laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards required for the project, as well as any mitigation and protection measures for sensitive biological resources. This document presents a detailed description of the project and addresses potential impacts to sensitive biological resources in the project development area. This BA further refines the analysis of impacts to special-status species potentially occurring within the Dutton Meadows project area. This BA also addresses state-listed species as it may be used during consultation with the CDFG under Fish and Game Code Section 2081 or 2080.1, including discussion of proposed mitigation measures.

2.0 Project Description

2.1 Project Site Location

The 55.88-acre Dutton Meadows development project site is located on the Santa Rosa Plain, in the southwest part of the City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California. The site is bounded by Dutton Meadow Avenue on the west, Hearn Avenue on the north, and Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel on the southeast. Five properties (Lechmanski, Peletz, Nelson, Minoia, and DM Associates, LLC) have been combined and are collectively referred to as the Dutton Meadows Property ("the Property") and define the extent of the area discussed in this document. Attachment 1, Figure 1 shows the regional location of the Property in the Santa Rosa Plain north of San Francisco Bay. Attachment 1, Figure 2 identifies the location of the Property on a site/vicinity map of the City of Santa Rosa. Attachment 1, Figure 3 shows the project site boundary on the Santa Rosa, U.S.G.S quadrangle map. Attachment 1, Figure 4 contains an aerial photograph of the site and surrounding community. An ownership (site) map is included as Attachment 1, Figure 5.

Access to the Property is obtained by taking U.S. Highway 101 north into the City of Santa Rosa; proceed west on Hearn Avenue turning south on Dutton Meadow Avenue. The project site is located southeast of the intersection of Hearn and Dutton Meadow Avenue directly across the street from Meadow View Elementary School (Attachment 1, Figure 4).

2.2 Project Site Description

All five properties are located southeast of the intersection of Hearn Avenue and Dutton Meadow Avenue (Attachment 1, Figure 5). This area consists of existing mixed residential and agricultural lands. Residences occur on the Nelson, DM Associates, LLC, Minoia and Lechmanski properties, with homes generally positioned along Hearn Avenue and Dutton Meadow Avenue. Several of the properties contain outbuildings such as barns and sheds, and have fenced areas utilized by livestock. The areas surrounding residential properties are landscape with ornamental vegetation while the interior of the properties support a non-
native dominated grassland habitat. A remnant orchard is located on the Nelson property in the northeastern corner of the Property. No structures are present on the Peletz property.

Elevations vary from 130 feet at the northeastern corner of the Nelson property to 115 feet at the southwestern corner of the Lechmanski property draining surface flows in a southwestern direction. The Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel, an engineered flood control channel, forms the southeastern boundary of the Property. The flood control channel is the only defined drainage feature within close proximity to the Property. Meadow View Elementary School and the Southwest Community Park are located directly west of the site. Detailed descriptions of the five properties are contained below.

2.2.1 Lechmanski Property
The Lechmanski parcel (A.P. No.043-071-029) is approximately 12.05 acres in size, and has been subject to a variety of land use practices over the last several decades. The property was used as a prune orchard for many decades, but all orchard trees were removed between 13 and 15 years ago. The trees appear to have been removed by shallow excavation. The result of tree removal is that networks of small depressions remain on site. Each shallow depression indicates the position at which an orchard tree once stood. The site has been disced and used for the production of volunteer hay crops; however, the site was never planted and the discing and harvest of hay have been irregular. A residence and associated out structures occur on the western boundary of the site.

This parcel slopes very gradually from the east to the west with a relatively uniform grade from the eastern property line to the structures along the western margin of the property. The total difference in elevation from east to west is approximately five to six feet. Variations in microtopography exist throughout most of the property as a result of the small excavations left unfilled when the prune trees were removed. A roadside drainage ditch fronts Dutton Meadow Avenue. No other recognizable natural drainage patterns occur elsewhere on the property.

Soils on the Lechmanski property are mapped by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) [SCS 1978] as the ponded phase of the Clear Lake clay series; 0-2 percent slopes, and as Zamora silty clay loam, also 0-2 percent slopes. The Clear Lake clay series is a soil typically characterized by a several feet of clay, which are very impermeable once expansion cracks have closed. Water is admitted slowly and often ponds at the surface. In a native, undrained state, Clear Lake clays are listed as hydric soils by the NRCS (SCS 1991), but whether or not they are hydric depends upon local conditions. The Zamora soils are similar, although the surface soils are slightly coarser textured. Field observations of the Lechmanski property suggest that the soils are more like the Zamora series because the surface soils are not clayey.

2.2.2 Peletz Property
Two parcels (A.P. Nos. 043-191-021 and 043-200-004) make up the Peletz property. The northern parcel is approximately 2.49 acres and the southern parcel is approximately 17.01 acres; the two parcels together total approximately 19.05 acres.
These parcels appear to have been used for rural agriculture in the historical past. More recently disking has been conducted for fuel control purposes. The current property owners purchased the properties in 1960-61 and since that time they have authorized no agricultural activities. It appears that no deep plowing or planting has occurred within the last 20 years (Russ Lockner, personal communication; Barry Denenberg, personal communication). The surface soils on the 2.49-acre parcel abutting Heat Avenue (A.P. No.043-191-021) contain gravel and small pieces of asphalt. The soils in the southern 17.01-acre parcel (A.P. No.043-200-004) have been covered by what appears to be surface and subsurface soils excavated from Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel when it was widened and deepened between 1967 and 1969.

The northern 2.49-acre parcel is essentially level. Low areas occur near the western and eastern fence lines, but the soils in the depressions appear to be the same as those in the adjoining higher ground. Consequently, any fill that was placed on that parcel was minimal. The southern 17.01-acre parcel is higher along the flood control channel and slopes toward the channel or toward the west. The total difference in elevation over the entire property is approximately seven feet.

There are no natural drainage features on the property; however, a small ditch has been excavated between the two properties. The ditch is two to three feet deep and varies in width from approximately 10 to 16 feet. Another small ditch has been excavated across the property or left as a linear depression in the historically placed fill, apparently to drain the fill and/or carry concentrated runoff from the fill surface to an inlet for delivery into the flood control channel.

The soils on the northern parcel are mapped by the NRCS (SCS 1978) as Zamora silty clay loam, 0-2 percent slopes. The soils on the southern parcel abutting Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel are mapped as the ponded phase of the Clear Lake clay series, 0-2 percent slopes. The Zamora soils have a silty clay loam surface horizon and a gravelly clay subsoil at about 55 inches that serves as a water-restricting horizon. The soils between the clay and the surface silty clay loam soils are clay loams. The subsoils, including the clay loams, are relatively impermeable. The native soils have fill material mixed into the upper horizon or have been buried. In the latter case, the fill material was excavated from Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel and side cast where it currently exists.

2.2.3 Nelson Property
The Nelson parcels (A.P. Nos. 043-191-018, -019, and -020) total 5.75 acres and are east of the northern Peletz parcel and front onto Heat Avenue. The Nelson parcels support a large abandoned orchard containing pear and prune trees with some walnut trees around the homes and other structures. The orchard was planted by Mr. Arthur Nelson's (the current resident) grandfather, but has been abandoned. The last prune crops were harvested in 1988 (Arthur Nelson, personal communication). Since that time the site has been disced and mowed regularly and the primary use has been sheep grazing within fenced pasture in the south-central part of the property. Several "antique," and currently used pieces of agricultural equipment are stored haphazardly in the northern half of the property.
The Nelson property slopes gradually to the south. A low area occurs near the southwest corner of the site, but the effect of the apparent depression on local hydrologic function was exaggerated by the placement of fill on the adjacent property to the south when Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel was deepened and widened. Fill placed just south of the southern fence line blocks the southerly flow of water and causes it to collect until it is deep enough to flow out of a ditch on the adjacent property to the west. The ditch is partially blocked, however, which restricts outflow. There are no natural drainage features on the property. There is no ditch along Heam Avenue and water from the site does not drain via any defined natural or artificial feature to a navigable waterway or a tributary to one. Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel is within 200 feet of the southeast corner of the property but there is no surface hydrologic connection between the site and the flood control channel.

Soils on the Nelson property are mapped by the Soil Conservation Service (U.S. Soil Conservation Service 1978) as Zamora silty clay loam, 0-2 percent slopes. The Zamora soils have a silty clay loam surface horizon and a gravelly clay subsoil at about 55 inches that serves as a water-restricting horizon.

2.2.4 DM Associates, LLC Property
Two parcels (A.P. Nos. 043-071-007 and 043-007-022) make up the DM Associates, LLC property (a.k.a. Bellevue Ranch Phase-8). The two parcels total approximately 12.4 acres. Two residences and associated out structures occur on the western boundary of the site. These parcels appear to have been used for rural agriculture. The site has been used for the production of volunteer hay crops; however, discing and harvest of hay have been irregular. Discing has occurred to control grasses for fuel suppression. This 12.4-acre site has previously mitigated for CTS habitat.

This parcel is relatively level, sloping very gradually from the eastern property line to Dutton Meadow Avenue along the western margin of the property. The total difference in elevation from east to west is approximately five to six feet with small variations in microtopography existing throughout most of the property. A 0.16 acre seasonal wetland formerly existed on this property prior to the authorized placement of fill and/or excavation.

Soils on the DM Associates, LLC property are mapped by the Soil Conservation Service (U.S. Soil Conservation Service 1978) as the Zamora series 0-2 percent slopes. The Zamora surface soils are slightly coarser textured. The Zamora soils are not listed as hydric soils by the NRCS. The native soils have fill material mixed into the upper horizon or have been buried by fill material.

2.2.5 Minoia Property
The Minoia parcels (A.P. Nos. 043-191-016 and 043-119-024) total approximately 6.63 acres. These parcels form a narrow rectangular shaped parcel located along the northern section of the Property. These parcels front Heam Avenue and contain several residential and outbuildings. The Minoia property slopes gradually to the southwest from Heam Avenue. The total difference in elevation over the entire property is approximately five feet. There are
no natural drainage features on the property. All surface runoff is directed onto the adjacent properties, but may pond on the surface in the southern area of the parcels under heavy rainfall. Landscape trees and shrubs surround many of the buildings. The Minoia parcel supports a large fenced pasture south of the homes and structures. This pasture is routinely grazed.

Soils on the Minoia property are mapped as Zamora silty clay loam, 0-2 percent slopes by the NRCS (SCS 1978). The Zamora soils have a silty clay loam surface horizon and a gravelly clay subsoil at approximately 55 inches that serves as a water-restricting horizon.

### 2.3 Project Site Background

The property supports a mosaic of senescent orchard, non-native annual grassland, seasonal wetland and developed/ruderal habitat. Most of the site slopes to the south and southwest except for a narrow strip along the eastern property line that abuts the flood control channel. Prune and pear orchards once covered the northern and southwest portions of the Property. The trees in the northern part of the site remain, but fruit is no longer harvested. The trees were removed from the southwest portion of the site about 14 years ago by shallow excavation leaving a network of small depressions where trees once stood. Several of these depressions now support shallow seasonal wetlands. The majority of the properties appear to have been disced and used for the production of a volunteer hay crop. The Property has also been disced and mowed regularly to control fuels. Sheep continue to graze in several properties in the northern part of the site.

Prior to agricultural and rural development, the regional drainage network carried water generally from northeast to southwest, across the Santa Rosa Plain toward the Laguna de Santa Rosa. Land leveling; placement of fill; excavation of ditches; construction of roads, and residential, commercial, and industrial development has interrupted the drainage patterns. Past drainage patterns have been interrupted and modified within the Property. However, drainage still takes place in a generally northeast-to-southwest direction. Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel occurs just to the southeast of the site. It appears that the Property drained into the creek prior to channelization. Fill removed from the channel during maintenance activities has historically been placed on portions of the Property, including the Peletz property, blocking drainage of some surface water runoff.

### 2.4 Land Use and Zoning

The Property area is under the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Rosa and the County of Sonoma. The Property is within the Southwest Specific Plan Area of the City of Santa Rosa. According to the Area Plan, the Property is designated for a combination of Residential-Low Density, Residential-Medium-Low Density and Retail, and Business Service land uses.

The 2.49-acre Peletz parcel and Lechmanski parcel are zoned "C-2-PD," General Commercial-Planned Development. The larger of the three Nelson parcels (A.P. No.043-191-019) is zoned "IOS," Interim Open Space, a zoning designation the City uses for many
reasons, among them assignment of temporary status until wetland- and/or natural-resource-related constraints have been identified and resolved to the satisfaction of the Corps and the resource agencies. The two smaller Nelson parcels, A.P. Nos. 043-191-018 and 043-191-020, are zoned, respectively, R-1-6 and R-4, both urban residential zoning designations. The southern 17.01-acre parcel previously owned by Peletz (A.P. No.043-200-004) is also zoned C-2-PD. All parcels have "Mixed Use-Residential/ Medium and Retail Business" land use designations.

Residential development is found on all sides of the Property resulting in a semi-isolated site (see Attachment 1, Figures 7 & 8). Bellevue Ranch subdivision occurs west of Dutton Meadow Avenue, Phase 6 of which is planned on both sides of Dutton Meadow Avenue. Nationwide Permit authorization (File No. 24554N) has been received from the Corps facilitating this residential development project. Scattered residential development and office buildings occur to the north along Hearn Avenue. Areas immediately east of Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel are residentially developed (along Victoria Drive and Darlyn Way), the lands to the east of this residential area is developed for commercial and industrial uses. Meadow View Elementary School and the Southwest Community Park are located across Dutton Meadow Avenue to the west.

There are no known conservation easements on any portion of the Property or on nearby properties according to the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District (SCAPPOS). The site has not been identified by the SCAPPOS for conservation nor has any other agency expressed any interest in fee title acquisition or a conservation easement.

2.5 Development Project Purpose

Basic Project Purpose - The purpose of the project is to construct a combination of commercial development and residential housing within the community of Santa Rosa.

Overall Project Purpose - The overall project purpose is to develop market-rate and affordable housing, a community shopping center, and a neighborhood park, all consistent with and/or required by the zoning and specifications of the City of Santa Rosa's General Plan.

Need for the Project - The City of Santa Rosa's Area Plan requires that commercial land use, i.e., retail and grocery stores, and a neighborhood park be constructed on the project site to serve the existing and projected population in the Area Plan boundaries. The Area Plan also requires that any plan for the site incorporate the extensions of Tuxhorn Drive, Northpoint Parkway, and Dutton Avenue to relieve current problems with local traffic congestion.

The Area Plan also recognizes that, to create a thriving neighborhood, the project must comprise a variety of housing types. One of the primary goals of the proposed project is to create an integrated, pedestrian-oriented neighborhood that provides commercial conveniences and recreational opportunities. Proposed commercial and residential development is consistent with the Area Plan and mutually sustaining.
2.6 Proposed Development Project

The proposed project consists of housing and commercial development that will result in mixed uses of the Property. (Attachment 1, Figures 7-9). A Planned Community District, which encompasses the Property and adjacent parcels, will be rezoned to accommodate three housing types, 464 homes; three small parks (one 2.9 acres, another 1.0 acres, the third a 1.1-acre linear park along the flood control channel); 81,000 square feet of retail and commercial space, all intended to yield a cohesive neighborhood within which pedestrian travel is encouraged and facilitated. The retail area will be located so as to permit easy access from the surrounding residential areas. A connection will be provided to the proposed trail system along Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel.

The proposed project would have an overall gross residential density of 17.3 dwelling units per acre. The residential portion of the project would include 138 town homes, which would vary in size from 1,224 to 1,722 square feet (sf) and have three bedrooms; 63 cottage homes, 81 condominiums, and 182 apartment units. The apartment units would vary in size from 779 to 1,336 sf and contain up to three bedrooms.

The proposed commercial and retail area would include a 45,000-square-foot grocery store, approximately 26,000 square feet for other retail operations, and approximately 10,000 square feet for either a restaurant or commercial office space. Second-floor mixed uses, including residential uses above retail, are also proposed.

The project development and circulation plans accommodate the City of Santa Rosa's proposed extensions of Northpoint Parkway, Tuxhom Drive, and Dutton Avenue. Dutton Avenue would be extended south from its existing tee intersection with Hearn Avenue and northwest from its existing termination south of Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel. Northpoint Parkway would be extended from a point near the intersection of Hearn and Burbank Avenues west of the project site, with a southeasterly alignment through the Property, to a crossing at Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel and a connection with Dutton Avenue, which would be extended to the northwest as a part of other projects. Tuxhorn Drive would be extended from Bellevue Ranch on the west side of Dutton Meadow Avenue. Dutton Avenue would be extended south from Ream Avenue. The extensions would meet the Northpoint Parkway extension, forming a roundabout near Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel.

The project would also incorporate a path adjacent to the Colgan Creek, planned as part of the City's bicycle path system. This path would be a Class-I bicycle path with a paved portion reserved for bicycles.

The proposed project is being planned in conjunction with the DM Associates, LLC housing development at 2664 Dutton Meadow Avenue for which the Corps issued a previous authorization (File No. 24554N) [Attachment 2].
3.0 Biological Resources

This section describes the existing habitat types and the plant and wildlife surveys, results, and conclusions for the Property. Plant and wildlife surveys were conducted for target special-status species who’s distributional range includes the Property, and which were considered to have the potential to occur at the site.

