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Executive Summary

Proposed Project

The Dutton Meadows Project (Project) is a proposed residential and commercial development located in the City of Santa Rosa (City), Sonoma County, California, in central Sonoma County, California. The Project is located within incorporated Southwest Santa Rosa, south of Hearn Avenue, east of Dutton Meadows, and northwest of Colgan Creek. The approximately 58-acre Project area currently consists primarily of rural residential and agricultural land uses.

Project Objectives

There are three primary objectives of the Project:

- Provide 586 new housing units in Southwest Santa Rosa consistent with the land uses designated in the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan (Area Plan).
- Develop one of the Community Commons (a center with a large supermarket or drugstore and other retail/services serving the community) as identified in the Area Plan (Area Plan Policy 1.2.3).
- Promote implementation of Area Plan goals, objectives and policies for infrastructure such as streets, water delivery system, and storm drainage, and for public services such as schools and parks.

The residential land uses designated in the Area Plan as updated in the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan (General Plan) for the parcels within the Project boundary include Mixed Use Retail and Residential Medium Density (8 to 18 units per acre), Residential Medium Low Density (8 to 13 units per acre), and Residential Low Density (2 to 8 units per acre).

Project Components

The proposed Project includes three main components: (1) rezoning to add parcels to the Planned Development zoning district and to modify the Policy Statement; (2) adoption of a conceptual Master Development Plan for the Dutton Meadows project area, which shows streets and land uses; and (3) development of three of the projects within the Master Development Plan.

Rezoning would modify the Policy Statement for the Planned Development zoning district to include professional office uses and public parks, simplify the description of residential uses, and rezone several parcels to this zoning district. The purpose of the Master Development Plan is to show the interrelationship and general location of Project land uses in a pattern that is consistent with the General Plan. The Phase 1, Phase 2 Minoia, and Phase 5 Dutton Village Projects are three of the six proposed residential development plans within the Master Development Plan area.
The development areas within the Master Development Plan, which covers 56.32 acres, include the following (see Figure 2-5):

- Phase 1: Residential medium density on 12.4 gross acres in the northwest portion of the Project site (see Phase 1 Project description below for more details).
- Phase 2: Residential low density and medium-low density on 5.8 gross acres in the northern portion of the Project site (see Phase 2 Minoia Project description below for more details).
- Phase 3: Up to 10,000 square feet of office space and potentially up to 12 live/work condominiums on 1.0 gross acres in the northeast corner of the Project site. Residential medium density on 7.6 gross acres in the northeast portion of the Project site, including 90 two-story townhomes.
- Phase 4: The Community Shopping Center (Center), a retail/office/restaurant space with potential for condominiums as well. A 4-acre neighborhood park will be located near the Center.
- Phase 5: Residential medium density on 12.05 acres in the southwestern portion of the Project site (see Phase 5 Dutton Village Project description below).
- Phase 6: Residential medium density on 2.4 acres in the southeast portion of the Project site, including 34 three-story attached townhomes.

The Project will be constructed in phases. Phases 1, 2 (Minoia) and 5 (Dutton Village) are anticipated to begin construction in Spring 2006, and be completed by Fall 2006. The remaining phases (Phases 3, 4 and 6) are anticipated to begin construction in Spring 2007 or later. Table ES-1 shows the proposed total buildout for the Project. The table indicates numbers of residential units and square footage for commercial, retail and office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Residential</td>
<td>586 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Residential</td>
<td>97,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park</td>
<td>4.0 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approvals and Permits**

The Project will require approvals from several local, state and federal agencies. A brief summary of the agencies with potential jurisdictions over the Project is provided below:

- **City of Santa Rosa.** For this project, the Lead Agency is the City of Santa Rosa, which will be responsible for certifying the Final SEIR.
• Sonoma County Water Agency. Because the Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA) owns the right-of-way along Colgan Creek within the Project area, a revocable license will be required prior to any work performed within SCWA right-of-way.

• North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The RWQCB administers regulations pertaining to construction and post-construction impacts to stormwater under the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s (USEPA) National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program.

• California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). State lead agencies are required to consult with CDFG to ensure that any action they undertake is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in destruction or adverse modification of essential habitat.

• United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Clean Water Act (CWA) was created to “restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation’s waters.” Section 404 of the CWA prohibits the discharge of dredged or fill material into “waters of the United States” without a permit from the USACE. The Phase 1 Project received an USACE Nationwide Authorization Permit 39, dated May 8, 2001.

• United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)/National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries). Under Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), federal agencies are required to consult with the USFWS or NOAA Fisheries as applicable if their actions, including permit approvals or funding, could adversely affect an endangered species (including plants) or its critical habitat. At a minimum, the Project will require consultation for impacts to the California Tiger Salamander and its habitat.

Approach

The Project is located within the geographical area of the Area Plan, the Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Plan (Redevelopment Plan), and the General Plan. Environmental review of these plans was completed in the Southwest Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (Master EIR), certified in 1994 and reviewed for currency in 2000; the Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Final EIR (Redevelopment EIR), certified in 2000; and the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (General Plan EIR). The proposed Project is consistent with the land uses, policies and objectives included in these plans. Therefore, the environmental review of the Project will tier from the Master EIR, Redevelopment EIR, and General Plan EIR. CEQA Statute 21157.1 states that “preparation and certification of a master environmental impact report, if prepared and certified consistent with this division, may allow for the limited review of subsequent projects that were described in the master environmental impact report as being within the scope of the report....”

Therefore, Project impacts that have already been adequately evaluated in the Master EIR, Redevelopment EIR, or General Plan EIR do not need additional evaluation in this document. The Project Initial Study concluded that evaluation of Land Use; Population, Employment and Housing; Visual Quality and Community Character; Soils, Geology and Seismicity; Hydrology and Water Quality; Air Quality; and Noise were adequate in the Master EIR and Redevelopment EIR. For these impact areas, no further environmental review is needed for the proposed Project. This Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact
Report (Draft SEIR) evaluates potentially significant impacts on traffic and circulation; utilities and public services; public and worker health from hazardous materials; historic and cultural resources; and vegetation, wildlife and habitat.

**Proposed Impacts and Mitigations**

As described above, some Project impacts have already been addressed in the Master EIR, Redevelopment EIR, and General Plan EIR. The Lead Agency is responsible for implementing all appropriate and feasible mitigation measures included in the Master EIR, Redevelopment EIR and General Plan EIR for these impacts. For the Project impacts addressed in these EIRs, all potential impacts could be mitigated to a less than significant level except for the following:

- Loss of approximately 848 acres of farmland of Local Importance as designated by the State Department of Conservation and Sonoma County
- Addition of traffic to US 101, which is already congested; traffic Level of Service (LOS) would be LOS “F” in some areas, primarily south of the Hearn interchange, with “stop and go” traffic conditions and an average speed of about 8-10 miles per hour
- Increased traffic volumes exceeding the LOS objective for roadway segments
- Significant change in visual character from conversion of land that is currently semi-rural and rural land in character to an urban condition
- The proposed Fulton/Wright Road overcrossing and interchange at Highway 12 would be seen as increased urbanization in an area that currently appears semi-rural in character; the transition from rural to urban conditions to the eastbound Highway 12 motorist would be sudden and abrupt
- Loss of grassland foraging area for sensitive bird species known to occur within the Southwest Area Plan
- Degradation of air quality to levels inconsistent with State standards, specifically PM10 and CO
- Increased traffic noise impacts on existing Area Plan land uses from development of the Area Plan and its infrastructure improvements, in conjunction with cumulative traffic

Table ES-2 provides information on the potential impacts and mitigation measures for the analyses completed in this Draft SEIR. This includes potential impacts and mitigation measures for traffic and circulation; utilities and public services; hazardous materials; historic and cultural resources; and vegetation, wildlife, and habitat.

Definitions of significance levels included in the table are as follows:

- **Significant and Unavoidable.** An adverse and substantial effect on the environment that cannot be reduced to a level that is less than significant.
- **Significant.** An adverse and potentially substantial impact prior to implementation of mitigation measures. Implementation of mitigation measures may or may not reduce the impact to a level that is less than significant.

- **Less than Significant.** An adverse effect that is not considered substantial.

### TABLE ES-2
Summary Table of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Significance after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-2 Traffic and Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.2-1.</strong> The Project, in combination with other projects expected to be built in the same time period, may degrade traffic levels on Bellevue Avenue.</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1. Add a traffic signal to the intersection at Bellevue Avenue and Dutton Avenue.</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.2-2.</strong> The Project may decrease the average speed on Stony Point Road, Hearn Avenue, and Northpoint Parkway</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.2-3.</strong> The Project may result in an increase in traffic at the unsignalized intersection of Hearn Avenue and the new access road to the Phase 2 Minoia development</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.2-4.</strong> The Project would result in increased traffic at the unsignalized crossing of Hearn Avenue by student pedestrians</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4a. Signalize intersection of Dutton Meadow and Hearn Avenue</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4b. Add a road within Dutton Meadows parallel to Hearn Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4c. Encourage or expedite construction of Tuxhorn Drive between Dutton Meadow and Burgess Drive/Rain Dance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4d. Improve bicycle and pedestrian travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.2-5.</strong> The Project could affect the timing of turns out of driveways and cross streets onto Hearn Avenue</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.2-6.</strong> Construction of the Project would lead to increased truck and construction vehicle activity on the local roadway network and could create lane closures causing traffic delays, transit delays, restricted access, increased traffic hazards, and rerouting of traffic, including emergency vehicles</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-6a. Implement Construction Traffic Management Plan</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-6b. The Project would result in a measureable addition of traffic to US 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Significance after Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-7. The Project would result in a measureable addition of traffic to US 101</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-8. The Project may result in impacts to US 101/Hearn Avenue Interchange</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-9. The Project would result in increased demand for transit services</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-9. Provide transit service improvements</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impact 3.2-10. Cumulative traffic growth may result in increased traffic volumes exceeding the LOS objective for roadway segments</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-10a. Implement traffic improvements on City streets, Mitigation Measure 3.2-10b. Improve residential street environment</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impact 3.2-11. The Project, along with cumulative traffic growth, may have a significant impact (LOS “D” or worse) on US 101 at certain areas from Wilfred Avenue to State Route 12</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-11. Add auxiliary lanes to US 101</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impact 3.2-12. The Project, along with cumulative growth, may increase demand for transit trips beyond available capacity</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-12. Improve transit services</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impact 3.2-13. The Project, along with cumulative traffic growth, may increase vehicular traffic</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-10b, described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impact 3.2-14. The Project, along with cumulative growth, may increase demand for bicycle and pedestrian travel</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4d, described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impact 3.2-15. Infrastructure construction related to the Project, along with cumulative infrastructure construction in the Southwest Area, may lead to increased truck and construction vehicle activity on the local roadway network in the area of the construction and may create lane closures causing traffic delays, transit delays, restricted access, increased traffic hazards, and rerouting of traffic, including emergency vehicles.</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-6a, described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impact 3.2-16. Project buildout, along with cumulative buildout, may result in parking demand exceeding the available capacity for the Project area</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-16. Comply with Santa Rosa parking requirements</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE ES-2
Summary Table of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Significance after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3 Utilities and Public Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.3-1.</strong> The Project may increase demand for water supply and distribution to such a degree that the City cannot commit to providing adequate service</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.3-2.</strong> The Project may increase demand for wastewater treatment and disposal to such a degree that the City cannot commit to providing adequate service</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.3-3.</strong> The Project may increase demand for schools to such a degree that enrollment is greater than school capacity</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.3-3. Implement payment of mitigation fees</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.3-4.</strong> The Project may increase demand for parks and recreation facilities to such a degree that General Plan service standards are not maintained</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.3-4. Require park land dedication and park development or in-lieu park fees</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.3-5.</strong> The Project may increase demand for solid waste removal to such a degree that the General Plan service standard is not maintained</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.3-6.</strong> The Project may increase demand for police services to such a degree that the General Plan service standard is not maintained</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.3-6. Implement community services district program</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.3-7.</strong> The Project may increase demand for fire and emergency services to such a degree that the General Plan service standard is not maintained</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.3-7. Fund new fire station Mitigation Measure 3.3-6, described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Impact 3.3-8.</strong> The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Plan Area, may increase demand for water supply to such a degree that the City cannot commit to providing adequate service</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.3-8a. Implement water conservation measures Mitigation Measure 3.3-8b. Develop alternative sources of water</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Impact 3.3-9.</strong> The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Plan Area, may increase demand for wastewater treatment and disposal to such a degree that the City cannot commit to providing adequate service</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.3-9. Collect sanitary sewer connection fee</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE ES-2**  
Summary Table of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Significance after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Impact 3.3-10.</strong> The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Plan Area, may increase demand for schools to such a degree that enrollment is greater than school capacity</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.3-3, described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Impact 3.3-11.</strong> The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Plan Area, may increase demand for parks and recreation facilities to such a degree that the General Plan service standards are not maintained</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.3-4, described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Impact 3.3-12.</strong> The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Plan Area, may increase demand for solid waste removal to such a degree that the General Plan service standard is not maintained</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Impact 3.3-13.</strong> The Project may increase demand for police, fire and emergency services to such a degree that the General Plan service standards are not maintained</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures 3.3-6 and 3.3-7, described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

**Impact 3.4-1.** Construction of the Project could result in exposure of construction workers to lead paint and asbestos  
| Significant | Mitigation Measure 3.4-1a. Implement OSHA standards for lead paint removal  
Mitigation Measure 3.4-1b. Properly abate asbestos-containing materials | Less than Significant |
### TABLE ES-2
Summary Table of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Significance after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-2.</strong> The Project could expose workers, the public and the environment to hazards resulting from hazardous contaminants in soils</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2a. Notify agencies regarding contamination</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2b. Characterize soil and groundwater conditions and remediate as necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2c. Perform Phase II investigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2d. Perform Phase III remediation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2e. Place remediation notes on grading plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-3.</strong> The Project could expose workers, the public and the environment to hazards resulting from aboveground fuel tank and oils in the 55-gallon drums on the Phase 3 parcels</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-3. Remove aboveground fuel tank and oil in 55-gallon drums located on the Phase 3 development site</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.4-4.</strong> The Project may result in increased use and disposal of household hazardous wastes</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-4. Support proper disposal of household hazardous waste</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 Historic and Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Significance after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.5-1.</strong> Construction of the Project could result in impacts to prehistoric cultural resources</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.5-1a. Monitor ground-disturbing activities during construction</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.5-1b. Incorporate monitoring requirements into grading plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.5-2.</strong> Construction of the Project could result in impacts to potential historic structures</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.5-2. Complete an historic evaluation of structures on parcel 043-071-028</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE ES-2
Summary Table of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Significance after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-1. Implementation of the Project would result in the loss</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1a. Replace trees in accordance with the City Code (Chapter</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of valley oaks and other native trees</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-24 - Trees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1b. Use tree preservation notes on all improvement, grading,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and building plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1c. Require application of Best Management Practices during</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-2. Implementation of the Project would result in loss of</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2a. Avoid or minimize impacts to wetland resources.</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wetland habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2b. Preserve and create new wetland habitat offsite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2c. Transfer mitigation responsibilities to new property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2d. Obtain appropriate permits for filling of wetlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-3. Implementation of the Project would result in loss of</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2b and 3.6-2c described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California tiger salamander aestivation habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-3. Preserve/Enhance California tiger salamander aestivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-4. Implementation of the Project would result in the loss</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures 3.6-2b and 3.6-2c described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of potential California linderiella habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-5. Provide protection of migratory birds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-5. Implementation of the Project would result in the loss</td>
<td>Less than</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures 3.6-1a and 3.6-1b described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of raptor nesting habitat</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide protection of migratory birds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Significance after Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-6. Implementation of the Project could result in the loss of special-status plant species and special status plant habitat</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures 3.6-2b, 3.6-2c, and 3.6-3, described above Mitigation Measure 3.6-6. Complete special status plant species pre-construction surveys and plant salvage</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-7. Implementation of the Project would result in indirect impacts to California tiger salamander</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures 3.6-3, described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-8. Project construction activities could result in impacts to California tiger salamander</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-8a. Perform onsite monitoring during construction Mitigation Measure 3.6-8b. Protect California tiger salamander during construction Mitigation Measure 3.6-8c. Prepare a Biological Resources Mitigation Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-9. Project construction activities could result in impacts to western pond turtle</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures 3.6-8a, 3.6-8c described above Mitigation Measure 3.6-9. Provide protection for western pond turtle during construction</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-10. Project construction activities could result in impacts to nesting and migratory birds</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-5, described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-11. Project construction activities could result in impacts to sensitive habitats</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-11a. Protect water quality during construction Mitigation Measure 3.6-11-b. Implement NPDES Permit requirements</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impact 3.6-12. The Project, in combination with other development in Southwest Santa Rosa, would result in a significant loss of California tiger salamander habitat</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-12. Create California tiger salamander habitat outside of the Southwest Plan Area Mitigation Measures 3.6-2b, 3.6-2c, 3.6-8a, 3.6-8b, 3.6-8c, described above</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE ES-2  
Summary Table of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Significance after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impact 3.6-13. The Project, in combination with other development in Southwest Santa Rosa, could result in a substantial reduction in the number of California tiger salamanders.</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures 3.6-8a, 3.6-8b, 3.6-8c, described above.</td>
<td>Significant and Unavoidable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatives

Alternatives of the Project include:

- **No Project Alternative.** Without the Project, the Southwest quadrant of Santa Rosa bounded on the east and north by U.S. Highway 101 and State Highway 12 respectively, would be expected to be built out according to the provisions of the General Plan, Area Plan, and Southwest Area Redevelopment Plan.

- **Alternative Location.** This alternative would locate the proposed development outside the proposed Project boundary but within the Area Plan planning boundaries. Only two other locations for the Project would meet the Area Plan objective of implementing a Community Commons. One of these Community Commons developments would be the revitalization of the Roseland Village Center, located in the northeastern portion of the Southwest Plan Area on Sebastopol Road. However, because this area is already partially developed, it cannot accommodate the new housing units included in the Project objectives. The other Community Commons is located in the western portion of the Area Plan on the north side of Northpoint Parkway. Although this Community Commons site has available land for development, the site is smaller than the proposed Community Commons site. The Project could not meet its objectives in this location because it could not accommodate the number of housing units or commercial/retail square footage required.

- **Reduced Density Alternative.** Partial Buildout would entail development at the low end of the planned range of development density. This could be accomplished by either lower-density housing or a greater concentration of housing with increased open space. This alternative could reduce some proposed Project impacts such as localized traffic congestion, wetlands fill, and demand for public services. It would not, however, noticeably reduce any of the cumulative impacts, for example, to traffic and California Tiger Salamander (CTS) habitat. In addition, this alternative would not meet the project objectives because it would not include the required number of housing units or commercial/retail space and would not support development of the Community Commons.

- **Maximum Density Alternative.** Maximum Density would entail development at the high end of the planned range of development density. This alternative, with its higher
density development, would meet objectives for new housing units and development of the Community Center; however, it would result in greater impacts than the proposed Project, including greater demand for public services, more traffic impacts, and possibly less park space. Additional mitigation measures would be required. Moreover, if planned density was not reduced elsewhere in the Plan Area to offset the alternative’s increased density, greater cumulative impacts could occur.

Of the four alternatives described above, only the Maximum Density Alternative meets the three primary Project objectives of providing new housing units in Southwest Santa Rosa consistent with the Area Plan and General Plan; developing a Community Commons as identified in the Area Plan and General Plan; and promoting the Area Plan and General Plan goals, objectives, and policies for infrastructure and public services. However, the Maximum Density Alternative would have greater overall impacts than the proposed Project.

The Reduced Density Alternative likely would have fewer localized impacts than the proposed Project; however, this alternative would not have fewer significant unavoidable cumulative impacts. In addition, the Reduced Density Alternative does not meet the key Project objectives.

The No Project Alternative and the Alternative Location would have similar impacts as the proposed Project, but would not meet all Project objectives.

A summary of the alternatives analysis is provided in Table ES-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Meets Project Objectives?</th>
<th>Level of Impacts Compared to Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Location</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Density</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fewer Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Greater Impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of CEQA-Required Sections

Cumulative Impacts

CEQA requires that an EIR examine cumulative impacts. As discussed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(1), a cumulative impact “consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts.” The analysis of cumulative impacts need not provide the level of detail required of the analysis of impacts from the project itself, but shall “reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)).
Because this Draft SEIR is tiering from the Master EIR, the Area Plan and Master EIR provide the summary of projections for assessing cumulative impacts. In this case, the projections are buildout of the Southwest Plan Area as described in the Southwest Area Plan and as updated in the Redevelopment Plan and General Plan. Cumulative impacts are discussed within their respective impact sections and in Section 4.1.

**Growth-Inducing Impacts**

Impacts associated with the Project have been analyzed in the Master EIR, Redevelopment EIR, and General Plan EIR, and mitigation provided to reduce impacts. Although the Project is part of an ongoing and coordinated regional planning program that anticipates the demands of projected population growth and accompanying land use changes, the Project is considered to be growth-inducing. The Dutton Meadows Project would represent a contribution to growth, it would be urban growth within the context of the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan, and it would not generate significant growth-inducing impacts.

**Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Unavoidable significant adverse impacts have been identified for the Project. The identified unavoidable adverse impacts are:

- Loss of approximately 848 acres of farmland of Local Importance as designated by the State Department of Conservation and Sonoma County
- Addition of traffic to US 101, which is already congested; traffic Level of Service (LOS) would be LOS “F” in some areas, primarily south of the Hearn interchange, with “stop and go” traffic conditions and an average speed of about 8 to 10 miles per hour
- Increased traffic volumes exceeding the LOS objective for roadway segments
- Significant change in visual character from conversion of land that is currently semi-rural and rural land in character to an urban condition
- The proposed Fulton/Wright Road over crossing and interchange at Highway 12 would be seen as increased urbanization in an area that currently appears semi-rural in character; the transition from rural to urban conditions to the eastbound Highway 12 motorist would be sudden and abrupt
- Loss of grassland foraging area for sensitive bird species known to occur within the Southwest Area Plan
- Loss of California tiger salamander (CTS) aestivation habitat and indirect loss of individual CTS
- Degradation of air quality to levels inconsistent with State standards, specifically PM_{10} and CO
- Increased traffic noise impacts on existing Area Plan land uses from development of the Area Plan and its infrastructure improvements, in conjunction with cumulative traffic
Environmentally Superior Alternative

Four alternatives were considered: No Project, Alternative Location, Reduced Density, and Maximum Density. The Reduced Density Alternative is the only alternative that would be expected to have fewer impacts than the proposed Project. Specifically, impacts to local traffic, wetlands, and some public services may be less than for the proposed Project. Therefore, Reduced Density is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, this alternative would not be expected to reduce any of the significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts, and it does not meet the Project objectives.
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1.0 Introduction

This Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) for the proposed Dutton Meadows Project (Project) has been prepared on behalf of the City of Santa Rosa (City) in conformance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines as amended. This chapter provides an introduction to the purpose, approach, issues, reference documents, and organization of this Draft SEIR.

1.1 Purpose and Use of this Draft SEIR

The City is the Lead Agency under CEQA and requires environmental review prior to initiating any discretionary actions for the proposed Project. This Draft SEIR has been prepared to provide the City, public agencies, and the general public with detailed information about the environmental effect of implementing the Project, to examine and institute methods of mitigating any adverse environmental impacts should the Project be approved for implementation, and to consider alternatives to the Project as proposed. CEQA provides that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed until all feasible means available have been employed to substantially lessen the significant effects of such projects. “Feasible” means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time.

Responses to the comments submitted during the 45-day public review of this Draft SEIR will be compiled into the Final SEIR, as required by CEQA. The Final SEIR will be subject to certification by the City of Santa Rosa, prior to implementation of the Project. The Final SEIR will be considered at public hearings by officials of the City, including the Planning Commission and City Council, prior to any decisions being made for implementation of the Project. The Final SEIR specifically will address the components of the Project, potential impacts of the Project, and potential mitigation measures for these impacts, as well as alternative solutions. Certification of the Final SEIR by the City as complete and adequate in conformance with CEQA does not grant any specific approvals to the Project. The City will use the Final SEIR for future decisions regarding the Project, including the following:

- Rezoning of several parcels to the Northpoint Parkway Community Commons, General Commercial-Planned Development zoning district and modification to the Policy Statement for the zoning district
- Conditional Use Permits for individual development plans within the Master Development Area
- Building and Grading Permits for individual development plans within the Master Development Area

This Draft SEIR, as well as the documents incorporated by reference (described below in Section 1.4), are available for public inspection and review at the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development, City Hall, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Santa Rosa, California, 95402.
1.2 Approach

The Project is located within the Southwest Area designated by the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan. It is located within the boundaries of the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan (Area Plan) and the Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Plan (Redevelopment Plan). Environmental review of these plans was completed in 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, the Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Final EIR (referred to in this document as “Redevelopment EIR”), certified in 2000, and the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (General Plan EIR), certified in 2002. The proposed land uses in the Project are consistent with the land uses designated in these plans. Therefore, the environmental review of the Project will tier from these EIRs. CEQA Statute 21157.1 states that “preparation and certification of a master environmental impact report, if prepared and certified consistent with this division, may allow for the limited review of subsequent projects that were described in the master environmental impact report as being within the scope of the report....”

CEQA requires that a new EIR, rather than a Negative Declaration, be prepared for subsequent environmental review if a project involves potentially significant environmental impacts not addressed in the master EIR. Since the Master EIR and Redevelopment EIR were certified, the California Tiger Salamander (CTS) was placed on the federal endangered species list. Potential CTS habitat is widespread throughout southwest Santa Rosa, and the Project could result in impacts to CTS habitat, as identified in the Initial Study. Potentially significant cumulative impacts to traffic and water supply were also identified in the Initial Study. These potentially significant impacts were not addressed in the Master EIR and Redevelopment EIR. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, the Project requires what is called a subsequent EIR to provide environmental review focused on new potentially significant impacts not previously addressed.

This Draft SEIR will provide two levels of environmental review. One level is project-specific review for portions of the Project site for which specific development plans have been submitted and in which all needed project-specific studies have been conducted. The second level of environmental review is for the more conceptual Master Development Plan and Rezoning portions of the Project (see Chapter 2 Project Description). Since these actions are not accompanied by specific development plans, some site-specific impacts are not known. For those impacts, a more programmatic level of review is provided, with impacts and mitigation measures described in more qualitative terms. As specific development plans are completed for these areas of the Project site in the future, additional project-specific environmental review with greater detail may be required.

1.3 Public and Agency Involvement

On February 6, 2004, the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) that an SEIR would be prepared for the Project (see Appendix B for a copy of the NOP) and an Initial Study. The NOP and Initial Study were submitted to the State Clearinghouse, responsible and interested agencies, and interested members of the public. The purpose of the NOP was to allow for concerns and comments to
be received regarding the scope and content of the SEIR. Written comments were accepted through March 12, 2004. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on March 4, 2004 at the Finley Community Center in Santa Rosa.

This Draft SEIR was prepared based on input received during scoping. The Draft SEIR will be circulated for review by the public and agencies for 45 days. The 45-day comment period will run through Friday, February 25, 2004. Comments must be received by 5:00 on February 25.