The designation of special-status includes: federal- and state-listed species under either the Federal or the California ESA, species proposed for those listings, federal Species of Concern, California Species of Special Concern, California Fully-Protected Species under the Fish and Game Code, and plant species designated as rare, threatened, or endangered by the state or federal government or the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). Special-status wildlife species known to occur on the Santa Rosa Plain include the California tiger salamander (Ambystoma californiense, referred to as CTS), the California red-legged frog (Rana aurora draytonii), California freshwater shrimp (Syncaris pacifica), California linderiella (Linderiella occidentalis), and Western pond turtle (Clemmys marmorata marmorata). Endangered plant species that could occur at the Property are Sonoma sunshine (Blennosperma bakeri), Sebastopol meadowfoam (Limnanthes vinculans), and Burke’s goldfields (Lasthenia burkei).

3.1 Existing Habitat Types

Four distinct habitat types occur within the Property. Aerial photographs and field surveys were used to evaluate vegetation characteristics and various site conditions of the on-site habitats and those of the surrounding properties. These four habitat types are (1) seasonal wetlands; (2) non-native grassland; (3) orchard, and (4) developed/ruderal. The predominant habitat type is non-native grassland, which occupies the majority of the Property. Seasonal wetlands are interspersed within the non-native grassland habitat and in the vicinity of the orchard. The developed/ruderal habitat type, a habitat type associated with human occupation and intensive disturbance, occurs at several locations where old houses and sheds are located within the Property. Some scattered coast live oak and valley oak (Quercus agrifolia and Q. lobata) are present. Gum (Eucalyptus sp.) trees mark the boundary between the Lechmanski and Peletz properties. These trees provide different habitat; however, there is virtually no tree reproduction or assemblages of native plants in the areas in which they occur. Discing, mowing, and grazing activities have disturbed the vegetation and topography over the majority of the Property. Each of these habitat types is described in further detail below.

3.1.1 Seasonal Wetlands

A number of areas within the Property have been delineated by the Corps as wetlands. These seasonal wetlands are of artificial origin and are disturbed on a regular basis. Various filling and grading activities on the Property have altered most of the original topography. The hydrologic regime of the existing wetlands is a modified or altered regime. The wetland areas
are not entirely distinct floristically from the non-native grassland habitat type, and often have many of the same dominant species. Some of the plants present are species that are restricted typically to vernal pools, but many other plant species also occur (including seasonal wetland and weed species). Wetlands were delineated based largely on the presence of standing water observed during the wet season and on specific soil characteristics. The wetlands across the site occur in shallow depressions and are virtually certain to contain surface water for seven days or more during the rainy season in a normal rainfall year. However, due to their shallow nature, these seasonal wetland features tend to dry out soon after the rainy season ends.

Corps jurisdictional determinations were conducted for the properties in 2000 and 2001 (Stromberg 2000a, 2001a, and 2001b). An additional Corps jurisdictional determination was prepared in 2003 for the Minoia property (Olberding 2003). Attachment 3 contains the Corps verification letters and maps illustrating the location of the verified wetland areas on the Property. Approximately 4.16 acres of wetland habitat and 0.01 acres of drainage swale habitat have been verified by the Corps within the properties that comprise the development Property. An additional 0.2 acres of non-verified seasonal wetland habitat occurs on the Minoia property. Corps verification is being sought concurrently for this property. Approximately 0.16 acres of seasonal wetland habitat was present on the DM Associates, LLC property prior to the permitted fill of the property. The total area of existing wetlands on the Property amounts to 4.37 acres. As a whole, the wetlands on the development Property are very shallow (with an average depth of 0.3 ft.) containing limited diversity.

The seasonal wetlands are scattered throughout the non-native grassland where localized depressions occur that are relatively poorly drained and appear to remain moist longer than the surrounding grassland. These local depressions lack outlets from which water could potentially drain away from the depression. The seasonal wetland areas often contain native grass and herb species, in addition to the non-native species characteristic of the grassland. Vegetation within the seasonal wetlands is dominated by the two grasses, perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne*), and/or California semaphore grass (*Pleuropogon californicus*). With the exception of the deepest topographic depressions, Mediterranean barley (*Hordeum marinum gussoneanum*) is also a subdominant species. Other subdominant species include bristly oxtongue (*Picris echioides*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), six-weeks fescue (*Vulpia bromoides*), meadow barley (*Hordeum brachyantherum*), little rattlesnake grass (*Briza minor*), spiny-fruit buttercup (*Ranunculus muricatus*), purple loosestrife (*Lythrum hyssopifolium*), fringed downingia (*Downingia concolor*), and popcorn flower (*Plagiobothrys stipitatus var. micrantha*). In addition, species that were normally associated with the annual grassland were observed in the seasonal wetlands such as parentucellia (*Parentucellia viscosa*), soft chess (*Bromus hordaceus*), vetches (*Vicia sativa* and *V. cracca*), lupine (*Lupinus bicolor*), oats (*Avena fatua* and *A. barbata*), cutleaf geranium (*Geranium dissectum*), and sheep sorrel (*Rumex acetosella*), however, these species occurred in much fewer numbers.

The seasonal wetlands on the western half of the site (the Lechmanski property) all occur in the depressions created by the removal of the prune trees. The pattern reflects their obviously artificial origin. Fill has also been historically placed on several of the other properties.
blocking overland flow of surface water, thereby creating impoundments that allowed the
development of several larger seasonal wetland areas. The seasonal wetlands on the eastern
half of the site include a vernal pool, inundated areas where surface water runoff is blocked,
and wetlands in ditches excavated on dry ground, or left as a linear depression in fill to
convey runoff to Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel.

The wetland features in the northern part of the project site, along the border of the Minoa
and Nelson properties, are located in a pasture and orchard that has been grazed by sheep in
the recent past. Vernal pool habitat located along the southern portion of the Minoa property
was characterized by small topographic depressions that contained annual forbs and grasses
that are typically associated with vernal pool areas. The plant species recorded in the pools
on the Minoa property consisted of downingia (Downingia concolor), smooth goldfields
(Lasianthea glaberrima), popcorn flower (Plagiobothrys stipitatus), and curly dock (Rumex
crispus). These vernal pool plants sparsely vegetated the wetland areas. Some areas within
the site were also found to support scattered meadow barley (Hordeum brachyantherum).

On the Nelson property the tailwater pond habitat was located in the southwestern corner of
the site and was characterized by a small pond of water with annual forbs and grasses around
the border. The plant species recorded within the shallow pond consisted of meadowfoam
(Linmanthes douglasii ssp. nivea), downingia (Downingia concolor), smooth goldfields
(Lasianthea glaberrima), and curly dock (Rumex crispus). Plant species formed a dense cover
in the wetland. The upper zones of the pond were found to support thickly growing
semaphore grass (Pleuropogon californicus) and meadow barley (Hordeum
brachyantherum).

In the southern portion of the Property, the dominant plant species were observed to vary
with the depth and period of inundation. In the extreme southwest corner, where the water
depth is greatest, California semaphore grass, and manna grass (Glyceria occidentalis) are
the dominant species, and quillwort (Lilaea scilloides) and water starwort (Callitriche sp.)
are subdominant. Spiny-fruited buttercup was also commonly found in these wetlands. All
four species are obligate wetland species typically associated with vernal pools on the Santa
Rosa Plain. In the shallower portions of the wetlands, the aforementioned species become
less abundant and/or become somewhat stunted, and ryegrass, six-weeks fescue, annual
bluegrass (Poa annua), and Mediterranean barley increase in relative cover. Also, upland
species such as soft chess and cutleaf geranium intrude into the wetlands contributing to an
increased cover. Spiny-fruited buttercup persists throughout the inundation gradient and
other species typically associated with disturbance, such as bristly ox-tongue and toad rush
(Juncus bufonius) become more abundant in that portion of the wetland where the water level
does not interfere with year-round sheep grazing. Annual bluegrass cover is also related to
the sheep grazing. This annual species is virtually absent from areas of the property, which
are not subject to grazing and/or regular disturbance.

Table 1 indicates the size of each property and the amount of wetland acreage identified.
Table 1: Wetland Acreage by Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Property size</th>
<th>Wetland acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lechmanski</td>
<td>12.05 acres</td>
<td>2.41 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peletz</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>1.12 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.64 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM Associates, LLC</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoia</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>0.2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.88</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.37 acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Non-Native Grassland

Non-native grassland occupies most of the Property. It corresponds to the non-native grassland habitat type of Holland (1986). The non-native grassland type, as herein recognized, is quite heterogeneous in physiognomy and species composition on site, and a number of subtypes could be recognized. One subtype in the non-native grassland was the ruderal vegetation type that occurred in small patches. The ruderal habitat type is dominated by forbs, otherwise described as “broadleaf” plant species. Some of the heterogeneity in the annual-grassland habitat is clearly correlated with microtopography, soil moisture, and drainage conditions. It is mostly characterized by a dense (approximately 100%) cover of grasses and associated herbs, generally 1-3 feet tall. The dominant grasses are mostly annual and non-native. Harding grass (*Phalaris aquatica*), an invasive, introduced bunchgrass has increased in abundance by several hundred percent on the Property. It now occupies virtually the entire center of the Property, and is expected to spread in the future at the same rapid pace as it has been doing throughout the Santa Rosa Plain.

The most abundant and widespread dominant is Italian rye grass (*Lolium multiflorum*), which is sometimes a biennial. Other characteristic non-native grasses include soft chess (*Bromus hordaceus*), six-weeks fescue (*Vulpia bromoides*), slender wild oat (*Avena barbata*), wild oat (*Avena fatua*), Mediterranean barley (*Hordeum marinum ssp. gussoneanum*), little rattlesnake grass (*Briza minor*), rat-tail fescue (*Vulpia myuros*), and ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*). Commonly encountered subdominant species include field mustard (*Brassica rapa*), vetch (*Vicia sativa*), parentucellia (*Parentucellia viscosa*), owl’s clover (*Triphysaria versicolor ssp. Faucibarbata*), lupines (*Lupinus nanus* and *L. bicolor*), and cat’s ear (*Hypochaeris radicata*).
3.1.3 Orchard
A remnant orchard is located on the Nelson property in the northeastern corner of the development Property. The pear and prune orchard covers most of the land on the southern ¾ of the Nelson property. The orchard begins just south of the outbuildings in the north and extends to the southern Property boundary. The fruit trees are planted in rows and were used for production in the past; however, the trees are not pruned, irrigated, or maintained for production at this time. Non-native annual grassland habitat has grown between the tree rows, forming a dense cover over the ground surface. The grass species and forbs in the non-native annual grassland habitat are present throughout the orchard. It appears that a tailwater pond was created to capture the irrigation water draining off the orchard. Since abandoned, the tailwater pond now forms a seasonal wetland described above in the seasonal wetland habitat type. Orchard trees are located at the northern and southern edges of the feature.

3.1.4 Developed/Ruderal
The developed/ruderal habitat type consists of outbuilding such as barns and sheds, and has fenced areas utilized by livestock, or areas that were once used by livestock. The areas containing buildings have been subject to intensive and ongoing disturbance associated with livestock occupation and grazing, tractor and equipment movement, mowing, discing, and herbicide application. Some areas, especially on the Nelson property, contain numerous old tractors, farming equipment, cars and other debris. Landscape and volunteer ornamental vegetation surrounds many of the residential buildings while the interior of the properties support a non-native dominated grassland habitat.

In limited areas around the barns and outbuildings dominant ruderal species include milk thistle (Silybum marianum), yellow-star thistle (Centaurea solstitialis), Italian thistle (Carduus pychnecephalus), vetches, and other weedy broadleaved species. The barns and outbuildings that are no longer in use within the various sub-properties are overgrown with these species that form thick patches of vegetation.

3.2 Wildlife
A variety of common reptile, bird, and mammal species use the Property for foraging, nesting. Common mammalian carnivores and omnivores that may inhabit and/or use food resources found at the Property include the striped skunk (Mephitis mephitis), raccoon (Procyon lotor), red fox (Vulpes fulva), gray fox (Urocyon cinereoargenteus), Virginia opossum (Didelphis virginiana), and western harvest mouse (Reithrodontomys megalotis). Other common small mammals that are likely to occur include Botta’s pocket gopher (Thomomys bottae), the broad-footed mole (Scapanus latimanus), and the California meadow vole (Microtus californicus) (Storer 1925, Jennings and Hayes 1994, Jennings 1996; Padgett-Flohr, unpublished data).

Common reptiles are expected to occur on the Property such as the western fence lizard (Sceloporus occidentalis), alligator lizard (Elgaria coerulea), gopher snake (Pituophis
catenifer), and garter snake (Thamnophis spp.). Also, amphibian species such as the Pacific tree frog (Hyla regilla) larvae have been observed in the wetlands when inundated.

The presence of small mammals and reptiles in the grassland areas makes the habitat attractive for raptors such as hawks and owls, and other predators such as snakes and feral cat (Felis cattus). Raptors that were observed to forage in the grassland included the red-tailed hawk (Buteo jamaicensis) and the white-tail kite (Elanus leucurus). A pair of white-tail kites was observed to roost in the Nelson property orchard in 2003 (Olberding 2003a). Common raptors including turkey vultures (Cathartes aura) and American kestrel (Falco sparverius) are likely to forage on the Property due to the presence of the grassland habitats.

Passerine and songbirds observed in the non-native grassland include the house finch (Carpodacus mexicanus), morning dove (Zenaida macroura), black phoebe (Sayornis nigricans), California towhee (Pipilo crissalis), white-crowned sparrow (Zonotrichia leucophrys), and red-winged blackbird (Agelaius phoeniceus). Several shore and wading birds have been identified within the Property vicinity including the great egret (Casmerodius albus), killdeer (Charadrius vociferous), and snowy egret (Egretta thula).

### 3.3 Special-Status Plant Species

Literature review was conducted to determine the special-status wetlands plants that could occur within the Property. Distributional information for Sonoma sunshine (Blennosperma bakeri), Sebastopol meadowfoam (Limnanthes vinculans), and Burke's goldfields (Lasthenia burkei), three federally endangered plant species, indicated that potential habitat for the listed plant species does occur in the wetlands on the project site (CH2M Hill 1996). In addition, plant species listed in the Vernal Pool Ecosystem Preservation Plan contribute more than 10 percent relative cover in many of the individual wetlands. The cover percentage was mostly due to the presence of California semaphore grass in the wetlands (CH2M Hill, 1996). Information was also obtained through site visits, acquisition of information from the City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County Permit and Resource Department, and the SCAPOS.

A Rarefind Database search of the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB), [CNDDB 2001 and 2003] was conducted on the Santa Rosa, Cotati, Two Rock, and Sebastopol 7.5- minute quadrangles. Information on distributional and habitat requirements of both wetland and upland species was obtained from floral guides including the California Native Plant Society's list of rare and endangered plant species in the state (Skinner and Pavlik 1994) and the Jepson Manual of Higher Plants of California (Hickman 1993). Recent reports that include special-status plant surveys conducted within uplands habitat on the Santa Rosa Plain were also reviewed (Olberding 2003a).

Field surveys for plants occurring on the Property were conducted for three years (2000, 2001, and 2003). Surveys for special-status plant species were conducted using methods consistent with the CDFG guidelines for assessing the effects of proposed developments on rare and endangered plants and plant communities (CDFG 1984). The surveys were...
conducted within the "window" during which virtually all target species were either in flower or were readily identifiable. Field surveys for special-status plants were conducted by thoroughly searching each wetland and conducting a transect survey of the annual grassland habitats.

Results of the surveys are included in the Results of Survey for Special-Status Plant Species, Hearn Avenue Property (Stromberg, 2000); the Results of Survey for Special-Status Plant Species, Lechmanski - Hearn Avenue Properties (Stromberg 2001a); Results of Survey for Special-Status Plant Species, Nelson Property (Stromberg 2001b, Stromberg 2002, Olberding 2003), and Results of Special-Status Plant Species, Minoa Property, (Olberding, 2003a). Although potential habitat for the three federally listed plant species is present on the Property, none of the federally listed plant species that are known to occur on the Santa Rosa Plain were observed during three seasons of field surveys (Stromberg, 2000; Stromberg, 2001a; Stromberg, 2001b, Olberding, 2003). One CNPS List-4 (watch list) species, Lobb's aquatic buttercup (*Ranunculus lobbii*), was observed during year 2001, 2002 and 2003 surveys on the 2.49-acre Peletz parcel and the Nelson property. No other special-status plant species were observed.

One population of Lobb's aquatic buttercup was observed in 2001, 2002, and 2003, in the vernal pool at the southwest corner of the Nelson property, extending off-site into the adjacent 2.49-acre Peletz parcel. Observations were initially made during the 2000 special-status plant survey. The population extended over an area of approximately 15-ft. x 10-ft. containing an estimated 100 plants. This species occurs in floating mats in ponded or shallow water. Obtaining exact counts of this species is not possible due to the difficulty in accessing the plants and to the physical structure of the flowering plant making it impossible to distinguish individual plants among the floating mats.

The on-site seasonal wetlands are of recent artificial origin and have been created over time by filling and grading activities that have altered most of the original micro topography. Discing, mowing, and grazing activities have further disturbed the vegetation and microtopography. Historically, before agriculture occurred on the Santa Rosa Plain, the Property likely supported vernal pool complexes and native grassland habitat. The conversion of the land in the past to domestic uses eliminated the historically occurring vernal pool habitat on the site; however a seed bank remained in the soil profile from which the existing plant species have germinated. The historical site conditions are the reason vernal pool type plant species are found in the on-site seasonal wetlands. Many other plant species also occur on the Property including common seasonal wetland and weed species. The on-site wetlands are isolated from other vernal pool habitats, although wading and shore birds likely move between the seasonal wetlands on the Santa Rosa Plain including those on the Property, throughout the spring. The Property is geographically isolated from other vernal pool habitats such that no hydrologic connections occur due to paved roadways, flood control levees and buildings that surround it. The development of homes and businesses has occurred surrounding the Property on all borders, eliminating hydrologic connectivity.
The dominant vegetation that exists on the Property is of somewhat limited botanical interest because it is composed of non-native annual grassland with common grasses and forbs that are found throughout the state of California.

Some scattered coast live oak and valley oak (Quercus agrifolia and Q. lobata) and fruit trees are present in portions of the site. Gum (Eucalyptus sp.) trees along the boundary between the Lechmanski and Peletz properties once formed a wind row. These trees provide different habitat, but there is virtually no tree reproduction or native plants in the areas in which they occur.

3.4 California Tiger Salamander

The following sections summarize the life cycle and ecology of the California tiger salamander (Ambystoma californiense, referred to as CTS), and present results of the field surveys that were conducted to evaluate the site as potential CTS habitat. The CTS is a native terrestrial salamander that was emergency listed as endangered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in September 2000 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2000), following a petition for listing (Long 1992; Sorenson 1994). On March 19, 2003, the Sonoma County population segment was listed as federally endangered. On May 23, 2003, the USFWS published a proposed rule to reclassify the central California distinct population segment of CTS as threatened.

3.4.1 CTS Range, Sonoma County

The USFWS has issued a map that defines the critical habitat range based on the listing petition and a map produced by Cook and Northern (2000) that is called, "the Potential Range of the Sonoma County California Tiger Salamander." The CTS range map includes the entirety of the Cities of Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Cotati and parts of the towns of Windsor and Sebastopol. However, fully developed areas have been identified and excluded, as they are not considered to support CTS. The Property and the undeveloped area along Dutton Meadow Avenue are within the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of Santa Rosa. However, these areas are included within the CTS range, presumably due to the presence of a known breeding pond in the vicinity. The CTS breeding pond is located in Southwest Community Park, a CTS preserve located approximately 1,250 feet west of the site. Additionally, CTS have recently been observed approximately 1,400 feet north of a number of other properties located on the west side of Dutton Meadow Avenue (Attachment 1, Figure 6).

To date, CTS have persisted in the excavated depression and adjacent uplands habitat in the corner of Southwest Community Park. In the winter of 2002, CTS reproduction in the pond in Southwest Community Park may have been the result of a single pair of salamanders, and none of the larvae survived to metamorphosis due to predation associated with the early drying of the pond (in April). In 2003, many more CTS were observed. By the end of December, David Cook, who is conducting a research project at the Southwest Community Park, had observed 90 CTS (Cook personal communication). Studies conducted in the
Southwest Community Park indicate that suitable aestivation habitat occurs on properties on the west side of Dutton Meadow Avenue.

### 3.4.2 CTS Morphology

The CTS is a large terrestrial salamander with adults attaining a total length of over 8 inches (203 millimeters) [Stebbins 1951]. Dorsally (on the back side), the background color of the CTS appears to be jet black, normally with an overlain pattern of white or yellow spots or bars (Stebbins 1985). Ventral, or belly, surfaces of the CTS are highly variable in pattern, ranging from nearly uniform white or pale yellow to variegated white or pale yellow and black (Jennings and Hayes 1994). The CTS have relatively small, protruding eyes with black irises (Jennings and Hayes 1994).

Juvenile salamanders are 1.7-2.8 inches (42-70 millimeters) from the tip of the snout to the rear of the vent and have the same coloration pattern as adults (Jennings, unpublished data). Salamanders that are recently metamorphosed often have a pale yellowish-brown, tan, or greenish-colored dorsum with dark flecks and blotches (Jennings, unpublished data). These blotches soon fade to a white or yellow color after only a few weeks. Larval salamanders range in size from 0.4-6.6 inches (11-150 millimeters) in total length with a pale yellowish-brown, tan, or dark-colored dorsum (Anderson 1968). External gills and legs are prominent features on all salamander larvae over 2 weeks old (Storer 1925).

### 3.4.3 CTS Breeding Ecology and Habitat

Breeding habitat can be characterized by physical, hydrologic, and biologic attributes. Aestivation habitat, likewise, can be characterized by physical and biological attributes. Research and field experience have produced information about both types of habitat. Less information is available about the annual movements between these habitats, i.e., what pathways are followed, what difficulties obstacles pose to movement, how far from straight-line migratory routes CTS can be diverted or forced, and at what point barriers or obstacles are so numerous that they become collectively insurmountable or impassable. In the procedure, migration has been treated in terms the distance a CTS would have to travel between the breeding pond and potential aestivation habitat and the presence of actual or potential barriers to the salamanders annual migratory movements. The procedure is based on the assumption that as the migratory distance and number of barriers between aestivation habitat and the breeding pond increase, the risk of CTS mortality increases.

Structures, walls and other solid structures increase the distance a salamander must travel, increase the exposure to predators, dehydration, and mortality, and lower the probability that a CTS will successfully reach suitable aestivation or breeding habitat. While insurmountable curbs, lateral or median-strip k-raiis, roadways and other flat hardscape areas (e.g., abandoned airport runways) impose physical barriers to migration; the roadways themselves increase the risk of mortality. Risk to the survival of migrating CTS increases with the number of roads and the traffic volumes on roadways within a migration corridor (Stromberg 2003).

The USFWS (2003, based on Trenham 1998b, 2001) defines a breeding site as “the location where the salamanders are able to successfully breed in years of normal rainfall and complete their aestivation.” This definition indicates that a breeding site includes both the breeding pond
and surrounding aestivation habitat. The CTS is a long-lived animal and some individuals may survive for more than 10 years. Trenham et al. (2000) found that population turnover in CTS often occurs on a time scale of 10 or more years. However, Trenham and his coworkers (1998, 2000) found that less than five percent of newly metamorphosed larval CTS survive to reach breeding age and that first-summer juvenile mortality exceeded 50 percent (Trenham et al. 2000). The USFWS (2003) considers the lifetime reproductive success of the CTS to be low.

Trenham et al. (2000) determined that the minimum age at first breeding was two years for males and three years for females although the average age did not differ significantly between the sexes. According to the USFWS (2003) some individuals may not breed until they are four to six years old. Trenham et al. (2000) in his study found that the females breed an average of 1.4 times and produces 8.5 young that survived to metamorphosis per reproductive event, resulting in roughly 12 lifetime metamorphic offspring per female. However, in a long-term study of CTS demography, Trenham et al. (2001) found that most individuals did not survive to breed a second time, concluding that most individuals, consequently, return to and breed only in their natal ponds.

CTS adults tend to skip breeding in certain years and females are more apt to skip breeding in a particular year than males (Trenham et al. 2000). This behavior likely results in females not breeding during dry years when the water levels in breeding ponds may not be sufficient to allow complete larval development. According to Petranka (1998, cited in USFWS 2003), the larval stage usually lasts three to six months, meaning that successful breeding ponds must contain standing water for a long duration during the winter and spring to allow full larval development of the newly hatched CTS larvae. The size of emigrating juvenile size was found to be positively related to the number of days a pond contains water (Trenham et al 2000). The longer the period of ponding, the larger the larvae and metamorphosed juveniles can grow, and the more fit they are to survive and reproduce (Pechmann et al. 1989, Semlitsch et al. 1988, Morey 1998, Trenham 1998b, as cited in USFWS 2003).

Breeding CTS tend to return to their natal ponds. In the long-term study by Trenham et al. (2000), the greatest number of individuals was captured as the first soaking rains of the season filled the breeding ponds. Trenham (1998b) found that approximately 80 percent of marked individuals were recaptured at ponds where they were initially captured; approximately 20 percent of the marked metamorphs were recaptured at a breeding pond 580 meters from their natal pond (Trenham et al. 2000).

Most adult migration to the breeding ponds generally occurs between December and February (Trenham et al. 2000), the males arriving first and remaining longer. The distance moved by individuals leaving the breeding pond averaged 60 m for males and 44 m for females according to the study reported in Trenham (2001) although the maximum observed distance moved from the point of release ranged from 16 m to 248 m, with the average final distance moved being $114 \pm 83$ m. Trenham et al. (2001) estimated the upper bound of a 95 percent confidence interval for adult CTS emigration distance in their study to be 173 m. Juvenile CTS have been observed to migrate up to 1.6 km (1 mi) from breeding ponds to aestivation areas (Austin and Shaffer 1992, as cited in USFWS 2003). According to
Sweet (1998, as cited in USFWS 2003), adult CTS may migrate up to 2 km (1 mi) from aestivation sites to the breeding pond.

Males generally precede initial females movement from burrows during the breeding season by 1-2 weeks (Shaffer et al. 1993, Loredo et al. 1996). Following underwater courtship from one or more males, females normally deposit their moderate-sized (0.13-0.21 inches [3.6-5.9 millimeters] diameter) eggs singly on vegetation and other debris in the shallow margins of rainwater pools (Storer 1925). Large females may deposit up to 350 eggs per season, although most females only deposit 100-200 eggs (Jennings, unpublished data). Adult salamanders apparently leave breeding ponds soon after spawning (Storer 1925), although they may forage for up to a month in the general area if conditions continue to be moist (Barry and Shaffer 1994). Most salamanders soon return to aestivation habitats in small mammal burrows where they spend approximately 9-10 months underground until the next winter rains (Barry and Shaffer 1994; Jennings, unpublished data).

Adult CTS must breed successfully (i.e., produce offspring that reach reproductive maturity) at least once every eight years to contribute to species recruitment. Annual mortality can reach 40-percent and few individuals are likely to survive for eight years (Shaffer et al. 1991; Shaffer et al. 1993). A typical salamander breeding population in a pond can drop dramatically from year to year depending on rainfall amounts and timing, making these local populations prone to extinction. CTS, therefore, require large contiguous areas of vernal pools (vernal pool complexes or comparable aquatic breeding habitat) containing multiple breeding ponds to ensure recolonization of individual ponds.

Breeding of adult CTS has been observed from late November through February, following the onset of warm rains (Storer 1925, Barry and Shaffer 1994). Based on observations during the 1990's (Jennings, unpublished data) salamanders often do not breed during periods of seasonally cold rains or during drought (whether breeding ponds are filled with water or not) [Barry and Shaffer 1994; Jennings, unpublished data]. Both males and females engage in nocturnal breeding migrations traveling up to 1 mile (1.6 kilometers) [Austin and Shaffer 1992] or more from subterranean refuge sites (e.g. small mammal burrows) [Loredo et al. 1961] to egg deposition sites (long-lasting rain pools) (Andersen 1968). Adult salamanders are possibly stimulated to move to breeding sites by the vibrations of rainwater falling on the soil, as adult male salamanders have been observed (after preceding night(s) of rainfall) wandering on the dry soil of rain pools that had not yet filled (Jennings, unpublished data). Anecdotal evidence indicates that salamanders have a high degree of site fidelity to their breeding ponds and also to the small mammal burrows they use for refugia (Shaffer et al. 1993; Jennings, unpublished data). For example, a gravid, adult, female CTS removed from a breeding site and transported to a newly-created mitigation pond, moved a straight line distance of approximately 0.9 mile (1.4 kilometers) back to the original point of capture over a 3-week period (Duke et al. 1998).

Sites used for reproduction are typically natural pools that fill with rainwater and artificial stock ponds; however, salamanders have also been observed to breed in springs, ponded swales, vernal pools, wells, artificial reservoirs, quarry ponds, man-made canals, and rarely, in the slack waters of oxbows in small- to medium-sized streams (Jennings, unpublished data). Ponds that hold water for less than 105 days are unlikely to be suitable breeding
habitat. Some ponds hold water for sufficient duration in years of considerably above-normal rainfall, once every 10 or 20 years. Larvae may be found in some pools that are ponded for sufficient duration under such unusual circumstances.

CTS breeding ponds may or may not contain dense amounts of aquatic vegetation. The highest numbers of larvae appear to occur in aquatic habitats that contain very turbid water. In such situations, salamander larvae often hide during the day in the deeper portions of the pond, or under debris (such as dead Russian thistles \(Salsola tragus\)) that blows into the pond (Jennings, unpublished data).

One seasonal wetland in the northwest corner of the Property, on the Nelson parcel, remained inundated beyond the end of the CTS larval and hydrologic surveys, which ended in April. Most of the other topographic depressions, primarily formed in the western half of the site as a result of tree removal, contained ponded water over the course of the winter, but the period of continuous ponding was inadequate to dry out more than once during the rainy season, which resulted in the death of hundreds of tree frogs.

### 3.4.4 Larval CTS Habitat and Ecology

Embryos of CTS hatch in approximately 14-28 days after being laid (Storer 1925) and the resulting gilled, aquatic larvae (0.41-0.43 inches [10.5-11 millimeters] in length) require a minimum of about 10-12 weeks to complete development through metamorphosis. Since salamander larvae are very cryptic in coloration, they are often hard to observe in the turbid waters of breeding habitats. At metamorphosis, young salamanders have attained a total length of about 2.6 inches (75 millimeters) [Anderson 1968, Feaver 1971]. Metamorphosis is apparently initiated by receding water levels in breeding ponds and most larval salamanders do not metamorphose until they are as large as possible (Feaver 1971). Although the native breeding habitat for this species normally dries each year and metamorphosis is paramount under such conditions, there are a few observations of larval salamanders overwintering in artificially constructed, permanent ponds (H. Bradley Shaffer, University of California at Davis, pers. comm.). The overwintering of larvae (especially to sexual maturity) is common in many closely related species of mole salamanders \(\text{Ambystoma spp.}\) found in other parts of North America (Stebbins 1985, Petranka 1998).

CTS larvae are carnivorous and are voracious predators that feed on organisms they can overpower, including smaller conspecifics (Feaver 1971). Larger larvae have been observed to feed on the larvae of Pacific tree frogs \(\text{Hyla regilla}\), California toads \(\text{Bufo boreas halophilus}\) and western spadefoots \(\text{Scaphiopus hammondii}\), as well as many aquatic invertebrates (Anderson 1968, Feaver 1971, Jennings, unpublished data).

### 3.4.5 CTS Dispersal

CTS are believed to move in a straight-line path between breeding ponds and aestivation sites. Movement between the aestivation areas and breeding pond(s) needs to be relatively free of barriers. Relatively minor habitat modifications, such as construction of roads, storm drains, and road curbs that traverse the area between breeding and aestivation sites, increasingly fragment habitat, impede or prevent migration, and cause in direct and indirect CTS mortality (Mader 1984, S. Sweet, in litt. 1993, 1998, Findlay and Houlanhan 1996,
Curbs and berms as low as 9 to 13 cm (3 to 5 in), which allow salamanders to climb onto the road but can restrict or prevent their movements off the roads, can turn the roads into sources of high mortality (Launer and Fee 1996, S. Sweet, in litt. 1998, cited in USFWS 2003).

Distance between the aestivation habitats and breeding pond(s) is also important to the survival of the CTS. The lack of suitable aestivation habitat close to the breeding ponds puts at greater risk the recently metamorphosed larval CTS. According to Dr. Mark Jennings, the recently metamorphosed individuals are not quite fully developed and require time to complete their metamorphosis to adults (M. Jennings, personal communication, April 8, 2003). Therefore, the greater the distance they have to travel, the greater the likelihood that they will suffer mortality due to predation or other causes resulting from the lack of appropriate aestivation habitat within proximity of the breeding pond. The same can be said of breeding adults moving to and from the breeding pond; the greater the distance the individual must travel, the greater the risk to that individual.

Jennings and Hayes (1994) report species movement in nocturnal migrations over distances in excess of 1000 meters. Upon leaving breeding sites, adult CTS have been observed to disperse up to 130 meters before entering their burrows (Loredo et al. 1996). Juvenile CTS have been observed traveling distances from up to 60 meters in an evening upon leaving a pond (Loredo et al. 1996). CTS usually enter burrows in the vicinity of their breeding site (Jennings, 1996). Adult CTS have been observed in locations up to two kilometers from suitable spawning and larval habitat (Center for Biological Diversity 2001). The ability of juveniles and adults to disperse is important for the long-term survival and recovery of the species as the dispersing individuals can recolonize areas subjected to local extirpation.

3.4.6 CTS Aestivation Habitat
According to Trenham (2001), CTS prefer to aestivate in open grassland and open oak savanna habitat and probably require active burrowing mammal activity (e.g., ground squirrels, gophers) to provide appropriate aestivation habitat. On the Santa Rosa Plain, ground squirrel colonies are extremely uncommon and gophers are the prime excavators of aestivation sites. Active gopher dens and tunnel networks have been observed in upland annual grassland habitat, in seasonal wetland swales, and within the saturated fringes of vernal pools (L. Stromberg, personal observations; S. Talley, personal observations; W. T. Hanes, personal observations; D. Cook, comment letter in response to a Corps of Engineers public notice.