Written comments should be sent to:

Frank Kasimov, City Planner
City of Santa Rosa
Department of Community Development
P.O. Box 1678
Santa Rosa, CA 95402-1678
Fax: (707) 543-3218
Email: fkasimov@ci.santa-rosa.ca.us

1.4 Areas of Controversy and Issues Addressed in this Draft SEIR

Given that this Draft SEIR derives from the Master EIR, Redevelopment EIR, and General Plan EIR, potential impacts that were adequately addressed in those previous EIRs will not be evaluated further in this document. This Draft SEIR focuses on site-specific impacts of the proposed Project and on new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the previous EIRs. In addition, the Master EIR and Redevelopment EIR analyzed future buildout and cumulative impacts through the year 2010. The more recent General Plan EIR, however, used a planning horizon of 2020 for cumulative impacts. Therefore, certain cumulative impacts from the Master and Redevelopment EIRs also require updating using a 2020 planning horizon. Primarily, this Draft SEIR addresses the environmental impacts as they pertain to CTS and CTS habitat, other site-specific biological resources, traffic and circulation impacts, and cumulative impacts through 2020 for traffic, water supply, and public services.

The Draft SEIR also addresses potential impacts and issues of concern identified in the scoping process through written responses received on the Notice of Preparation and through comments made at the scoping meeting. Copies of the comment letters and emails and a detailed list of comments provided during the public scoping meeting are included in Appendix C.

Comments received on the NOP as well as in the public scoping meeting have been taken into consideration during the development of this Draft SEIR. Responses to the issues raised are provided in detail in the appropriate sections in Chapter 3. The list below identifies areas of concern that were raised about the Project and the section in which the issue is evaluated.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

- Detailed project description and schedule
- Phasing of infrastructure improvements
- Construction site access routes
- Effects on groundwater
- Potential for flooding onsite after construction
- Inclusion of bicycle pathways, including along Colgan Creek
- Increased traffic congestion, especially along Hearn Avenue
- Location of traffic improvements, including new traffic signals
- Impacts to water supply and water costs
- Impacts to school capacity
- Potential presence of California tiger salamander (CTS) onsite
- Impacts to and potential onsite mitigation for CTS
- Impacts to wetlands and vernal pools and potential for onsite mitigation
- Consistency with conceptual plan for Colgan Creek

Chapter 2 Project Description
Chapter 2 Project Description
Chapter 2 Project Description
Section 3.1 Impacts Previously Evaluated
Section 3.1 Impacts Previously Evaluated
Chapter 2 Project Description; Section 3.2 Traffic and Circulation
Section 3.2 Traffic and Circulation
Section 3.2 Traffic and Circulation
Section 3.3 Utilities and Public Services
Section 3.3 Utilities and Public Services
Section 3.6 Vegetation, Wildlife, and Habitat
Section 3.6 Vegetation, Wildlife, and Habitat
Section 3.6 Vegetation, Wildlife, and Habitat
Section 4.1 Cumulative Impacts

1.5 Documents Incorporated by Reference

1.5.1 CEQA Guidelines

CEQA Guidelines permit documents of lengthy technical detail to be incorporated by reference in an EIR. Specifically, Section 15150 states that an EIR may "incorporate by reference all or portions of another document which is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public." This Draft SEIR incorporates by reference three plan EIRs previously certified by the City of Santa Rosa. All three documents are Program EIRs, which are prepared under CEQA on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project that are geographically related.
1.5.2 Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and Final EIR

The Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan (General Plan) and Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (General Plan EIR), State Clearinghouse Number 2001012030, were certified on June 18, 2002. State law requires that each California city prepare a general plan, defined as a comprehensive, long-term plan for the physical development of the city. The General Plan addresses issues related to physical development, growth management, transportation, public facilities, community design, and resource conservation.

In 1996, voters approved an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) area, which assured that urban development would not extend past the designated boundary until at least the year 2016. The UGB includes the City of Santa Rosa and unincorporated land that the City plans to annex and serve.

The 2002 General Plan continues the Growth Management Program that was adopted in the 1996 General Plan. The Program permits construction of 800 to 950 housing units annually through the year 2020, for a total of 19,300 new housing units over 20 years. The General Plan also includes goals and policies to maintain a ratio of jobs to employed residents at 1.3 to 1 (1.3 jobs for every employed resident).

The General Plan EIR identifies potentially significant impacts resulting from the growth accommodated in the General Plan and offers mitigation measures to reduce the impacts to less than significant. The General Plan EIR assessed in detail several areas of controversy, including traffic congestion, air quality, population and job growth, visual quality, and biological resources. Even with mitigation, the General Plan is projected to cause significant impacts, as follows:

- Impact 4.4-A: New urban development may result in increased traffic volumes exceeding the LOS objective for roadway segments, specifically:
  - US 101 south of Hearn and Yolanda
  - South Wright Road, Sebastopol Road to Highway 12
  - Stony Point Road south of Highway 12
  - Northpoint Parkway west of Stony Point Road
  - Bellevue Avenue west of Dutton Avenue
  - Hearn Avenue east of Dutton Avenue
  - Santa Rosa Avenue south of Bellevue Avenue
  - Montgomery Drive west of Mission Boulevard
  - Sonoma Highway west of Mission Boulevard
  - Montecito Boulevard east of Brush Creek Road
  - Fountaingrove Parkway east of Old Redwood Highway
  - Fulton Road north of Guerneville Road

- Impact 4.14-A: Degradation of air quality to levels inconsistent with State standards, specifically PM$_{10}$ and CO.
1.5.3 Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan and EIR

The Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan and Master EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 92083076) were certified on June 21, 1994. The Area Plan was prepared in accordance with the City’s General Plan, which directed the City to “prepare area plans for southwest and southeast Santa Rosa, using this General Plan as a guide, to comprehensively address issues unique to each area and refine the land use plan for each area...” As a long-range development program, the Area Plan reflects the Santa Rosa General Plan land use diagram and General Plan development policies relevant to the southwest area. The Area Plan encompasses approximately 3,800 acres and includes policies, goals and objectives for residential, commercial, institutional, and park/open space to be built in the area.

Subsequent to preparation of the Area Plan, 35 individual project proposals located within the Southwest Area Plan study area were submitted to the City for consideration. Along with the Area Plan, the 35 project proposals are evaluated in the EIR. Significant, unavoidable adverse impacts from buildout of the Area Plan identified by the Master EIR include the following.

- **Impact 3.1.2-1**: Implementation of the Area Plan would result in the loss of approximately 848 acres of farmland of Local Importance as designated by the State Department of Conservation and Sonoma County. The use of Farmland of Local Importance for urban uses would be an irreversible and irretrievable loss of agricultural land.

- **Impact 3.1.4-2**: The Area Plan adds traffic to US 101, which was already congested at the time. Traffic LOS would be LOS “F” in some areas, primarily south of the Hearn interchange. LOS “F” corresponds to “stop and go” traffic conditions, with an average speed of about 8 to 10 miles per hour.

- **Impact 3.1.5-1**: Buildout of the Area Plan would convert land parcels that are currently semi-rural and rural land in character to an urban condition. This development would constitute a significant change in visual character.

- **Impact 3.1.5-3**: If constructed as proposed, the proposed Fulton/Wright Road overcrossing and interchange at Highway 12 would be seen as increased urbanization in an area that currently appears semi-rural in character. The transition from rural to urban conditions to the eastbound Highway 12 motorist would be sudden and abrupt.

- **Impact 3.2.3-6**: Development within the Southwest Area Plan would result in loss of grassland foraging area for sensitive bird species known to occur within the Southwest Area Plan.

- **Impact 3.2.5-3**: Development of the Area Plan and its infrastructure improvements, in conjunction with cumulative traffic, could result in increased traffic noise impacts on existing Area Plan land uses.

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21157.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15179, the Master EIR expired in 1999. In order to use the Master EIR for purposes of environmental review for subsequent projects within the Southwest Plan Area, a review of the Master EIR was completed in June 2000. The review determined that the Master EIR was still valid for purposes of CEQA environmental review for new project proposals within the area.
Area Plan boundaries. The Redevelopment EIR (described below) also provided an update of the Master EIR.

1.5.4 Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Plan and Subsequent EIR

The Redevelopment EIR was certified by the City of Santa Rosa in 2000. The Redevelopment Plan was prepared to provide the City with detailed information about the environmental effects of a comprehensive redevelopment plan for portions of the Area Plan. The Redevelopment Plan targeted areas within the Area Plan that had blighted conditions and/or were determined to have the greatest need for redevelopment. In doing so, the City hoped to move forward with the revitalization promoted by the Area Plan. Redevelopment included financial incentives to private investors, improvements in existing neighborhoods, and a housing program.

The Redevelopment Plan Area consists of two noncontiguous Redevelopment Subareas, totaling approximately 2,006 gross acres. The EIR focuses on physical changes stimulated through redevelopment assistance as identified in the Redevelopment Plan. Significant, unavoidable impacts created by implementation of the Redevelopment Plan include the following:

- Impact 3.1.3-2: The Redevelopment Plan, along with cumulative traffic growth, would have a significant impact (LOS “E” or worse) on US 101 from Wilfred Avenue to Highway 12, which is projected to be at an LOS “F.” Average travel speeds would be in the 9 to 25 mph range during the PM peak hour.

- Impact 3.1.6-1: Buildout as envisioned in the Southwest Area Plan and as assisted through the Redevelopment Plan would result in the conversion of undeveloped land parcels that are currently vacant to an urban condition. This development would constitute a significant change in visual conditions within central, southern and western portions of the Southwest Plan Area, and visually contrast with remaining undeveloped lands to the west and south outside of the Southwest Plan Area.

- Impact 3.1.6-4: If constructed as proposed, the Fulton/Wright Road overcrossing and interchange at State Highway 12 would be seen as increased urbanization in an area that currently appears semi-rural in character. The transition from semi-rural to urban conditions to the eastbound Highway 12 motorist would be sudden and abrupt.

- Impact 3.2.3-6: Development within the Southwest Plan Area as assisted through the Redevelopment Plan will result in loss of grassland foraging area for sensitive bird species known to occur within the Southwest Plan Area.

- Impact 3.2.5-3: The increase in traffic resulting from new construction as assisted through the Redevelopment Plan, in conjunction with cumulative increased traffic, would result in traffic noise impacts on existing Plan Area land uses.

1.6 Organization

Because this Draft SEIR tiers from the Master EIR, Redevelopment EIR, and General Plan EIR and addresses potential impacts at both the project and programmatic level of review,
this Draft SEIR presents the Project description, environmental setting, and findings of impacts and mitigation measures in a specialized format.

The Project includes several actions that will be addressed in this Draft SEIR, and are described in further detail in Chapter 2, Project Description. These actions are: (1) rezoning to add parcels to the Planned Development zoning district and to modify the Policy Statement; (2) adoption of a conceptual Master Development Plan for the Dutton Meadows project area, which shows streets and land uses; and (3) development of three of the projects within the Master Development Plan.

Chapter 3, Setting, Impact Analysis, and Mitigation Measures, begins with the section “Impacts Previously Evaluated,” which provides a general discussion of the environmental review already completed in the Master, Redevelopment, and General Plan EIRs. New potentially significant impacts not previously identified in these EIRs and site-specific impacts from the Project are then individually evaluated in detail. Impacts to be analyzed in detail are Traffic and Circulation; Utilities and Public Services; Hazardous Materials; Historic and Cultural Resources; and Vegetation, Wildlife, and Habitat. Each impact section includes a description of the environmental setting, the standards of significance for evaluating impacts, the impacts and mitigation measures, and references. Potential cumulative impacts for traffic, utilities/public services, and California tiger salamander are discussed in the respective impact sections.

Chapter 4 discusses required CEQA considerations, including cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, unavoidable significant adverse impacts, and the environmentally superior alternative.

Chapter 5 contains a description and brief evaluation of alternatives to the Project, including the required No Project alternative.

Chapter 6 lists the document preparers.

With deference to previously analyzed sections in the Master, Redevelopment, and General Plan EIRs and supplementation of newly-added Project details, this Draft SEIR complies with Section 15151 of the CEQA Guidelines, which specifies that an EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information that enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes into account environmental consequences.

1.7 References
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2.0 Project Description

2.1 Background and Project Origination

Preparation of the Area Plan was required following the adoption of the City’s General Plan in July 1991. Completion of the Area Plan in 1994 implemented General Plan Policy LUR-2b, which directed the Santa Rosa Department of Community Development to “Prepare area plans for southwest and southeast Santa Rosa, using this General Plan as a guide, to comprehensively address issues unique to each area and refine the land use plan for each area....” The Area Plan is intended to accomplish the following:

- Create livable neighborhoods, where services and community needs are met within a short distance of home
- Address issues, opportunities and constraints unique to the Southwest area
- Plan future transportation and circulation systems which meet local and regional needs while minimizing disturbances to neighborhoods
- Provide a basis for infrastructure funding, development timing and implementation priorities

The Area Plan builds on the General Plan and contains more specificity with regard to land use designations and a set of Goals, Objectives, and Policies which speak more directly to potential buildout of the Southwest area than do the goals and policies of the General Plan. The Area Plan identifies necessary major infrastructure improvements in streets, sanitary sewers, storm drainage, and water delivery systems as well as mechanisms for infrastructure financing. The Area Plan also contains 35 development projects proposed by individual project sponsors during the development of the Area Plan. Implementation of these projects and other future development projects will be guided by the components of the Area Plan.

The Master EIR, certified in 1994, provided environmental review under CEQA of potential impacts from implementation of the Area Plan. The Master EIR was reviewed for currency in 2000. As described in Section 1.4, the Master EIR primarily provided both programmatic review of the more general components of the Area Plan and project-level review of the 35 proposed development projects. In 2000, the Redevelopment Plan was completed and the Redevelopment EIR, a subsequent EIR to the Master EIR, was certified. The Redevelopment Plan primarily introduces programs to encourage redevelopment in the more blighted portions of the Southwest Plan Area. The various development projects in the Southwest Plan Area that have been proposed since the certification of the Master EIR have tiered from the Master EIR for environmental review. For these projects, a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration was usually prepared to evaluate site-specific impacts not previously evaluated in the Master EIR. Development projects in the Redevelopment Area would also incorporate the Redevelopment EIR by reference. The proposed Project is located within the boundary of both the Area Plan and the Redevelopment Plan. With the
implementation of the Rezoning Action component of the Project, the proposed land uses within the Project boundary will be consistent with the land uses designated in the Area Plan and Redevelopment Plan. Therefore, this environmental review of the Project will tier from the Master EIR and Redevelopment EIR. As with the previous development projects, the Master EIR and Redevelopment EIR have provided sufficient evaluation of most impacts, such as land use and air quality. However, new potentially significant impacts not previously identified in these EIRs, including impacts to CTS (a federally listed endangered species in 2000) 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 Redevelopment EIR. As a result, it was determined that a subsequent EIR, rather than a negative declaration, would be required under CEQA.

This Draft SEIR focuses on the Project components (Rezoning Action, Master Development Plan, and specific development projects) by addressing the site-specific environmental impacts of implementing development in a currently undeveloped area. The proposed Project description and other details are provided below.

2.2 Project Objectives

The objectives of the Project are three-fold:

- Provide 586 new housing units in Southwest Santa Rosa consistent with the land uses designated in the Area Plan
- Develop the Community Commons (a center with a large supermarket or drugstore and other retail/services serving the community) as identified in the Area Plan for this location (Area Plan Policy 1.2.3)
- Promote implementation of Area Plan goals, objectives and policies for infrastructure such as streets, water delivery system, and storm drainage, and for public services such as schools and parks

The residential land uses designated in the Area Plan and as updated in the General Plan for the parcels within the boundary of the Project include Mixed Use Retail and Residential Medium Density (8 to 18 units per acre), Residential Medium Low Density (8 to 13 units per acre), and Residential Low Density (2 to 8 units per acre). The proposed residential density in the Project area is at the approximate midpoint density for the Plan-designated land uses, which was the density assumed in the Area Plan. This results in the addition of approximately 586 housing units within the boundaries of the Area Plan.

The Community Commons is defined in the Area Plan as “a complex of retail and service enterprises anchored by a supermarket or possibly a super drugstore, or both, and serving a community clientele.” The policy to develop the three Community Commons in southwest Santa Rosa is a key Area Plan land use policy to establish patterns of population densities, transportation, and services that will function together effectively and efficiently. The Project site includes one of these designated Community Commons. The General Plan also promotes development of what it calls a Community Shopping Center through Policy LUL-G-1: “Develop the following areas as mixed use centers...South of Hearn Ave, at Dutton Meadow Avenue.” The Rezoning Action included in the Proposed Project will promote the
development of the Community Commons by adding professional office uses and public parks to the zoning district. The PD zoning district requires the adoption of a Master Development Plan.

The Project supports Area Plan goals, objectives and policies for infrastructure and services, including addition of a segment of Northpoint Parkway and payment of fees for schools and public services.

2.3 Project Location

Santa Rosa is located along the U.S. Highway 101 corridor in central Sonoma County, California. Situated on the Santa Rosa Plain, the City is bounded by the foothills of the Sonoma Mountains to the east, and Laguna de Santa Rosa to the west (see Figure 2-1). Santa Rosa’s Urban Growth Boundary area was approved by voters in 1996, and assured that urban development would not extend past this boundary until at least 2016. This area contains the City of Santa Rosa, as well as unincorporated land that is planned to be annexed and served by the City.

The Project is located within incorporated Southwest Santa Rosa, south of Hearn Avenue, east of Dutton Meadows, and northwest of Colgan Greek (see Figure 2-2). The approximately 58-acre Project area currently consists primarily of rural residential and agricultural land uses.

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 are Canine Companions and other commercial and light industrial developments. Some residential development has been completed on nearby parcels.

2.4 Proposed Project Description

The Project encompasses approximately 58.07 acres. The Project includes three components that will be addressed in this Draft SEIR, and are described in further detail below. These components are: (1) rezoning to add parcels to the Planned Development zoning district and to modify the Policy Statement; (2) adoption of a conceptual Master Development Plan for the Dutton Meadows project area, which shows streets and land uses; and (3) development of three of the projects within the Master Development Plan. Rezoning would modify the Policy Statement for the Planned Development zoning district to include professional office uses and public parks, simplify the description of residential uses, and rezone several parcels to this zoning district. The purpose of the Master Development Plan is to show the interrelationship and general location of Project land uses in a pattern that is consistent with the General Plan. The Phase 1, Phase 2 Minoia, and Phase 5 Dutton Village Projects are three of the six proposed residential development plans within the Master Development Plan area. These components are described in detail below. Additional information on construction activities and Project schedule follows.

Table 2-1 shows the proposed total buildout for the Project. The table indicates numbers of residential units and square footage for commercial, retail and office.
TABLE 2-1
Project Total Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (attached townhomes/condominiums)</td>
<td>459 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (detached townhomes)</td>
<td>65 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (apartments/condominiums)</td>
<td>50 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (live/work lofts)</td>
<td>12 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residential</td>
<td>586 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery/Anchor Retail</td>
<td>55,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Office/Roastaurant ¹</td>
<td>29,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>3,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>10,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Residential</td>
<td>97,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park</td>
<td>4.0 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Specific uses for this portion of the Community Center have not yet been determined.

2.4.1 Rezoning Action

The Rezoning Action of the Project includes modification of the Policy Statement for the Northpoint-Dutton Community Commons district to include professional office uses and public parks and to simplify the description of residential uses. Several parcels are not zoned to the PD district and are proposed to be rezoned for consistency with the Santa Rosa General Plan (see Figure 2-3). These parcels include:

- Parcel 043-191-016 (rezoning from Open Space-Conservation [OSC] to PD)
- Parcel 043-191-018 (rezoning from OSC to PD)
- Parcel 043-191-019 (rezoning from OSC to PD)
- Parcel 043-191-020 (rezoning from R-1-6 to PD)
- Northern portion of Parcel 043-191-021 (rezoning from R-1-6 to PD)
- Parcel 043-191-024 (rezoning from OSC to PD)
- Southern portion of Parcel 043-200-004 (rezoning from R-3-18, Multi-Family Residential, to PD)

In addition, Parcel 043-071-028, currently zoned PD, will be affected by the modifications to the Policy Statement.

The Policy Statement describes a range of guidelines and requirements for the PD zone, including permitted uses, allowable accessory uses, uses allowed with Conditional Use Permit approval, subdivision regulations, setback and building height requirements, parking requirements, and design guidelines (City of Santa Rosa 2004b). The PD zoning
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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. As a result of the subsequent approvals required, the
rezoning does not directly provide any development entitlements.

### 2.4.2 Master Development Plan

The purpose of the Master Development Plan is to show the interrelationships of Project
land uses in a pattern that is consistent with the General Plan. The land uses shown on the
Master Development Plan are conceptual, similar to a General Plan land use diagram. The
Master Development Plan shows the general location of different land uses; it does not
show exact locations of buildings as would a specific development plan or a site
development plan. 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."

The Master Development Plan encompasses the full Project except for parcel 043-171-028,
which is included only in the Rezoning Action (see Figure 2-4). The 11 parcels included in
the Master Development Plan cover 56.32 acres. Land uses designated by the 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
specific parcels included in the Master Development Plan are listed in Table 2-2 and shown
in Figure 2-4.

#### TABLE 2-2
Dutton Meadows Project Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor Parcel Number (APN)</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master Development Plan Parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-071-007</td>
<td>8.00 acres</td>
<td>DM Associates LLC</td>
<td>2684 Dutton Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-071-022</td>
<td>3.55 acres</td>
<td>DM Associates LLC</td>
<td>2666 Dutton Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-071-023</td>
<td>0.52 acres</td>
<td>DM Associates LLC</td>
<td>2650 Dutton Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-071-029</td>
<td>12.05 acres</td>
<td>Constance L. Lechmanski Tr et al.</td>
<td>2732 Dutton Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-191-016</td>
<td>1.93 acres</td>
<td>Frank Minoia</td>
<td>1200 Hearn Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-191-018</td>
<td>0.21 acres</td>
<td>Dorothy Caskaton Tr</td>
<td>976 Hearn Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-191-019</td>
<td>5.65 acres</td>
<td>Dorothy Caskaton Tr</td>
<td>980 Hearn Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-191-020</td>
<td>0.23 acres</td>
<td>Arthur Vincent Nelson, et al.</td>
<td>1004 Hearn Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-191-021</td>
<td>2.49 acres</td>
<td>Judith S. Peletz, Tr et al.</td>
<td>1130 Hearn Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-191-024</td>
<td>4.68 acres</td>
<td>Gina Sedie</td>
<td>1112 Hearn Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-200-004</td>
<td>17.01 acres</td>
<td>Richard G. Rayburn</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-071-028</td>
<td>1.75 acres</td>
<td>Patrick Curran</td>
<td>2706 Dutton Meadow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development areas within the Master Development Plan include the following (see Figure 2-5):

- **Phase 1**: Residential medium density on 12.07 acres in the northwest portion of the Project site (see Phase 1 Project description below for more details).

- **Phase 2**: Residential low density and medium-low density on 6.61 acres in the northern portion of the Project site (see Phase 2 Minoia Project description below for more details).

- **Phase 3**: Up to 10,000 square feet of office space and potentially up to 12 live/work condominiums on approximately 1.0 acre in the northeast corner of the Project site. Residential medium density on approximately 7.6 acres in the northeast portion of the Project site, including 90 two-story townhomes.

- **Phase 4**: The Community Shopping Center (Center) on approximately 13.6 acres, including a maximum 55,000 square feet for grocery; maximum 29,000 square feet for retail, office, and/or restaurants; 300 parking spaces for customers; and potentially up to 50 apartments or condominiums over the Center. The Center may also include up to 3,000 square feet of public facilities such as a police substation, public childcare facility, library, or public meeting rooms. A 4-acre neighborhood park will be located west and south of the Center. The park will include an approximately 1,000-foot linear portion along Colgan Creek that will provide a bike and pedestrian path and picnic tables. The ends of the bike path at the boundaries of the Project site will be designed to integrate with future segments of the Colgan Creek Trail System to the north and south. These future segments will be developed under other projects.

- **Phase 5**: Residential medium density on 12.05 acres in the southwestern portion of the Project site (see Phase 5 Dutton Village Project description below).

- **Phase 6**: Residential medium density on approximately 2.4 acres in the southeast portion of the Project site, including 34 three-story attached townhomes.

Transportation infrastructure improvements are a key feature of the Master Development Plan. The development will include construction of a network of streets that will include both pedestrian and bicycle access. These improvements are shown in Figures 2-5 and 2-6, and are described in detail below.

### 2.4.2.1 Phase 1 Transportation Improvements

The following improvements will be completed prior to or concurrent with construction of Phase 1 of the Project.

- Widening and realigning Dutton Meadow (to be renamed Northpoint Parkway) north of the Meadow View School, so that both left and right turn approach lanes are provided. Construction of Northpoint Parkway within Phase 1 to the east edge of the property.

- Addition of a signal to the intersection of Dutton Meadow (Northpoint Parkway) and Hearn Avenue.

- Addition of stop signs to Dutton Meadow approaches, and temporary barricading of the southeast leg of the intersection except for emergency vehicle access.
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Realignment of Dutton Meadow to turn easterly and 'T' into Northpoint Parkway extension. Construction of Dutton Meadow within Phase 1 from Northpoint Parkway to the east edge of the property, and provide an interim street-end.

- Abandonment of a small existing portion of Dutton Meadow and transfer of the property to Bellevue School District.

### 2.4.2.2 Phase 2 Transportation Improvements

The following improvements will be completed prior to or concurrent with construction of Phase 2 of the Project.

- Construction of 'A' Street from Hearn Avenue south to Dutton Meadow at the edge of the Phase 2 property. Addition of stop sign control from 'A' Street to Hearn Avenue, 'A' Street onto Aloise Avenue, and 'A' Street onto Dutton Meadow.

- Extension of existing Aloise Avenue to the east edge of Phase 2, and a temporary barricade at the east end of Aloise Avenue.

- Extension of Dutton Meadow east to the east edge of Phase 2, and a temporary barricade at the east end of Dutton Meadow.

### 2.4.2.3 Phases 3 and 4 Transportation Improvements

The following improvements will be completed prior to or concurrent with construction of Phases 3 and 4 of the Project.

- Continuation of Northpoint Parkway southeasterly to Colgan Creek from the southern edge of Phase 1. Widening of Northpoint Parkway to the ultimate lane configuration between Dutton Meadow and Hearn Avenue. Addition of signal at the Northpoint Parkway Extension and Dutton Meadow intersection.

- Construction of the Colgan Creek Bridge to connect with the existing South Dutton Avenue south of the creek (by others).

- Construction of Dutton Extension from Northpoint Parkway north to Hearn Avenue, to align with the existing intersection of Hearn Avenue/North Dutton Avenue.

- Installation of Northpoint Parkway Extension and Dutton Extension-Tuxhorn Drive roundabout.

- Extension of Dutton Meadow east to the east to connect to Dutton Extension.

### 2.4.2.4 Phases 5 and 6 Transportation Improvements

The following improvements will be completed prior to or concurrent with construction of Phases 5 and 6 of the Project.

- Construction of Tuxhorn Drive from Dutton Meadow east to the Northpoint Parkway roundabout.

- Construction of an internal loop street to serve Phases 5 and 6 with access from Tuxhorn Drive. Addition of stop sign controls from Loop Street onto Tuxhorn Drive.
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- Construction of a southbound left turn pocket on Dutton Meadow for traffic turning left onto Tuxhorn Drive.

2.4.2.5 Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

- All street construction will include pedestrian sidewalks. Pedestrian links will be provided to the Southwest Community Park and the Colgan Creek Trail System.

- A Class 1 bicycle path will be constructed along the Colgan Creek flood control channel.

- Class 2 bicycle lanes will be included along the full length of Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Extension in the Project area.

Class 3 bicycle routes will be included along Hearn Avenue, Aloise Avenue, 'A' Street, Dutton Meadow, Tuxhorn Drive, and Loop Street.

2.4.2.6 Other Infrastructure Improvements

Other infrastructure to be implemented as part of the Master Development Plan includes local sewer collection, water supply, and stormwater facilities. Applicable fees for utilities and public services to support region-wide infrastructure and service improvements will also be paid, including the following (information on school fees is included in Section 3.3).