The presence of suitable terrestrial aestivation habitat is critical to the persistence of local CTS populations (Trenham 2001) and activities that eliminate burrowing mammals (e.g., rodent control through poisoning) or collapses their burrows (e.g., discing) decreases the suitability of the affected landscape for aestivating CTS. Active gopher burrowing activity is probably needed to sustain CTS. Jennings (personal communication) believes that insects, bugs, and other microorganisms on gopher feces provide food. Abandoned dens do not offer the same food abundance. Also, inactive burrow systems become progressively unsuitable over time (USFWS 2003).
The location of the aestivation sites relative to the breeding ponds depends on local topography and vegetation, and distribution of burrowing mammal activity (Stebbins 1989, as cited in USFWS 2003). The USFWS (2003) believes that the lack of uplands for aestivation during the dry season could be a limiting factor at three of the identified protected breeding sites at the Santa Rosa Plain.

Adequate aestivation habitat is essential for juvenile and adult CTS (Jennings, 1998). Following metamorphosis (normally from early May through July), juveniles emigrate en masse at night from the drying breeding pond (Holland et al. 1990; Jennings, unpub. data). Traveling distances of up to two kilometers or more from breeding sites, juvenile salamanders wander into small mammal burrows or deep cracks in the soil, which they use as refugia during the hot summer and fall months (Shaffer et al. 1993, Loredo et al. 1996). Juveniles will also wander into certain man-made structures such as wet basements, wells, underground pipes, and septic tank drains (Storer 1925). Mortality of juveniles can be high during this transition period due to the stress of metamorphosis and the problems of finding a suitable refuge site before the sun comes up. For example, Holland et al. (1990) found an entire cohort of salamanders killed by unsuitable weather conditions when they attempted to emigrate from their breeding pond during the late summer. Juveniles feed on the rich invertebrate fauna that is normally associated with small mammal burrows and grow rapidly over the next several months. Data suggest that most individuals require 2 years to become sexually mature, but some individuals may be slower to mature during periods of drought or a seasonal rainfall (Shaffer et al. 1993).

Although predation to salamanders is probably minimal in underground refugia, juveniles and adults are known to be eaten by bullfrogs (Rana catesbeiana), garter snakes and probably black-crowned night herons (Nycticorax nycticorax) and raccoons when they are present on the surface during the wet winter and spring months (Morey and Guinn 1992; Jennings, unpub. data). Larvae are eaten by a wide variety of predators when still within their natal ponds including garter snakes, bullfrogs, California red-legged frogs (Rana aurora draytonii), herons, and terns (Sterna spp.), and apparently fish when the latter are introduced into breeding ponds (Baldwin and Stanford 1987; Shaffer et al. 1993; Fisher and Shaffer 1996; Jennings, unpublished data).

The CTS spends most of its lifecycle aestivating underground in rodent burrows or other natural crevices located in grassland, coastal sage scrub, or deciduous oak woodland communities with a predominant ground cover of grazed or sparse grasses. In Sonoma County, CTS aestivation habitat at the site could include burrows used by small mammals such as the Botta's pocket gopher, the broad-footed mole, and the California meadow vole (Storer 1925, Jennings and Hayes 1994, Jennings 1996; Padgett-Flohr, unpublished data). Of these small mammals, gophers are known to create an extensive underground burrow system that may be between 200-2000 feet long, and which are likely to provide CTS aestivation habitat. As mentioned earlier, salamanders may also turn up in certain man-made structures (e.g., wet basements, wells, swimming pools, underground pipes, and septic tank drains [Storer 1925, Pickwell 1947), sometimes many years after their local breeding site has been destroyed by urbanization (Jennings, unpublished data). Juvenile and adult salamanders are especially common in situations where piles of concrete, rock, or other rubble are mixed with
dirt and are located near breeding sites (Jennings, unpublished data). This is probably because such sites are attractive to burrowing rodents that create extensive tunnel and burrow systems that in turn are used by juvenile and adult salamanders.

Elsewhere in their range, CTS have been found to use California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*) burrows (Loredo et al. 1996). Salamanders have also been observed in the burrows of blacktail jackrabbits (*Lepus californicus*) and the deep cracks of clay soil which may extend up to 15-feet (4.6-meters) deep from the soil surface (Jennings, unpublished data).

Adult CTS forage both within underground habitat and surface from burrows to forage above ground. Adults apparently eat the same food organisms as juvenile salamanders (Morey and Guinn 1992, Jennings, unpublished data) and may live as long as 20+ years in the wild based on the longevity of other closely related species in captivity (see Snider and Bowler 1992).

### 3.4.7 Population Stability and Recovery

Two of the purposes of the listing of the CTS as endangered are to stabilize the species population in Sonoma County and to identify the actions necessary for recovery. The literature has identified a number of factors paramount to the continued existence of CTS, including the presence of aestivation habitat around breeding pond(s), large enough protected areas to support interconnected arrays of breeding ponds and aestivation habitat that support multiple CTS subpopulations, breeding habitat free of exotic predators of the CTS, and the lack of barriers between breeding pond(s) and aestivation habitat.

A breeding site for the CTS is defined by the USFWS (2003) to include the location where the animals are able to successfully breed in years of normal rainfall and complete their aestivation. The definition explicitly indicates that to effectively stabilize the CTS population and manage for its recovery, the entire landscape used by the CTS must be considered. According to the USFWS (2003), the survival and viability of the Sonoma County CTS is directly related to availability of breeding ponds with hydrological and other factors conducive to the salamander's reproduction and adequate upland acreage, with associated small mammal burrows, in the vicinity of the breeding ponds to accommodate aestivation (USFWS 2003). The "breeding site" is a loosely defined, descriptive unit without quantitative characteristics that permits one to assess minimum size requirements, place spatial boundaries around one, or distinguish one site from another. Because the annual reproductive success of ambystomatid salamanders appears to be universally low (<30 metamorphs produced per reproductive female), Trenham et al. (2000), indicates that regulation of salamander populations may be more dependent upon terrestrial survival than previously suggested. However, the presence of multiple breeding ponds in the aestivation landscape is an important element contributing to CTS survival over the long term.

According to Trenham and his coworkers (Trenham 2001, Trenham et al. 2000), isolated breeding ponds, even where surrounded by optimal terrestrial habitat, may be insufficient for the long-term maintenance of a viable population of CTS. Because salamanders wander widely over the landscape and because multiple breeding ponds reduce the risk of extinction, habitat connectivity that permits inter-pond dispersal is crucial and should be a management and recovery priority.
Trenham et al. (2001) and the USFWS (2003) agree that the greatest threat to the Sonoma County CTS population stems from human habitat modification resulting in the loss and isolation of breeding ponds, increases in migratory barriers, and fragmentation of the remaining occupied habitat. According to the USFWS (2003) and the references cited therein, the loss of migrating CTS from automobile traffic can be substantial, ranging from 25 to 72 percent of the breeding population for different populations of the species (Twitty 1941, S. Sweet, in litt. 1993, Launer and Fee 1996, as cited in USFWS 2003). In fact, the USFWS (2003) believes that road construction can reduce or completely eliminate the viability of a breeding site, and, in some cases larger portions of a metapopulation.

3.4.8 Project Site CTS Survey

Adult and Juvenile Surveys
Adult and juvenile CTS surveys were conducted by Dr. Mark R. Jennings, Gretchen E. Flohr, and a crew of assistants during the winter/spring of 2001-02. Surveys were conducted on December 22, 2001; January 8 and 28 and February 20 and 26, 2002. Surveys were conducted on the entire Property except for the portion of the development Property identified as DM Associates, LLC. The DM Associates, LLC property was not surveyed due to the lack of wetlands on the property. Other portions of the development Property were surveyed using the protocol methods developed by Brode (1997), which were established by the CDFG. Each individual used headlamps or flashlights to search for salamanders on the ground surface, in likely small mammal burrows, and under debris along transects across the entire site. Additionally, Dr. Jennings surveyed all paved roads within one-half mile of the Property at the conclusion of the on-site surveys.

No CTS adults, or juveniles were observed during first-year surveys

Larval Surveys
2001/2002
Surveys for CTS larvae were conducted on rainy or wet nights during the 2001-2002 rain events (January 8 and 28, February 20 and 26, 2002, and on April 3 and 18, 2002). Surveys for CTS larvae were conducted by Dr. Mark R. Jennings, Gretchen E. Flohr, and a crew of assistants. In addition, pond depth was monitored throughout the winter/spring season to assist in analyzing the site ponds as potential CTS breeding habitat. Eighteen-inch tall staff gages graduated in 0.1-foot increments were installed in three wetlands that were determined, through laser-level survey, to have the potential to pond water to the greatest depth. The staff gage was installed at the deepest point in each wetland. Water level observations were made on a regular basis during the winter rainy season. Observations began on December 7, 2001, and ended on April 22, 2002.

2002/2003
Surveys for CTS larvae were conducted by wildlife biologists Mark Allaback and David Laabs who performed aquatic sampling during the 2003 rain events (26 February, 19 March, and through April 2003). Three seasonal wetlands containing sufficient amounts of water, when compared to all other wetland areas on the Property, were sampled with long-handled D-shaped dip-nets (12-inch). On March 19, 2003, a potentially suitable wetland, located on
the Nelson property, was also sampled with a fine-mesh seine (4 x 10 feet with extra lead weights on the bottom), which is recommended by current protocol (USFWS 2002). Two of the wetland areas sampled were too shallow to sample with a seine. The third area was sampled using a seine. No CTS were captured or recorded demonstrating absence of CTS.

No CTS larvae were observed during the first-year surveys in 2001-2002 or during the second-year larval surveys in 2002-2003.

3.4.9 Project Site CTS Breeding Habitat
The Property contains three individual seasonal wetlands which could potentially pond on a continual basis during the winter rains. Two of the seasonal wetlands are unlikely to provide potential breeding habitat for the CTS. Both seasonal wetlands are too shallow to support development of larvae and provide sufficient protection from predators. No Pacific tree frog (*Hyla (= Pseudacris) regilla*) tadpoles were present and a relatively low number of aquatic invertebrates were observed. Although the two shallow wetlands may stay inundated for over three months, they average only a few inches deep with 4-6 inch deep depressions only a few feet in diameter. A dirt track that passes by the north edge of one of the shallow wetlands contained water in the tire ruts about 6 inches deep. The second shallow wetland is very small and was nearly dry during both visits in 2003.

A seasonal wetland located on the Nelson property, was determined to provide potential breeding habitat for CTS. It is about 50 by 75 feet in size and about ¼ of the wetland was 12 inches deep on 19 March 2003. It contained hundreds of Pacific tree frog larvae and invertebrates including *Daphnia* were common. However, no CTS have been recorded in this wetland feature during three years of surveying.

3.4.10 Project Site CTS Aestivation Habitat Assessment

**Methods**
The Property could offer suitable CTS aestivation habitat. The non-native annual grassland provides sites in which adult and juvenile salamanders could potentially spend the non-breeding season. Studies conducted in the Community Park indicate that suitable aestivation habitat occurs within properties on the west side of Dutton Meadow Avenue (Cook, personal communication). The aestivation habitat on the west side of Dutton Meadow Avenue is similar in composition to the habitat on the Property.

The Property was surveyed for potential CTS aestivation habitat, which included burrows used by small mammals including the Botta's pocket gopher, the broad-footed mole, and the California meadow vole (Olberding 2003b). Using an east-west baseline, 19 five-foot wide north-south transect lines were systematically established on 100-foot spacing to count rodent (i.e., gopher, mole and meadow vole) mounds and holes to estimate potential aestivation habitat densities. A five-foot width was used because, at that width, the transect was considered narrow enough to permit relatively accurate, time-efficient mound detection even in habitat vegetated with tall grass species. Along each transect the following features were counted:
• debris piles, with extensive amount of woody debris and/or debris.
• mounds of dirt 6-12 inches in diameter, which are composed of the tailings of burrowed earth deposited by small mammals such as gophers and moles. Mounds are characterized by loose, freshly piled dirt (Attachment 4 [Site Photographs]).
• small mammal burrows.

Results
Mounds and debris piles were found in the immediate vicinity of buildings that included the abandoned homes and miscellaneous associated storage areas at the west end of the Property, adjacent to Dutton Meadow Avenue (Attachment 1, Figures 6-7; and Attachment 4). Active below-ground burrows were recognizable by mounds of fresh dirt on the surface, which represent soil the small mammal removes from its burrow. A relatively high density of mounds was also found at the northeastern end of the site, adjacent to and within the Nelson property. These mounds are plugs that mark entries to underground Botta’s pocket gopher or mole. The underground tunnels and burrows constitute potential CTS aestivation habitat. There was a notable absence of small mammal (gopher or mole) mounds the interior area of the Property, possibly due to past discing activities (Olberding 2003b).

A higher density of relatively larger burrows was found in one area containing a small knoll that appears to have been left intact (not recently disced). One vole was observed leaving one of those burrows and entering another. Several burrows at this location were 3-4 inches in diameter (Attachment 4). These burrows could constitute CTS aestivation habitat.

Small burrows were found throughout the entire site along most transects. Most of these burrows appear to be shallow and are 1-3 inches in diameter. Many of the smaller burrows were closely examined and tend to end abruptly.

3.4.11 Dispersal Corridors and Barriers

Methods
Potential barriers to CTS dispersal into or out of the Property were assessed through the use of low elevation aerial photograph and on-site surveys. Ground truthing of information was obtained by surveying the surrounding properties and roadways. Observed barriers Include:

• roadways with heavy traffic volumes are anticipated to create a dispersal barrier.
• large buildings are anticipated to act as partial barriers to CTS dispersal.
• walls and wooden fences in contact with the ground surface could act as a dispersal barrier. Wire mesh fencing is not a barrier.
• the Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel may be a barrier during high flow times following storm events.
• curbs along roadways could be potential barriers to dispersal.

Aerial photographs were reviewed and analyzed for potential barriers prior to on-site foot surveys. All barriers were marked on the aerial photograph and verified in the field. Additional barriers were added when identified. The entire Property boundary was walked to
determine the presence of on-site barriers that could potentially restrict or eliminate movement of CTS to and from the Property. Additional off-site structures were assessed by driving and walking within neighborhoods adjacent to the site. The residential area along Silverspur Road, Rain Dance Way, and Tuxhorn Road (west of the site) were assessed by driving along smaller neighborhood roads and by asking residents about commonly used fence designs. Barriers in the areas to the south of the site and adjacent to the Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel were assessed by walking the maintenance road and examining all fencing materials on both sides of the channel. Properties to the south and west of the site were assessed by walking and driving along small neighborhood roads along Dutton Meadow Avenue, Maureen and Cass Roads, a pair of local cross streets, and by talking to residents about common fencing designs currently in use. Existing office buildings along Dutton Avenue, located south of the Property, were examined by driving through the area. Residential areas along Victoria Avenue, located to the east and south east of the Property, were assessed by talking to residents about commonly used fence designs, and by driving through the areas.

Results

All buildings within the properties surrounding the site were determined to be partial barriers to CTS dispersal. A few fences in areas surrounding the site are partial barriers to CTS dispersal, as indicated in Attachment 1, Figure 5. These areas contain (a) walls that constitute impassable barriers, or (b) impassable fences that are in contact with the ground surface along their length. The high-density residential areas along Rain Dance Way, Tuxhorn Drive, and Silverspur Road are likely to constitute an almost contiguous barrier to CTS dispersal. However, detailed examination and conversations with residents living on Rain Dance Way confirmed that most fences in the residential neighborhood are designed to be clear off the ground surface by less than an inch. Gaps between individual fence posts were also noted. The Rain Dance Way fences are therefore unlikely to be barriers to CTS dispersal.

Hearn Avenue and Bellevue Avenue are considered to be barriers to CTS dispersal due to heavy traffic volumes. Dutton Meadow Avenue is likely to be a barrier to CTS dispersal due to heavy traffic volumes during rush hours. The Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel is likely to be a barrier during high flow events following storms. However, at the time of the field surveys, the water level was relatively low. Slow flow areas within the flood control channel are likely to be passable to dispersing CTS.

Additional barriers include curbs located along a majority of the roadways. Concrete or asphalt curbs with a 6-8 inch vertical side would constitute a potential barrier to overland movement. With the exception of an open curb system along Dutton Meadow Avenue, the site is surrounded by roadways containing constructed curbs potentially limiting overland movement of CTS.

Areas with structures that are likely to be a dispersal barrier were also marked. However, most of the fencing in neighborhoods in the vicinity of the site is unlikely to be a dispersal barrier to CTS. Wooden fencing was closely examined for the presence or absence of tight contact with the ground surface. Most of the wood fencing leaves at least 0.5-1 inches clear off the ground surface. Conversations with one resident in Dutton Meadow Avenue, and a
residential living on Victoria Avenue confirmed that most wooden fences in these areas are
designed to leave a small space clear off the ground. Residents indicated that this design
feature prevents wood rot by prolonged contact with the wet earth during the rainy season.
All fencing on both sides of the flood control channel in properties south of the site was
passable to CTS. The office areas along Dutton Avenue (southeast of the site) are considered
to be barriers to CTS dispersal. No CTS dispersal barriers were found around Meadow View
Elementary School to the west of the site.