- Southwest Area Plan Recovery Fee
- Southwest Area Development Impact Fee, residential medium density
- Southwest Area Development Impact Fee, residential medium-low density
- Southwest Area Development Impact Fee, office
- Southwest Area Development Impact Fee, retail/service
- Water Demand Fee, single family residential
- Water Demand Fee, multi-family residential
- Water Demand Fee, typical office (8,000 square feet)
- Sewer Demand Fee, single family residential
- Sewer Demand Fee, multi-family residential
- Sewer Demand Fee, non-residential land uses (per thousand gallons per month estimated wastewater flow
- In Lieu Park Development Fee, single family detached
- In Lieu Park Development Fee, single family attached
- In Lieu Park Development Fee, multi-family
2.4.3 Development Projects

2.4.3.1 Phase 1 Project

The Phase 1 Project is a proposed development project on 12.07 acres within the Master Development Plan area, located across Dutton Meadow from Meadow View Elementary School (see Figure 2-7). Phase 1 consists of the following three parcels:

- Parcel 043-071-007
- Parcel 043-071-022
- Parcel 043-071-023

The specific project includes 160 three-story townhomes in a residential medium-density land use designation. The Phase 1 Project also includes the Phase 1 transportation improvements listed in Section 2.4.1.

The Phase 1 parcels contain 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. The Phase 1 parcels have been affected by routine and long-term soil ripping, annual discing, hay planting, and harvesting.

Before the Phase 1 Project can move forward with construction, a conditional use permit, a detailed development plan, design review, and a tentative subdivision map are required. These approvals plus building and grading permits are entitlements for development.

2.4.3.2 Phase 2 Minoa Project

The Phase 2 Minoa Project is a proposed development project on 6.61 acres within the Master Development Plan area. The Phase 2 Minoa Project is located south of Hearn Avenue in the northern portion of the Master Development Plan Area (see Figure 2-7). The Phase 2 Minoa Project consists of the following two parcels:

- Parcel 043-191-016
- Parcel 043-191-024

The specific project includes 65 three-story detached townhomes in Low Density and Medium-Low Density land use designation. The Phase 2 Minoa Project also includes the Phase 2 transportation improvements listed in Section 2.4.1.

Before the Phase 2 Minoa Project can move forward with construction, a conditional use permit, a detailed development plan, design review, and a tentative subdivision map are required. These approvals plus building and grading permits are entitlements for development.

The northern portion of the Phase 2 parcels currently contains several homes, garages, shops and barns. There is an additional house just outside the Project boundary that will be maintained. Landscape trees and shrubs surround many of the buildings. The Minoa 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
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Parcels slope very gradually to the southwest from Hearn Avenue. There are no natural drainage features on the parcels.

2.4.3.3 Phase 5 Dutton Village Project

The Phase 5 Dutton Village Project is a proposed development project on 12.05 acres within the Master Development Plan area. The Phase 5 Dutton Village Project is located in the southwestern portion of the Master Development Plan Area (see Figure 2-7). The Phase 5 Dutton Village Project consists of Parcel 043-071-029.

The specific project includes 153 three-story condominiums on a Medium-Density land use designation. The Phase 5 Dutton Village Project also includes the Phase 5 transportation improvements listed in Section 2.4.1.

Before the Phase 5 Dutton Village Project can move forward with construction, a conditional use permit, a detailed development plan, design review, and a tentative subdivision map are required. These approvals plus building and grading permits are entitlements for development.

2.4.4 Schedule and Construction

The Project will be constructed in phases. Phases 1, 2 (Minoia) and 5 (Dutton Village) are anticipated to begin construction in Spring 2006, and be completed by Fall 2006. The remaining phases (Phases 3, 4 and 6) are anticipated to begin construction in Spring 2007 or later.

Existing structures and buildings on the Project site, except for a house on the Phase 2 Minoia Project parcels (see Subsection 2.4.3), will be removed at the beginning of construction of each Project phase.

During construction, construction vehicles and equipment will access the Project during Phase 1 via Hearn Avenue and Dutton Meadow; Phase 2 via Hearn Avenue, Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadow; and Phases 3 through 6 via Hearn Avenue, Dutton Extension, Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadow. Staging areas for each phase will be located within the Project boundary for that phase. Construction activities and equipment will be typical for residential and commercial development; equipment used will include scrapers, graders, dump trucks, loaders, backhoes, water trucks, cement trucks, and forklifts.

2.5 Required Approvals

The Project will require approvals from several local, state and federal agencies. A brief summary of the agencies with potential jurisdictions over the Project is provided below.

2.5.1 City of Santa Rosa

CEQA applies to all discretionary activities proposed to be carried out or approved by California public agencies, including state, regional, county, and local agencies, unless an exemption applies. A Lead Agency is the California government agency that has the
principal responsibility for preparing the CEQA document. For this Project, the Lead Agency is the City of Santa Rosa, which will be responsible for certifying the Final SEIR.

Several other City approvals may be required for individual development projects. These approvals include conditional use permits, tentative subdivision map approvals, design reviews, tree replacement plans, and grading plans. Santa Rosa Fire Department permits may be required for removal of contaminated soils from some parcels. The Fire Department will also approve the remediation prior to grading in the vicinity of the contaminated soils.

2.5.2 Sonoma County Water Agency

Because SCWA owns the right-of-way along Colgan Creek within the Project area, a revocable license will be required prior to any work performed within SCWA right-of-way. SCWA will need to review any development plans for these areas prior to construction. Creekside greenway plans will need to be coordinated with SCWA to verify continued flood control protection, hydrological capacity, and continued maintenance access.

SCWA will also review Project design plans for compliance with County Flood Control Design Criteria and approve drainage plans to verify that the Project will not increase the potential for flooding.

2.5.3 North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

Regulations pertaining to stormwater discharges associated with construction activity were issued by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) in 1990. The regulations prevent the pollution of stormwater through the control of erosion, sedimentation and toxic or hazardous materials at construction sites. These regulations are administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards through the NPDES Program. Pollution reduction design is required as part of the permanent drainage system for the post-construction period as well as for the construction phases of a project. Certain categories of industrial facilities are also required to obtain NPDES permits for the operation of the facilities.

A permit is required for construction projects such as road extensions or development projects that are greater than one acre in extent. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required that identifies the sources of sediment and other pollutants, and reduces sediment and other pollutants in the stormwater discharge from a construction site. A monitoring program is required to aid the implementation of, and assure compliance with, the SWPPP.

A Water Quality Certification or Waiver pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA is required for Section 404 permit actions (see Subsection 2.5.5 USACE); this certification or waiver is issued by the RWQCB. However, if a proposed project does not require a federal permit, but does involve dredge or fill activities that may result in a discharge to “Waters of the State,” the RWQCB has the option to regulate the project under its state authority provided by the Porter-Cologne Act in the form of Waste Discharge Requirements or Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements.

Under section 401 of the Clean Water Act, the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has the authority to certify projects subject to the USACE jurisdiction for
water quality impacts or to waive certification. On behalf of Trumark properties, Laurence P. Stromberg, Ph.D., applied for a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB, dated August 8, 2001. On January 25, 2002, the RWQCB denied the request, without prejudice (RWQCB File: Dutton Meadows Development, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County; WDID No. 1B01099WNSO).

On February 1, 2002, prior to the listing of the CTS as an endangered species, the RWQCB issued a Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements and Issuance of Clean Water Act Section 401 Conditional Certification for the Phase 1 Project (titled Bellevue Ranch Phase 8 in the Certification). The Project applicants must comply with this Certification during Project construction.

### 2.5.4 California Department of Fish and Game

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) generally parallels the main provisions of the ESA, but unlike its federal counterpart, CESA applies the take prohibitions to species proposed for listing (called "candidates" by the state). Section 2080 of the CDFG Code prohibits the taking, possession, purchase, sale, and import or export of endangered, threatened, or candidate species, unless otherwise authorized by permit or in the regulations. Take is defined in Section 86 of the CDFG Code as "hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill." CESA allows for take incidental to otherwise lawful development projects. Because CDFG is a trustee and responsible agency under CEQA, state lead agencies are required to consult with CDFG to ensure that any action they undertake is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in destruction or adverse modification of essential habitat.

### 2.5.5 United States Army Corps of Engineers

The CWA was created to “restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation’s waters.” Section 404 of the CWA prohibits the discharge of dredged or fill material into “waters of the United States” without a permit from USACE. The definition of waters of the United States includes rivers, streams, estuaries, territorial seas, ponds, lakes and wetlands. Wetlands are defined as those areas “that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions” (33 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 328.3 7b). Substantial impacts to wetlands may require an individual permit. Projects that only minimally affect wetlands may meet the conditions of one of the existing Nationwide Permits. The Phase 1 Project received an USACE Nationwide Authorization Permit 39, dated May 8, 2001.

### 2.5.6 United States Fish and Wildlife Service/National Marine Fisheries Service

The ESA protects plants and wildlife that are listed as endangered or threatened by USFWS and NOAA Fisheries. Section 9 of ESA prohibits the taking of endangered wildlife, where taking is defined as “harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, collect, or attempt to engage in such conduct” (50 CFR 17.3). Under Section 7 of ESA, federal agencies are required to consult with the USFWS or NOAA Fisheries as applicable if their actions,
including permit approvals or funding, could adversely affect an endangered species (including plants) or its critical habitat. Through consultation and the issuance of a biological opinion, the USFWS, or NOAA Fisheries as applicable, may issue an incidental take statement allowing the take of the species that is incidental to another authorized activity provided the action will not jeopardize the continued existence of the species. Section 10 of ESA provides for issuance of incidental take permits to private parties provided a habitat conservation plan is developed. At a minimum, the Project will require consultation for impacts to the CTS and its habitat.
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3.0 Setting, Impact Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

As described in Chapter 1, this Draft SEIR tiers from the Master EIR, Redevelopment EIR, and General Plan EIR. Potential impacts that were adequately addressed in those previous EIRs will not be evaluated further in this document. This Draft SEIR focuses on site-specific impacts of the proposed Project and on new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the previous EIRs. Therefore, this chapter addresses a subset of the potential impacts typically addressed in an EIR, as follows.

- Section 3.1 summarizes impacts previously evaluated in the Master and Redevelopment EIRs. This section also includes an analysis of consistency between the Project and applicable provisions of the Southwest Area Plan to support the tiering from the Master EIR. Additional information on impacts previously evaluated is included in the Initial Study in Appendix A.

- Section 3.2 includes an evaluation of impacts to traffic and circulation.

- Section 3.3 includes an evaluation of impacts to utilities and public services, including water supply.

- Section 3.4 includes an evaluation of impacts to worker and public health from hazardous materials that may be present onsite.

- Section 3.5 includes an evaluation of historic and cultural resources and potential impacts to these resources.

- Section 3.6 includes an evaluation of vegetation, wildlife, and habitat resources, including CTS and CTS habitat, present onsite and potential impacts to these resources.

Each section is divided into two subsections: a description of the existing setting and a discussion of the impacts and mitigation measures. References are listed in Chapter 7.

3.1 Impacts Previously Evaluated

As described in Section 1 Introduction, the Project is located within the geographical area of the Area Plan, the Redevelopment Plan, and the General Plan. Environmental review of these plans was completed in the Master EIR, certified in 1994 and reviewed for currency in 2000, the Redevelopment EIR, certified in 2000, and the General Plan EIR, certified in 2002. This Draft SEIR will tier from these previously certified EIRs because the proposed land uses in the Project are consistent with the policies, objectives, and land uses designated in these plans and are within the scope of these plans. Similarly, the environmental review of the Project will tier from the Master EIR, Redevelopment EIR, and General Plan EIR. CEQA Statute 21157.1 states that “preparation and certification of a master environmental impact report, if prepared and certified consistent with this division, may allow for the limited
review of subsequent projects that were described in the master environmental impact report as being within the scope of the report...." Table 3.1-1 below provides a point-by-point analysis of consistency between the Project and applicable provisions of the Southwest Area Plan and General Plan. Additional information supporting the consistency determination for traffic, cultural resources, safety/hazardous materials, and natural resource conservation can be found in the impacts discussions below.

The Dutton Meadows Project Initial Study concluded that no significant effects on the environment that were not previously evaluated in the Master, Redevelopment, or General Plan EIRs would occur in the following impact categories: Land Use; Population, Employment and Housing; Visual Quality and Community Character; Soils, Geology and Seismicity; Hydrology and Water Quality; Air Quality; and Noise. For these impact areas, no further environmental review is needed for the proposed Project. However, the Lead Agency is responsible for implementing all appropriate and feasible mitigation measures included in the Master EIR and Redevelopment EIR, and the additional mitigation measures included in the Initial Study, for these impacts. For the impact areas listed in this paragraph, all potential impacts could be mitigated to a less than significant level except for the following:

- Loss of approximately 848 acres of farmland of Local Importance as designated by the State Department of Conservation and Sonoma County
- Addition of traffic to US 101, which is already congested; traffic Level of Service (LOS) would be LOS “F” in some areas, primarily south of the Hearn interchange
- Increased traffic volumes exceeding the LOS objective for roadway segments
- Significant change in visual character from conversion of land that is currently semi-rural and rural land in character to an urban condition
- The proposed Fulton/Wright Road overcrossing and interchange at Highway 12 would be seen as increased urbanization in an area that currently appears semi-rural in character; the transition from rural to urban conditions to the eastbound Highway 12 motorist would be sudden and abrupt
- Loss of grassland foraging area for sensitive bird species known to occur within the Southwest Area Plan
- Degradation of air quality to levels inconsistent with State standards, specifically PM_{10} and CO
- Increased traffic noise impacts on existing Area Plan land uses from development of the Area Plan and its infrastructure improvements, in conjunction with cumulative traffic

Appendix A to this document includes a copy of the Initial Study, which describes the potential impacts, lists required mitigation measures, and includes significance conclusions for these impact categories. The Initial Study is incorporated into this Draft SEIR by reference.

The following sections provide information on the setting and potential impacts and mitigation measures for traffic and circulation; utilities and public services; hazardous materials; historic and cultural resources; and vegetation, wildlife, and habitat.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1-1</th>
<th>Consistency of Project with Santa Rosa Southwest Area Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1.1: Encourage the establishment of neighborhoods as the basic building block of southwest Santa Rosa.</td>
<td>Goal LUL-F: Maintain a diversity of neighborhoods and varied housing stock to satisfy a wide range of needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.1.2: Utilize the Planned Community Zoning District to advance the concept of neighborhood development on large scale projects.</td>
<td>Policy LUL-F-2: Require development at the mid-point or higher of the density range in the Medium and Medium High Density Residential categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.1.5: Require the development of Medium-low, Medium, and Medium-high Density residential projects within the Community Commons designation south of Hearn Avenue and in the vicinity of other Community and Neighborhood Commons areas in accordance with the Land Use Diagram in order to support the development of Neighborhood and Community Commons facilities as focal points for community interaction.</td>
<td>Goal LUL-G: Promote mixed use sites and centers. Policy LUL-G-1. Develop the following as mixed use centers [Community Shopping Center]:...South of Hearn Ave, at Dutton Meadow Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1.2: Provide for a balance of neighborhood, community, and regional serving retail uses within the southwest and maintain the integrity of Business Parks and General Industrial areas.</td>
<td>Goal LUL-J: Maintain vibrant, convenient and attractive commercial centers. Policy LUL-J-1: Provide a range of commercial services that are easily accessible and attractive, that satisfies the needs of people who live and work in Santa Rosa and that also attracts a regional clientele. Policy LUL-J-4: Distribute shopping centers so that new centers containing either a supermarket or a drug store are located at least one mile away from existing major shopping centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.2.3: Establish two additional “Community Commons” areas to provide for the needs of the southwest community as identified on the Land Use Diagram.</td>
<td>Policy LUL-J-2: Ensure easy access to major facilities within the southwest. Policy LUL-J-3: Provide a range of commercial services that are easily accessible and attractive, that satisfies the needs of people who live and work in Santa Rosa and that also attracts a regional clientele.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.2.5 [partial]: Encourage major anchor tenants that serve both day-to-day and week-to-week shopping needs to locate within the Community Commons areas. Examples of appropriate uses for a Community Commons area include: grocery, hardware, drug, craft/hobby, and clothing stores. Policy 1.2.7: Provide a Community Meeting Room large enough to accommodate a minimum of 50 people. In addition to the Community Meeting Room requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3.1-1
Consistency of Project with Santa Rosa Southwest Area Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>General Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>encourage each Community Commons to public/civic type uses such as childcare, a library, or a museum/nature center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1.3: Encourage mixed use development to: a) maximize use of available land; b) reduce vehicular travel; c) promote pedestrian orientation; and d) buffer residential uses from noise sources.</td>
<td>Policy LUL-G-2: Require design of mixed-use projects to focus residential uses in the upper stories or toward the back of parcels, with retail and office activities fronting the regional/arterial street.</td>
<td>The proposed Project may include up to 50 apartment/condominium units above the Community Commons, which allows Mixed Use development. It may also include up to 12 live/work lofts in an office development. The shopping center will front the new intersection of Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.3.1: Allow development of residential housing units over a ground floor or behind office or commercial developments in areas designated for Mixed Use development.</td>
<td>Policy LUL-G-3: Prepare and implement mixed-use zoning district(s) that provide development standards for mixed use sites and centers.</td>
<td>The proposed Project includes residential development adjacent to the Community Commons, which will be built concurrently with the Commons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.3.3: Require the development of residential housing units in coordination with the development of both Neighborhood and Community Commons areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The rezoning will include a policy statement that defines permitted uses, establishes design standards and guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Circulation and Transportation**

| Objective 1.2: Develop safe pedestrian and bicycle pathways and improve existing conditions wherever feasible. | Policy UD-D-4: Provide continuous sidewalks and bicycle lanes on both sides of major regional/arterial streets. | The proposed Project includes a bike path along Colgan Creek within the Project boundary. |
| Policy 1.2.3: Develop bikeways in accordance with the Bikeways Master Plan. | Goal T-H: Expand the existing transit network to provide convenient and efficient public transportation to workplaces, shopping, and other destinations. | The Project includes bicycle shoulder lanes on Dutton Meadow, Tuxhorn Drive, Dutton Extension, and Northpoint Parkway. |
| Policy 1.2.4: Require that a pedestrian/bicycle shoulder lane/path be provided by developers to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety on rural roads which are designated as collector streets on the Future Circulation Network. | Policy T-H-3: Require new development to provide transit improvements, where a rough proportionality to demand from the project is established. Transit improvements may include: direct and paved pedestrian access to transit stops; bus turnouts and shelters; and land width to accommodate buses. | The Project includes sidewalks along all new streets within the Project. |
| Objective 1.4: Utilize Colgan and Roseland Creek corridors and the Sebastopol-Santa Rosa railroad corridor for pedestrian, bicyclist, and possibly equestrian movements. | Goal T-J: Provide attractive and safe streets for pedestrians and bicyclists. | Several new bus turnouts will be included in the Project. |
| | Policy T-J-1: Pursue implementation of walking and | |

The proposed Project may include up to 50 apartment/condominium units above the Community Commons, which allows Mixed Use development. It may also include up to 12 live/work lofts in an office development. The shopping center will front the new intersection of Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Extension.

The proposed Project includes residential development adjacent to the Community Commons, which will be built concurrently with the Commons.

The rezoning will include a policy statement that defines permitted uses, establishes design standards and guidelines.
### TABLE 3.1-1
Consistency of Project with Santa Rosa Southwest Area Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>General Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bicycling facilities as envisioned in the City's Updated Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Goal T-L: Develop a citywide system of designated bikeways that serves both experienced and casual bicyclists, and which maximizes bicycle use for commuting, recreation, and local transportation. Policy T-L-1: Provide bicycle lanes along all regional/arterial streets and high volume transitional/collector streets.</td>
<td>Goal T-B: Provide a safe, efficient, free-flowing circulation system. Policy T-B-1: Require site design to focus through-traffic on regional/arterial streets. Promote the following design techniques to increase driver safety and efficiency: Reduce the number of driveways and intersections; combine driveways to serve numerous small parcels; avoid residential access; install street lights; install and facilitate timing of traffic signals; and ensure continuous sidewalks. Goal T-E: Complete needed transportation improvements in a timely manner. Policy T-E-1: Complete the projected street and highway improvements in time to accommodate the traffic that will be generated by future development.</td>
<td>The proposed Project includes construction of major roadways shown in the Backbone Circulation Improvements, including Northpoint Parkway East, Dutton Avenue Connection [Dutton Extension], and improvements on Hearn Avenue. Traffic flow through residential neighborhoods is minimized. Sidewalks will be included on all Project streets. New roadways and other traffic improvements will be completed prior to or concurrent with construction of each adjacent Project phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4.1: Support the timely construction of major roads and circulation improvements (Backbone Circulation Improvements) which minimize impacts to residential neighborhoods and improve vehicular traffic flows to commercial and industrial businesses. Policy 4.1.1: Coordinate circulation improvements with anticipated development to assure both short and long term impacts to local neighborhood streets are minimized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4.2: Require local and minor neighborhood streets to interconnect with one another to provide multiple routes for local traffic. Policy 4.2.2: Minimize use of cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets to distribute the traffic burden throughout the neighborhood rather than concentrating it in just a few locations.</td>
<td>Policy UD-G-4: Provide through-connections for pedestrians and bicyclists in new developments. Avoid cul-de-sac streets, unless public pedestrian/bikeways interconnect them.</td>
<td>The local and minor neighborhood streets are interconnected, include sidewalks and bikeways, and do not include any cul-de-sacs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.1-1
Consistency of Project with Santa Rosa Southwest Area Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>General Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resource Conservation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal NRC-2: Conserve wetland areas.</td>
<td>Goal OSC-D: Conserve wetlands, vernal pools, wildlife ecosystems, rare plant habitats, and waterways.</td>
<td>Although the Project would result in impacts to low-quality wetlands, the impacts will be mitigated through creation of new wetlands and conservation of existing wetlands at a mitigation bank outside the Urban Boundary in the southwest Santa Rosa area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2.1: Achieve no-net-loss of wetland acreage within the greater Santa Rosa Plain area.</td>
<td>Policy OSC-D-1: Utilize existing regulations and procedures, including Subdivision Guidelines, Zoning, Design Review, and environmental law, to conserve wetlands and rare plans. Comply with the federal policy of no net loss of wetlands using mitigation measures such as: avoidance of sensitive habitat, clustered development, transfer of development rights, and/or compensatory mitigation, such as restoration or creation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.2.2: Encourage off-site wetland mitigation be focused within or adjacent to areas identified as open space within the Southwest Area or outside the Urban Boundary where land costs are generally lower.</td>
<td>Policy OSC-D-9: Ensure that construction adjacent to creek channels is sensitive to the natural environment. Ensure that natural topography and vegetation is preserved along the creek, and that construction activities do not disrupt or pollute the waterway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy OSC-D-11: New development along channelized waterways should allow for an ecological buffer zone between the waterway and development. This buffer zone should also provide opportunities for multi-use trails and recreation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Preservation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal HP-1: Preserve southwest Santa Rosa's historic, architectural and cultural heritage.</td>
<td>Goal HP-A: Protect Native American heritage.</td>
<td>Archival research with Sonoma State University's Northwest Information Center was completed for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy HP-A-1. Review proposed developments and work in conjunction with Sonoma State University's Northwest Information Center to determine whether sites contain known Native American resources or have the potential for such resources.</td>
<td>Mitigation measures are included to protect any archaeological resources that may be found during grading, including evaluation of the find by a qualified cultural resource consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy HP-A-3: If cultural resources are encountered during grading, avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified cultural resource consultant has evaluated the situation and recorded identified cultural</td>
<td>No significant historical resources are located on the portions of the Project site proposed for development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.1-1
Consistency of Project with Santa Rosa Southwest Area Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>General Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5.1: Develop Community and Neighborhood Commons, as well as public facilities (such as schools), as community focal points.</td>
<td>Policy UD-G-1: Establish a defined center – such as a park, school, neighborhood shopping center, or transit stop – at the core of large residential projects.</td>
<td>The proposed Project includes development of a Community Commons as defined in the Southwest Area Plan (and as the General Plan as a Community Shopping Center) as the focal point of the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.1.1: Potable water for all future development in the study area shall be supplied by the municipal water system.</td>
<td>Goal PSF-F: Ensure that an adequate supply of water is available to serve existing and future needs of the City.</td>
<td>The proposed Project will obtain potable water supplies from the municipal system. A Water Supply Analysis has been completed for the Project and determined that adequate water supply is available for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal S-2: Eliminate existing hazardous sites and prevent new hazardous sites from forming.</td>
<td>Goal NS-E: Minimize dangers from hazardous materials.</td>
<td>Contaminated soils present on some parcels will be remediated prior to development. The proposed Project does not include any new industrial land uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2.1: Identify and remediate existing hazardous sites.</td>
<td>Policy NS-E-1: Require remediation and cleanup, and evaluate risk prior to reuse, in identified areas where hazardous materials and petroleum projects have impacted soil or groundwater.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.1.3: Insure adequate improvements are in place to convey storm water runoff from new developments.</td>
<td>Goal PSF-I: Manage, maintain, and improve stormwater drainage and capacity. Policy PSF-I-2: Require developers to cover the costs of drainage facilities needed for surface runoff generated as a result of new development.</td>
<td>The proposed Project includes the necessary improvements to convey storm water from the site, including the applicable major improvements outlined in the Southwest Area Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.1-1
Consistency of Project with Santa Rosa Southwest Area Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>General Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Services &amp; Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1.1: Establish new Community and Neighborhood Parks in accordance with established General Plan standards.</td>
<td>Policy UD-E-1: Provide for new open space opportunities throughout the city, especially in neighborhoods that have less access to open spaces. This includes exploring potential for creek corridors, bicycle and pedestrian ways, as well as new pocket parks and conservation areas.</td>
<td>The proposed Project includes a new 4-acre neighborhood park in the Community Commons and along Colgan Creek, where a recreation path is included. All parts of the Project are within one-half mile of the new park. The park fronts and will be visible from the future Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.1.5: Give preference to park sites located adjacent to creek corridors, elementary schools, or secured open spaces over other sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1,2: Provide multi-use pathways along creek corridors; along Sebastopol-Santa Rosa railroad right-of-way; and on the fringes of open space preserves, where feasible and appropriate.</td>
<td>Policy PSF-A-3: Continue planning efforts to acquire and develop small neighborhood park facilities within a 10-minute (one-half mile) walking distance of all Santa Rosa residences. Policy PSF-A-5: Design new parks so that they are highly visible from adjacent streets and neighborhoods to increase safety and enhance visual quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backbone Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal BI-1: Provide the infrastructure improvements necessary to support development of the study area.</td>
<td>Policy PSF-F-2: Ensure that water supply capacity and infrastructure are in place prior to occupancy of new development.</td>
<td>The proposed Project includes all the water, storm drainage, sewage collection, and road and circulation improvements needed to serve the new development. A Water Supply Analysis has been completed for the Project and determined that adequate water supply is available for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal BI-5: Insure that a project's local infrastructure impacts are mitigated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5.1: Determine local impacts caused by individual development projects and insure that appropriate measures are included in the project to address these impacts.</td>
<td>Objective PSF-G: Ensure that adequate sewer capacity is available to serve existing and future needs of the City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Santa Rosa 1994a; City of Santa Rosa 2002a.
3.2 Traffic and Circulation

This section describes existing traffic conditions and transit, potential impacts to traffic and circulation, and mitigation measures, for the proposed Dutton Meadows Project. Information was obtained from several traffic studies completed by Dowling Associates, Inc. (Third Revised Transportation Impact Study: *Dutton Meadows Mixed-Use Development in Southwest Santa Rosa*, August 2002; *Focused Transportation ADEIR Section, Minoia Property Residential Development; Hearn Avenue in Southwest Santa Rosa*, January 2004; and *Traffic and Circulation, Southwest Area Cumulative Development*, June 2004.)