In summary, the existing buildings, high-traffic roads and road side curbs form major barriers
to CTS dispersal from the known breeding pond located to the west in the Southwest
Community Park and from potential breeding sites located north of the Property (Olberding
2003b). The heavy volume of traffic that occurs on Dutton Meadow, Hearn and Bellevue
Avenue would likely result in the mortality of any dispersing CTS attempting to cross on to
the Property. If CTS attempt to move from the east or south on to the Property they could
probably disperse under most existing fences found within the surrounding properties;
however, there are no known breeding areas at these locations from which CTS would be
dispersing.

3.5 Other Special-Status Wildlife

3.5.1 Raptors
The non-native annual grassland habitat on the Property provides foraging habitat for birds of
prey, i.e. raptors. The raptors of special concern that could occur at the Property or use it for
foraging purposes include the Cooper’s hawk (Accipiter cooperii), the sharp-shinned hawk
(Accipiter striatus), the white-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus), and northern harrier (Circus
cyaneus). Additionally, the red-tail hawk (Buteo jamaicensis), American kestrel (Falco
sparverius), and turkey vulture (Cathartes aura) could potentially be found foraging and/or
nesting on the Property.

A pair of white-tailed kites has been observed at the Property and is likely nesting nearby.
The pair of kites could potentially nest within the gum or oak trees located on the Property,
or in trees to the east of the Property. The two kites were observed to use the orchard trees in
the Nelson property in which to roost and preen. The kites have been observed on several
occasions to forage over the grasslands on the Property.

Suitable nesting habitat for the Cooper’s and sharp-shinned hawk is not present on the
Property. The northern harrier could potentially nest within the grassland habitat if the
height of the grasses allowed for a covert nest site. However, given that continual
disturbance (i.e., discing and grazing) occurs, it is extremely unlikely that the site would be
utilized.

The gum trees on the south-eastern side of the Property are considered to be potential nest
trees for red-tail hawks. The red-tail hawk prefers tall trees with a well-developed canopy
that include a strong branching structure on which to build a nest. Red-tail hawks could find ample foraging habitat in the non-native annual grasslands within the Property. Red-tail hawks are known to nest in grasslands located within urbanized areas such as found at the Property.

The American kestrel utilizes cavities in trees for nesting. These raptors hunt small rodents and birds. The gum and oak trees on the property could contain cavities that would be potentially utilized by the kestrel for nesting. American kestrels could forage in the non-native annual grassland habitat found within the Property. Kestrels are known to nest in grasslands within urbanized areas such as found at the Property.

The entire Property is suitable for hunting raptor species due to the presence of grassland habitat. The red-tail hawk, American kestrel, and white-tail kite could find nesting and foraging opportunities on or adjacent to the Property based on the presence of the specific habitat types these species are known to use.

### 3.5.2 California Red-Legged Frog

California red-legged frog (CRLF) is a State Species of Concern and is Federally listed as threatened. The CRLF is a pond frog found in lowlands, foothill woodland and grasslands, near marshes, lakes, ponds or other water sources, but can use ephemeral water sources as well. These amphibians require dense shrubby or emergent vegetation closely associated with deep still or slow moving water. Generally these frogs favor intermittent streams with water at least 2.5 feet deep and where the shoreline has relatively intact emergent or shoreline vegetation. The red-legged frog is known from streams with relatively low gradients and those waters where introduced fish and bullfrogs are absent. The CRLF occurs west of the Sierra Nevada-Cascade and in the Coast Ranges along the entire length of the state.

No suitable CRLF habitat occurs on the Property. Furthermore, according to the Vernal Pool Ecosystem Preservation Plan (Plan) (CH2M Hill 1996). The CRLF does not occur on the Santa Rosa Plain as it is defined in the Plan (CH2M Hill 1996). CRLF are not anticipated to occur on the Property due to the lack of suitable habitat for any portion of its life cycle.

### 3.5.3 Western Pond Turtle

The western pond turtle inhabits areas associated with primarily permanent or semi-permanent water, i.e., marshes, streams, drainage canals, and irrigation ditches. They require basking sites such as partially submerged logs, vegetation mats, rocks, or mud banks. Although matted vegetation occurs throughout the site's uplands and wetlands, no suitable habitat for the western pond turtle occurs at the site. Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel located along the southeastern border, is considered to be suitable habitat for the western pond turtle. It is possible the western pond turtle could use the Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel waterway and nest on the banks or in the fields adjacent to the creek. However, there have been no historic or current observations of this species on or adjacent to the Property.
3.5.4 Freshwater Shrimp
According to a study conducted in support of the Huichica Creek (Napa County) Stream Assessment report (U. S. D. A. Soil Conservation Service no date) for Huichica Creek, the California freshwater shrimp occurs in sandy and gravelly reaches of streams, typically inhabiting pools found below undercut banks and exposed tree roots. No creek habitat occurs on the Property and; therefore, no suitable freshwater shrimp habitat is present. Furthermore, according to the Vernal Pool Ecosystem Preservation Plan, there are no known occurrences of the freshwater shrimp within the Santa Rosa Plain as it was defined in the Plan (CH2M Hill 1996).

3.5.5 California linderiella
California linderiella occurs in vernal pools on the Santa Rosa Plain. The seasonal wetlands on the Property occur in shallow topographic depressions that appear unlikely to provide habitat for the fairy shrimp. However, some of the wetlands meet the criteria for suitable habitat for listed plants, and therefore meet the criteria for suitable habitat for California linderiella, as stipulated in the Plan.

Seasonal wetlands on the site occur in shallow, topographic depressions that are unlikely to pond water into June. The deeper portions of the eastern most wetland located on the Nelson property may provide suitable habitat for vernal pool fairy shrimp. In 2003, the seasonal wetland at this location was observed to be inundated through May. This species has not been observed on the Property.

4.0 Project Biological Impacts
This section describes potential impacts associated with proposed project activities on the Property. Types of impacts reviewed include the following:

- existing impacts—impacts to biological resources that currently exist on the Property and those properties immediately surrounding the Property.
- direct impacts — impacts that could have an immediate effect on biological resources that may be present at the Property.
- Indirect impacts — impacts on biological resources whose likely range includes the Property, despite the fact that these resources may be currently absent from the Property but occur on adjacent properties.
- cumulative impacts — describe ways in which the project development exists as a part of a series of existing impacts that ultimately cause detrimental effects to biological resources present in the vicinity of the Property.

Some project-related impacts, when considered in conjunction with impacts attributable to other projects (either in the vicinity or with similar characteristics), could have the potential to result in collectively adverse effects to the environment that are of greater significance than the individual impacts of the proposed project. As described in the above sections,
projects that involve the conversion of land from open space to other uses in areas surrounding the project site could result in the loss of special-status plant and wildlife species, and the loss or the loss of biologically unique or sensitive communities. On a cumulative level, activities associated with continued development in the Santa Rosa Plane could contribute further to the isolation of CTS breeding and aestivation habitats from each other, thereby adversely affecting the long-term viability of the population in the area (Allaback, personal communication; Jennings, personal communication; Stebbins 2002; Trenham et al 2000). As project development occurs, other related infrastructure developments could cause cumulative effects.

As mentioned above, it has only been assumed that the species may utilize portions of the Property as aestivation habitat. Since the CTS is presumed to be absent from the Property, the project would not result in the degradation or elimination of occupied habitat.

4.1 Existing Impacts

Existing impacts on the Property include disturbances attributed to agriculture, urbanization, and roadways. The most significant impact the Property currently experiences is disturbance associated with agricultural land use for livestock grazing and volunteer hay crops. Most of the Property has been used agriculturally for at least 50 years, which likely resulted in past losses of biological resources including recently listed special-status species such as the CTS.

The result of the past agricultural practices on the Property is the predominance of the non-native annual grassland and developed/ruderal plant habitat types. Both these habitats result from human occupation and intensive disturbance. Existing land-use practices including discing, mowing, and grazing, have resulted in disturb vegetation conditions and topography across the Property. This activity has also resulted in perpetuating a non-native plant invasion.

Existing impacts in the vicinity of the Property include the newly created Southwest Community Park (directly west of the site). An estimated 60 percent of the CTS habitat in the Park was destroyed to construct the low, rolling hills and complete the landscaping (David Cook, personal communication). A deep depression was excavated to obtain borrow material for landscaping the Park area. Excavation of the borrow pit resulted in the creation of new habitat for breeding amphibian species. The unintentionally created pond was then colonized by breeding CTS that probably dispersed from vernal pools that previously existed in the surrounding areas. The habitat from which the CTS once dispersed was likely eliminated with the increased and ongoing urbanization of the area surrounding the park.

Physical barriers (roads, buildings, and associated structures) exist between the Southwest Community Park CTS breeding pond and the Property that constitute a current impact to dispersal of adult and juvenile CTS. The surrounding urbanization of the landscape, with subdivisions, schools, parks, roads, and flood control structures, is likely to have worked in concert to prevent salamanders from moving between Southwest Community Park breeding ponds and aestivation sites, many of which have effectively become isolated from one another. Locally, Bellevue Ranch, the Community Park, Elsie Allen High School, and
Meadow View Elementary School, are recent elements of a process of urbanization that has been underway in the vicinity of the Property for decades. The A-1 storage facility, which was constructed in 1985, Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel, which was widened and deepened between 1967 and 1969, and the Marv's Meadows subdivision, construction on which began in 2001, have also eliminated both breeding and aestivation habitat and made migration more difficult between suitable sites that remain. The current conditions are apparent in the aerial photograph in Attachment 1, Figures 6-7.

Existing roads have an adverse impact on CTS. Hearn Avenue, Tuxhorn Drive, Rain Dance Way, and Burgess Drive experience high traffic volumes, and have been constructed with curbs that could be barriers to CTS dispersal. Traffic volumes on Dutton Meadow Avenue could potentially result in CTS mortality and effectively constitute barriers to CTS migration, despite remaining partially passable. The six-inch asphalt dividers installed to create a safe pedestrian pathway for school children walking along the west side of Dutton Meadow Avenue have added a potential barrier to CTS movement in addition to the buildings, curbs, and fences on the Meadow View Elementary School site. The asphalt dividers further interfere with movements between the breeding pond in the Southwest Community Park and any aestivation sites on the Property.

In summary, existing conditions surrounding the Property include the presence and expansion of barriers, which interfere with the potential for successful breeding, and return of CTS to aestivation sites on the Property. Other impacts that exist and influence the Property include the extensive land development within the surrounding area and the recent establishment and spread of Harding grass on the Property. Despite recent CTS observations at the Southwest Community Park, no CTS have been observed on the Property during three seasons of surveys. The lack of CTS observation on the Property has also led Dr. Jennings and Mark Allaback to conclude that CTS may be absent from the Property.

4.2 Direct Impacts

4.2.1 Impacts on Wetlands
A total of 4.37 acres of seasonal wetlands will be filled to construct the proposed project (Attachment 1, Figures 10 & 11). Approximately 0.16 of additional wetland acres have been previously filled as permitted according to Corps authorization (File No. 24554N) and are therefore, not included in this discussion of wetland impacts. All 4.37 acres of wetlands on the Property will be filled and the surrounding upland habitat will be impacted during implementation of the project. There will be no indirect off-site impacts on wetlands as a result of project development. The wetland impacts resulting from the Project would not be significant for several reasons:

- the wetlands are disturbed, low-quality habitat, dominated by non-native species, and do not support endangered plant species (CH2M Hill, 1996; 1998; Stromberg 2000; 2001; Olberding 2003);
• the on-site and adjacent wetlands are hydrologically and ecologically isolated from high-quality wetlands;
• the Property is located within incorporated City of Santa Rosa; the land to the east, northeast, north, and northwest has been developed (school, Southwest Community Park, residential and commercial development), and the wetlands are isolated from surrounding natural open-space habitat, surrounding areas are not likely to be preserved over the long term;
• the total area of wetland habitat is relatively small given the size of the Property.

4.2.2 Impacts on CTS
Approximately 42.03 acres of potential CTS aestivation habitat exists on the 56.88-acre Property. Approximately 1.45 acres of the Property is covered by hardscape features such as buildings, driveways, and other impervious surfaces that are not considered to be CTS habitat (David Wooten, personal communications). An additional 12.4 acres associated with the DM Associates, LLC property has already been mitigated. A CTS mitigation agreement was negotiated with CDFG for potential impacts to 12.4 acres of aestivation habitat following issuance of the Corps permit. A copy of the Corps permit is included in Attachment 3.

The Property is surrounded by urban residential and commercially developed lands, is separated from the only known CTS breeding pond in the immediate area by Meadow View Elementary School and Dutton Meadow Avenue, lacks well-developed aestivation habitat because of the absence of abundant burrows, and has no known on-site breeding. Physical barriers to inbound and outbound CTS migration exist in all directions around the Property. The hydrologic function of the known breeding pond in Southwest Community Park is declining and, in 2003, water had to be pumped into it to prevent it from drying (Flohr, personal communication). The Property is located in an area where long-term persistence of the CTS population is extremely unlikely.

CTS surveys conducted over a three year period resulted in no positive findings. In addition, a survey of Phase 8 of the Bellevue Ranch housing development at 2664 Dutton Meadows Avenue was also negative. Overall, an assessment of the full extent of impacts of the proposed project on CTS is difficult to determine because no CTS have been observed on the Property. Habitat assessments indicate that most of the gopher mounds exist along the edges of the Property in the vicinity of abandoned homes and storage areas. At the time of the surveys, the middle section of the Property appeared to support relatively few gopher mounds, suggesting that the Property may not represent ideal CTS aestivation habitat.

In spite of the negative survey results to date, it would be difficult to state that the project would not have an effect on CTS because the project will eliminate potentially suitable aestivation habitat based on the proximity of the Property to the known breeding pond located within Southwest Community Park. Trumark Companies stipulates that the proposed project has a very low potential to result in direct impacts to CTS (incidental take; disruption or failure of breeding efforts); given that no CTS have been documented on the Property during three consecutive years of surveying.
Based on the negative findings obtained during these surveys, it has only been assumed that the species may utilize the portions of the Property as aestivation habitat. Since the CTS is presumed to be absent from the Property, the project would not result in the degradation or elimination of occupied habitat, reduce the number or restrict the range of the species and will not directly contribute to a loss of an individual.

4.2.3 Impacts on Special-Status Plant Species
The special-status plant species identified by the USFWS, CDFG, CNDDB and CNPS as potentially occurring in or around the Property, based on regional reports, are known to grow in specific habitat types. The habitats necessary for the USFWS, CDFG, CNDDB and CNPS reported plant species consist of valley and foothill grassland, chaparral, coastal scrub, alkaline flats, coastal dunes, marshes, swamps and vernal pools. The specific habitats or “micro-climate” necessary for many of the listed plant species to occur are not found within the boundaries of the Property. The non-native grassland, vernal pools, and seasonal wetlands offer three habitats in which several plants could occur on the Property. Lobb’s aquatic buttercup, a non-listed species occurs in a single seasonal wetland on site. It would be eliminated when the wetland it occupies is filled. None of the other special-status plant species listed as threatened or endangered by the federal government has been observed on the Property during three seasons of surveys that were conducted following state and federal survey requirements.

4.3 In-Direct Impacts

4.3.1 In-Direct Impacts to CTS
The functional value or utility of the Property and its habitat and actual occupancy by CTS depend upon the conditions on the surrounding lands. In-direct impacts on CTS include the elimination of potential aestivation habitat on the Property that could be used by CTS in the future, and the creation of barriers to dispersal or movement away from existing breeding areas such as Southwest Community Park. CTS migratory pathways are generally straight-line movements into which are incorporated diversions to circumnavigate physical barriers (Jennings, personal communication; Stebbins 2002). CTS that cross the sidewalks and manage to get down onto the roads cannot get back upon the other side of the road even if the curbs are less than eight inches high. Development on the Property would include the construction of curbs and gutters along Dutton Meadow Road that would limit potential future CTS movement from other sites. Although to date, two years of winter CTS surveys and a spring larval survey have not identified CTS on the Property or within the roadways.

4.4 Cumulative Impacts
For purposes of this BA, cumulative affects use the definition at 50 CFR 402.02. That is, “those effects of future State or private activities, not involving Federal activities, that are reasonably certain to occur within the action area of the Federal action subject to consultation.”
Considered a single entity, the proposed project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on biological resources. However, the development of the Property would result in the conversion of approximately 50.06 acres of grassland to an urban and suburban environment. The project would convert annual grassland habitat on the Property to commercial and residential development. The loss of 50.06 acres of grassland would reduce the cumulative foraging habitat available to raptors such as the red-tail hawk, American kestrel and white-tailed kite. Disturbances associated with Property development activities would reduce the habitat quality for those species currently using the Property. The development underway on the Santa Rosa Plain incrementally decreases foraging habitat for birds of prey and other more common bird species. The development of the Property will contribute to the cumulative loss of grassland habitat for raptors and other common mammal species in the State including potential aestivation habitat for CTS. This is the general trend in the Santa Rosa Plain, and it incrementally reduces the value of habitat available to native wildlife species.

5.0 Mitigation and Protection Measures

The following sections provide a comprehensive description of mitigation commitments and protection measures proposed to avoid, minimize and compensate for potential direct and indirect impacts that could result from project development activities. These mitigation and protection measures have been prepared in recognition of the fact that a comprehensive or final mitigation plan will be developed following consultation and discussions with USFWS and CDFG. Therefore, the following draft measures are intended to initiate the preparation of a final plan for appropriate mitigation and protection measures that would be implemented as a result of further communications with resource agencies.