3.2.1 Setting

The study area for traffic analysis was generally bounded by Sebastopol Road on the north, Corby Avenue on the east, Bellevue Avenue on the south, and Stony Point Road to the west (see Figure 3.2-1). This includes the Project site and adjacent areas.

In the General Plan (adopted 2002), the following streets are located in the study area and are classified as regional (arterial) streets (streets that connect town centers to the greater region):

- Northpoint Parkway and the future Northpoint Parkway Extension
- Dutton Avenue and the future Dutton Extension
- Bellevue Avenue
- Stony Point Road
- Hearn Avenue (Dutton Avenue to Santa Rosa Avenue)

Transitional (collector) streets (which connect residential areas to commercial centers) located in the study area include:

- Dutton Meadow
- Corby Avenue
- Moorland Avenue
- Hearn Avenue (Stony Point Road to Dutton Avenue)

3.2.1.1 Intersections

Traffic counts used for this study included both morning (7 to 9 AM) and afternoon peak period (4 to 6 PM) counts, and were taken in October 2001. The intersections, with the east-west street listed first, include the following (numbers correspond to those shown on Figure 3.2-1):

1. Sebastopol Road/Stony Point Road
2. Northpoint Parkway/Stony Point Road
3. Hearn Avenue/Stony Point Road
4. Bellevue Avenue/Stony Point Road
5. Dutton Meadow/Bellevue Avenue
6. Hearn Avenue/Dutton Avenue
7. Hearn Avenue/Corby Avenue
8. Bellevue Avenue/Dutton Avenue
9. Hearn Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue  
10. Highway 12 eastbound ramps/Stony Point Road  
11. Highway 12 westbound ramps/Stony Point Road  
12. Hearn Avenue overcrossing/Santa Rosa Avenue

The status of existing and future intersections and the type of traffic control proposed in the Area Plan are listed below. Stop-controlled intersections are denoted as all-way stop control (AWSC) or two-way stop control (TWSC).

- Sebastopol Road/Stony Point Road (existing/signal)
- Northpoint Parkway/Stony Point Road (existing/signal)
- Hearn Avenue/Stony Point Road (existing/signal)
- Bellevue Avenue/Stony Point Road (existing/signal)
- Bellevue Avenue/Dutton Meadow (existing AWSC/future signal)
- Hearn Avenue/Dutton Extension (existing signal, future four legs)
- Hearn Avenue/Corby Avenue (existing signal)
- Bellevue Avenue/Dutton Avenue (existing AWSC/future signal)
- Hearn Avenue/Northpoint Parkway Extension (future/signal or roundabout)
- Hearn Avenue (101 overcrossing)/Santa Rosa Avenue (existing/signal)
- Dutton Meadow/Northpoint Parkway Extension (future/signal)
- Tuxhorn Drive/Dutton Meadow (future/stop-sign control)
- Tuxhorn Drive-Dutton Extension/Northpoint Parkway (future/signal)
- Hearn Avenue/Burbank Avenue (existing TWSC/future signal)
- US 101 southbound ramps/Corby Avenue (existing signal)

3.2.1.2 Traffic Volumes

Existing daily traffic volumes are summarized in Table 3.2-1.

The daily traffic counts are shown primarily for informational purposes. The peak hour, not the daily, traffic volumes are used for the LOS calculations at intersections, although daily volumes are sometimes used in noise analyses.

3.2.1.3 Existing Traffic Levels of Service

Traffic LOS is a widely used technique for qualitatively evaluating the performance of intersections. Like a report card, the LOS designations are ranked from “A” (best) to “F” (worst), although “F” does not necessarily imply “gridlock” and LOS “E” is also used. The City requires that, for new development, street corridors should be planned to provide drivers with at least an LOS “D” during peak hours. The use of LOS “D” strikes a balance between convenience and safety as well as other factors that are considered in roadway design. These factors include:

- Aesthetic considerations (wide, high-capacity roadways are generally unattractive)
- Cost for both construction and maintenance
- Pedestrian and cyclist “friendliness”
- Efficient and reliable movement of transit vehicles

1 A new fourth leg will be added for Northpoint Parkway extension when it is extended to Stony Point Road.
Figure 3.2-1
Study Area And Intersections Where Traffic Counts Were Taken
TABLE 3.2-1
Weekday 24-Hour Traffic Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Year Counted</th>
<th>Daily Volume (nearest 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Avenue</td>
<td>Stony Point to Dutton Meadow</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutton Meadow to Dutton Avenue</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutton Avenue to Corby Avenue*</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby Avenue</td>
<td>Baker to Heam</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton Avenue</td>
<td>Heam to Barham</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton Meadow</td>
<td>Midway Bellevue to Heam</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heam Avenue</td>
<td>Corby to Santa Rosa Avenue</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corby to Dowd</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>18,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dowd to Dutton Avenue</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutton Avenue to Dutton Meadow*</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>18,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutton Meadow to Stony Point Road</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road</td>
<td>Bellevue to Heam</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>18,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellevue to Todd*</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heam to Northpoint Parkway</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>19,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northpoint Parkway to Villa Royale</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>20,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Villa Royale to Sebastopol Road</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>22,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 freeway</td>
<td>Todd to Heam**</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heam to Baker**</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


At intersections, traffic LOS is typically measured in terms of the total control delay for all vehicles passing through the intersection, including braking, waiting for the light to change, and accelerating back to cruising speed. Further descriptions of intersection traffic LOS can be found in the Cumulative Traffic Study included in Appendix D.

Level of service at unsignalized intersections (whether partial or AWSC) uses somewhat different delay ranges. This is because drivers expect shorter delays at unsignalized intersections, and greater driver attentiveness is required for analyzing safe go/no-go decisions.

The City’s adopted approach to evaluating traffic LOS is a corridor LOS analysis that looks at intersections and the connecting roadways as a system. The performance measure for determining LOS is the average speed on the segment, including stops at signals. This methodology has been a requirement of the City’s General Plan for more than 10 years. The arterial segments studied are:

- Stony Point Road – Sebastopol Road to Bellevue Avenue
- Hearn Avenue – Santa Rosa Avenue to Stony Point Road
- Bellevue Avenue – Corby to Stony Point Road
- Northpoint Parkway – Corporate Center Parkway to Stony Point Road
Because arterial streets have differing posted and design speeds, have different adjacent land use functions, and serve a variety of different roadside development densities, they have been classified into four different street types. Class II (suburban) streets provide the high speeds and performance levels for motorists; Class IV (urban) streets provide for more land access in a higher density environment; and Class III (intermediate) streets have speeds between the Class II and Class IV streets. No Class I streets are located in the study area.

Level of service and corresponding speeds are shown in Table 3.2-2.

**TABLE 3.2-2**
Levels of Service for Arterial Streets (Corridors) in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
<th>Class IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&gt;=35 mph</td>
<td>&gt;=30 mph</td>
<td>&gt;=25 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>28 to 34.9 mph</td>
<td>24 to 29.9 mph</td>
<td>19 to 24.9 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>22 to 27.9 mph</td>
<td>18 to 23.9 mph</td>
<td>13 to 18.9 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>17 to 21.9 mph</td>
<td>14 to 17.9 mph</td>
<td>9 to 12.9 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>13 to 16.9 mph</td>
<td>10 to 13.9 mph</td>
<td>7 to 8.9 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt;13 mph</td>
<td>&lt;10 mph</td>
<td>&lt;7 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mph = miles per hour.

Table 3.2-3 shows that the arterials in the study area currently operate at LOS that meet the City’s objective for roadway level of service. However, westbound Hearn Avenue between Stony Point Road and Santa Rosa Avenue is operating at the marginal LOS of “D.” Hearn Avenue speeds were measured with field measurement of travel speeds (rather than using formulas), because traffic at certain Hearn intersections is “oversaturated” (i.e., the volume exceeds capacity) and the formulas do not always provide reliable results. These oversaturated intersections are east of Dutton Avenue.

**TABLE 3.2-3**
Peak Hour Arterial Level of Service and Average Travel Speed (mph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arterial Segment</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road (Class II) Bellevue Avenue to Sebastopol Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound AM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound AM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound PM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>31 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue (Class III) Stony Point Road to Santa Rosa Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17* mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>19 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3.2-3
Peak Hour Arterial Level of Service and Average Travel Speed (mph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arterial Segment</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Avenue (Class II) Stony Point Road to Corby Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound AM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound PM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound AM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound PM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northpoint Parkway (Class II) Corporate Center Parkway to Stony Point Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound AM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>29 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound PM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>37 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound AM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>33 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound PM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>35 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Speed based on actual field observation

A “gap” analysis was made on Hearn Avenue in the 1200 block (between West Avenue and Dutton Avenue) in September 2001. This section of Hearn has a two-way left turn lane in the median, which facilitates both left turns from and into the Hearn Avenue traffic stream. The analysis was used to classify the time between successive vehicles in each direction, over a 24-hour period. During the peak travel period, volumes are high (greater than 600 vehicles per hour) for much of the day, as shown in Table 3.2-4. The percentage of gaps in traffic suitable for backing out of a driveway into the center turn lane, averaging 6.5 seconds, is shown in Table 3.2-4. The time to make a left turn from Hearn into a driveway is somewhat shorter, about 5 seconds (Transportation Research Board 1994).

TABLE 3.2-4
Hearn Avenue Traffic Counts and Gap Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours for which volume &gt; 600 vehicles per hour (vph)</td>
<td>7 to 8 AM</td>
<td>8 to 9 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 AM to 8 PM</td>
<td>3 to 4 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available gaps &gt; 6.5 seconds during peak hour</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest traffic hour</td>
<td>5 to 6 PM</td>
<td>3 to 4 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest hourly volume (vph)</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


vph=vehicles per hour.

3.2.1.4 Traffic Improvements Planned or Under Construction by Others
Several traffic improvements are under construction or are completely funded. These projects are described below.
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Projects: The US 101 freeway was widened from Wilfred Avenue in Rohnert Park to Highway 12 with the addition of a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction during peak hours. The lanes are open to all traffic in non-peak hours, including weekends. A project to continue the HOV lanes north, to the Guerneville Road/Steele Lane interchange in Santa Rosa, is underway and construction is scheduled to be completed by 2006-2007.

Project studies are underway for extending the new HOV lanes to Windsor in the north and Petaluma in the south. Construction of these projects is not budgeted yet and is not likely to be completed until 2012.

City of Santa Rosa: The City prepares a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) each year for a 5-year period (City of Santa Rosa 2001). It lists traffic improvements and the necessary funding over the next 5 years, but only the first year of the program is actually funded as the capital budget. CIP projects that are relevant to this SEIR include:

- Hearn Avenue Widening from Dutton Avenue to Railroad Tracks – This project would widen Hearn Avenue to four lanes, plus bike lanes, from Dutton Avenue to the Northwestern Pacific Railroad tracks (CIP Project #8131). A companion project (#8091) would improve the railroad grade crossing. This project has no funding in the current year. This project has not been assumed in the existing or future traffic models used for this analysis.

- Traffic Signal Installation for School Pedestrians (Continuing) – A traffic signal has been proposed at Dutton Meadow and Hearn Avenue, where there is an existing AWSC (Project #5559). Traffic volumes at this intersection currently warrant a signal. This project was requested from general funds and is not programmed in the capital budget for 2003-04.

- Stony Point Road from Sebastopol Road to Hearn Avenue – Stony Point Road will be widened to four lanes with bike lanes (Project #8008). Funding would occur in three phases: Phase I is preliminary design and environmental clearance (underway in 2004); Phase II is final design and acquisition of necessary right-of-way; and Phase III is project construction.

- Bellevue Avenue Widening from Stony Point Road to Corby Avenue – This project (#8115) includes realignment of the street between the Colgan Creek Channel and Ludwig Avenue, and a three-lane widening as an interim project between Stony Point Road and Corby Avenue. The ultimate width will be four lanes. The project is expected to begin construction in 2005 and be completed in 2007. It is considered a funded and committed project (Wilt 2002). However, this project has not been assumed in the existing or future traffic models used for this analysis.

- Colgan Creek Bridge (Dutton/Northpoint Parkway Extension Connection) – The 2002/03 CIP included $100,000 for design services and $300,000 for construction in 2003/04 (Project #8212). However, this project has not been assumed in the existing or future traffic models used for this analysis.

- Bellevue Avenue Southbound Freeway On- and Off-Ramps – This project (#8053) would add southbound ramps to US 101, near the Bellevue/Moorland intersection. However,
due to the anticipated long-term construction date, this project has not been assumed in the existing or future traffic models used for this analysis.

3.2.1.5 Transit Services

Two transit operators provide service to the immediate area: Santa Rosa CityBus and Sonoma County Transit (SCT). A third operator, Golden Gate Transit, operates on US 101 and Santa Rosa Avenue. CityBus operates three routes in the study area at 30-minute intervals on weekdays and hourly service during limited hours of the day on weekends. The three CityBus routes in the study area include the following:

- Route 5 South Park begins at the downtown transit mall (2nd/B Streets), travels through the South Park Neighborhood, crosses the freeway on Hearn Avenue, and continues to a terminal at the Southwest Community Park.

- Route 12 Roseland operates between the downtown transit mall and Southwest Community Park, using a loop that includes Corby Avenue, Hearn Avenue, West Avenue, and Sebastopol Road.

- Route 15 Stony Point Road makes a clockwise loop using Hearn Avenue, a right on Dutton Meadow, a right on Bellevue Avenue, and a right on Stony Point Road. This route serves Elsie Allen High School, and continues north on Stony Point Road, serving the Coddingtown Mall and the westside transit center on Range Avenue.

SCT Route 42 operates on Dutton Avenue, a short portion of Hearn Avenue, and Corby Avenue. Route 22 operates on Sebastopol Road. The generally accepted walking distance for bus services is 0.25 miles; both services are located beyond this distance from the study area.

3.2.1.6 Existing Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Existing pedestrian facilities are shown in Figure 3.2-2. Counts of pedestrians and cyclists at intersections during peak hours were made in October 2001. A summary of the total pedestrians and cyclists entering or crossing the study intersections during peak hours (for two morning and two afternoon hours) is shown in Table 3.2-5. Pedestrian and cyclist counts are heaviest at the Sebastopol Road and Stony Point Road intersection, followed by the Hearn Avenue and Corby Avenue intersection and Hearn Avenue and Dutton Avenue intersection, both of which are near the Project site.
TABLE 3.2-5
Total Pedestrian and Cyclist Volumes Entering Intersection, October 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>7 to 9 AM</th>
<th></th>
<th>4 to 6 PM</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Cyclist</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Cyclist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Avenue/Stony Point Road</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton Meadow/Hearn Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue/Dutton Avenue</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue/Stony Point Road</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol Road/Stony Point Road</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Avenue/Dutton Meadow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northpoint Parkway/Stony Point Road</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue/Corby Avenue</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Avenue/Dutton Avenue</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the study area include the following:

- **Dutton Meadow** – There is a paved asphalt path, separated by a raised berm, along the length of Dutton Meadow from Hearn to Bellevue Avenue. The path is approximately 5-feet wide, although in front of the Meadow View School it is concrete and appears to be slightly wider. The posted speed limit on this section of Dutton Meadow is 35 mph.

- **Hearn Avenue** – There is sidewalk on the south side of Hearn in front of Southwest Community Park.

- **Burbank Avenue** – This is a typical rural residential street which pedestrians and bikes are allowed to use. The pavement width appears to be 26 to 28 feet, and there is no curb, gutter, or sidewalk. Drainage ditches on both sides limit the off-pavement walking area. There is street lighting at only a few locations. The posted speed limit is 25 mph. Traffic counts done by Sonoma County indicate that Burbank Avenue carries perhaps 1,500 vehicles per day.

- **Sebastopol Road** – This road has a sidewalk abutting the curb face on its south side, and a modest amount of pedestrian activity. The sidewalk connects to a path continuing to the Lawrence Cook Middle School.

- **Stony Point Road** – This road has sporadic sidewalks. In some cases, utility poles encroach on the sidewalk area. The sidewalk disappears and reappears, mostly having been provided where new development has occurred.

- **Rain Dance** – This road has sidewalk on its west side, and a path on the east side. The sidewalk is concrete with a parkway strip between the curbface and the sidewalk. This path continues through Southwest Community Park as an asphalt path.
Figure 3.2-2
Existing Pedestrian Facilities on Major Streets in Project Area
• Burgess Drive – This road has a path north from Elsie Allen High School. Although the path ends at the northern edge of the high school, there is pedestrian access to the school buildings near where the path ends. The remainder of Burgess (south of this point) has lighting and fencing on the east side.

The City’s Public Works Department updated its "Pedestrian Needs in Santa Rosa" study in February 2001. It contains the following crossing needs for streets that have a nexus with the Project:

• Hearn Avenue – Audible pedestrian crossing aids ("chirpers") are needed at the intersection of Dowd Drive. A railroad/sidewalk crossing is needed where Hearn Avenue crosses the railroad tracks.

• Northpoint Parkway – Audible pedestrian crossing aids and pedestrian signals are needed at Stony Point Road.

• Stony Point Road – Sections of sidewalk are needed between Hearn Avenue and Sebastopol Road. A traffic signal at Giffen Avenue was recently installed, and a future signal is proposed at Lazzini Avenue.

• Bellevue Avenue – A railroad/sidewalk crossing is needed where Bellevue Avenue crosses the railroad tracks.

Figure 3.2-3 shows the existing bicycle facilities in the study area. The General Plan calls for the following additional bicycle facilities:

• Northpoint Parkway – Bicycle lanes (striped/Class II)
• Tuxhorn Drive – Bicycle route (signing only/Class III)
• Stony Point Road – Bicycle lanes (striped/Class II)
• Hearn Avenue – Bicycle route (signing only/Class III)
• Burbank Avenue – Bicycle route (signing only/Class III)
• Colgan Creek Trail – Bicycle path (Class I)

Per the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, a Class 2 bicycle lane shall be provided on Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Extension.

There are three schools near the Project site (see Figure 3.2-4):

• Meadow View Elementary School, 2665 Dutton Meadow, near Hearn Avenue
• Lawrence Cook Middle School, 2480 Sebastopol Road, near Stony Point Road
• Elsie Allen High School, 599 Bellevue Avenue, near Dutton Meadow

The Meadow View Elementary School (Bellevue Union School District) is nearest to the Project, located west of the Project on the west side of Dutton Meadow. Pedestrian facilities in the area include the following:

• A temporary bermed pathway located on the west side of Dutton Meadow

• A pedestrian-activated flasher with crossing guard at Hearn Avenue/Westland Court (primarily used by Elsie Allen High School Students)
A three-way (all-way) stop installed at Hearn Avenue/Dutton Meadow as a temporary measure in 1999.

Current desirable walking routes to the Meadow View School and to the middle and high school are shown in Figure 3.2-4. Lawrence Cook Middle School is located somewhat more than two walking miles to the northwest of the Project. The school district presently provides busing only for students living more than 3 miles from school. Because of the significant distance involved, it is likely that middle school students living in the proposed development would travel to school by cycling, by being dropped off in a vehicle, or by using CityBus Route 15. Route 15 is near the Project, although it makes a somewhat circuitous route down to Bellevue Avenue, and then through the Corporate Center Business Park.

The preferred walking route to the middle school involves crossing to the north side of Hearn at the Project site, crossing Hearn again at Westland Drive, continuing to Stony Point Road, then north on Stony Point Road to Sebastopol Road. Stony Point Road in this area currently has intermittent sidewalks and unpaved walking paths on both sides. An EIR for a project to widen Stony Point and add sidewalks and bike lanes was certified by the Santa Rosa City Council in September 2004. Sidewalks in this area are available mainly adjacent to developments that have been built in recent years. Near older developments and homes, off-street paths or sidewalks are not available. Traffic volumes on Stony Point Road are in the range of 20,000 to 22,000 per day. The City’s “School Pedestrian Needs in Santa Rosa” study notes (City of Santa Rosa 1998, page 29) that “with protection that has been added within the last ten years, the crossing protection seems adequate for the students walking to Cook Middle School.”

Elsie Allen High School is located approximately 1.5 walking miles southwest of the Project site. Meadow View Elementary School is located along the same walking path as the high school, roughly 0.4 miles from the Project site on the west side of Dutton Meadow. The existing desired walking route would have students cross to the north side of Hearn at the Project site (where no stop controls currently exist), then travel west on Hearn to Dutton Meadow using the existing path on the west side of Dutton Meadow to Bellevue Avenue. On the north side of Bellevue Avenue (between the avenue and the flood control channel) is an existing multi-use trail (bicycle and pedestrian) that connects to Burgess Drive and the high school. A connection was recently made from Burgess Avenue to the Bellevue Ranch project; when Tuxhorn Drive is extended east to Dutton Meadow, it will provide a continuous walking connection using Tuxhorn Drive, Rain Dance Way, and Burgess Drive to the high school.

The “School Pedestrian Needs in Santa Rosa” study indicates the need for the following in the study area:

- New traffic signal at Bellevue Avenue/Burgess Avenue (presently AWSC)
- Street reconstruction of Bellevue Avenue
- Improved signing at Bellevue Avenue/Burgess Avenue
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School Locations and Preferred Walking Routes
3.2.2 Standards of Significance

Significant impacts would occur if implementation of the proposed Project resulted in any of the following:

- Degradation of peak hour LOS for roadway segments below the City of Santa Rosa's objective of LOS "D"

- Degradation of peak hour LOS on surrounding highways below Sonoma County Congestion Management Authority LOS "E"

- Lack of efficient and convenient transit services accessible to all portions of the Urban Growth Boundary, as measured by number of transit routes operating within ¼ mile during peak activity periods

- Increased vehicular traffic that adversely affects the sense of residential environment and affects safety

- Lack of accessible bicycle and pedestrian routes in areas of new growth and redevelopment

- Lane closures resulting from construction that cause traffic delays, transit delays, restricted access, increased traffic hazards, and rerouting of traffic including emergency vehicles

- Increased parking demand that exceeds supply according to City standard

3.2.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Traffic analysis was done using existing traffic data and the traffic and road improvements that will be constructed as part of the Project (see Section 2.4). Table 3.2-6 shows the daily, AM, and PM peak hour trip generation rates assumed for the various land uses included in the Project. The table uses a standard source, the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation, 6th edition (1997) and 7th edition (2003), for trip generation rates. Table 3.2-7 shows the actual number of vehicle-trips that would be generated during different phases of the Project.

**TABLE 3.2-6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>ITE Land Use Code</th>
<th>Weekday Total</th>
<th>AM Rate Total</th>
<th>In:Out split</th>
<th>AM Rate In</th>
<th>AM Rate Out</th>
<th>PM Rate Total</th>
<th>In:Out split</th>
<th>PM Rate In</th>
<th>PM Rate Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>28:72</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>61:39</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>88:12</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>17:83</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>61:39</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>51:49</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>49:51</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>55:45</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>61:39</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>48:52</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>25:75</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>64:36</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dowling Associates, Inc., 2002, 2004a, and 2004c. Trip generation rates were taken from the ITE Trip Generation Handbook (6th Edition) and Single Family Detached Units (ITE 7th Edition). Trip Generation rates shown above for Grocery Store (PM only), Retail, Apartments, and Single Family Detached (PM Only) were calculated from the ITE Fitted Curve Equations. These fitted curve rates may not produce the same number of trips for each land use as seen in Table 3.2-7 since the total trips seen in that table were calculated in project phase groups, and not all in the same group as shown.
### TABLE 3.2-7
Total Dutton Meadows Project Vehicle Trip Generation (vehicle trip-ends, total inbound + outbound)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutton Meadows Project Land Uses</th>
<th>Weekday Total (24 hours)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Trips</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>371 Townhomes $^2$</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 Condominiums $^2$</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Apartments $^3$</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,000 square feet (sf) General Office $^4$</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000 sf Grocery Store $^{1,2}$</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 sf Restaurant $^1$</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000 sf Retail $^{1,2}$</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Trip Generation</td>
<td>14,146</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes:

1 - Trip generation reduced for "pass-by" trips captured from nearby roadways. Trips reduced by 10% in AM peak hour and 35% in PM peak hour per ITE.

2 - Fitted curve trip generation equation used for PM peak hour.

3 - Fitted curve trip generation equation used for AM and PM peak hours.

4 - 3,000 square feet of Civic Office Space is included in the Project, but because the proposed uses for the space would be intermittent, small and irregular, the trips associated with this use were not included in this table or in the traffic model. In addition, the 10,000 square feet of office space in Phase 3 was analyzed instead of the 12 of optional live/work condominiums.

Because of the small size of the Project’s 4-acre park, easy walking distance to other parts of the Project, and lack of "active" uses, it is anticipated to attract few or no peak hour vehicle trips.

Trip distribution refers to the origin and destination locations of trips. The trip distribution was developed from the Santa Rosa City Traffic model and future development patterns in the City from the Dutton Meadows traffic analysis zone (called a TAZ, with a City designated number 472, in which the entire Project is located). The distribution was developed for the PM peak hour, for both inbound and outbound trips. During the AM peak, the directionality was reversed (i.e., the inbound became the outbound). Many inbound trips to residences in the PM peak are commute trips (i.e., people coming home from work), while most outbound trips from residences in the PM peak are for shopping and other non-work purposes. The predicted trip distribution is shown in Table 3.2-8.
**TABLE 3.2-8**

Trip Distribution (PM Peak Hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry or Exit Point from Study Area (Gateway)</th>
<th>Inbound</th>
<th>Outbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Freeway South</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Avenue South</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 12 Freeway East</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Avenue North</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Freeway North</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton Avenue North</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road North</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Road North</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 12 West</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road South</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal to Study Area (see below)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal Assignment Within Study Area (Trips starting and Ending in Study Area)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Inbound</th>
<th>Outbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Santa Rosa Avenue Retail Strip</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Bellevue Avenue</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point s/o Northpoint Parkway</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northpoint Parkway/Corp Center</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Sebastopol Road and South of Highway 12</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham/Corby Area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Internal to Study Area</strong></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3.2-9 summarizes the results of the analysis for three scenarios: existing, existing plus approved development projects, and existing plus approved development projects plus proposed development projects. The Stony Point Road widening is included in the two existing plus approved development projects scenarios. This is a funded project that will both increase the number of travel lanes and improve the traffic signal coordination in this corridor.
### TABLE 3.2-9
Peak Hour Arterial Level of Service and Average Travel Speed (mph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arterial Segment</th>
<th>Existing LOS/ Average Travel Speed</th>
<th>Existing + Approved Development Projects</th>
<th>Existing + Approved + Proposed Development Projects *(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road (Class II) Bellevue Avenue to Sebastopol Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved 4-lane arterial</td>
<td>Improved 4-lane arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound AM</td>
<td>B/29 mph</td>
<td>C/25 mph</td>
<td>C/25 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound PM</td>
<td>C/27 mph</td>
<td>C/22 mph</td>
<td>C/22 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound AM</td>
<td>B/29 mph</td>
<td>C/23 mph</td>
<td>D/22 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound PM</td>
<td>B/31 mph</td>
<td>C/23 mph</td>
<td>D/21 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue (Class III) Stony Point Road to Santa Rosa Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heam &amp; Northpoint Parkway (Dutton Meadow) Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound AM</td>
<td>D/16 mph</td>
<td>C/20 mph</td>
<td>C/19 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound PM</td>
<td>D/17* mph</td>
<td>C/20 mph</td>
<td>C/19 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound AM</td>
<td>C/19 mph</td>
<td>D/18 mph</td>
<td>D/15 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound PM</td>
<td>C/20 mph</td>
<td>C/19 mph</td>
<td>D/16 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Avenue (Class II) Stony Point Road to Corby Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound AM</td>
<td>B/32 mph</td>
<td>D/19 mph</td>
<td>F/13 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound PM</td>
<td>B/32 mph</td>
<td>D/20 mph</td>
<td>E/17 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound AM</td>
<td>B/29 mph</td>
<td>D/19 mph</td>
<td>D/19 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound PM</td>
<td>B/29 mph</td>
<td>D/19 mph</td>
<td>D/20 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northpoint Parkway (Class II) Corporate Center Parkway to Stony Point Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound AM</td>
<td>A/29 mph</td>
<td>C/27 mph</td>
<td>C/26 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound PM</td>
<td>A/37 mph</td>
<td>C/27 mph</td>
<td>C/26 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound AM</td>
<td>B/33 mph</td>
<td>C/25 mph</td>
<td>C/24 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound PM</td>
<td>B/35 mph</td>
<td>B/29 mph</td>
<td>C/27 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold** indicates arterial not meeting City’s LOS standard. * indicates speed based on actual field observation.  