Where potential take effects and mitigation options are recognized, measures for mitigation are specific in nature. The mitigation discussion for federally listed species is to be developed in close coordination with the mitigation plan prepared as part of the permit application to the Corps through section 404 of the CWA to compensate for the placement of fill into waters of the United States. Much of the habitat compensation that will be performed to address wetlands impacts will also be serving as mitigation for listed species.

5.1 Proposed Site for Wetlands, Special-Status Plants and Wildlife Mitigation

The USFWS has informally indicated in conversations with biological consultants at field and office meetings that they are interested in one or more large CTS preserves that ideally would approach 500 acres each and that three specific areas might be considered as focal points for developing such a preserve (Browning, personal communication; Wooten, personal communication; Buford, personal communication). For projects proposed within the City of Santa Rosa boundaries, the two focal points are:
• an area around the Wright Preservation Bank (between Hall and Occidental Roads west of Fulton Road).
• lands around the Beretta Dairy and the existing mitigation banks between Ludwig and Todd Roads.

A third focal point in the southern part of the Santa Rosa Plain has been discussed by the agencies; this mitigation area would likely be more appropriate for proposed projects within the towns of Rohnert Park and Cotati.

Trumark Companies reviewed aerial photographs around both the Wright Preservation Bank and the Beretta Dairy to locate and identify potential sites to acquire for use as mitigation. Trumark Companies identified the Gobbi Ranch, owned by Robert Gobbi, as the preferred mitigation alternative. The Gobbi Ranch straddles Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel south of Todd Road and west of Stony Point Road (Attachment 1, Figures 13 & 14). It was determined, based on a review of the Gobbi Ranch, that the site is suitable for CTS, wetland and endangered plant species mitigation. Trumark Companies has initiated negotiations with Mr. Gobbi for the acquisition of mitigation rights on portions of the ranch.

Lands purchased for mitigation by Trumark Companies, located within the available Gobbi Ranch property acreage, would form a preserve contiguous with the 31-acre Gobbi Wetland Mitigation Site. The Gobbi Wetland Mitigation Site contains approximately nine acres of vernal pools and swales that were restored to mitigate for wetlands affected by the Courtside Village project. CTS larvae have been observed at the 31-acre site and several vernal pools appear to be deep enough to provide CTS breeding habitat. Additionally, the Gobbi Ranch parcel supports Sebastopol Meadowfoam, Sonoma sunshine, and Lobb's aquatic buttercups. The location of the site and its immediate surroundings are shown in the photograph contained in Attachment 1, Figure 14. The 31-acre Gobbi Wetland Mitigation site is also located directly across Todd Road from the Engle Mitigation Bank, where numerous vernal pools supporting colonies of Sebastopol meadowfoam occur. Several vernal pools at the Engle Mitigation Bank appear to be deep enough to provide CTS breeding habitat.

The Gobbi Ranch property contains three known and several potential CTS breeding ponds. Gophers provide a continuously available network of active dens and burrows for aestivation in the surrounding grasslands. The Gobbi Ranch property is removed from urban development and surrounded by rural residential properties and lands that have been placed into extensive agricultural practices (i.e., primarily cattle grazing). The Gobbi Ranch property is also located near the Beretta Dairy (a focal point identified by the USFWS for a future Central Santa Rosa Plain CTS preserve), several other preserves (the CDFG Preserve) and mitigation banks (Engle Bank, Carinalli-Todd Road Mitigation Bank, Hale Bank, and the Hazel Mitigation Bank). Please refer to Attachment 1, Figure 13.

After review of available data it was concluded that land within the Gobbi property is considered an ideal mitigation site. No structural barriers exist between the Gobbi Mitigation Site and the land that would be acquired by Trumark Companies. CTS could move freely between breeding ponds and aestivation habitat. The proposed mitigation site for the Dutton Meadows Property would be contiguous with high quality CTS and vernal pool habitat.
of land within the Gobbi Ranch site would result in the preservation of habitat that is superior to what currently exists on the Dutton Meadows Property.

By virtue of the size, location, and existing resources values, land within the Gobbi Ranch site is considered to be highly desirable for mitigation. Trumark Companies proposes to fulfill its wetland and CTS mitigation obligations by purchasing a portion of the Gobbi Property and restoring wetlands that would be suitable to support potential breeding ponds for CTS.

The Property along Dutton Meadow Drive is relatively low-quality habitat for CTS regardless of the proximity of the known CTS breeding pond in Southwest Community Park, given that the single breeding pond is an isolated feature. Mitigation at the Gobbi Ranch property would provide the opportunity to create additional breeding ponds and add to the preservation of existing highly functional habitat, including habitat located on the surrounding banks and preserved properties. The following table offers a preliminary comparison of habitat characteristics between the impact site (Property) and the mitigation site (Gobbi Ranch). Some of the characteristics are descriptive of the project site or study area; others are descriptive of the surrounding land. Table 2 provides a comparison of habitat types on the Property and at the Gobbi Ranch Property.

Table 2: Comparison of Habitat Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site and Habitat Characteristic</th>
<th>Dutton Meadow Drive Project Site</th>
<th>Gobbi Ranch Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Known On-site Breeding Pond(s)</td>
<td>No known breeding ponds</td>
<td>Three known breeding ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Nearby Known Breeding Pond(s)</td>
<td>One known breeding pond in Southwest Community Park</td>
<td>Fourteen known breeding ponds in 31-acre Gobbi Mitigation Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers between Nearest Off-site Known Breeding Ponds and Site</td>
<td>Dutton Meadow Drive, Meadowview Elementary School, low asphalt curb barriers</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Potential On-site Breeding Ponds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of On-site Aestivation Habitat (index: abundance of burrows)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Closest Road and Traffic Volume</td>
<td>Collectors (adjacent)</td>
<td>Collectors (removed several hundred feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Preserve or Protected Habitat</td>
<td>Distant, Isolated</td>
<td>Adjacent to 31-acre Gobbi Mitigation Site, and close to Engle and Hale Banks, and Beretta Dairy and other preserves and protected areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.1 Mitigation for Impacts on Wetlands
The total area of wetlands to be impacted by development of the Property is 4.37 acres. Either on-site or off-site mitigation would be consistent with the wetland construction-restoration mitigation requirements established in the Programmatic Consultation between the USFWS and the Corps dated July 17, 1998. The applicant could satisfy the requirements of both the state and federal governments in its restoration and construction of wetlands or acquisition of wetland credits. Mitigation for wetland impacts is proposed to be offset at a 1.5:1 ratio (1.5 acre of mitigation for 1 acre of impact) for a total construction-restoration of 6.55 acres of seasonal wetlands and/or vernal pools. This mitigation ratio is proposed to satisfy the Corps, CDFG, USFWS and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Wetland mitigation would involve the creation of potential CTS breeding ponds on the Gobbi Ranch property. Each agency regulates different wetland features on the Property, and the proposed construction-restoration of these habitats will cumulatively mitigate for the total number of affected acres.

Trumark Companies proposes to mitigate wetland impacts by constructing or restoring wetlands on the property acquired from Mr. Gobbi. On-site mitigation is not considered to be preferable because the Property is isolated from all surrounding wetlands. Wetlands within the Project site exist in a pocket of undeveloped land surrounded by development. Preservation of wetlands on-site would be undesirable as they would become further isolated over time as the Dutton Meadow and Hearn Avenue area becomes more developed. In addition, the on-site habitats are considered to be low quality due to the influence of invasive species such as Harding grass and past agricultural disturbances. The floristic value of on-site wetland habitats is not considered high due to the presence of many common weed species within the features. Off-site wetland restoration-construction would result in the creation of 6.55 acres of fully functional seasonal wetland and/or vernal pool habitat in a large preserve setting. The establishment of wetlands in a contiguous preserve would result in high-quality habitats, especially since the proposed preserve area currently supports special-status species including CTS. The created mitigation wetlands would be anticipated to support populations of special-status species and result in the increase in their numbers. Off-site mitigation is therefore considered to be a more appropriate and biologically superior option for the project.

5.1.2 Mitigation for Impacts on Special-Status Plants
Off-site mitigation of impacts to special-status plants is proposed at the Gobbi Ranch property or by purchasing credits in an approved mitigation bank site. Listed plant species have not been identified on the Property; however, Trumark Companies proposes to mitigate for impacts on potential habitat for Sebastopol meadowfoam. The preference of Trumark Companies is to mitigate for potential habitat impacts in concert with the wetland mitigation on the Gobbi Ranch property, which currently supports Sebastopol meadowfoam. Habitat for this species will be constructed or restored through the wetland creation process. The
6.55 acres of wetland mitigation will provide habitat in which the special-status plant may occur.

5.1.3 Mitigation for Impacts on California Tiger Salamander

Although CTS survey results to date have been negative, the Property is located in close proximity to the Southwest Community Park, where a CTS preserve was established. Surveys of potential aestivation habitat on the Property indicate that an abundance of gopher mounds exists in the areas immediately surrounding the abandoned homes, storage areas, and the orchard, but the remainder of the Property is largely devoid of gopher mounds. Small, shallow mammal burrows do appear to persist across the Property, and there is a higher concentration of vole-burrows in one area of the site (Olberding 2003c). Due to the close proximity of a CTS breeding pond to the west, and the presence of potential aestivation habitat on the Property it was assumed that 42.03 acres of potential CTS aestivation habitat would be impacted (55.88 acres less 1.45 acres of existing impermeable surfaces and 12.4 acres for the previously mitigated DM Associates, LLC property).

The two alternatives proposed to mitigate for loss of potential CTS aestivation habitat are on-site and/or off-site mitigation. The USFWS staff has identified variables that are critical in assessing CTS habitat quality (Wooten, personal communication), which include:

- size of the site;
- past and current on-site land use;
- surrounding land use;
- traffic volumes on surrounding roads;
- on-site breeding ponds;
- proximity of known CTS observations;
- quality of aestivation habitat;
- restoration potential as reflected by soils and current wetland/other vegetation;
- potential significance of the site in the recovery of the CTS.

Based on the above criteria, on-site mitigation would not appear to be an ecologically suitable approach because mitigation must retain the existing habitat values over the long term. The avoidance of any part of the 42.03 acres of potential habitat on the Property would not result in the preservation of a high-quality CTS aestivation site due to the ongoing urbanization of the surrounding land, the high and growing traffic volumes on surrounding roadways, and the lack of breeding ponds. Although the existing Southwest Community CTS preserve is located near the Property, several potential barriers to CTS dispersal occur between the Property and the preserve. Furthermore, the area around Dutton Meadow Avenue represents habitat that has been fragmented by several recent urban developments, and the Property is unlikely to be considered suitable aestivation habitat over the long term.

The location of the Property in relationship to the suburban and urban environment of Santa Rosa decreases its value in the long-term recovery of CTS. The significance of the Property in the recovery of CTS is marginal due to the isolation of the Property from sustainable CTS breeding habitats. It may be concluded the Property is best suited to be developed as infill due to the existing urbanization on all borders. This site would not be considered the best
choice to develop a CTS mitigation site due to the cumulative lack of required criteria as outlined above. In light of the above variables, proposed use of the project site as a CTS mitigation site or CTS preserve has been rejected.

Off-site mitigation is proposed by Trumark Companies for CTS aestivation habitat. A 0.5:1 ratio (0.5 acre of mitigation for 1 acre of impact) for the mitigation of assumed potential aestivation habitat is proposed that would result in the preservation of habitat currently occupied by CTS and the creation of 6.55 acres of new breeding ponds. The proposed off-site CTS mitigation consists of 21.02 acres of the Gobbi Ranch property that is contiguous with the 31-acre Gobbi Wetland Mitigation site where CTS are also known to occur. The Gobbi Ranch property is also reported to contain a relatively high number of gopher mounds/potential aestivation habitat (Olberding 2003c). The 6.55 acres of wetland mitigation will be combined with the 21.02 acres of CTS preservation for a total of 27.57 acres within the Gobbi Ranch site, as described above in Section 5.1.1.

In recognition of the conditions in the vicinity of the Southwest Community Park, the CDFG reached an agreement with Tuxhorn, the prior landowner, to mitigate for DM Associates, LLC (a.k.a. Bellevue Ranch Phase – 8) at a mitigation site established on Yuba Drive. As mitigation for impacts on 12.4 acres of potential CTS habitat at the DM Associates, LLC property, Trumark Companies accepted the Tuxhorn/CDFG agreement, fulfilling their mitigation requirement for this property. Therefore, the DM Associates, LLC property has not been included in the mitigation acreage for the proposed development project.

Trumark Companies intends to work with USFWS staff to substantiate and document the habitat quality at the Gobbi Ranch site. In recognition of the requirement to determine the presence of CTS and associated habitat at or close to the proposed mitigation lands, Trumark Companies will conduct all required surveys that would complete the assessment needed for the USFWS to approve the use of 27.57 acres of the Gobbi Ranch site as wetland and CTS mitigation for the Dutton Meadows Development Site.

5.2 Summary of Mitigation Measures for Construction Impacts

The following sections provide a comprehensive description of mitigation actions that will be implemented during project construction to avoid, minimize and compensate for potential impacts to species or their habitats that could be affected by the project. The following actions are based on the best scientific information available. Trumark Companies recognizes that additional data and planning may potentially be required to fully implement mitigation actions during the course of project construction.

5.2.1 General Protection and Mitigation Measures to be Established Prior to Project Construction

The entire Property would be graded and developed by the proposed project. Additional impacts to adjacent biological resources would be avoided through implementation of
general conditions that guide good work practices that are established prior to project construction. The following measures would be implemented for all project impact areas including the construction of new wetland breeding ponds at the Gobbi Ranch mitigation site. These measures would help to avoid and minimize incidental mortality and injury to plants and wildlife. The project would:

- prepare a Biological Resource Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan (BRMIMP) that outlines how the protection and mitigation measures will be implemented. The BRMIMP is a document that also describes the responsibilities of the Compliance Manager who oversees all compliance measures required for the project, the Designated Biologist who will oversee compliance with biological mitigation measures, and the Biological Monitor who oversees construction activities on the ground. The Designated Biologist would prepare and submit daily logs and monthly compliance reports.
- avoid and minimize impacts to Colgan Creek during construction by designating exclusion zones with silt fence.
- conduct pre-construction surveys for listed species including raptors, western pond turtle and plant species.
- conduct CTS pre-construction salvage surveys.

5.2.2 On-site Monitoring During Construction

Biological monitors will be employed to monitor and/or implement construction mitigation measures and to report on compliance of contractors with mitigation requirements. Monitors will report directly to the Designated Biologist. Biological monitors will be qualified to conduct required mitigation activities. Reports on non-compliance with environmental requirements may result in temporary halting of construction activity to examine the non-compliance and prevent further resource damage. Biological monitors will:

- provide worker environmental awareness training for all construction personnel that identifies sensitive biological resources that may occur in construction areas and that addresses measures required to minimize project impacts during construction and operation.
- be present onsite during initial construction activities to identify sensitive resources.
- monitor mitigation construction near sensitive habitats and resources, i.e., Colgan Creek and Gobbi Ranch.
- prohibit ground disturbance until sensitive areas are cleared.
- be present during open trench work construction activities that require special attention in sensitive areas.
- prepare construction monitoring and compliance reports that analyze the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.
5.2.3 Other Mitigation Measures to be Implemented During Construction Activities

Construction mitigation actions and plans will be installed to ensure that adopted avoidance and mitigation measures are achieved in the field. On-site actions and plans will include:

- prohibit refueling or storage of hazardous materials within 200 feet of flagged sensitive plant species or sensitive wildlife habitat features (raptor nest, Colgan Creek, Gobbi Ranch site). For portable equipment that uses fuels or lubricants, use Visqueen or other containment material under the equipment to capture leaks or spills
- prohibit intentional killing or collection of either plants or wildlife at construction sites.

5.3 Timing Restrictions During Construction

Timing restrictions and acceptable work windows for construction in sensitive areas will be developed and coordinated with the USFWS to avoid and minimize impacts to special-status species.

5.4 Mitigation for Erosion Effects During Construction

Temporary increases in erosion could occur during construction. To mitigate for erosion impacts, best management practices for construction will be implemented during and after construction. These include measures such as installing silt fences, placing rice-straw bales on and directly downstream of exposed soils, and minimizing exposed surfaces. Stockpiled soils, equipment and materials will be covered with tarps during construction. Contractor access will be institutionally controlled, and will also be monitored by the on-site biologist, who will be present throughout the construction period.

5.5 Mitigation for Impacts to Waters of the U.S.

For any location where project construction would fill jurisdictional waters, the applicant would obtain and comply with the applicable conditions of permits issued from the Corps (Section 404, Clean Water Act). The final mitigation requirements for impacts to jurisdictional waters would be determined through continuing consultation with Corps.

Implementation of the conditions associated with an issued Section 404 permit would be sufficient to protect the biological resources or mitigate for loss of biological resources at these locations. The application provided to the Corps would provide sufficient analysis of alternatives to identify the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative, as specified under Section 404(b)(1) guidelines.
5.6 Protected and Special-Status Species

A summary of the mitigation measures for project construction is presented in the table below. Additional detailed mitigation measures are presented in the following sections for each special-status species affected by the project. Sections on individual wildlife species follow.