*(1) Approved and proposed development projects are from the City of Santa Rosa, September 2003, and include Dutton Meadows as a proposed project. Assumes that Stony Point Road is widened to four lanes between Hearn Avenue and Sebastopol Road.*
3.2.3.1 Project Impacts

Impact 3.2-1. The Project, in combination with other projects expected to be built in the same time period, may degrade traffic levels on Bellevue Avenue.

Analysis: Significant.

As shown in Table 3.2-9, the Project, in combination with other projects expected to be built in the same period in the area, degrades the arterial levels of service on Bellevue Avenue (from Stony Point Road to Corby Avenue) from LOS D to F in the westbound direction during the AM peak hour and from LOS D to E during the PM peak hour. This is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-1. Add a traffic signal to the intersection at Bellevue Avenue and Dutton Avenue. Signalizing the existing four-way stop controlled intersection would bring the LOS for this arterial section up to C during both peak hours and meets the City’s LOS significance criteria.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.2-2. The Project may decrease the average speed on Stony Point Road, Hearn Avenue and Northpoint Parkway.

Analysis: Less than Significant

Although speeds would decrease somewhat as a result of the Project on Stony Point Road, Hearn Avenue and Northpoint Parkway, the Project does not cause the LOS on any of these roadways to fall below D. Overall, the addition of the Project would reduce average traffic speeds by no more than four miles per hour. This is a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation: No mitigation necessary.

Impact 3.2-3. The Project may result in an increase in traffic at the unsignalized intersection of Hearn Avenue and the new access road to the Phase 2 Minoia development.

Analysis: Less than Significant

The unsignalized intersection of Hearn Avenue and the Minoia development’s access road can operate acceptably, with average control delays in the LOS C range in the existing plus project scenario (23 to 25 seconds, depending on the time period and alternative). The intersection meets current City standards for intersection spacing, because it is approximately 500 feet west of Dutton Avenue and 500 feet east of West Avenue. Because traffic volumes approaching the access road (i.e., exiting the Minoia development) would not exceed 37 vehicles per hour, the intersection does not warrant signalization. It is assumed that only vehicles from the Phase 2 Minoia development would use this access road, and other Dutton Meadows Project vehicles would use other access points to Hearn Avenue. The existing two-way left turn lane along Hearn Avenue can be used for left-turn storage (an area for cars to wait to make the left turn) into the Phase 2 Minoia access road. This is a less than significant impact.
Mitigation: No mitigation necessary.

Impact 3.2-4. The Project would result in increased traffic at the unsignalized crossing of Hearn Avenue by student pedestrians.

Analysis: Significant

As described above in Existing Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, student pedestrians will likely be crossing Hearn Avenue from the Project site where no stop controls exist (see Figure 3.2-4). Due to this uncontrolled crossing of Hearn Avenue for pedestrians crossing to the north side of the street to reach the sidewalk there, this is a potentially significant impact. However, with the mitigation measures described below, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-4a. Signalize intersection of Dutton Meadow and Hearn Avenue. As part of the proposed Project, a signal will be added to the intersection of Dutton Meadow (Northpoint Parkway) and Hearn Avenue.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-4b. Add a road within Dutton Meadows parallel to Hearn Avenue. As part of the proposed Project, an internal road south of and parallel to Hearn Avenue will be constructed. As an interim measure, an asphalt path will be constructed connecting Dutton Meadows and the Project.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-4c. Encourage or expedite construction of Tuxhorn Drive between Dutton Meadow and Burgess Drive/Rain Dance. The Project includes construction of Tuxhorn Drive east of Dutton Meadow. Extension of Tuxhorn Drive to Burgess Drive/Rain Dance would improve walking safety at Elsie Allen High School. An interim asphalt path will be constructed along this alignment, along the informal path already worn in this location.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-4d. Improve Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-5). Improvements throughout the Project area would improve conditions for bicycle and pedestrian travel, including along Hearn Avenue. The pedestrian needs addressed through the policies of the Area Plan include the following:

- A well-connected internal circulation system that, to the extent possible, minimizes pedestrian crossings at major streets
- Mixed land uses that minimize distances for daily trip activities, and thus promote walking and cycling as alternatives to the automobile
- Sidewalks provided on streets

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.2-5. The Project could affect the timing of turns out of driveways and cross streets onto Hearn Avenue.

Analysis: Less than Significant

As described above, the gap analysis for existing traffic levels on Hearn Avenue only 26 to 36 percent of gaps in traffic are suitable for backing out of a driveway into the center turn lane (see Table 3.2-4). The Project would add vehicles to the current traffic on Hearn Avenue.
However, construction of the Northpoint Parkway Extension, Dutton Extension, and other proposed minor residential street connections will help reduce traffic volumes and thus increase the frequency of suitable gaps on Hearn.

Mitigation: No mitigation necessary.

Impact 3.2-6. Construction of the Project would lead to increased truck and construction vehicle activity on the local roadway network and could create lane closures causing traffic delays, transit delays, restricted access, increased traffic hazards, and rerouting of traffic, including emergency vehicles.

Analysis: Significant

The Project includes construction of several road improvements that could affect traffic on existing roads, including connection of Dutton Extension to Hearn Avenue, connection of Tuxhorn Drive to Dutton Meadow, and the Northpoint Parkway/Dutton Meadow intersection. Construction of these improvements could require temporary lane closures for activities such as paving. However, with implementation of the mitigation described below, impacts would be less than significant.

Other impacts to traffic during construction are likely to result from site grading/preparation, transport of building and finish materials to the site, and construction workers. Since the site is fairly level, the amount of earthwork will be minor. Usually, such trips are distributed throughout the day and do not adversely affect peak hour traffic. In addition, the phasing of Project construction will reduce the amount of construction traffic in any single year. Construction workers typically arrive on the site early in the morning, prior to the morning peak commute traffic (which occurs from 7:30 to 8:30 AM), and generally leave before the highest afternoon peak hour begins (usually beginning between 4 and 4:30 PM). A maximum of 50 construction workers is expected to be on-site at any time (Dowling Associates 2002). For this reason, construction-related vehicles are not expected to have a significant impact on existing traffic levels of service.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-6a. Implement Construction Traffic Management Plan (Redevelopment Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.3-7). A Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be prepared by the construction contractor prior to beginning work on the Project. The plan shall identify strategies to maintain adequate service levels on local roadways and provide access to residential and business sites, including emergency vehicle access.

Advance notice of construction activity shall be provided to the City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department and to affected homeowners through letters or leaflets, and in the general media (such as newspaper advertising). Sufficient penalties (or bonuses) shall be included in the construction contracts to encourage prompt completion of a contract by the contractor.

To maintain existing service levels in peak hours during the construction period, the City shall include in the conditions of approval for the Project a condition limiting construction hours and/or construction vehicles so that additional trucks are not added to the roadway system during peak hours.
Mitigation Measure 3.2-6b. Promote safety of school-age children during construction. Although impacts to traffic from construction are expected to be less than significant, the Project site is near the Meadow View Elementary School. To help promote the safety of school-age children during construction activities, the following measures will be implemented during construction:

- Notifying the school in advance of the date of commencement of construction, including starting and ending times
- Warning construction crews and delivery truck drivers in advance that school-age children may be present nearby, especially near school starting and ending hours
- Creating a temporary construction road access to the site that makes minimal use of the existing street (Dutton Meadow) on which the school fronts.
- Avoiding construction quitting times that coincide with the end of the school day, to minimize traffic congestion in the area

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.2-7. The Project would result in a measurable addition of traffic to US 101.

Analysis: Significant

The Sonoma County Transportation Authority has established a standard of LOS E for freeways. Current operating conditions (post-HOV lane) on US 101 were measured in January 2003 for the US 101 widening project. Travel time (floating car) studies indicated that between Todd Road and Highway 12, the northbound AM peak period was the most congested, with average travel speeds of 10 to 20 mph between 7 and 8:30 AM. The AM southbound direction, and the PM peak period in both directions, showed some degradation in travel speeds, but not below 50 mph on average. A bottleneck occurs at Highway 12 where the HOV lane is dropped. A project to continue the HOV lane north to Steele Lane is in progress and is expected to open by 2007.

The calculated existing LOS (using the CORSIM model) is F from Hearn to College Avenue northbound in the AM peak, and C in the southbound direction. In the PM peak, backups from Highway 12 cause the northbound direction to be LOS E north of Baker Avenue, but B/C in the southbound direction. The proposed Project would add traffic to the freeway. The additional trips would have a measurable impact. Based on the data in Tables 3.2-7 and 3.2-8, an estimated 60 to 250 trips would be added to each freeway/direction in the peak hours. These impacts are expected to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation: None identified.

After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable

Impact 3.2-8. The Project may result in impacts to US 101/Hearn Avenue Interchange.

2 Caltrans generally uses the transition between LOS C & D as a desired standard.
**Analysis: Less than Significant**

The project will add traffic to the US 101/Hearn Avenue Interchange. The 2001 Sonoma Countywide Transportation Plan lists the modification of the U.S. 101/Hearn Avenue Interchange as a future project. The traffic analysis (Table 3.2-9) does not suggest any significant degradation in speeds or LOS on Hearn Avenue due to the project traffic volumes. Therefore, any impact to the Hearn interchange (either the current or proposed) is less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation necessary.

**Impact 3.2-9. The Project would result in increased demand for transit services.**

**Analysis: Significant**

The Project would result in increased demand for transit services due to the increased number of residences and businesses. However, the Master EIR included mitigation to address increased demand for transit services. With this mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 3.2-9. Provide transit service improvements (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-3 as modified below).** The Project will include addition of two bus turnouts at each of the following locations: intersection of Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadow, intersection of Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Extension, Northpoint Parkway at the Community Shopping Center, and intersection of Dutton Extension and Hearn Avenue. Service at these stops will be provided by CityBus and/or SCT.

Additional potential transit service improvements include the following:

- Make reasonable and justified reductions in parking requirements where an aggressive transit or TSM program is agreed to by the developer
- Implement the City’s Long Range Transit Plan
- Encourage use of shared parking facilities where multi-use sites are developed
- 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.
- 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, that inhibit walking and transit travel.

**After Mitigation: Less than Significant**

**3.2.3.2 Cumulative Impacts**

An analysis of cumulative traffic impacts was completed by Dowling Associates (2004b). The City of Santa Rosa’s TRANPLAN traffic model was used to update the cumulative traffic analysis that was completed for the Southwest Area Plan and Master EIR. This model,
in its current version as developed for the most recent General Plan update (2002), covers an area that includes the Project area and most of southwest Santa Rosa. Where applicable, proposed development land use data were provided by the City of Santa Rosa, its consultants, and project proponents (or their representatives). Other land uses in the model were based on the mid-point density of the planned General Plan land uses. Road improvements assumed for 2020 are consistent with improvements assumed in the General Plan. The cumulative traffic study is included as Appendix D.

Cumulative Impact 3.2-10. Cumulative traffic growth may result in increased traffic volumes exceeding the LOS objective for roadway segments.

Analysis: Significant

Buildout of the Southwest Plan Area would generate a substantial increase in traffic on City streets. However, if the traffic improvement mitigation measures included in the Master EIR and Redevelopment EIR are implemented, cumulative traffic growth would have no significant level of services impacts (i.e., result in conditions below City standards) on City streets. Table 3.2-10 shows the results of the TRANPLAN traffic model with the traffic improvement mitigation measures implemented. Some reduction in the existing travel speeds may occur in certain areas as the result of additional traffic and new traffic signal or stop sign installations, but would not result in speeds dropping below the City’s adopted level of service threshold.

**TABLE 3.2-10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2020 Arterial Levels of Service with Mitigation, PM Peak Hour</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 Avenue</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 Avenue - 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 Avenue</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The area covered is called traffic analysis zone (TAZ) 502.

5 A complete list can be found in the Transportation Appendix of the General Plan, page 5-25 through page 5-29.
TABLE 3.2-10
Year 2020 Arterial Levels of Service with Mitigation, PM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Center Parkway - Stony Point Road</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road – Dutton Extension</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>17.8</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>EB</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road—Moorland</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby Avenue (Class III)</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Street - Hearn Avenue</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>


Mitigation Measure 3.2-10a. Implement traffic improvements on City streets (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-1, Redevelopment EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.3-1, as modified below). 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).

(a) Northpoint Parkway/Stony Point Road: Add north-bound turn (NBT), south-bound turn (SBT), south-bound left (SBL), and east-bound turn (ETB) lanes. Convert existing east-bound right (EBR) lane to shared through/right movements. Add two west-bound turn (WBT) lanes on Northpoint Parkway extension.

(b) Sebastopol Road/Stony Point Road: Add NBT, west-bound right (WBR), SBT, south-bound right (SBR), and east-bound left (EBL) lanes to this intersection. There is room at this intersection (with right of way acquisition) to make this substantial improvement.

(c) Hearn Avenue/Stony Point Road: Signalize the present two-way stop intersection. Add north-bound lane (NBL), NBT, north-bound right (NBR), west-bound left (WBL), SBL, south-bound turn/right (SBT/R) lanes to the intersection.

(d) Bellevue Avenue/Stony Point Road: Convert traffic control from existing two-way stop to signalized. Add NBL, NBT, west-bound turn/left (WBT/L), WBR, SBL, SBT lanes; to the Ludwig Avenue approach (with realignment of the intersection), add an EBR lane.

(e) Highway 12/Dutton Avenue Eastbound ramps: Signalize. No change to existing lane configuration.

(f) Highway 12/Dutton Avenue Westbound ramps: Signalize. No change to existing lane configuration, although existing NBL turn pocket may require lengthening.

(g) Dutton Avenue/Sebastopol Road: Add NBT, WBT, SBT/R, EBL, and EBT lanes to this intersection.
(h) Hearn Avenue/Dutton Avenue: Signalize this existing two-way STOP controlled intersection. New approach on Dutton Extension shall have a north-bound turn/left (NBT/L), 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.

(i) Dutton Avenue/Bellevue Avenue: Signalize this two-way STOP controlled intersection. Add NBL, NBT, NBR, WBL, WBT, WBR, SBL, SBT, 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.

(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.

(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.

(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.

(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.

(o) Corporate Center Parkway/Northpoint Parkway: Convert existing flashing red (effectively, all-way STOP) operation to normal signal operation. No additional physical improvements required.

(p) Baker Avenue/Corby Avenue: Add NBR and SBL lanes to accommodate increased traffic traveling to and from US 101 (and the east side of the freeway). Signalize intersection and provide appropriate turn lane lengths.

(q) Northpoint Parkway/Dutton Avenue: Provide signalization at this future intersection.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-10b. Improve Residential Street Environment (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-4 as modified below). Several techniques are available for improving the residential street environment. These include the following:

Street Design. Incorporation of good street designs is by far the optimum 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 (such as traffic control devices, traffic chokers, or road undulations—see descriptions below) 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, reduce pedestrian street crossing distances, 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 to 14 feet). They have been proven to be more effective in slowing traffic than speed bumps, and also create less noise. Modest reductions 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).

- **All-way STOP signs** – 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 to 60 percent of all vehicles will only come to a rolling stop (below 5 mph), and 20 to 40 percent 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.

**After Mitigation: Less than Significant**

**Cumulative Impact 3.2-11.** The project, along with cumulative traffic growth, may have a significant impact (LOS “D” or worse) on US 101 at certain areas from Wilfred Avenue to State Route 12.

**Analysis: Significant**

No significant impact is expected on State Route 12 if auxiliary lanes are added between the Stony Point Road and Dutton Avenue interchanges. However, the Project, along with cumulative traffic growth, would cause a significant impact (LOS “D” or worse) on US 101 at certain areas from Wilfred Avenue to State Route 12 (see Table 3.2-11). Average travel speeds would be as low as 43 mph during the PM peak hour. This is a significant impact.

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 modeling framework of the two studies is generally similar, although the US 101 study has analyzed in greater detail the impacts of HOV lanes and actual traffic operations on the US 101 freeway. The US 101 widening study is based on the year 2030 in the Project area. The analysis results are shown in Table 3.2-11. The results for State Route 12 are based on 2020 conditions from the Santa Rosa City Traffic Model.

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 State Route 12 and Baker would experience "E" and "F" conditions. Segments shown in bold in Table 3.2-11 do not meet Caltrans desired standard of LOS "C/D" operation. The table shows that traffic conditions along State Route 12 would generally be good, even during peak hours.

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 State Route 12 will be northbound in the morning, and southbound in the evening.

**TABLE 3.2-11**  
Year 2020 Freeway Mainline Levels of Service with Southwest Area Plan Improvements, 4:30-5:30 PM  
Volumes expressed in vehicles per hour (VPH), \( m \)=rounded 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>4,200 m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>975 h</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3,850 m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200 h</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Bellevue-Hearn (Yolanda)*</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>3,700 m</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850 h</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3,700 m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,075 h</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Hearn Avenue-Baker Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>4,150 m</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100 h</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3,700 m</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200 h</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Baker Ave -- Highway 12</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>4,900 m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>925 h</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>4,400 m</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200 h</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>59</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.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-11. Add auxiliary lanes to US 101 (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-2, Redevelopment EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.3-2, as modified below). Add auxiliary lanes to US 101 in both directions between Stony Point Road and Dutton
Avenue. These lanes would be needed as a result of cumulative traffic growth in western Sonoma County and Santa Rosa, as well as the Southwest Area. Additional 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 to 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

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, this impact 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.

After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable

Cumulative Impact 3.2-12. The Project, along with cumulative growth, may increase demand for transit trips beyond available capacity.

Analysis: Less than Significant

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 the extent to which services were expanded to serve new demand. Additional funding may be needed to expand services. This is a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-12. Improve transit services. 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 (City of Santa Rosa 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 (NWP) right-of-way provides a significant opportunity for the development of 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.

*After Mitigation: Less than Significant*

**Cumulative Impact 3.2-13.** The Project, along with cumulative traffic growth, may increase vehicular traffic.

**Analysis: Significant**

The Project, plus cumulative traffic growth, would increase vehicular traffic, including use of local and collector streets in developed portions of the Southwest area. This is a significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-10b (Improve residential street
Cumulative Impact 3.2-14. The Project, along with cumulative growth, may increase demand for bicycle and pedestrian travel.

Analysis: Significant

The Project, plus cumulative growth, would increase the demand for non-motorized transportation in the area, i.e., bicycle and pedestrian travel. This is a significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-4d (Improve bicycle and pedestrian travel) described above would provide adequate bicycle and pedestrian routes in the Project area and reduce the impact to less than significant.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Cumulative Impact 3.2-15. Infrastructure construction related to the Project, along with cumulative infrastructure construction in the Southwest Area, may lead to increased truck and construction vehicle activity on the local roadway network in the area of construction and may create lane closures causing traffic delays, transit delays, restricted access, increased traffic hazards, and rerouting of traffic, including emergency vehicles.

Analysis: Significant

Cumulative construction impacts are likely to result from site grading/preparation, transport of building and finish materials to construction sites, trips by construction workers, location of construction activities, and staging areas.

Some additional truck traffic (primarily for delivery of building materials) would occur for several months during the early phases of any future development projects. Usually such trips are distributed throughout the day and would not adversely affect peak hour traffic. Construction workers typically arrive on the site early in the morning, prior to the morning peak commute traffic (which occurs between 7:30 and 8:30 AM) and generally leave before the highest afternoon peak hour begins (usually beginning between 4 and 4:30 PM). Therefore, construction-worker related vehicles are not expected to have a significant impact on existing traffic levels of service.

Depending on the infrastructure project (roadway, sewer, water, or drainage improvement project), location, duration and timing, such projects can be expected to create temporary impacts (vehicular delay) due to the presence of construction activities as well as the occasional need to impede traffic. Depending on how the infrastructure construction is staged, there may be a need to temporarily close traffic lanes and/or intersections (or portions thereof) in the vicinity of the construction site on a temporary basis, thereby causing inconvenience to residents and travelers.

The traffic impacts associated with this type of construction activity would largely be limited to trucks and heavy equipment moving in and out of the construction site as needed. Depending on details of the construction plans, there may be trucks associated with earth-moving activity in the early stages of a project. Impacts on residential access would be greatest in the AM peak when construction is occurring (most contractors typically quit before
residents return home from work). Because detailed infrastructure construction plans have not yet been prepared, the specific impacts are unknown.

The uncertainty of the impacts associate with infrastructure construction on residential access makes this impact significant. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-6a (Implement construction traffic management plan) described above would reduce the impacts to less than significant by noticing homeowners of construction activity and by implementing a traffic management plan to maintain adequate service levels.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Cumulative Impact 3.2-16. Project buildout, along with cumulative buildout, may result in parking demand exceeding the available capacity for the Project area.

Analysis: Significant

The number of parking spaces under each future development application is unknown. There is a potential inadequacy of parking facilities within the City.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-16. Comply with Santa Rosa parking requirements. The applicants of future development proposals shall comply with the Santa Rosa Zoning Code parking requirements.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant
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3.3 Utilities and Public Services

The Master EIR and Redevelopment EIR evaluated impacts to electricity and natural gas. The Project does not introduce new impacts to these utilities not previously addressed in the Master EIR. No mitigation measures would be required for electricity and natural gas service, which is provided by Pacific Gas and Electric Company. Utilities and public services evaluated in this section for the Dutton Meadows Project include water supply, sanitary sewer, solid waste, schools, parks, and fire and police services. An evaluation of water supply availability is required for new development projects. Comments on the sanitary sewer system and schools were received during the scoping period for this Draft SEIR, and therefore are addressed.

3.3.1 Setting

3.3.1.1 Domestic Water Supply

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 dwelling units or that would demand an amount of water equivalent to or greater than the amount of water required by a 500 dwelling unit project. The Project will have up to 586 dwelling units. It will also involve 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 Project is therefore subject to SB 610. The City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department completed a WSA (Santa Rosa 2004) that addresses the current water demand of the water supplier, the projected demand of the Project, the current and future water supply of the water supplier, and makes a determination of supply availability for the Project. The WSA is included with this Draft SEIR as Appendix E. The following discussion is summarized from the WSA.

The Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA) provides the City with its potable water supply. SCWA is authorized to undertake the following:

- 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
- 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 North Marin, Valley of the Moon, and the Forestville Water Districts and the cities of
Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Petaluma, Cotati, and Sonoma. 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.

SCWA’s primary source of supply is the Russian River. 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 is currently 75,000 acre-feet per year (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 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. SCWA Urban Water Management Plan 2000 estimates the production capacity of these wells at 3,025 afy.

Santa Rosa currently receives all of its potable water supply from SCWA. 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 (1994 to 2003) at an average annual rate of approximately 1.1 percent from 21,400 afy to 23,990 afy. The City’s entitlement to SCWA water is 29,100 afy. In November 2004, Santa Rosa approved a plan use some of its own groundwater supply to meet future demands.

3.3.1.2 Sanitary Sewer

Santa Rosa’s wastewater system collects, treats, and disposes of sewage generated from residential, commercial, and industrial uses. The collection system has been constructed gradually over time, and system extensions have generally occurred concurrently with development of the associated areas. The City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department operates the Laguna Wastewater Treatment Plant, which is a sub-regional wastewater treatment system treating wastewater from Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, Cotati, Sebastopol, and some unincorporated areas. The Laguna Wastewater Treatment Plant treats wastewater to the tertiary level and would serve the Project. The current capacity of the Laguna plant is 21.34 million gallons per day (mgd) average dry weather flow (Kernkamp 2004). The new buildouts projected in the updated General Plans for Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park, however, would exceed this treatment capacity. This incremental increase in demand for wastewater treatment was evaluated in the Incremental Recycled Water Program by the City of Santa Rosa, which certified the Programmatic EIR on March 4, 2004. The Preferred Program outlines a combination of conservation; urban, agricultural, and geysers reuse; storage; discharge; and treatment plant upgrade to manage the future wastewater treatment demand.

3.3.1.3 Schools

There are two school district governing bodies that serve the Project site. The Bellevue Union School District provides elementary school services for children in kindergarten to
grade 6. Santa Rosa City Schools provides junior high and high school services for children in grades 7 to 12 through the Santa Rosa High School District.

**Bellevue Union School District.** The Meadow View Elementary School, located at the intersection of Hearn Avenue and Dutton Meadow Avenue, will provide elementary school services for new residents of the Dutton Meadows Project. The school is currently operating at capacity and has an enrollment of 504 students (Roeder 2004). Construction is planned in 2004/2005 for a new school (Taylor Mountain Elementary) in Santa Rosa near Bellevue Avenue and Santa Rosa Avenue, just east of US 101. This school would relieve enrollment pressure on the Meadow View School. It is expected that some students currently attending the Meadow View Elementary School would attend the new east side school instead. Bus service would be provided for students enrolled in the District’s elementary schools (Roeder 2004).

**Santa Rosa City Schools/Santa Rosa High School District.** Lawrence Cook Middle School will provide educational services for grades 7 and 8 to new residents of the Dutton Meadows Project. The school is located at 2480 Sebastopol Road and has capacity for additional students; the current enrollment is 771 students, and school capacity is 850 students (Bower 2004). Bus service is provided to students who live more than 3 miles from the campus (Lynch 2004 and Tabor 2004).

Elsie Allen High School will provide educational services for grade 9 through 12 to new residents of the Dutton Meadows Project. The school is located at 599 Bellevue Avenue and has capacity for additional students, as the current enrollment is 1,570 students, and the school capacity is 1,650 students (Bower 2004). Bus service is provided for students that live more than 3 miles from the campus (Lynch 2004 and Albeni 2004).

School capacity and enrollment information is summarized in Table 3.3-1.

**TABLE 3.3-1**
Local School Capacity and Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meadow View Elementary School</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Cook Middle School</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Allen High School</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 3.3.1.4 Parks and Recreation

The City of Santa Rosa Recreation and Parks Department is responsible for the acquisition and maintenance of park land and recreational facilities, as well as the maintenance of street medians and street trees. The General Plan policy PSF-A-2 establishes the City of Santa Rosa’s park standard as 3.5 acres of City (neighborhood and community) parks, 1.4 acres of school recreational land, and 1.1 acres of public-serving open space per 1,000 residents, for a total of 6 acres of park land per 1,000 residents (City of Santa Rosa 2002a).

Neighborhood parks and community parks are the two main types of parks existing in Santa Rosa. Neighborhood parks are generally less than 10 acres in size and are located...
within about 0.5 mile of the residents they serve. Community parks are generally between 15 and 25 acres and serve residents throughout the City. They are sited so that most residents will be no further than 1 mile from a community park facility. In 2001, the total neighborhood and community park area within City of Santa Rosa City limits was 468 acres. Undeveloped parkland was another 222 acres, and there were 12 additional community and/or recreational facilities (City of Santa Rosa 2002a). While not operated by the City of Santa Rosa, Spring Lake County Park (320 acres, including the 72-acre lake) and Annadel State park (5,000) acres are two additional local parks that increase recreational opportunities available to residents of Santa Rosa. Assuming a 2004 population of 154,379, the City currently has approximately 3.04 acres of City parkland per 1,000 residents.

The Project area currently does not contain any parks or recreation facilities. The nearest park or recreation facility to the Project area is the school grounds at Meadowview Elementary School to the west of the Project.

The City's Recreation and Parks Department charges parkland dedication in-lieu fees and park development fees for all residential development. These fees are collected at the time that building permits are issued. For large developments (i.e., subdivisions of 50 units or larger), parkland is usually required of the developer by the City, calculated at 6 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents (City of Santa Rosa 2002a) instead of collecting in-lieu or development fees.

3.3.1.5 Police Services

Law enforcement services within the City of Santa Rosa are provided by the Santa Rosa Police Department (SRPD). The Department is comprised of three major divisions: Field Services Division, Special Services Division, and Technical Division. Under these divisions are special sections and units, staffed by employees and officers assigned to other full-time duties such as patrol, as follows:

- **Field Services Division**: Community outreach unit, crime analysis, environmental crimes unit, homicide, robbery and felony assault investigations section, the identification bureau, multi-agency task forces, organized crime and intelligence section, property crime investigations section, school resource section, and sex crime and family violence section

- **Special Services Division**: Criminal Street Team, patrol and traffic sections, abandoned vehicle abatement, accident investigation unit, bicycle safety grant and downtown enforcement team

- **Technical Division**: Bomb, mounted enforcement, canine, crisis negotiations, special response, and tactical support units

The SRPD currently consists of 167 sworn officers, including 136 line level police officers and 84 civilian employees (77 of the 84 civilian employees are line level employees). This provides the City of Santa Rosa with an officer-to-population ratio of 1.07 sworn personnel per 1,000 residents. The SRPD’s current goal and recommended level of service standards for police services is 1.5 officers per 1,000 residents. According to the SRPD, this is one of the lowest ratios in California for a city the size of Santa Rosa. In 2003, patrol officers responded
to over 121,040 calls for service, averaging 332 calls per day (City of Santa Rosa Police Department 2003).

The SRPD divides its coverage of the City into 11 patrol zones. Each patrol zone is covered on weekdays by 1 to 2 police officers depending on the time of the day, and on weekends by 3 officers. The Dutton Meadows Project is located in patrol zone 7.

3.3.1.6 Fire and Emergency Services

The Santa Rosa Fire Department (SRFD) is responsible for responding to emergency incidents within the City of Santa Rosa. These incidents include fires of all types, medical emergencies, and hazardous materials incidents. To provide a timely response, eight fire stations are strategically located throughout the City and the Roseland District. Each fire station houses an Engine Company and is staffed 24 hours per day. The SRFD response goal is to have the first unit arrive on the scene within 4 minutes 80 percent of the time; within 5 minutes 90 percent of the time; and within 6 minutes 100 percent of the time (City of Santa Rosa 2002b). The SRFD is staffed by 128 sworn and 7 civilian employees, including 1 fire chief, 1 deputy chief, 1 fire marshal, 1 division chief for training and safety, 3 battalion chiefs, 6 fire inspectors, 1 fire protection engineer, 1 administrative assistant, 34 fire captains, 72 firefighters, 1 administrative secretary, 4 senior administrative assistants, 1 public education coordinator, and 1 administrative technician.

Based upon a deployment analysis completed for the SRFD in April 2002 (Sonoma County 2004), the SRFD has determined a need to relocate three fire stations and to construct three additional fire stations in order to provide the desired level of service to Santa Rosa. The new fire stations are a new southwest station located on Northpoint Parkway between Kingfisher Way and Thunderbolt Way; a new southeast station located at the intersection of Kawana Terrace and Franz Kafka Avenue; and a new Station 8 relocated to the vicinity of Sebastopol Road and Timothy Avenue.

In 2003, the SRFD responded to 16,970 emergency incidents. This is a 1 percent increase over the previous year and a 63 percent increase over the last 10 years. Approximately 69 percent of the calls were related to medical emergencies. About 5 percent were for fires and the remaining calls were for other types of service. The SRFD average response time for Code 3 (emergency) calls in 2003 was 4 minutes and 48 seconds. During 2003, 30 percent of emergencies received a 4-minute or less response time, 59 percent received a 5-minute or less response, and 83 percent received a 6-minute or less response time.

3.3.1.7 Measure O—City of Santa Rosa Transaction and Use Tax Ordinance

In November 2004, Santa Rosa City voters approved Measure O by the required two-thirds majority. Approval of Measure O enacted Municipal Code Ordinance Number 3680, entitled “City of Santa Rosa Transaction and Use Tax Ordinance.” Ordinance 3680 is a retail transactions and use tax ordinance that incorporates provisions identical to those of the Sales and Use Tax Law of the State of California. The tax, which becomes operational on April 1, 2005, imposes a 0.25 percent tax upon all retailers in the incorporated area of the City on the gross receipts from the sale of all tangible personal property sold within the City after April 1, 2005. The tax also applies to out-of-territory retailers for sale of personal property within the incorporated City limits. To facilitate Ordinance 3680, the City is required to contract with the State Board of Equalization.
Measure O funds must be used exclusively to enhance police, fire and gang prevention services. Even with Measure O, there exists a gap between revenues available for and costs associated with providing Police, Fire, Public Works and Parks services to the community. This gap is being analyzed currently and the amount will be determined in the near future. In order to provide funding for the gap, Staff is evaluating the formation of a Community Facilities District. If such a district is approved by Council, an assessment equal to the gap would be levied upon each newly developed property within the City.

3.3.1.8 Solid Waste

Sonoma County has a solid waste management program in place that provides solid waste collection and disposal services for the entire County (SCWMA 2003). Two permitted disposal sites (one for municipal solid waste) and six permitted transfer stations (five with public access) currently are operating in Sonoma County. These sites include:

- Disposal Facilities: Central Landfill, Santa Rosa Geothermal WMO Disposal Site
- Transfer Facilities: Occidental, West College, Guerneville, Sonoma, Healdsburg, Annapolis

Nearly all waste collected in the county is disposed of at the Central Landfill, located in Petaluma. The permitted daily capacity of the Central Landfill is 2,500 tons and 4,167 cubic yards. Waste destined for disposal is delivered to the transfer facilities in refuse collection trucks and then loaded into 100 cubic yard long-haul vehicles for transfer to the Central Landfill. The transfer stations have drop-off and floor-sort operations to separate recyclable materials remaining in the waste stream and to consolidate refuse for transport to the Central Landfill for disposal. In addition, a small quantity of debris box waste generated in Sonoma County is disposed at the Redwood Sanitary Landfill in Marin County. Recyclable materials collected by local haulers, drop-off/buy-back operations, and the material reuse/recovery program operating in Sonoma County are consolidated at private yards for shipment to secondary materials processors and end users.

The City of Santa Rosa disposes of solid waste at the Central Landfill. An estimated 31 percent (148,900 tons) of the total 1998 waste stream at the Central Landfill originated in Santa Rosa (City of Santa Rosa 2000). In the City of Santa Rosa, the refuse and recycling hauling services currently are being provided by North Bay Corporation. It hauls between 1,000 and 1,500 tons per day of refuse and recyclables.

3.3.2 Standards of Significance

Significant impacts would occur if implementation of the proposed Project would result in any of the following:

- Increased demand for police services to such a degree that the General Plan service standard is not maintained
- Increased demand for fire services to such a degree that the General Plan service standard is not maintained
- Increased demand for school facilities to such a degree that accepted service standards are not maintained and enrollment is greater than school capacity
3.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

3.3.3.1 Project Impacts

Impact 3.3-1. The Project may increase demand for water supply and distribution to such a degree that the City cannot commit to providing adequate service.

Analysis: Less than Significant

The WSA prepared by the City estimated short-term and long-term water demands. This analysis evaluated two scenarios: (1) high water demand with conservation, above average weather conditions, and service to private systems (systems now deriving water supply from private wells), and (2) 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 afy, and under the second scenario, water demand would be 30,500 afy. The General Plan assumes that the midpoint of the high and low scenarios, or 32,900 afy, 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 (City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department 2004). The City has also requested that the SCWA augment the City’s annual entitlement, and is working with SCWA 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.

The water demand for the Project is projected to be a maximum of 266 afy (City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department 2004). 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 (City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department 2004). Only a portion of the development anticipated in the City’s General Plan has occurred.

The City’s current water supply to meet the growth projected in the General Plan is from a combination of sources. The primary source of supply, as described in Section 3.3.1, 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 (City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department 2004). 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.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation necessary.

**Impact 3.3-2.** The Project may increase demand for wastewater treatment and disposal to such a degree that the City cannot commit to providing adequate service.

**Analysis: Less than Significant**

The Project includes construction of infrastructure, primarily sewer laterals, required to connect the development to the City's wastewater collection system. The Laguna Wastewater Treatment Plant has sufficient existing capacity to accommodate the wastewater flows that would be generated by the Project. In addition, the sanitary sewer connection fee (see Section 2.4.2) will be collected to provide funds to serve the proposed Project as well as other developments in the Southwest Area.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation necessary.

**Impact 3.3-3.** The Project may increase demand for schools to such a degree that enrollment is greater than school capacity.

**Analysis: Significant**

The proposed Project will have an impact on existing school services in the Project area. The Redevelopment Plan estimated the number of new students in the Redevelopment Plan Area by multiplying the net number of new housing units by student-generation factors. These factors, which estimate the number of students per household based on grade level, are 0.4 for elementary school students, 0.1 for junior high school students, and 0.2 for high school students. Multiplying these factors by the 586 new housing units in the Dutton Meadows Project provides the following estimated new students from the Project:

- Approximately 235 new elementary school students
- Approximately 59 new junior high students
- Approximately 118 new high school students

Lawrence Cook Middle School currently has capacity to accommodate students from the Project. Although Meadow View Elementary School is currently at capacity and does not have the capacity to accommodate the estimated number of new elementary school students, the new Taylor Mountain Elementary School is expected to be completed in time to accommodate the overall number of elementary school students in the area. The 80-student capacity remaining at Elsie Allen High School is not sufficient to accommodate the estimated new 118 high school students, and the available capacity to students elsewhere in the district would be decreased.

Under current State legislation, the City cannot deny administrative or quasi-judicial approvals for a development based on the development's adverse impact on school facilities. Pursuant to this legislation, the sole mitigation for such impacts arising from
Mitigation Measure 3.3-3. Implement payment of mitigation fees (Redevelopment EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-3 as modified below). Santa Rosa City Schools and Bellevue Union School District require payment of statutory fees to offset the cost of providing elementary, junior high, and high school services to new residential developments. The impacted school districts should use these funds to provide adequate school facilities, consistent with Policy PSF-C-2, Page 6-19 of the General Plan, to meet the needs of the additional school district enrollments to reduce school impacts to an insignificant level. The fees charged will be consistent with current district policies (Freshley 2004 and Roeder 2004).

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.3-4. The Project may increase demand for parks and recreation facilities to such a degree that General Plan service standards are not maintained.

Analysis: Significant

The City standard for parks is 3.5 acres per 1,000 population, excluding school grounds and open space. In order to meet this standard, given a projected ultimate residential population of 1,506 persons in the Project area, a total of 5.27 acres of park land or accessible open space would be required. Because the Project includes only 4.0 acres of park areas, the deficit of 1.27 acres of park could be significant. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-4, however, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-4. Require park land dedication and park development or in-lieu park fees (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.7-5 and Redevelopment EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-4). 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 pay in-lieu Land Dedication Fees and pay the Park Development Fees.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.3-5. The Project may increase demand for solid waste removal to such a degree that the General Plan service standard is not maintained.

Analysis: Less than Significant

The County of Sonoma is capable of providing the solid waste disposal services necessary to serve the Project, including during construction. All future planning includes using the Central Landfill at least through the year 2050 (SCWMA 2003; SCWMA 2004). In addition, the County is currently hauling waste out of Sonoma County for disposal, and could include this as a future disposal option. All municipal solid waste collected in Sonoma County is hauled by licensed commercial haulers. The North Bay Corporation is the licensed hauler and recycler for the Project area. For residential customers, North Bay Corporation provides recycling and green waste containers and weekly collection of these materials.
(North Bay Corporation 2004). Businesses are also provided with bins, and collection up to 6 days per week can be arranged.

The City will implement various strategies to reduce the volume of waste sent to landfills. Santa Rosa Zoning Code 20-30.120 requires all developments except single-family and multiple-family dwelling groups of four or fewer units to provide dedicated solid waste collection and recycling areas (City of Santa Rosa 2004). Integrated collection and recycling areas allow source separation of recyclables and assist in the reduction of waste materials. Consistent with the zoning code, collection areas will be sited to minimize nuisances, especially noise. In addition, the City must comply with Assembly Bill 939, passed in 1989, to reduce the volume of material sent to landfills by implementation of a recycling plan for both construction and operation phases of the Project.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation necessary.

**Impact 3.3-6. The Project may increase demand for police services to such a degree that the General Plan service standard is not maintained.**

*Analysis: Significant*

The impact on police services would have been evaluated and addressed at the time the Project area was annexed to the City of Santa Rosa. However, the SRPD currently is not meeting its level of service standard of 1.5 officers per 1,000 residents. The addition of approximately 1,506 new residents from the Project could potentially affect the adequacy of police protection services of the SRPD. The SRPD has indicated that total staffing must increase for each increase of 1,000 people to the City's population. To achieve the level of service standard, an additional 2.25 officers would be required by the SRPD at buildout of the Project. Because the SRPD currently does not have sufficient staff to meet its level of service standards, this is a potentially significant impact. As discussed above, Measure O funds will be used to enhance police services. Even with Measure O, there exists a gap between revenues available for and costs associated with providing police services to the community. However, with implementation of the mitigation below, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-6. Implement Community Services District Program.** If the City Council adopts a program requiring a Community Services District program prior to approval of final development plans, the applicant shall participate in the program as a condition of approval.  

*After Mitigation: Less than Significant*

**Impact 3.3-7. The Project may increase demand for fire and emergency services to such a degree that the General Plan service standard is not maintained.**

*Analysis: Significant*

The impact on fire and emergency services would have been evaluated and addressed at the time the Project area was annexed to the City of Santa Rosa. However, as described above in Section 3.3.1, emergency response time standards currently are not being met by the SRFD. The Sonoma County Grand Jury issued a report in February 2004, which indicated that the City should build three new fire stations and relocate three others to ensure adequate public
protection. The grand jury report said that since Santa Rosa last built its last new fire station in 1982, its population has grown from 88,100 to 151,900 in 2002, about a 72-percent increase. The six-page report said fire crews lagged behind the City's goal of responding to all emergency calls within 6 minutes. In the City's rapidly developing southwest quadrant, where responses were slowest, fire crews arrived within 6 minutes just 83 percent of the time in 2002 (Sonoma County 2004). Citywide, the report said fire crews met the 6-minute goal just 86 percent of the time. The Project would place further demands on fire crews and SRFD infrastructure.

To improve performance in the southwest area, the grand jury said the City should follow through on its own report calling for a fire station in the vicinity of Northpoint Parkway and Kingfisher Way and relocation of Station 8 to Sebastopol and Timothy Roads. Measure O funds will be used to enhance fire and emergency services. Even with Measure O, there exists a gap between revenues available for and costs associated with providing fire and emergency services to the community. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-6 (Implement Community Services District Program) described above and the mitigation below, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-7. Fund new fire station (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.7-3, as modified below). The City should agree to fund, if required, construction of a new fire station in the southwest area and to provide the funding necessary for the new fire department personnel and equipment. In addition to General Funds budgeted for fire services, the Southwest Area Plan Infrastructure Fee is collected for all development within the boundaries of the Southwest Area Plan and can be utilized to fund fire stations in the Southwest Area. Timing of this action would be justified by residential and commercial development in the area, with the standard of providing satisfactory fire protection for the full southwest area.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

3.3.3.2 Cumulative Impacts
Cumulative development in the City of Santa Rosa will place additional burdens on services in the Project area. Potential cumulative effects are discussed below.

Cumulative Impact 3.3-8. The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Plan Area, may increase demand for water supply to such a degree that the City cannot commit to providing adequate service.

Analysis: Significant

As described above, the City's current water use is approximately 23,990 acre-feet/year (afy). The City receives its potable water supply from the SCWA, which supplies water to several local communities. SCWA has secure rights to 75,000 afy from the Russian River; it also has several deep wells with production capacity estimated at 3,025 afy. The City's entitlement to SCWA water is 29,100 afy. The General Plan estimates approximately 32,900 afy as Santa Rosa's 2020 annual water demand, representing a midpoint of high demand scenario (35,300 afy) and low demand scenario (30,500 afy). Therefore, the City's current water entitlement from SCWA alone will not be sufficient to meet even the low demand scenario projected in the General Plan.
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, between 1,700 and 2,300 afy, will become part of Santa Rosa’s regular supply within the period covered by the General Plan (City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department 2004). Additional supply is expected to be needed between 2011 and 2024, depending on whether the City is required to provide water service for sites currently served by private wells, and depending on weather conditions.

The City expects to meet the projected annual water volume demand associated with the General Plan through 2020 through a combination of utilization of the City’s own groundwater resources, additional entitlement from SCWA, the City’s recycled water supplies, and/or conservation efforts. 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 (City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department 2004). 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.

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.

The City has requested that SCWA augment the City’s annual entitlement, and is working with SCWA to this end. However, there are several conditions that could affect this request and the City’s long-term sustainable water supply available from SCWA, including 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. These conditions are described in more detail in the Water Supply Analysis in Appendix E. SCWA has submitted petitions to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to increase its annual diversions from the Russian River from 75,000 afy to 101,000 afy. SCWA has also notified its customers that it would be inappropriate to anticipate water deliveries based on diversions of 101,000 afy at this time.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-8a. Implement water conservation measures (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.6-1 as modified below). Incorporate drought-tolerant landscaping and other water efficient landscape standards included in the City of Santa Rosa Water Efficient Landscape Policy (City of Santa Rosa 1992). Incorporate low-flow plumbing fixtures to minimize water use.
Mitigation Measure 3.3-8b: Develop alternative sources of water (Redevelopment EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.5-1). SCWA is experiencing a regional constraint to water supply because of regulatory constraints and mitigation measures that are delaying development of planned water supply and transmission system facilities. Because of this, the City shall continue to develop alternative sources of water and storage/conveyance facilities, including reactivating unused wells, developing new wells, and increasing storage capacity to meet peak water needs. The City will also pursue implementation of the Incremental Recycled Water Program. In addition, the Santa Rosa Utilities Department will continue to encourage water conservation and the use of water conserving devices.

After mitigation: Less than Significant

Cumulative Impact 3.3-9. The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Plan Area, may increase demand for wastewater treatment and disposal to such a degree that the City cannot commit to providing adequate service.

Analysis: Significant

Santa Rosa has updated its General Plan since the capacity of the Geysers Recharge Project was determined, and the recharge project will not accommodate projected 2020 wastewater demand based on the new General Plan projections. Possible increased wastewater flows greater than available capacity are considered a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-9. Collect sanitary sewer connection fee (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.6-2 as modified below). To fund additional infrastructure required to serve the developments in southwest Santa Rosa, the sanitary sewer connection fee will be collected (see Section 2.4.2).

After mitigation: Less than Significant

Cumulative Impact 3.3-10. The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Plan Area, may increase demand for schools to such a degree that enrollment is greater than school capacity.

Analysis: Significant

Increases in population in the southwest area will generate comparable increases in the youth population (ages 5 to 18). Enrollment for elementary, middle, and high schools is expected to be higher than existing capacity. Generation of student population above existing school capacity is considered a significant impact. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-3 (Implement payment of mitigation fees) described above, impacts would be less than significant.

After mitigation: Less than Significant

Cumulative Impact 3.3-11. The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Plan Area, may increase demand for parks and recreation facilities to such a degree that General Plan service standards are not maintained.

Analysis: Significant

As described above, the City has a standard of 3.5 acres of City (neighborhood and community) parks, 1.4 acres of school recreational land, and 1.1 acres of public-serving open
space per 1,000 residents, for a total of 6 acres of park land per 1,000 residents. With the increase in population in the southwest area, there is a potential for failing to meet the acreage standard for both the total 6-acre goal and the City park, school land, and open space goals. This is considered a significant impact. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-4 (Require park land dedication/development or in-lieu park fees) described above, impacts would be less than significant.

After mitigation: Less than Significant

Cumulative Impact 3.3-12. The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Plan Area, may increase demand for solid waste removal to such a degree that the General Plan service standard is not maintained.

Analysis: Less than Significant

As described above in Impact 3.3-5, the County of Sonoma is capable of providing the solid waste disposal services necessary to serve the Project through implementation of its long-range solid waste management plan. The plan includes using the Central Landfill at least through the year 2050 (SCWMA 2003; SCWMA 2004). Implementation of City Zoning Code 20-30.120 and AB939 as described above will reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal.

Mitigation: No mitigation necessary.

Cumulative Impact 3.3-13. The Project may increase demand for police, fire and emergency services to such a degree that the General Plan service standards are not maintained.

Analysis: Significant

The cumulative effect of projects over time affects the ability of the SRPD and SRFD to provide timely and effective protection city wide. As a result, response times throughout the city are expected to increase. Both the General Plan EIR and Redevelopment Plan EIR identified that new residential uses will increase the population served by Santa Rosa’s police and fire personnel. Increases in demand for fire and police services could result in a significant impact. However, Measure O funds will be used to enhance police and fire services. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-6 (Implement Community Services District Program) and Mitigation Measure 3.3-7 (Fund new fire station) described above, impacts would be less than significant.

After mitigation: Less than Significant

3.3.4 References
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3.4 Hazardous Materials

This section describes the potential hazards to human health or the environment associated with the handling, storage, use and transportation of hazardous materials, including handling of contaminated soils that may be present on the Project site. Information on definitions of hazards, applicable regulations including hazardous material worker safety requirements, and known hazardous waste sites is included in Section 3.1.8 of the Master EIR and Section 3.1.8 of the Redevelopment EIR, and is incorporated here by reference.

3.4.1 Setting

Historically, the southwest area of Santa Rosa supported industrial uses. Chemical storage and handling facilities are associated with industrial use, including underground storage tanks (USTs) that can leak and result in releases of petroleum products and other wastes to soil and groundwater. The Master EIR included a compiled list from several sources of known hazardous materials within the boundaries of the Area Plan. The list of 62 hazardous waste sites identified included a number of USTs leaking hydrocarbons, benzene, toluene, xylene and ethylbenzene (BTEX); and the McMinn Avenue Superfund Site containing benzene and several solvents. The proposed Project site is located outside the 2,000-foot radius of the local study area and the 1-mile radius of the regional study area for the Superfund Site. Although the list did not identify any hazardous waste sites within the Project boundaries, one site with three USTs was identified within 1,000 feet (ft.) of the Project on the northwest corner of Dutton Avenue and Hearn Avenue. The tanks and associated piping was removed from the site in January of 1986 and soil in the area was excavated to a depth of 17 ft. Additional work was required to delineate the extent of soil and groundwater contamination from gasoline leaks. As of 1993, the remediation investigation was still in progress and delays in remediation were attributed to insufficient funds.

Several recent studies were completed for the Project site to update the information from the Master EIR and to provide more site-specific detail. The results of these studies are summarized below by Project component.

3.4.1.1 Master Development Plan and Rezoning Action (other than Phase 1, Phase 2 Minoia, and Phase 5 Dutton Village)

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report was prepared for parcels 043-191-018, -019 and -020 (ENGEIO 2001b). Sampling and testing of the near-surface (3 to 9 inches below the surface) showed organochlorine pesticides at concentrations above the Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRG), for the area contained by the orchards. In addition, the existing structures on the parcels, which will be demolished as part of the Project, may contain asbestos and/or lead. An asbestos and lead survey is needed prior to demolition of the existing structures. No other concerns were noted.

The report included an Environmental Data Registry (EDR) database search to review local, state and federal agency databases for contaminated sites on parcels 043-191-018, 043-191-019, and 043-191-020 in April, 2001 (ENGEIO 2001b). Databases reviewed included the following:
• Sonoma County Department of Health Services
• California Environmental Protection Agency department of Toxic Substances Control
• State Water Resources Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region
• Environmental Protection Agency

Neither parcel 043-191-018, -019 nor -020 were listed as a current or former UST facility and none of these were listed as a contaminated site in the county, state, or federal databases. Off-site database searches did not find any Federal National Priority List (NPL) Superfund sites or Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) treatment/storage/disposal facilities to be present. The off-site database searches identified one Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) site at the former Fouche Auto Wreckers located at 2290 Dutton Avenue, which is located within a 0.25 mile radius of the Project; however, this facility is not expected to impact the Project. Additionally, 12 leaking USTs were identified within a 0.5 mile radius, but they are not expected to impact the Project area as long as groundwater under the Project site is not used. One UST facility and four hazardous waste generator facilities were documented within a 0.25 mile radius. These facilities are not expected to impact the Project. There are no state landfills or solid waste disposal sites within a 0.5 mile radius of the Project.

Several 55-gallon drums containing motor oil were observed on the property. One active 350-gallon above-ground diesel storage tank was identified on parcel 043-191-019. There was no obvious evidence of soil staining associated with the above-ground storage tank.

The Agricultural Impact Assessment was completed for parcel 043-071-029 (ENGEO 2000). The assessment was intended to address only surface soils and potential impacts from organochlorine pesticides. The parcel 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 Santa Rosa Fire Department comments state that this is a Phase II site assessment, and there are no environmental issues.

The Environmental Site Assessment Update was completed for parcels 043-191-021 [formerly 043-191-005], 043-071-029 and 043-200-004 (ENGEO 2001c). 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. No evidence of hazardous materials related issues were found to be associated with the site, with the exception of potential asbestos-containing materials. 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 and analyzed to address the potential agrochemical impacts to future site development.

3.4.1.2 Phase 1 Project

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, McGill [Tuxhorn] Property, September 27, 1991, was prepared for parcel 043-071-007 (Giblin 1991a). The assessment 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.

The *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Gould [Tuxhorn] Property, September 27, 1991* was prepared for parcels 043-071-022 and 043-071-023 (Giblin 1991b). The assessment found oil-stained soil and dead vegetation in the area of the shed and barn present on the site and recommended that soil 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 that a Phase II environmental site assessment (analytical characterization) be submitted to address the soil contamination identified in the areas of the shed/barn, and to conduct a Phase III remediation, if necessary.

The *Environmental Review Gould and McGill [Tuxhorn] Properties* was prepared for parcels 043-071-007, -022 and -023 (ENGE0 2001a). This report served as a review of the 1991 reports identified above and provided a supplemental site reconnaissance of the three parcels. The study 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 survey 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.

The *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* was prepared for parcels 043-071-007, -022 and -023 (AEI Consultants 2001). This assessment 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 Properties* study above.

The *Soil Sampling Investigation, 2684 Dutton Meadow, Santa Rosa, California* was prepared for parcel 043-071-007 (AEI Consultants 2002a). 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.

The *Soil Sampling Investigation, 2650 Dutton Meadow, Santa Rosa, California* was prepared for parcel 043-071-023 (AEI Consultants 2002b). 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.