### Table 3: Summary of Mitigation Measures for Impacts to Sensitive Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Resource</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habitats</td>
<td>Compensate impacts through:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>Mitigate 6.55 acres at the Gobbi Ranch property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>Minimize impacts through:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobb’s aquatic buttercup (Present)</td>
<td>Mitigate potential habitat for absent species at the Gobbi Ranch property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>Provide 10-day notification for CDFG to salvage Lobb’s aquatic buttercup if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Tiger salamander</td>
<td>Protection and Mitigation Measures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western pond turtle</td>
<td>21.02 acres of off-site habitat preservation for potential impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raptors/Waterfowl and shorebirds</td>
<td>Construction fencing to prevent or restrict access along Colgan Creek, pre-construction surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesting and migratory birds</td>
<td>Pre-construction surveys to determine presence/absence. Worker environmental awareness training; Nest avoidance and tree removal from October to February Constrain construction schedule appropriately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.6.1 Protection for California Tiger Salamander

Measures will be taken to avoid any potential impacts to the California tiger salamander during project construction. A pre-construction survey of the area will be performed by a qualified biological monitor. Following the survey, fencing will be installed around all wetland or ponded areas using erosion control fabric. The biological monitor will be present during fence installation. The fencing will be inspected daily by a biological monitor to ensure that it is intact and in good condition.

If a CTS is observed within the construction area project construction within the area will be stopped until it is moved to a designated habitat area by the biological monitor. The designated habitat area will be located either within the fenced area on the project site, or at an off-site location determined by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. No individuals will handle a CTS.
5.6.2 Protection for Western Pond Turtle

Marginally suitable habitat for western pond turtle is present along the waterway of Colgan Creek. Protection measures were developed to prevent sediments and construction debris from entering waterways as described in the erosion control plan. The mitigation and protection measures proposed for the project to avoid impacts to turtles include:

- conduct pre-construction survey within the project construction zones to locate areas where turtles could occur.
- find and relocate individual animals prior to ground disturbance activities
- set up construction zone limits along the Property boundary near the creek banks, using silt fencing to restrict access by turtles into construction areas and place signage indicating the area is protected and not accessible for construction equipment and materials.
- relocate any turtle, or other wildlife to safe areas outside the construction zone limits.

5.6.3 Protection for Nesting and Migratory Birds

Resident and migratory raptors, herons, egrets, and waterfowl may occur at the Property during construction. These species are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code. Disturbance of nest sites, which is prohibited under Section 3503.5 of the Fish and Game Code, could result in abandonment of eggs or young. However, most birds such as waterfowl, songbirds, raptors, and shorebirds observed on the site have large home ranges (Small, 1974; EPA 1993). Existing adjacent habitat could provide alternative habitat during project construction.

Pre-construction surveys will be conducted for ground nesting raptors and for tree nesting raptor within 100 feet of construction activities. Resident birds often begin nesting as early as February in California. Nest searches will be conducted before site construction begins and the vegetation within construction areas will be removed and/or mowed to minimize the potential for birds to nest within the construction areas. If nests are found with no eggs or young, the nest will be removed. If nesting birds with eggs or young are found during the surveys, the Biological Monitor will coordinate with the Designated Biologist and CDFG for possible relocation or rehabilitation at an approved wildlife rehabilitation center. If an exclusion zone cannot reasonably be implemented at this distance, the following measures may be implemented:

- project construction may be postponed in the area until young are fledged, or
- a Biological Monitor will monitor the birds on the nest and stop construction if it appears that the birds will abandon the nest or young, or
- CDFG will be consulted if construction appears to jeopardize the nesting success and provide for the artificial rearing of eggs or young by a Biological Monitor.
5.7 Post-Construction Monitoring and Mitigation

Post-construction monitoring will be implemented to document the effectiveness of design and mitigation measures applied to mitigate for impacts on identified species or to mitigate for impacts on sensitive habitats. Restoring and creating habitats to achieve compensation for project construction impacts will involve ground disturbance. As the mitigation site has the potential to support listed species including the CTS, construction mitigation measures similar to those described above will be employed. Specific measures to avoid and minimize effects of mitigation construction will be identified in a site-specific plan subject to approval from appropriate agencies including the USFWS, Corps, and CDFG. Long-term monitoring and management will use adaptive management approaches to create the best possible mitigation habitat.
6.0 Literature Cited


CDFG. California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB). 2002. Rarefind list and locations of species observed on Goose Creek, Clay, Galt, Bruceville, and Florin USGS quadrangles.


Holland, R. F. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. California Department of Fish and Game. 1986.


Stromberg, L.P. 2000a. Results of survey for Special-Status Plant Species, Hearn Properties, Santa Rosa, California.


Stromberg, L.P. 2000c. Results of survey for Special-Status Plant Species, Lechmanski Property (A. P. No.043-171-029), Santa Rosa, California.


Stromberg, L.P. 2001b. Results of survey for Special-Status Plant Species, Nelson Property, Santa Rosa, California.


7.0 PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS

Mark Allaback, Wildlife Biologist, Biosearch Wildlife Surveys, Santa Cruz, California.


David Cook, Biologist, Sonoma County Water Agency, Sonoma, California

Barry Denenberg, Property Owner, Santa Rosa, California

Gretchen Flohr, Wildlife Biologist, Fremont, California

Mark Jennings, Wildlife Biologist, Davis, California.

Russ Lockner, Property Owner, Santa Rosa, California

Arthur Nelson, Property Owner, Santa Rosa, California

H. Bradley Shaffe, University of California at Davis, Davis, California

L. Stromberg, Wildlife Biologist, San Rafael, California

Carl Wilcox, California Department of Fish and Game, Yountville, California

ATTACHMENTS
ATTACHMENT NO. 1.

Figure 1: Regional Map of Property
Figure 2: Vicinity Map of Property
Figure 3: USGS 7.5 Minute Map of Property
Figure 4: Aerial Photograph of the Dutton Meadow Site
Figure 5: Dutton Meadow Ownership Diagram
Figure 6: Neighborhood Context
Figure 7: Site Analysis
Figure 8: Master Development Plan
Figure 9: Conceptual Build-Out Plan
Figure 10: Existing Wetland Plan
Figure 11: Proposed Development Plan with Seasonal Wetlands
Figure 12: Vicinity Map of the Mitigation Site and Dutton Meadows Property
Figure 13: Location of the Mitigation Bank with Respect to Other Preserves and Bank Sites
Figure 14: Aerial Photograph of the Mitigation Site
FIGURE NO. 1:
Regional Map of Property
FIGURE NO. 2:

Vicinity Map of Property
Figure 2. Vicinity Map of Dutton Meadows Property.
FIGURE NO. 3:

USGS 7.5 Minute Map of Property
Figure 3
FIGURE NO. 5:

Dutton Meadow Ownership Diagram
FIGURE NO. 6:

Neighborhood Context
FIGURE NO. 7:

Site Analysis
FIGURE NO. 8:

Master Development Plan
FIGURE NO. 9:

Conceptual Build-Out Plan
FIGURE NO. 10:
Existing Wetland Plan
DUTTON MEADOWS, SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA
EXISTING WETLAND PLAN

LEGEND

Seasonal Wetlands to be filled
FIGURE NO. 11:

Proposed Development Plan with Seasonal Wetlands
DUTTON MEADOWS, SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN
WITH SEASONAL WETLANDS

LEGEND

Seasonal Wetlands to be filled
FIGURE NO. 12:

Vicinity Map of the Mitigation Site and Dutton Meadows Property
FIGURE NO. 13:

Location of the Gobbi Ranch Site with Respect to Other Preserves and Bank Sites
FIGURE NO. 14:

Aerial Photograph of the Gobbi Ranch Site
Preliminary Map of Seasonal Wetlands and Locations of Endangered Species (Sebastopol Meadowfoam, Sonoma Sunshine, California Tiger Salamander Larvae) Observations

Approximate Scale: 1:7,600

Study Area
Seasonal Wetland:
CTS Larval Observation
Sebastopol Meadowfoam Colony
Sonoma Sunshine Colony
ATTACHMENT NO. 2

Bellevue Phase 8 (DM Associates, LLC) Corps
Section 404 Permit and Regional Board
Section 401 Certification
Regulatory Branch

SUBJECT: File Number 24554N

M. L. Tuxhorn
Bellevue Ranch Partners
P.O. Box 11128
Santa Rosa, California 95406

Dear Mr. Tuxhorn:

This is in reference to your submittal of June 16, 1999 concerning Department of the Army authorization to fill 0.16 acre of seasonal wetland to construct the Bellevue Phase 8 Project, located at 2650 and 2684 Dutton Meadows Drive in Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California (APNs 043-071-23, -22, -07). The project is shown on the attached drawing entitled "McGill Gould Land Plan", dated March 23, 2001. This letter specifically addresses two items. First, this letter approves the jurisdictional delineation for the site, as described below. Second, this letter serves as authorization for fill of these wetlands, as conditioned below.

1. Jurisdictional Delineation

Enclosed is a map showing the extent and location of Corps of Engineers jurisdiction on this parcel. We have based this jurisdictional delineation on the current conditions of the site. A change in those conditions may also change the extent of our jurisdiction. This delineation will expire in three years from the date of this letter. However, if there has been a change in circumstances that affects the extent of Corps' jurisdiction, a revision may be done before that date.

You are advised that the Corps has established an Administrative Appeal Process, as described in 33 CFR Part 331 (65 FR 16,486; Mar. 23, 2000), and outlined in the enclosed flowchart and "Notification of Administrative Appeal Options, Process, and Request for Appeal" from (NAO-RFA). If you do not intend to accept the approved jurisdictional determination, you may elect to provide new information to the District Engineer for reconsideration or submit a completed NAO-RFA form to the Division Engineer to initiate the appeal process. You will relinquish all rights to appeal, unless new information or a completed NAO-RFA form is received by the Corps within sixty (60) days of the date of the NAO-RFA.
2. Nationwide Authorization


The project must be in compliance with the General Conditions cited in Enclosure 1 for the Nationwide Permit authorization to remain valid. Upon completion of the project and all associated mitigation requirements, you shall sign and return the enclosed Certification of Compliance, Enclosure 2, verifying that you have complied with the terms and conditions of the permit. Non-compliance with any condition could result in the revocation, suspension or modification of the authorization for your project, thereby requiring you to obtain an individual permit from the Corps. This Nationwide Permit authorization does not obviate the need to obtain other State or local approvals required by law.

This authorization will remain valid for two years from the date of this letter unless the Nationwide Permit is modified, suspended or revoked. If you have commenced work or are under contract to commence work prior to the suspension, or revocation of the Nationwide Permit and the project would not comply with the resulting Nationwide Permit authorization, you have twelve (12) months from that date to complete the project under the present terms and conditions of the Nationwide Permit.

This authorization will not be effective until you have obtained Section 401 water quality certification or a waiver of certification from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). If the RWQCB fails to act on a valid request for certification within two (2) months after receipt, the Corps will presume a waiver of water quality certification has been obtained. You shall submit a copy of the certification or waiver to the Corps prior to the commencement of work.

To ensure compliance with the Nationwide Permit, the following special conditions shall be implemented:

1. To compensate for the loss of 0.16 acre of seasonal wetlands, you have mitigated by reserving 0.16 acre of wetlands at your Yuba Drive Mitigation Site (Corps file no. 22045N) for this project. To fully protect this site, you shall, within one year of the date of this letter, fully complete a Banking Enabling Instrument, and have it signed by all applicable resource agencies. We are in communication with you regarding this, and expect that this will be completed in the near term.
2. To compensate for the loss of 0.16 acre of endangered species habitat, you shall complete one of the following, within one year from the date of this letter:

   a. You shall purchase 0.16 acre of preservation credits at an approved endangered species preservation bank and provide proof of this purchase to the Corps, or;

   b. You shall have the Yuba Drive Mitigation Site approved for endangered species preservation by completing the Banking Enabling Agreement and having full agency approval for this.

   You may refer all questions to Brian Wirtz of our Regulatory Branch at 415-977-8438. All correspondence should reference the file number 24554N.

   Sincerely,

   Calvin C. Fong
   Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosures

Copies Furnished:

US EPA, San Francisco, CA
US F&WS, Sacramento, CA
CA RWQCB, Santa Rosa, CA
CA DFG, Yountville, CA
February 1, 2002

Mr. Tux Tuxhorn
Tuxhorn Company
P.O. Box 11128
Santa Rosa, CA 95406

Dear Mr. Tuxhorn:

Subject: Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements and Issuance of Clean Water Act Section 401 Conditional Certification for Bellevue Ranch Phase 8, Sonoma County, California.

File: 401 Certification – Bellevue Ranch Phase 8
WDID No. 1B01060WNSO

This letter responds to Mr. Tux Tuxhorn’s July 12, 2001, request for a Clean Water Act, Section 401, Water Quality Certification that the proposed project described below will not violate state water quality standards. The North Coast Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) received a complete application and processing fee in the amount of $1,000.00 on July 12, 2001. A 21-day Public Notice was issued on October 11, 2001 on the Regional Water Board website. Comments were received from the public regarding concerns over California Tiger Salamander (Ambystoma californiense) (CTS) habitat loss and appropriate mitigation measures. Those comments have been considered and appear to be addressed through the CTS mitigation measures implemented as required by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG).

Project Description: Mr. Tux Tuxhorn of the Tuxhorn Company requested Water Quality Certification pursuant to administrative regulations and Clean Water Act Section 401, and a Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements pursuant to Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act Authorities for the proposed Bellevue Ranch Phase 8. The proposed Bellevue Ranch Phase 8 project will be developed as a medium density townhouse project, which will include associated roadways, infrastructure, and landscaping. The project site is a 12.0-acre site that is currently undeveloped, located at 2650 and
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2684 Dutton Meadows Drive in Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California (APNs 043-071-07, -22, -23).
According to the application, the project will result in filling of 0.16 acre of seasonal wetland habitat as a result of complete grading and build-out of the site. According to Mr. Charlie Patterson, Plant Ecologist, the wetland habitat present on the site includes highly degraded, isolated, seasonal wetland habitat that occurs in the form of several small, shallow (less than 15 inches deep) remnant sections of swale topography that still collect and retain soil saturation. As determined by the CDFG the entire site also represents CTS (*Ambystoma californiense*) estivation habitat; consequently there will be permanent removal of 12.0 acres of this species habitat.

After construction, discharges of storm water runoff from the site are likely to contain nutrients, pesticides, bacteria, petroleum products, heavy metals, and sediment typically identified with urban runoff. In order to mitigate for these potential impacts to waters of the state, the applicant will develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to help prevent water quality violations during the construction of the project. Prior to the commencement of construction, the applicant will file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board to comply with the terms of the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction Activity (Storm Water General Permit).

In addition, the overall design and development of the Bellevue Ranch Phase 8 will be required to include a combination of post-construction storm water runoff Best Management Practices (BMPs) to manage the quantity and improve the quality of storm water runoff from all impervious surfaces. The final design of the development shall include storm water containment and treatment through storm water BMPs such as vegetated swales, bottomless catch basins, and detention basins. The BMPs will be designed to provide treatment of the 85th percentile/24 hour precipitation event, which equates to approximately 0.95 inches, according to criteria from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board).
Receiving Waters: Seasonal Wetlands

Hydrologic Unit: 114.21 - Laguna HSA

Filled or Excavated Area: 0.16 - acre of seasonal wetland habitat

Federal Permit: The Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) issued a Nationwide Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Permit 39 - Residential, Commercial, and Institutional Developments (Corps File No. 24554N) on May 8, 2001, for the filling of 0.16 acre of seasonal wetland habitat on the project site.

Compensatory Mitigation: The impacts to wetland habitat, suitable habitat for listed plant species, and the CTS habitat were mitigated through creation of 0.16 acre of replacement in-kind seasonal wetland habitat, and preservation of 0.16 acre of high quality wetland habitat at the Yuba Mitigation Bank, on Yuba Drive, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California. The Yuba Mitigation bank is a 10.99-acre parcel of almost level land at the western end of Yuba Drive in southwestern Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California (APN 035-211-019). The site is in the final approval process by the Interagency Mitigation Bank Review Team (MBRT), for dedication to long term conservation, and will be transferred in Fee Title to the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) to be preserved in perpetuity. According to the applicant, the actual mitigation design for created wetlands has already been fully implemented and has successfully functioned as wetland habitat through one winter/spring season.

The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) responsible for determining adequate avoidance/mitigation measures for potential impacts to CTS breeding and estivating habitat. The Regional Water Board is the permitting agency responsible for protecting all the beneficial uses of wetlands, which includes CTS and its breeding and estivation habitat. In most cases, the Regional Water Board requires the same mitigation measures that the CDFG determines to be appropriate for the protection of CTS and its habitat. The CDFG has reviewed the...
proposed project, and based on ongoing efforts to provide enhancement of potential summer dormancy and winter breeding habitats for CTS at the Yuba Drive Mitigation Bank, CDFG has determined that additional mitigation efforts for CTS are not needed for the current and pending Bellevue Ranch projects (including Phases 6 and 8).