The Asbestos & Lead Based Paint Survey, 2650 Dutton Meadow, Santa Rosa, California, was prepared for parcel 043-071-023 (AEI Consultants 2002c). This report summarizes the analysis of the asbestos and lead-based paint surveys. The report documents the presence of lead in 7 samples, 2 of which had concentrations at levels greater than or equal to 5,000 parts per million (ppm), 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 USEPA 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); gray roof mastic located around the penetration on the roof (approximately 1 square foot); and black roof patch compound located in various locations on the roof of the front house (approximately 100 square feet).

The Asbestos & Lead Based Paint Survey, 2684 Dutton Meadow, Santa Rosa, California was prepared for parcel 043-071-007 (AEI Consultants 2002d). This report summarizes the analysis of the asbestos and lead-based paint surveys. The report documents the presence of lead in six samples, one of which had concentrations at levels greater than or equal to 5,000 ppm, 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 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 1 square foot); and beige linoleum located on the kitchen floor (approximately 250 square feet).

3.4.1.3 Phase 2 Minoia Project

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 1112 and 1200 Hearn Avenue, Santa Rosa, was prepared for parcels 043-191-016 and 043-191-024 (AEI Consultants 2003). No on-site recognized environmental conditions or historical recognized conditions were identified during the course of the investigation. Due to the age of the buildings on the subject property, asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paint may be present.

3.4.1.4 Phase 5 Dutton Village Project

The Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, Lechmansi Property evaluated parcel 043-071-029 (Kleinﬁeldner 2004). The assessment included local, state and federal database searches and a site reconnaissance survey. Observed at the property were two piles of household debris/rubbish (including empty paint cans) and a small pile of asphalt south of the well house. Use or storage of hazardous chemicals and petroleum products were not observed at the site. Furthermore, no known offsite hazardous materials concerns are associated with
this parcel. All adjacent properties are residences, and none of these properties is listed as a generator of hazardous wastes or as a hazardous chemical release site.

3.4.2 Standards of Significance

Significant impacts would occur if implementation of the Project results in any of the following:

- Exposure of construction workers or the public to hazardous contaminants during construction
- Exposure of construction workers, the public or the environment to hazardous contaminant materials from demolition, removal or renovation of existing buildings and building components
- Increased use, generation, or disposal of hazardous wastes by residents and commercial businesses
- Project location on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List) and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment

3.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The Project is not located on a site included on the Cortese List. As described below, the potentially significant impacts of hazardous materials can be mitigated to a less than significant level. No significant unavoidable impacts from hazardous materials would occur as a result of Project implementation.

Impact 3.4-1. Construction of the Project could result in exposure of construction workers to lead paint and asbestos.

Analysis: Significant

During demolition and construction, contractors and construction workers may encounter hazardous materials that may pose a risk to their health. Structures have been identified on the Project site that likely contain lead paint and asbestos. Additionally, there is the potential to encounter contaminated areas not identified in previous studies. This impact was evaluated and mitigation proposed in the Master EIR. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 described below, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-1a. Implement OSHA Standards for Lead Paint Removal. United States Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards requiring protection for workers when working with paint containing lead shall be implemented during building renovations and/or demolitions, regardless of the concentration. Workers performing paint removal work shall follow the OSHA lead standard for the construction industry. The lead content of the paint shall be determined and proper waste disposal requirements and worker protection measures implemented.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-1b. Properly abate asbestos-containing materials. 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 will be followed while removing, repairing, and disposing of the asbestos-containing materials.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.4-2. The Project could expose workers, the public and the environment to hazards resulting from hazardous contaminants in soils.

Analysis: Significant

Contaminated soil found on the Phase 1 Project component site on parcels 043-071-007 and 043-071-023 could result in potential exposure of hazards to humans or the environment. Although minor concentrations of petroleum oil and grease were detected from 1 foot bgs in front of storage sheds, neither stressed vegetation nor stained soil was observed and no detectable traces of petroleum hydrocarbons were found in the upper soil layers (within 4 feet bgs). With implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.4-2a, 3.4-2b, 3.4-2d, and 3.4-2e below, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Contaminated soil found on the Master Development Plan component site on parcels 043-191-018, -019, and -020 could result in potential exposure of hazards to humans or the environment. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment found organochlorine pesticides at concentrations above the primary remediation goals in the orchard areas of the properties. In addition, potential pesticide-contaminated soil on the Master Development Plan component site on parcels 043-191-021, 043-071-029, and 043-200-004 could result in potential exposure of hazards to humans or the environment. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.4-2c, 3.4-2d, and 3.4-2e below, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-2a. Notify agencies regarding contamination. (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.8-1). The Project Applicant shall contact the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Sonoma County Environmental Health Division and Santa Rosa Fire Department immediately if HI contamination is encountered during construction activities.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-2b. Characterize soil and groundwater conditions and remediate as necessary (Redevelopment EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.8-1). Prior to approval of a development project, each applicant of future development projects shall characterize the soil and groundwater conditions of the area to be disturbed. In many cases, site conditions have already been characterized. Where sufficient information is not already available to determine the potential for soil and groundwater contamination, the project applicant will retain a qualified environmental specialist (e.g., a Registered Environmental Assessor or similarly qualified individual) to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. The assessment will list current and past uses of the site, review environmental agency databases and records, report site reconnaissance observations, and summarize potential contamination issues, including any that warrant further investigation. The project applicant will submit the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment to the California Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region; the Sonoma County Health Services Department or Department of Emergency Services; or the Santa Rosa Fire Department, as appropriate.
If determined to be necessary as a result of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment or other information already available for a site, the project applicant will prepare a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment. Soil and groundwater samples will be collected and tested as directed by a qualified environmental specialist (e.g., a Registered Environmental Assessor or similarly qualified individual). Sampling will extend at least as far as the areas and depth proposed for excavation. The samples will be analyzed to identify and quantify any suspect soil or groundwater contamination. In some cases, existing soil and groundwater sampling results may be sufficient to characterize the extent of potential contamination. The project applicant will submit the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment to the California Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region; the Sonoma County Health Services Department or Department of Emergency Services; or the Santa Rosa Fire Department, as appropriate.

Soil and groundwater monitoring and remediation will be completed as deemed necessary to protect future occupants of the site, neighboring properties, and groundwater quality. The project applicant will evaluate the potential human and environmental risks associated with the existing contamination and proposed remediation strategies and work with regulatory agencies to select a prudent approach to address site conditions consistent with foreseeable future uses. For example, if residential uses are proposed for a contaminated site, cleanup standards will be based on human health risk standards using residential exposure parameters. The project applicant will consult with the California Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region; the California Department of Toxic Substances Control; the Sonoma County Health Services Department or Department of Emergency Services; or the Santa Rosa Fire Department, depending on which agency has jurisdiction over the site. Possible remediation strategies could include, for example, natural attenuation, encapsulation, aeration, bioremediation, soil-vapor extraction, or off-site disposal. Remediation plans will address the replacement of excavated soils with soils of lower permeability, the installation of barriers within trenches, and the lining of storm drains and sewers to prevent infiltration.

Each applicant of future development projects will prepare a plan to manage and handle contaminated soil and groundwater. The Plan will contain provisions for removal of contaminated materials (soil and groundwater), transport, and treatment or disposal.

Prior to undertaking work at a contaminated site, the applicant will prepare a Site Safety and Health Plan (a California Division of Occupational Safety and Health requirement for work at hazardous waste sites). The plan will be prepared in accordance with regulatory requirements and the *Occupational Safety and Health Guidance Manual for Hazardous Waste Site Activities* (NIOSH 1985). It will identify potential hazards, material handling procedures, dust suppression measures, necessary personal protective clothing and devices, and appropriate monitoring equipment. In addition to measures that protect on-site workers, the plan will include measures to minimize public exposure to contaminated soil or groundwater. Such measures will include dust control, appropriate site security, restriction of public access, and posting of warning signs, and will apply from the time of surface disruption throughout the completion of earthwork construction.

**Mitigation Measure 3.4-2c. Perform Phase II Investigation.** Prior to approval of a development project, a Phase II investigation (soil sampling and analysis) for any known contaminated areas shall be prepared. These include the contaminated areas near the above-
Mitigation Measure 3.4-2d. Perform Phase III Remediation. If a Phase III (remediation) is required for a development project, this shall be completed with Santa Rosa Fire Department permits and approvals prior to the approval of the development plan. A Phase III remediation will be performed to remove the contaminated soils [minor petroleum and grease] on parcels 043-071-007 and -023. A permit is required from the Santa Rosa 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.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-2e. Place remediation notes on grading plans. The following note shall be on the grading and improvement plans: “No grading shall commence prior to Santa Rosa 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.”

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.4-3. The Project could expose workers, the public and the environment to hazards resulting from the aboveground fuel tank and oils in the 55-gallon drums on the Phase 3 parcels.

Analysis: Significant

The contents of the aboveground fuel tank and 55-gallon oil drums on Phase 3 parcels could result in potential exposure of hazards to humans or the environment. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-3, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-3. Remove aboveground fuel tank and oil in 55-gallon drums located on the Phase 3 development site. Prior to approval of the development project, a Fire Department permit shall be obtained to close/decontaminate and remove the aboveground fuel tank on Parcel 043-191-019. 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.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.4-4. The Project may result in increased use and disposal of household hazardous wastes.

Analysis: Significant

New residential development would result in an increase in the use and disposal of hazardous household wastes. This impact was evaluated and mitigation proposed in the
Master EIR. With implementation of this mitigation, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-4. Support proper disposal of household hazardous waste (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.8-2 as modified below). All new developments within the Plan area, will be included as participants of a Joint Powers Agency (JPA) for the handling, collection and disposal of hazardous wastes. Under the agreement between the Cities of Sonoma County and Sonoma County for a JPA, the County would provide sites free of charge at its Central Landfill Site for household hazardous waste collection and storage. The JPA would arrange for a household hazardous waste (HHW) operator to perform collection, recycling, and disposal services for participants. HHW will be received from the residents in a receiving area at the facility and will be inspected by trained personnel to determine its acceptability. The waste received would be sorted into materials that should be disposed of and those that could be reused. Those materials that should be disposed of would be prepared for transportation to disposal facilities. Those wastes received that could be reused would be inventoried for use, exchange, reuse, or shipping to a recycling facility. In addition, the JPA would develop a public education program to maximize the utilization of the HHW facility.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

3.4.4 References
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3.5 Historic and Cultural Resources

Details on local prehistory, ethnography, and history are provided in Section 3.1.9 of the Master EIR, and are incorporated here by reference. This section describes potential historic and cultural resources on the Project site, potential impacts to historic and cultural resources from the proposed Project, and mitigation measures.

3.5.1 Setting

A cultural resource is considered “significant” if it qualifies as eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Properties that are eligible for listing in the CRHR must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- Have association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the U.S.
- Have association with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history
- Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values
- Have yielded or have the potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation

The integrity of a resource (the qualities of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association relevant to the eligibility criteria) is also important in determining significance. Similar standards apply to listings of significant resources in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Cultural resource investigations in Southwest Santa Rosa have revealed that high potential exists for development projects to encounter potentially important cultural resources. In addition, several recorded historic sites and structures are present in the vicinity of the Project site (see study information below).

Several studies of the parcels in the Project area were completed between 2000 and 2004 to evaluate the historical value of existing structures and the potential for cultural resources to occur on site. These studies are summarized below.

3.5.1.1 Master Development Plan and Rezoning Action (other than Phase 1, Phase 2 Minoia, and Phase 5 Dutton Village)

- Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Property for the Proposed Dutton Meadows Project in the City of Santa Rosa (Archaeological Resource Management 2000). This study is the report of an archaeological survey on parcels 043-200-004, 043-071-029 and 043-191-021.

Archival research with the Northwest Information Center revealed that there are no recorded archaeological sites located within the study area. There are, however, 8 recorded historic sites within a 0.5-mile radius of the study area, including residential structures and their associated outbuildings constructed between the late 19th century and the 1950s, and an historic refuse deposit. During surface reconnaissance of the subject property, a single
structure (a residence constructed circa 1900 to 1920) was noted within the study area. The structure contains several additions and modifications, lacks architectural integrity, and does not appear to be historically significant.

There were no prehistoric cultural resources noted during the surface reconnaissance survey; however, visibility of the Project area was very poor. Even though prehistoric cultural resources were not discovered during the surface survey, it is possible that such resources exist on the site and cannot be seen due to soil and vegetation cover.

• *Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Property for the Proposed Project at 980 Hearn Avenue in the City of Santa Rosa* (Archaeological Resource Management 2001b). This study is the report of an archaeological survey for parcel 043-191-019 as well as parcels 043-191-018 and -020.

Archival research with the Northwest Information Center revealed that there are no recorded archaeological sites located within the Project area. There are, however, 8 recorded historic sites within a 0.5-mile radius of the study area, including residential structures and their associated outbuildings constructed between the late 19th century and the 1950s, and an historic refuse deposit. Two single-family residences and associated outbuildings including chicken coops and equipment sheds are present on the property. One of the homes is more than 100 years old. Deterioration and extensive remodeling have severely diminished its integrity, and it does not appear to be historically significant. The second house is approximately 60 years old; it also lacks integrity and does not appear to be historically significant. No traces of prehistoric cultural resources were noted during surface reconnaissance.

3.5.1.2 Phase 1 Project

• *Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Property for the Proposed 12.1 acre Dutton Meadows Project in the City of Santa Rosa* (Archaeological Resource Management 2001a). This study is the report of an archaeological survey on parcels 043-071-007, -022 and -023.

Archival research with the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, revealed that there are no recorded archaeological sites located within these three parcels. 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 the two reports summarized immediately below).

There were no prehistoric cultural resources noted during the surface reconnaissance survey; however, ground surface visibility in the survey area was very poor. Even though prehistoric cultural resources were not discovered during the surface survey, it is possible that such resources exist on the site and cannot be seen due to soil and vegetation cover.

• *Historical Evaluation of the Structures at 2650 Dutton Meadow Road in the City of Santa Rosa* (Archaeological Resource Management 2002a). This study evaluates the buildings and structures located on parcel 043-071-023.

The structures located on the parcel include a single-story vernacular residence, brick outbuilding, small cottage unit, pumphouse, small shed, barn, and children's treehouse. The house and barn were built circa 1910. The residence is a duplex built in an irregular pattern,
and is of balloon frame construction with horizontal, beveled wood siding. The roof is surfaced with composition shingles and is moderately pitched. The remaining structures appear to have been constructed at later dates. The proposed Project calls for the demolition of these structures to make way for future development.

None of the structures are historically or archaeologically significant. The structures are not listed on the NRHP or the CRHR. In addition, the structures do not appear to be eligible for listing; they 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.

- Historical Evaluation of the Structures at 2684 Dutton Meadow Road in the City of Santa Rosa (Archaeological Resource Management 2002b). This study evaluates the structures located on parcel 043-071-007.

The residential structure on this property is a single-story vernacular residence that appears to have been built circa 1910. It is of balloon frame construction with wooden shingle siding. The roof is surfaced with composition shingles and 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.

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, exposing wooden cross beams on raised posts. The proposed Project calls for the demolition of the existing structures to make way for future development.

The residence and the chicken coop are not historically or archaeologically significant. The structures are not listed on the NRHP or the CRHR. They do not appear to be potentially eligible for inclusion in either of these historic registers because they 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.

3.5.1.3 Phase 2 Minoia Project

- A Cultural Resources Evaluation of the Minoia Property Located at 1112 and 1200 Hearn Avenue, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County (APN 043-191-016 & 043-191-024) (Archaeological Resource Service 2003). This study is the report of an archaeological survey on parcels 043-191-016 and 043-191-024.

Archival research with the Northwest Information Center and the County Assessor revealed that there are no recorded archaeological sites located within the Project area. There are, however, six recorded historic structures within a 0.5-mile radius of the study area. The
closest recorded prehistoric site is 1 mile distant. There were no prehistoric cultural resources noted during the surface reconnaissance survey; however, visibility of the Project area was very poor due to dense grasses. Even though prehistoric cultural resources were not discovered during the surface survey, it is possible that such resources exist on the site and cannot be seen due to soil and vegetation cover.

Several previous studies for the area determined that several structures in the study area, 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, are ineligible for the National Register. Evaluation of all 11 buildings currently present in the study area determined that none of them are locally important.

3.5.1.4 Phase 5 Dutton Village Project

The Phase 5 Dutton Village Project, on parcel 043-071-029, was evaluated for potential prehistoric resources as described above in the report *Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Property for the Proposed Dutton Meadows Project in the City of Santa Rosa* (Archaeological Resource Management 2000). Additional cultural resource studies were completed for parcel 043-071-029, as described below.

- *A CEQA Review and Evaluation for Significance, Baptise Bossa Bungalow, 2732 Dutton Meadow Avenue (formerly 2732 Dutton Avenue), Santa Rosa, California* (Clark Historic Resource Consultants, Inc. 2004). This report provides an evaluation of historical significance for a building on parcel 043-071-029.

This report describes two standing structures on the property: a one-story, wood-frame vernacular bungalow measuring 32’ x 24,’ built approximately 1912, and a wood frame “pump house” measuring 2’ x 3’ and bearing a gable roof with composition shingles. The house also features a 12’ x 14’ plywood porch addition and currently stands vacant and significantly deteriorated. The property has been farmed since at least the late 1800s.

Evaluations in 1991 and 2004 determined that this building is ineligible for the National Register, the California Register, or local designation. As of April 2004, the property was observed to be “deteriorated, vacant, and in very poor condition. It has lost all of its agricultural buildings and its prune orchard, so it does not possess integrity of setting, feeling, design, materials, workmanship or association to convey its historical associations as an early 20th Century southwest Santa Rosa fruit farm under Criterion 1.” The parcel does not meet any of the other three requirements for designation as a historical resource under CEQA.

- *Archeological Investigation, Proposed Dutton Meadows Subdivision, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California.* (ASI Archaeology and Cultural Resources Management 2004). This study is the report of an archaeological survey for parcel 043-071-029.

This study includes results of cultural resource database searches and a field reconnaissance survey. It concludes that the structures and debris piles on this parcel are ineligible for the California Register. No prehistoric archaeological sites or artifacts, or historical archaeological materials were identified on the parcel.
3.5.2 Standards of Significance

Significant impacts would occur if implementation of the proposed Project results in:

- A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 15064.5
- Disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries

3.5.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The site-specific studies determined that none of the existing structures located in the Master Development Plan or on the Phase 1, Phase 2 Minoia, or Phase 5 Lechmanksi project sites are listed on the CRHR or the NRHP, are not locally important, and do not appear to be historically significant. They are not expected to be eligible for listing. No impacts to cultural or historical resources would occur as a result of the removal of these structures. The Master EIR did not identify any historic structures on other portions of the “Bellevue Ranch” project, one of the specific projects evaluated in the Master EIR and which included parcel 043-071-028 in the proposed Rezoning Action.

Impact 3.5-1. Construction of the Project could result in impacts to prehistoric cultural resources.

Analysis: Significant

Because a high potential exists for cultural resources to occur in Southwest Santa Rosa, potential impacts could occur to cultural resources during construction. Although no prehistoric cultural resources were noted during any of the surface reconnaissance surveys described above, visibility of the Project area was very poor, and there is a potential for cultural resources to be located on the Project site. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-1, potential impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.5-1a. Monitor ground-disturbing activities during construction. (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.9-1 as modified below).

A qualified archaeologist will monitor excavation and other ground-disturbing activities as necessary on the Project site. 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 find 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 retain the services of a qualified cultural resource specialist, as approved by the Department, to evaluate the archaeological deposit. The evaluation will determine the significance of the archaeological deposit in terms of its eligibility for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1).

If field reconnaissance or construction monitoring result in the identification of archaeological deposits and a qualified professional determines that the deposits meet the
3.0 SETTING, IMPACT ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

DUTTON MEADOWS PROJECT

Criteria for listing in the California Register and are therefore determined to be significant deposits, options for avoidance of or minimization of impacts to the sites would include the following:

1. Modify development plans to allow for the preservation of the archaeological site or sites. This could include incorporating site locations into protected open space areas or parklands.
2. Cover or “cap” the site with a layer of protective fill. This measure could be especially effective where a given project might lead to increased public access to a site area. A qualified archaeologist should monitor the capping or filling process to ensure that the site is not inadvertently damaged during this process. The project owner should deed a conservation easement for the area containing the site, plus a suitable buffer area, to ensure that subsequent activities do not damage the site.

If prehistoric archaeological deposits discovered before or during construction are determined significant and cannot be avoided or capped and avoided, the designated cultural resources specialist shall recommend a plan of action that may include a program of scientific excavation or other scientific investigation to recover data within the context of a detailed and approved regional research design that recognizes and addresses the informational value of the site for the study of history or prehistory.

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.

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 and the construction superintendent shall contact the County Coroner. 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 (NAHC) within 24 hours. The NAHC will appoint a Most Likely Descendant, who will contact the Project owner to consult regarding the disposition of the remains.

Mitigation Measure 3.5-1b. Incorporate monitoring requirements into grading plans. The public improvement and grading plans shall include the following notes:

1. “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, Santa Rosa 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, Santa Rosa Department of Community Development.”

2. “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 deposits for significance and develop a plan of action. If warranted by the discovery of a concentration of artifacts or soil deposits that may represent an archaeological site, further work in the discovery area should be monitored by an archaeologist. If human remains are encountered, the contractor must contact the County Coroner. If the Coroner deems the remains to be Native American, the Coroner will contact the NAHC so that a 'Most Likely Descendant' can be designated. The superintendent shall consult with the Most Likely Descendant regarding the disposition of the human remains.

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.”

_After Mitigation: Less than Significant_

**Impact 3.5-2. Construction of the Project could result in impacts to potential historic structures.**

_Analysis: Significant_

Evaluations of structures present on all parcels in the Project site except 043-071-028 concluded that none are historic, and removal of these structures would not result in impacts to potential historic structures. However, structures are present on parcel 043-071-028, which is included in the Rezoning Action. No surveys have been completed to evaluate the potential significance of these structures. Future development projects on this parcel could impact structures that may have historical significance. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-2, potential impacts to historic structures would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 3.5-2. Complete an historic evaluation of structures on parcel 043-071-028.** If development is proposed on parcel 043-071-028, complete an historical evaluation of the structures located on the parcel. 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.

_After Mitigation: Less than Significant_

**3.5.4 References**
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_____ 2002b. Historical Evaluation of the Structures at 2684 Dutton Meadow Road in the City of Santa Rosa. April 24.


3.6 Vegetation, Wildlife, and Habitat

Local, state and federal regulations applicable to biological resources are described in Section 2.5 of this document as well as in Section 3.2.3 of the Master EIR and Section 3.2.3 of the Redevelopment EIR, which are incorporated by reference. This section describes existing biological resources on the Project site, potential impacts to biological resources from the proposed Project, and mitigation measures.

In this section, Biological Study Area (BSA) refers to the Project area minus parcel number 043-071-028 (also known as the Curran Property, part of the Rezoning Action), because it was not included in the biological site studies. The BSA boundary is the same as the Master Development Plan Area boundary. References to the Project area in this section do refer to the full area including the Curran Property. Future actions or development on the Curran Property will require field studies to be completed to determine the presence of biological resources and to evaluate site-specific potential impacts.

3.6.1 Setting

The setting information provided below pertains to the BSA (Master Development Plan Area). Unless otherwise noted, the descriptions included below of vegetation and habitat types, wildlife, and special-status species are obtained from the Biological Assessment (BA) for the Dutton Meadows Project, including the Phase 1, Phase 2 Minoia, and Phase 5 Dutton Village development projects (Olberding Environmental 2003a), and Wetlands/U.S. Waters Delineation for the Minoia Property (Minoia Delineation) (Olberding Environmental 2003b). These documents are incorporated into this Draft SEIR by reference. The Master EIR provides a discussion of the regulatory framework relative to vegetation, wildlife and habitat.

3.6.1.1 Existing Vegetation and Habitat Types

The site is relatively flat. The area and its surroundings are predominantly open space with some rural residences. Aerial photographs and field surveys were used to evaluate vegetation and habitat characteristics and various site conditions in the Project area. Four distinct plant community and habitat types were identified including (1) seasonal wetlands (some of which may include areas commonly called vernal pools), (2) non-native grassland; (3) orchard, and (4) developed/ruderal. In addition, small portions of the BSA support native and non-native trees. These plant communities and habitats are described below.

Seasonal Wetlands

USACE jurisdictional determinations were conducted for the parcels in the BSA in 2000, 2001 and 2003 (Olberding 2003a). Approximately 4.36 acres of wetland habitat and 0.01 acres of drainage swale habitat have been verified by USACE within the properties that comprise the BSA, including the Phase 1, Phase 2 Minoia, and Phase 5 Dutton Village development projects. USACE wetland verification maps and letters are included in Attachment 3 of the Biological Assessment, except for the jurisdictional determination for the Minoia property, which is included in Appendix F.

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 wetland
topography. The hydrologic regime of the existing wetlands is a modified or altered regime. 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. In general, the wetlands are shallow (average depth of 0.3 feet). A complete description of wetland hydrology and vegetation is included in the BA.

The seasonal wetland areas have limited floristic diversity, although they often contain native grass and herb species, in addition to the non-native species characteristic of the grassland. These wetlands do not meet the definition of vernal pools as covered in the Santa Rosa Plain Vernal Pool Ecosystem Preservation Plan and the USFWS programmatic agreement (Olberding 2004b). Vegetation within the seasonal wetlands is dominated by the two grasses, perennial rye grass (*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 outstone (*Picris echioidea*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), six-weeks fescue (*Vulpia bromoides*), meadow barley (*Hordeum brachyantherum*), little rattle snake grass (*Briza minor*), spiny-fruited 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 hordeaceus*), 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 wetland acreage for the Project components is shown in Table 3.6-1.

**TABLE 3.6-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Parcel Numbers</th>
<th>Delineated Wetland Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>043-071-007, -022, -023</td>
<td>0.0 acres*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 (Minoia)</td>
<td>043-191-016, -024</td>
<td>0.2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>043-191-018, -019, -020</td>
<td>0.64 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4/6</td>
<td>043-200-004; 043-191-021</td>
<td>1.12 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5 (Dutton Village) and Curran parcel</td>
<td>043-071-029, -028</td>
<td>2.41 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Wetlands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.37 acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*0.16 acres previously filled under USACE File No. 24554N dated 4-8-2001

**Non-Native Grassland**

Non-Native Grassland occupies the majority of the BSA and the Curran parcel. It corresponds to the non-native grassland type of Holland (Olberding 2003a). The non-native grassland type is heterogeneous in physiognomy and species composition and includes
areas of ruderal habitat composed of a predominance of forbs (broadleaf plants). Some of
the heterogeneity in the annual grassland habitat can be correlated with microtopography,
soil moisture, and drainage conditions. The non-native grassland in the Project area is
generally characterized by a dense (approximately 100%) cover of grasses and herbs. The
dominant grasses are generally annual non-natives. Harding grass (*Phalaris aquatica*), an
invasive non-native, is dominant in parts of the BSA and is expected to continue to spread.
A complete description of non-native grassland vegetation is included in the BA.

**Orchard**

A remnant pear and prune orchard is located in the northeastern corner of the BSA. Pear
and prune orchard covers most of the land on the southern portion of parcel number 043-
191-019 (also known as the Nelson property). 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.

**Developed/Ruderal**

The developed/ruderal habitat type consists of outbuilding such as barns and sheds, fenced
areas used by livestock, and 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, disking, and herbicide
application. Some areas contain old tractors, farming equipment, cars and other debris.
Landscape and volunteer ornamental vegetation surrounds many of the residential
buildings. Vegetation in the developed/ruderal habitat type consists of weed and landscape
species.