CEQA Compliance:

The proposed project was covered in the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Resolution Number 21805, which was certified by the Council of the City of Santa Rosa on June 21, 1994, and updated in May 2000. A mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program was developed by EIP Associates for the Southwest Santa Rosa EIR in May 2000.

Standard Conditions:

Pursuant to Section 3860 of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (23 CCR), the following three standard conditions shall apply to this project:

1) This certification action is subject to modification or revocation upon administrative or judicial review, including review and amendment pursuant to Section 13330 of the California Water Code and Section 3867 of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations.

2) This certification action is not intended and shall not be construed to apply to any discharge from any activity involving a hydroelectric facility requiring a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license or an amendment to a FERC license unless the pertinent certification application was filed pursuant to 23 CCR Subsection 3855(b) and the application specifically identified that a FERC license or amendment to a FERC license for a hydroelectric facility was being sought.

3) The validity of any non-denial certification action (Actions 1 and 2) shall be conditioned upon total payment of the full fee required under 23 CCR Sections 3833, unless otherwise stated in writing by the certifying agency.
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Additional Conditions:

Pursuant to Section 3859(a) of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (23 CCR), the applicant shall comply with the following additional conditions:

1) The Regional Water Board shall be notified in writing at least 48 hours prior to the commencement of grading work, with details regarding the construction schedule, in order to allow staff to be present onsite during construction, and to answer any public inquiries that may arise regarding the project.

2) Construction work shall comply with provisions in the North Coast Basin Water Quality Control Plan.

3) Fueling, lubrication, maintenance, operation, and storage of vehicles and equipment shall not result in a discharge or a threatened discharge to any surface waters. At no time shall the applicant use any vehicle or equipment, which leaks any substance that may impact water quality. Staging and storage areas for vehicles and equipment shall be located outside of any surface waters of the state.

4) Best Management Practices for sediment and turbidity control shall be implemented and in place prior to, during, and after construction in order to ensure that no silt or sediment enters surface waters.

5) The overall design and development of Bellevue Ranch Phase 8 shall include a combination of post-construction storm water runoff Best Management Practices (BMPs) to manage the quantity and improve the quality of storm water runoff from all impervious surfaces, equal to the 85th percentile/24 hour precipitation event (0.95-inches). Prior to the Discharger qualifying for termination of coverage under the Storm Water General Permit, the Discharger shall submit as-built plans showing the location, size and other details of all post-construction storm water treatment facilities. The engineering plans shall be stamped by an engineer registered in the state of California.
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6) Wetland mitigation shall include creation of 0.16 acre of in-kind seasonal wetland habitat, and 0.16 acre of preservation of high quality existing wetland habitat at the Yuba Drive Mitigation Bank.

7) An as-built report of the wetland mitigation performed for Bellevue Ranch Phase 8 at the Yuba Drive Mitigation Bank shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board by March 15, 2002. The report shall document the entire mitigation construction activities, and shall include photographic documentation taken to document the extent of inundation/saturation within created impoundments.

8) If additional mitigation and monitoring measures for CTS are deemed necessary by the CDFG at a future date, the project applicant shall implement those measures in accordance with the CDFG findings and CEQA.

9) The Regional Water Board shall be provided with yearly monitoring reports for the creation and preservation mitigation as required under this permit. Reports shall be prepared by a professional consultant with in-depth experience in wetland ecosystem creation and function, as well as wetland mitigation monitoring techniques. Reports shall also include photographic documentation of the mitigation site. At the end of each monitoring year (years one through five), a detailed Annual Monitoring Report shall be submitted. After five years have passed, the mitigation will be evaluated for proper functionality, and a decision will be made whether additional mitigation measures are necessary.

10) A copy of this permit must be provided to the Contractor and all subcontractors conducting the work, and must be in their possession at the work site.

11) If at any time a discharge to surface waters occurs, or any water quality problem arises, the project will cease immediately and the Regional Water Board will be notified promptly.
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Mr. Tuxhorn

February 1, 2002

12) The issuance of this permit is expressly conditioned upon the applicant’s compliance with all federal and state environmental laws, and may be revoked if any violations occur.

13) The project shall comply with all plans and details submitted as part of the application for this permit.

14) This Waiver/Certification may be revoked if the Discharge violates waiver/certification conditions or causes an impact to the water quality of waters of the state.

Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements:
The proposed construction activity meets the waiver provisions of Regional Water Board Resolution No. 87-113 and, if constructed according to the information submitted and conditions of this waiver, this project will comply with applicable water quality standards. Therefore, we hereby waive the need for waste discharge requirements.

Water Quality Certification:
I hereby issue an order [23 CCR Subsection 3831(e)] certifying that any discharge from Bellevue Ranch Phase 8 (Facility No. 1B0160WNSO), will comply with the applicable provisions of Sections 301 ("Effluent Limitations"), 302 ("Water Quality Related Effluent Limitations"), 303 ("Water Quality Standards and Implementation Plans"), 306 ("National Standards of Performance"), and 307 ("Toxic and Pretreatment Effluent Standards") of the Clean Water Act [33 USC Subsection 1341 (a)(1)].

All certification actions are contingent on (a) the discharge being limited and all proposed mitigation being completed in strict compliance with the applicant’s project description, and (b) on compliance with all applicable requirements of the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Basin.

Expiration:
This waiver of waste discharge requirements and water quality certification expires upon completion of the project or on December 31, 2006, whichever occurs first.
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Any person affected by this action of the Regional Water Board may petition the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) to review the action in accordance with Section 13320 of the California Water Code and Title 23, California code of Regulations, Section 2050. The petition must be received by the State Board within 30 days of the date of this Waiver/Certification. Copies of the law and regulations applicable to filing petitions will be provided upon request. In addition to filing a petition with the State Board, any person affected by this Waiver/Certification may request the Regional Water Board to reconsider this Waiver/Certification. Such request should be made within 30 days of the date of this Waiver/Certification. Note that even if reconsideration by the Regional Water Board is sought, filing a petition with the State Board within the 30-day period is necessary to preserve the petitioner's legal rights.

Please notify Andrew Jensen of my staff at (707) 576-2683 when the construction commences so we can answer any public inquiries about the work.

Sincerely,

Susan A. Warner
Executive Officer

cc: Mr. Charlie Patterson, Plant Ecologist, 1806 Ivanhoe, Lafayette, CA 94549
Mr. Oscar Balaguer, SWRCB, Chief Water Quality Certification Unit, Division of Water Quality
Mr. Erik Spiess, SWRCB, Office of Chief Council
Ms. Jane Hicks, US Army Corps of Engineers, Regulatory Branch, 333 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94105
Mr. Don Hankins, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Wetlands Division, 2800 Cottage Way, Room 2605, Sacramento, CA 95815
Mr. Carl Wilcox, Department of Fish and Game, Region 3, P.O. Box 47, Yountville, CA 94599
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Mr. Liam Davis, Department of Fish and Game, Region 3, P.O. Box 47, Yountville, CA 94599

Director of Water Division (WTR-1), US EPA, Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, Re: Water Quality Certification

Mr. Philip T. Northern, Department of Biology, Sonoma State University, 1801 E. Cotati Avenue, Rohnert Park, CA 94928
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"The energy challenge facing California is real. Every Californian needs to take immediate action to reduce energy consumption. For a list of simple ways you can reduce demand and cut your energy costs, see our Web-site at: http://www.swech.ca.gov/"
Regulatory Branch (1145b)

Subject: File Number 25335N

Dr. Larry Stromberg
59 Jewell Street
San Rafael, California 94901

Dear Dr. Stromberg:

Thank you for your inquiry of May 30, 2000, on behalf of Russ Lockner, concerning the extent and location of Corps of Engineers jurisdiction at the Hearne Avenue properties (APN 043-191-021 and 043-200-004), located at 1130 Hearne Avenue, in the City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California.

Enclosed is a map, dated October 12, 2001, showing the extent and location of Corps of Engineers jurisdiction as verified during a site visit September 24, 2001.

We have based this jurisdictional delineation on the current conditions of the site. A change in those conditions may also change the extent of our jurisdiction. This jurisdictional delineation will expire in three years from the date of this letter. However, if there has been a change in circumstances, which affects the extent of Corps jurisdiction, a revision may be done before that date.

Please note that some of the wetlands on site are non-jurisdictional, based on the recent supreme court case, Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County (SWANCC) v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, No. 99-1178, 9 January 2001. However, this determination does not obviate the need to obtain other Federal, State or local approvals required by law, including compliance with the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). In particular, your proposed activity may still be regulated by the State of California’s Regional Water Quality Control Board, even if you avoid all jurisdictional wetlands.

All proposed discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States must be authorized by the Corps of Engineers pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) (33 U.S.C. 1344). Waters of the United States generally include tidal waters, lakes, ponds, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), and wetlands.

Your proposed work appears to be within our jurisdiction and a permit may be required. Application for Corps authorization should be made to this office using the application form in the enclosed pamphlet. To avoid delays it is essential that you enter the file number at the top of this letter into Item No. 1. The application must include plans showing the location, extent and character of the proposed activity, prepared in accordance with the requirements contained in this pamphlet. You should note, in planning your work, that upon receipt of a properly completed application and plans, it may be necessary to advertise the proposed work by issuing a public notice for a period of 30 days.
If an individual permit is required, it will be necessary for you to demonstrate to the Corps that your proposed fill is necessary because there are no practicable alternatives, as outlined in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. A copy is enclosed to aid you in preparation of this alternative analysis.

However, our nationwide or regional permits have already authorized certain activities provided specified conditions are met. Your completed application will enable us to determine whether your activity is already authorized. You are advised to refrain from commencement of your proposed activity until a determination has been made that it is covered by an existing permit. Commencement of work before you received our notification may be interpreted as a violation of our regulations.

You are advised that the Corps has established an Administrative Appeal Process, as described in 33 CFR Part 331 (65 FR 16,486, Mar. 28, 2000), and outlined in the enclosed flowchart and "Notification of Administrative Appeal Options, Process, and Request for Appeal" form (NAO-RFA). If you do not intend to accept the approved jurisdictional determination, you may elect to provide new information to the District Engineer for reconsideration or submit a completed NAO-RFA form to the Division Engineer to initiate the appeal process. You will relinquish all rights to appeal, unless new information or a completed NAO-RFA form is received by the Corps within sixty (60) days of the date of the NAO-RFA.

If you have any questions, please call Philip Shannin of our Regulatory Branch at telephone 415-977-8445. All correspondence should reference the file number at the head of this letter.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED
By
Calvin C. Fong
Calvin C. Fong
Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosures

Copies Furnished (w/enclosure)

RWQCB, Santa Rosa
EPA, San Francisco
Russ Lockner, Santa Rosa, CA
Request for the extent of Corps of Engineers Jurisdiction at 130 Hearn Avenue in Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California (APN 043-191-021 and 043-200-004).

Wetlands subject to Section 404 Clean Water Act Jurisdiction

Wetlands not subject to Section 404 Clean Water Act Jurisdiction

Project Boundary

I File No. 2533.5JSJ Date 12 October, 2000

Laurence P. Stromberg, PhD.
Wetlands Consultant

Pre-Jurisdictional Determination, Waters of the United States,
APN Numbers 043-191-021 and 043-200-004, Sonoma County, California.
Subject: File Number 25336N

Dr. Larry Stromberg
59 Jewell Street
San Rafael, California 94901

Dear Dr. Stromberg:

Thank you for your submittal of May 30, 2000, requesting confirmation of the extent of Corps of Engineers jurisdiction at the Lechmanski property (APN 043-171-029), located at 2732 Dutton Meadows, in the City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California.

Enclosed is a map, dated October 19, 2001, showing the extent and location of Corps of Engineers jurisdiction, as verified during site visits on August 27 and September 24, 2001.

We have based this jurisdictional delineation on the current conditions of the site. A change in those conditions may also change the extent of our jurisdiction. This jurisdictional delineation will expire in three years from the date of this letter. However, if there has been a change in circumstances, which affects the extent of Corps jurisdiction, a revision may be done before that date.

Please note that some of the wetlands on site are non-jurisdictional, based on the recent Supreme Court case, Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County (SWANCC) v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, No. 99-1178, 9 January 2001. However, this determination does not obviate the need to obtain other Federal, State or local approvals required by law, including compliance with the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). In particular, your proposed activity may still be regulated by the State of California's Regional Water Quality Control Board, even if you avoid all jurisdictional wetlands.

All proposed discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States must be authorized by the Corps of Engineers pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) (33 U.S.C. 1344). Waters of the United States generally include tidal waters, lakes, ponds, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), and wetlands.

Your proposed work appears to be within our jurisdiction and a permit may be required. Application for Corps authorization should be made to this office using the application form in the enclosed pamphlet. To avoid delays it is essential that you enter the file number at the top of this letter into Item No. 1. The application must include plans showing the location, extent and character of the proposed activity, prepared in accordance with the requirements contained in this pamphlet. You should note, in planning your work, that upon receipt of a properly completed application and plans, it may be necessary to advertise the proposed work by issuing a public notice for a period of 30 days.
If an individual permit is required, it will be necessary for you to demonstrate to the Corps that your proposed fill is necessary because there are no practicable alternatives, as outlined in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. A copy is enclosed to aid you in preparation of this alternative analysis.

However, our nationwide or regional permits have already authorized certain activities provided specified conditions are met. Your completed application will enable us to determine whether your activity is already authorized. You are advised to refrain from commencement of your proposed activity until a determination has been made that it is covered by an existing permit. Commencement of work before you received our notification may be interpreted as a violation of our regulations.

You are advised that the Corps has established an Administrative Appeal Process, as described in 33 CFR Part 331 (65 FR 16,486; Mar. 28, 2000), and outlined in the enclosed flowchart and "Notification of Administrative Appeal Options, Process, and Request for Appeal" form (NAO-RFA). If you do not intend to accept the approved jurisdictional determination, you may elect to provide new information to the District Engineer for reconsideration or submit a completed NAO-RFA form to the Division Engineer to initiate the appeal process. You will relinquish all rights to appeal, unless new information or a completed NAO-RFA form is received by the Corps within sixty (60) days of the date of the NAO-RFA.

If you have any questions, please call Philip Shannin of our Regulatory Branch at telephone 415-977-8445. All correspondence should reference the file number at the head of this letter.

Sincerely,

Calvin C. Fong
Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosures

Copies Furnished (w/enclosure):

Trumark Companies, Danville, CA; ATTN: Michael Maples
US EPA, San Francisco
RWQCB, Santa Rosa
Pre-Jurisdictional Determination, Waters of the United States, Lechmanski Property, A.P. Number 043-171-29
Santa Rosa, California.
Regulatory Branch

Subject: File Number 26341N

Mr. Mike Maples
Trumark Companies
4185 Blackhawk Plaza Circle
Suite 200
Danville, California 94506

Dear Mr. Maples:

Thank you for your submittal of May 30, 2001, requesting confirmation of the extent of Corps of Engineers jurisdiction at the Nelson property, located at 976, 980, and 1004 Heam Avenue, in the City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California (APN 043-191-018, 019, and 020).

We have determined that the waters on this site are non-jurisdictional based on the recent supreme court case, Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County (SWANCC) v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, No. 99-1178, 9 January 2001. Enclosed is a map, dated October 12, 2001, showing the extent and location of all non-jurisdictional waters, as verified during a site inspection on August 25, 2001.

We have based this jurisdictional delineation on the current conditions of the site. A change in those conditions may also change the extent of our jurisdiction. This jurisdictional delineation will expire in five years from the date of this letter. However, if there has been a change in circumstances which affects the extent of Corps jurisdiction, a revision may be done before that date.

This determination does not obviate the need to obtain other Federal, State or local approvals required by law, including compliance with the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). In particular, your proposed activity may still be regulated by the State of California’s Regional Water Quality Control Boards. Therefore, in addition to contacting other Federal and local agencies, you should also contact state regulatory authorities to determine whether your activities may require other authorizations or permits.
If you have any questions, please call Philip Shannin of our Regulatory Branch at telephone 415-977-8445. All correspondence should reference the file number at the head of this letter.

Sincerely,

Calvin C. Fong
Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure

Copies Furnished (w/Enclosure):

US EPA, San Francisco
RWQCB, Santa Rosa
Trumark Companies, Danville, CA; ATTN: Mike Maples
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
San Francisco District
Regulatory Branch

Extent of Corps of Engineers jurisdiction at 976, 980, and 1004 Hearn Avenue in Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California (APN 043-191-018, 019, and 020).

Wetlands not subject to Section 404 Clean Water Act jurisdiction.
Project: Minoia Property
Location: Santa Rosa, California
County: Sonoma County
Date: 6-6-03
Source: Civil Design Consultants Inc.
ATTACHMENT NO. 4

Dutton Meadows Site Photographs
Figure 1: Mound indicating small mammal burrow at site

Figure 2: Debris pile outside abandoned home at site
Figure 3: Debris pile within abandoned structure at site

Figure 4: Small mammal burrow outside abandoned home
Figure 5: Small knoll with numerous small mammal burrows, site transect 7

Figure 6: Small mammal burrow at knoll on site transect 7
ATTACHMENT NO. 5:

Gobbi Property Site Photographs
Figure 1: View of the Gobbi Ranch Property

Figure 2: Small mammal burrows scattered in the grassland habitat
Figure 3: Representative photograph of the high density of mammal burrows.

Figure 4: Entrance holes of the small mammal burrows habitat.