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

**Wooded Habitats**

There are no significant areas supporting tree or wooded habitats in the Project area.
However, in addition to the orchard remnant described above, individuals and clumps of
native and non-native trees are found scattered in the BSA. Scattered coast live oak and
valley oak (*Quercus agrifolia* and *Q. lobata*) and fruit trees are present in portions of the BSA,
as can be seen in Figure 7 of the BA. Trees on specific parcels include the following:

- The Phase 1 component of the proposed Project contains 47 trees, including 9 valley oaks
  and 14 other native trees (redwood [*Sequoia sempervirens*], Monterey pine [*Pinus radiata*],
  and willows [*Salix sp*]) (Horticultural Associates 2001).

- The Phase 2 Minoia site contains 30 trees of a range of species, including two valley oak
  (*quercus lobata*), 1 Monterey pine (*pinus radiate*), and 1 redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), as
  well as a range of non-native species and several non-native fruit trees (Horticultural
  Associates 2004b).

- The Dutton Village Parcel (Phase 5) contains 6 trees, including two black walnut (*Juglans
  nigra*), three dwarf blue gum (*Eucalyptus globulus compacta*), and one blue gum
(Eucalyptus globulus) (Horticultural Associates 2004a). Gum trees (Eucalyptus spp.) planted along the boundary between parcel 043-071-029 (Dutton Village property) and parcel 043-200-004 (Peletz property) once formed a wind break; however, there are virtually no tree seedlings or other native plants in the areas in which the gum trees occur.

3.6.1.2 Wildlife
A variety of common reptile, bird, and mammal species use the Project site for foraging and nesting. Common mammalian carnivores and omnivores that may inhabit and/or use food resources found in the Project site 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).

Common reptiles are expected to occur within the Project site and include 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 cats (Felis cattus). Raptors that were observed to forage in the grassland included the red-tailed hawk (Buteo jamaicensis) and the white-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus). A pair of white-tailed kites was observed to roost in the orchard on parcel 043-191-019 (Nelson property) in 2003.

Common raptors including turkey vultures (Cathartes aura) and American kestrel (Falco sparverius) are likely to forage within the Project site 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 Project site vicinity including the great egret (Casmerodius albus), killdeer (Charadrius vociferous), and snowy egret (Egretta thula).

3.6.1.3 Special-Status Species
Special status plant species and special status wildlife species potentially occurring or known to occur onsite are described in separate sections below.

Special-Status Plants
The following description of special status species is summarized and excerpted from the BA, the Spring 2004 Special-Status Plant Species Survey for the Dutton Meadows Property (Olberding Environmental 2004a), and the Spring 2003 Special-Status Plant Surveys for parcel the Nelson and Minoia Properties (Olberding Environmental 2003c). These surveys do not meet the USFWS protocol for the vernal pool endangered species (Blennosperma bakeri, Lasthenia burkei, Limnanthes vinculans), as outlined in the Programmatic Agreement on
the General Permit. USFWS protocol surveys meeting protocol will be required prior to construction.

A search and review for potential special-status plants was conducted using the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory On-Line data base. Additional sources consulted for agency status information include the USFWS for federally listed species and CDFG for state listed species. CNDDB special status species reports were obtained for the United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute quadrangles within the Project site, including Santa Rosa, Cotati, Two Rock and Sebastopol.

Up to 37 plant species were identified by the CNDDB and CNPS data base and background data research as potentially occurring within the Santa Rosa, Cotati, Two Rock, and Sebastopol quadrangles. One additional plant, Lobb's aquatic buttercup (*Ranunculus lobbii*), a CNPS List 4 (watch list) plant, was added to the search list due to the observation of this species during past site surveys. A complete list of the special-status species potentially occurring is provided in Attachment 2, Table 1, Potential Special-Status Plant Species for Dutton Meadows, of the Spring 2003 Special-Status Plant Species Survey for the Nelson and Minoa Properties.

Of the plant species identified, 15 plant species were identified that may have the potential to occur in the Project site based on general habitat types present, primarily vernal pools and non-native grassland. The remaining special-status plant species identified as potentially occurring require a specific habitat or micro-habitat that was not present within the Project site; therefore, these species were not included in plant surveys and are not expected to occur.

The 15 special-status plant species and their regulatory status and blooming period reported as potentially occurring in the Project site are shown in Table 3.6-2 and are also listed in Attachment 2, Table 1 of the Spring 2004 Special Status Plant Species Survey for the Project. Special-status species potentially occurring include: bent flowered fiddleneck (*Amsinckia lunaris*), big scale balsamroot (*Balsamorhiza macrolepis var. macrolepis*), Sonoma sunshine (*Blennosperma bakeri*), dwarf downingia (*Downingia pusilla*), fragrant fritillary (*Fritillaria liliaceae*), hayfield tarplant (*Hemizonia congesta ssp. leucocephala*), Burke's goldfields (*Lasthenia burkei*), Baker's goldfields (*Lasthenia macrantha ssp. bakeri*), Sebastopol meadowfoam (*Limnanthes vinculans*), Baker's navarretia (*Navarretia leucocephala ssp. bakeri*), legenere (*Legenere limosa*), Douglas's pogogyne (*Pogogyne douglasii*), Lobb's aquatic buttercup (*Ranunculus lobbii*) showy Indian clover (*Trifolium amoenum*), and saline clover (*Trifolium depauperatum var. hydrophilum*). A description of each species is also included in the Spring 2004 Special Status Plant Species Survey report.

Field surveys for special-status plant species occurring in the BSA were conducted during four years (2000 to 2004). 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. 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.
No federal or state listed species were observed in the BSA during any of the surveys conducted for the proposed Project. One CNPS List-4 (watch list) species, Lobb’s aquatic buttercup (*Ranunculus lobbii*), was observed during years 2001, 2002 and 2003 in the seasonal wetlands on the southwest corner of parcel 043-191-019 (Nelson property) and parcel 043-191-021 (Peletz property). The population extended over an area of approximately 15 feet by 10 feet and contained an estimated 100 plants. This species occurs in floating mats in ponded or shallow water. Obtaining exact counts of this species was 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. It appears that this species requires sufficient rainfall to germinate. In years with insufficient hydrology and rainfall, this plant may not germinate.

None of the other 15 special-status species listed above or any other special-status species were observed within the BSA (Olberding 2003a).

**Special-Status Wildlife Species**

Special-status wildlife species expected to potentially occur within the Project site include California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*), California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*), western pond turtle (*Emys marmorata marmorata*), freshwater shrimp (*Syncaris pacifica*), California linderiella (*Linderiella occidentalis*), and raptors of special concern including Coopers hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), sharp-shinned hawk (*Accipiter striatus*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), and northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*). Other bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Act and the California Fish and Game Code are also potentially present, including the red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), and turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*). These species, including their special-status designation, are described in detail in the BA.

Of the species listed above, no potential habitat for California red-legged frog, freshwater shrimp, or western pond turtle occurs within the BSA. However, there is potential habitat for western pond turtle adjacent to the Project site within the Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel, located along the southeastern border of the Project area.

Special-status species potentially occurring within the BSA include California tiger salamander, raptors, and California linderiella. These species are shown in Table 3.6-3 and are discussed below, together with western pond turtle, which may occur adjacent to the Project area.

**California Tiger Salamander**

CTS is a native terrestrial salamander. The Santa Barbara CTS population segment was emergency-listed as endangered by USFWS in September 2000, following a petition for listing. 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 list the Central Valley population as threatened and to downlist both the Santa Barbara and Sonoma County populations from endangered to threatened. In 2004, the USFWS listed the full range of CTS as federally threatened.

A complete description of the life cycle and ecology of the CTS is included in the BA in Appendix F. The following discussion of potential habitat and adult and larval surveys within the BSA is summarized and excerpted from the BA; details regarding potential habitat and potential CTS presence are included in the BA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal/State CNPS Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloeopsis aequans var. sonomensis</td>
<td>Sonoma alopecus</td>
<td>*'FE/None/1B</td>
<td>Marshes and swamps (MshSw) (freshwater), Riparian scrub (RpScr). 5 - 365 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorpha californica var. nagensis</td>
<td>Napa false indigo</td>
<td>'FSLC/None</td>
<td>Broadleafed upland forest (BUFrs) (openings), Chaparral (Chpfr), Cismontane woodland (CmWld). 120 - 2000 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsinckia lunaris</td>
<td>bent-flowered fiddleneck</td>
<td>'FSLC/None</td>
<td>Coastal bluff scrub (CbBlSc), Cismontane woodland (CmWld), Valley and foothill grassland (VFGrns). 3 - 500 meters</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos canescens ssp. sonomensis</td>
<td>Sonoma manzanita</td>
<td>*'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Chaparral (Chpfr), Lower montane coniferous forest (LCFrs) / sometimes serpentine. 180 - 1675 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos densiflora</td>
<td>Vine Hill manzanita</td>
<td>*'FSC/CE/1B</td>
<td>Chaparral (Chpfr) (acid marine sand). 50 - 120 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylosスタンフオリダータ ssp. decumbens</td>
<td>Rincon manzanita</td>
<td>*'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Chaparral (Chpfr) (phytotoxic), Cismontane woodland (CmWld). 75 - 370 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus claranus</td>
<td>Clara Hunt's milk-vetch</td>
<td>*'FE/CT/1B</td>
<td>Chaparral (Chpfr) (openings), Cismontane woodland (CmWld), Valley and foothill grassland (VFGrns) / serpentine or volcanic, rocky, clay. 75 - 275 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balsamorhiza macrolepis var. macrolepis</td>
<td>big-scale balsamroot</td>
<td>*'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Chaparral (Chpfr), Cismontane woodland (CmWld), Valley and foothill grassland (VFGrns) / sometimes serpentine. 90 - 1400 meters</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bienenosperma bakeri</td>
<td>Sonoma sunshine</td>
<td>*'FE/CE/1B</td>
<td>Valley and foothill grassland (VFGrns) (mesic), Vernal pools (VnPfs). 10 - 110 meters</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodiaea californica var. Isplandra</td>
<td>California brodiaea</td>
<td>*'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Broadleafed upland forest (BUFrs), Chaparral (Chpfr), Lower montane coniferous forest (LCFrs). 110 - 915 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calamagrostis bolanderi</td>
<td>Bolander's reed grass</td>
<td>'FSLC/None/4</td>
<td>Bogs and fens (BgFns), Broadleafed upland forest (BUFrs), Closed-cone coniferous forest (CCFrs), Coastal scrub (CoScr), Meadows and seeps (Medws) (mesic), Marshes and swamps (MshSw) (freshwater), North Coast coniferous forest (NCFrs) / mesic. 0 - 455 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calamagrostis crassiglumis</td>
<td>Thurber's reed grass</td>
<td>*'FSC/None/2</td>
<td>Coastal scrub (CoScr) (mesic), Marshes and swamps (MshSw) (freshwater). 10 - 45 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campanula californica</td>
<td>swamp harebell</td>
<td>*'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Bogs and fens (BgFns), Closed-cone coniferous forest (CCFrs), Coastal prairie (CoPr), Meadows and seeps (Medws), Marshes and swamps (MshSw) (freshwater), North Coast coniferous forest (NCFrs) / mesic. 1 - 405 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex albida</td>
<td>white sedge</td>
<td>*'FE/CE/1B</td>
<td>Bogs and fens (BgFns), Marshes and swamps (MshSw) (freshwater). 15 - 90 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilleja uliginosa</td>
<td>Pitkin Marsh Indian paintbrush</td>
<td>*'None/CE/1A</td>
<td>Marshes and swamps (MshSw) (freshwater). 60 - 60 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceanothus confusus</td>
<td>Rincon Ridge ceanothis</td>
<td>*'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Closed-cone coniferous forest (CCFrs), Chaparral (Chpfr), Cismontane woodland (CmWld) / volcanic or serpentine. 75 - 1065 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceanothus divergens</td>
<td>Calistoga ceanothis</td>
<td>*'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Chaparral (Chpfr) (serpentine or volcanic, rocky). 170 - 950 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceanothus foliosus var. vineaeus</td>
<td>Vine Hill ceanothis</td>
<td>*'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Chaparral (Chpfr). 45 - 365 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceanothus sonomensis</td>
<td>Sonoma ceanothis</td>
<td>*'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Chaparral (Chpfr) (sandy, serpentine or volcanic). 215 - 800 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorizanthe valida</td>
<td>Sonoma spinflower</td>
<td>'FSC/CE/1B</td>
<td>Coastal prairie (CoPr). 10 - 305 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkia imbricata</td>
<td>Vine Hill clarkia</td>
<td>*'FE/CE/1B</td>
<td>Chaparral (Chpfr), Valley and foothill grassland (VFGrns) / acidic sandy loam. 50 - 75 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphinium tatumum</td>
<td>yellow larkspur</td>
<td>'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Chaparral (Chpfr), Coastal prairie (CoPr), Coastal scrub (CoScr) / rocky. 0 - 100 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downingia puziloi</td>
<td>dwarf downingia</td>
<td>*'None/Non/2/</td>
<td>Valley and foothill grassland (VFGrns) (mesic), Vernal pools (VnPfs). 1 - 445 meters</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritillaria tripica</td>
<td>fragrant fritillary</td>
<td>'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Cismontane woodland (CmWld), Coastal prairie (CoPr), Coastal scrub (CoScr), Valley and foothill grassland (VFGrns) / often serpentine. 3 - 410 meters</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemizonia congesta ssp. leucocaphala</td>
<td>Hayfield tarplant</td>
<td>*'None/None/3</td>
<td>Coastal scrub (CoScr), Valley and foothill grassland (VFGrns). 25 - 425 meters</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hookeria brunnobracts</td>
<td>thin-lobed horkelia</td>
<td>*'FSC/None/1B</td>
<td>Broadleafed upland forest (BUFrs), Chaparral (Chpfr), Valley and foothill grassland (VFGrns) / mesic openings, sandy. 50 - 500 meters</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasthenia burkei</td>
<td>Burke's goldfields</td>
<td>*'FE/CE/1B</td>
<td>Meadows and seeps (Medws) (mesic), Vernal pools (VnPfs). 15 - 600 meters</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Habitat Types

TABLE 3.6-2
Special Status Plant Species Potentially Occurring Within the BSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal/State/ CNPS Status*</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lasthenia macrantha ssp. bakeri</td>
<td>Baker's goldfields</td>
<td>FSCL/None/ IB</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legenere limosa</td>
<td>Legenere</td>
<td>²FSCL/None/ 1B</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium pardalimum ssp. pilikiræa</td>
<td>Pilikin Marsh lily</td>
<td>²FE/CE/ 1B</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linanthus vinculans</td>
<td>Sebasapol meadowfoam</td>
<td>²FE/CE/ 1B</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linanthus jepsonii</td>
<td>Jepson's linanthus</td>
<td>²FSCL/None/ 1B</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microseris paludos</td>
<td>marsh microseris</td>
<td>²FSCL/None/ 1B</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarretia leucocarpa ssp. bakeri</td>
<td>Baker's navarretia</td>
<td>²FSCL/None/ 1B</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarretia leucocarpa ssp. plicantha</td>
<td>many-flowered navarretia</td>
<td>²FE/CE/ 1B</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perideridia gairdneri ssp. gairdneri</td>
<td>Gairdner's yampah</td>
<td>None/ None/ 4</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluimpogon hoovenanus</td>
<td>northcoast semaphore grass</td>
<td>FSCT/ 1B</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pogonome douglasi</td>
<td>Douglas's poppy</td>
<td>None/ None/ None</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranunculus ibbiti</td>
<td>Lobb's aquatic buttercup</td>
<td>None/ None/ 4</td>
<td>Occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora alba</td>
<td>white beaked-rush</td>
<td>²None/None/ 2</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora californica</td>
<td>California beaked-rush</td>
<td>²FSCL/None/ 1B</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora capitellata</td>
<td>brownish beaked-rush</td>
<td>²None/None/ 2</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhynchospora globularis var. globularis</td>
<td>round-headed beaked-rush</td>
<td>²None/None/ 2</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifolium amoenum</td>
<td>showy indian clover</td>
<td>²FE/None/ 1B</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifolium depauperatum var. hydropthium</td>
<td>saline clover</td>
<td>²FSCL/None/ 1B</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Habitat

Northern Hardpan Vernal Pool
- A low, amphibious, herbaceous community dominated by annual herbs and grasses. Germination and growth begin with winter rains, often continuing even when inundated. Rising spring temperatures evaporate the pools, leaving concentric bands of vegetation that colorfully encircle the drying pool.
- Potentially could occur.

Northern Vernal Pool
- Wetland habitat that is seasonally flooded, seasonally saturated.
- Potentially could occur.

Coastal and Valley Freshwater Marsh
- Dominated by perennial, emergent monocots to 4-5m tall. Often forming completely closed canopies. Scirpus and Typha dominated types and their environmental and floristic distinctions require clarification.
- Unlikely to occur.

Valley Needlegrass Grassland
- A midheight (to 2 feet) grassland dominated by perennial, tussock-forming Nassella pulchra. Native and introduced annuals occur between the perennials, often actually exceeding the bunchgrasses in cover. Usually on fine-textured (often clay) soils, moist or even waterlogged during winter, but very dry in summer. Often interdigitates with Oak Woodlands on moister, better drained sites.
- Potentially could occur.
### TABLE 3.6-3
Special Status Wildlife Species Potentially Occurring Within the BSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal/ State/ CNPS Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncorhynchus mykiss</td>
<td>Central California Coastal steelhead</td>
<td>FT/None</td>
<td>Cool, clear fast moving streams with an abundance of riffles</td>
<td>Not going to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invertebrates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carcereopsis patasemon susp</td>
<td>Sonoma arctic skimmer</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Freshwater shrimps, pond habitats scattered around the San Francisco Bay area, including Sonoma county</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrochara rickseckii</td>
<td>Ricksecker's water scavenger beetle</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Pond habitats scattered around the San Francisco Bay area, including Sonoma county</td>
<td>Not going to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linderella occidentalis</td>
<td>California linderella fairy shrimp</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Inhabit clear to tea-colored water in seasonal ponds, which range in size from square feet to many acres, and are typically located in grasslands or in depressions of sedimentary rock.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syncaris pacifica</td>
<td>Freshwater shrimp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pool areas of low-gradient, low-gradient streams, among exposed live tree roots (e.g., willows and alders) of undercut banks, overhanging woody debris, or overhanging vegetation.</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur, although adjacent Colgan Creek may provide suitable habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reptiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrynosa coronatum</td>
<td>California horned lizard</td>
<td>FSC/CSC</td>
<td>A variety of habitats, ranging from areas with an exposed gravelly-sandy substrate containing scattered shrubs (e.g. California buck wheat), to clearings in riparian woodlands, to dry uniform chamise chaparral, to annual grassland with scattered perennial scumweed (Suaeda fruticosa) or saltbush (Atriplex polycarpa).</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Adjacent Colgan Creek may provide suitable habitat, species could migrate onto site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emys (=Clemmys)</td>
<td>Northwestern pond turtle</td>
<td>FSC/CSC</td>
<td>Require some slack- or slow-water aquatic habitat. Often reach higher densities where many aerial and aquatic basking sites are available. Hatchlings require shallow water habitat with relatively dense submergent or short emergent vegetation in which to forage. Also require an upland oviposition site (high clay or silt fraction soil, on an unshaded slope) in the vicinity of the aquatic site.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Suitable breeding habitat exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amphibians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambystoma californiense</td>
<td>California tiger salamander</td>
<td>FT/CSC</td>
<td>Breeds in freshwater ponds or vernal pools, in association with upland areas with small mammal burrows.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Suitable breeding habitat exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana aurora aurora</td>
<td>Northern red-legged frog</td>
<td>FSC/CSC</td>
<td>Dense, shubby riparian vegetation associated with deep (0.7 m), still or slow-moving water. The shubby riparian vegetation that structurally seems to be most suitable for California red-legged frogs is that provided by arrow willow (Salix lasiolepis); cattails (Typha sp.) and bulrushes (Scirpus sp.) also provide suitable habitat.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Adjacent Colgan Creek may provide suitable habitat, species could migrate onto site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana boyli</td>
<td>Foothill yellow-legged frog</td>
<td>FSC/CSC</td>
<td>Shallow, flowing water, apparently preferentially in small to moderate-sized streams situations with at least some cobble-sized substrate.</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipiter cooperi</td>
<td>Cooper's hawk</td>
<td>None/CSC</td>
<td>Dense stands of live-oak, riparian deciduous, or other forest habitats near water used most frequently.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipiter striatus</td>
<td>Sharp-shinned hawk</td>
<td>None/CSC</td>
<td>All habitats except alpine, open prairie, and bare desert used in winter. Breeds in ponderosa pine, black oak, riparian deciduous, mixed conifer, and Jeffrey pine habitats. Prefers, but not restricted to, riparian habitats.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agelaius tricolor</td>
<td>Tricolored blackbird</td>
<td>FSC/CSC</td>
<td>Breeds near fresh water, preferably in emergent wetland with tall, dense cattails or tules, but also in thickets of willow, blackberry, wild rose, tall herbs. Feeds in grassland and cropland habitats.</td>
<td>Potentially could not occur. No suitable breeding habitat, could potentially use grassland to forage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athene cunicularia</td>
<td>Western burrowing owl</td>
<td>FSC/CSC</td>
<td>Open, dry grassland and desert habitats, and in grass, forb and open shrub stages of pinyon-juniper and ponderosa pine habitats.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Grassland provides potentially suitable nesting and foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baeolophus inornatus</td>
<td>Oak titmouse</td>
<td>FSCO/None</td>
<td>Occurs in montane hardwood-conifer, montane hardwood, blue, valley, and coastal oak woodlands, and montane and valley foothill riparian habitats in cismontane California.</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaetura vauxi</td>
<td>Vaux's swift</td>
<td>FSC/CSC</td>
<td>Prefers redwood and Douglas-fir habitats with nest-sites in large hollow trees and snags, especially tall, burned-out stubs.</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur. No suitable habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circus cyaneus</td>
<td>Northern harrier</td>
<td>None/CSC</td>
<td>Frequentst meadows, grasslands, open rangelands, desert sinks, fresh and saltwater emergent wetlands. Mostly found in flat, or hummocky, open areas of tall, dense grasses, moist or dry shrubs, and edges for nesting, cover, and feeding.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coccyclus americanus occidentalis</td>
<td>Western yellow-billed cuckoo</td>
<td>FC/CE</td>
<td>Inhabits extensive deciduous riparian thickets or forests with dense, low-level or understory foliage, and which abut on slow-moving watercourses, backwaters, or seeps. Willow almost always a dominant component of the vegetation.</td>
<td>Unlikely to occur. No suitable habitat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.6
Special Status Wildlife Species Potentially Occurring Within the BSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal/State/National</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Corynorhinus</em> (=<em>Plecptus</em>) <em>leucodon</em></td>
<td>Allen's hummingbird</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Uses habitats that provide nectar-producing flowers, such as valley foothill hardwood, valley foothill hardwood-conifer, riparian, and various chaparral habitats. In migration, flocks with other swallows over many open habitats.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Suitable breeding habitat not present, could use grassland for foraging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cypseloides nigripennis</em></td>
<td>Black swift</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Nests have been found only on cliffs behind or adjacent to waterfalls or steep coastal cliffs. If there are suitable nest sites for breeding, will forage over almost any terrain and habitat.</td>
<td>No suitable breeding habitat, may use grassland for foraging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Elanus leucurus</em></td>
<td>Rufous hummingbird</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Uses habitats that provide nectar-producing flowers, such as valley foothill hardwood, valley foothill hardwood-conifer, riparian, and various chaparral habitats. In migration, flocks with other swallows over many open habitats.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Suitable breeding habitat not present, could use grassland for foraging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Empidonaxfellax</em></td>
<td>White-rumped shrike</td>
<td>FD/CE</td>
<td>In summer, restricted to riparian, lacustrine, and coastal areas with vertical banks, bluffs, and cliffs with fine-textured or sandy soils, into which it digs nest holes. In migration, forages over many open habitats.</td>
<td>No suitable nesting habitat, may use grassland for foraging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Falco peregrinus</em></td>
<td>Loggerhead kite</td>
<td>FT/CE</td>
<td>Breeds mostly in woodland, forest, and coastal habitats. Riparian areas and coastal and inland wetlands are important habitats year-round, especially in non-breeding seasons. Breeds near wetlands, lakes, rivers, or other water on high cliffs, banks, dunes, mounds. Nest is a scrape on a depression or ledge in an open site. Will nest on human-made structures, and occasionally uses tree or snag cavities or old nests of other raptors.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. May use grassland to forage, suitable nesting habitat not present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</em></td>
<td>Bald eagle</td>
<td>FT/CE</td>
<td>Requires large bodies of water, or free flowing rivers with abundant fish, and adjacent snags or other perches. Nests in large, old-growth, or dominant live tree with open branchwork, especially ponderosa pine.</td>
<td>No suitable breeding habitat, may use grassland for foraging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lanius ludovicianus</em></td>
<td>Loggerhead shrike</td>
<td>FSC/CSC</td>
<td>Prefers open habitats with scattered shrubs, trees, posts, fences, utility lines, or other perches. Highest density occurs in open-canopied valley foothill hardwood, valley foothill hardwood-conifer, valley foothill riparian, pinyon-juniper, juniper, desert riparian, and Joshua tree habitats.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Suitable breeding habitat not present, could use grassland for foraging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Melanerpes lewis</em></td>
<td>Lewis’ woodpecker</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Suitable habitat includes open, deciduous and conifer habitats with brushy understory, and scattered snags and trees for nesting and perching. Uses logged and burned areas. Prefers oaks and acorns in winter.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Suitable breeding habitat not present, could use grassland for foraging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mergus stictonotus</em></td>
<td>Northern spotted owl</td>
<td>FT/None</td>
<td>Lives in a variety of communities, including coastal conifer and broad-leaf forests, oak and conifer woodlands, and grasslands and deserts, and high-elevation forests and meadows. Known nest sites include: limestone caves, lava tubes, mine tunnels, buildings, and other human-made structures.</td>
<td>No suitable nesting habitat, may use grassland for foraging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Myotis volans</em></td>
<td>Pacific western big-eared bat</td>
<td>FSC/GSC</td>
<td>Breeds mostly in woodland, forest, and coastal habitats. Riparian areas and coastal and inland wetlands are important habitats year-round, especially in non-breeding seasons. Breeds near wetlands, lakes, rivers, or other water on high cliffs, banks, dunes, mounds. Nest is a scrape on a depression or ledge in an open site. Will nest on human-made structures, and occasionally uses tree or snag cavities or old nests of other raptors.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. May use grassland to forage, suitable nesting habitat not present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Myotis phyllops</em></td>
<td>Long-eared myotis bat</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Inhabits herbaceous and open stages of most habitats mostly in xeromontane California. Forages in undisturbed, open grasslands, meadows, terrains and emergent wetlands.</td>
<td>No suitable breeding habitat, may use grassland for foraging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Myotis yumanensis</em></td>
<td>Yuma myotis bat</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Suitable habitat includes open, deciduous and conifer habitats with brushy understory, and scattered snags and trees for nesting and perching. Uses logged and burned areas. Prefers oaks and acorns in winter.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Suitable breeding habitat not present, could use grassland for foraging.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mammals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal/State/National</th>
<th>Habitat Description</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Corvus auratus</em> (=<em>Plectus</em>) <em>townsendii</em> <em>townsendii</em></td>
<td>Pacific western big-eared bat</td>
<td>FSC/GSC</td>
<td>Live in a variety of communities, including coastal conifer and broad-leaf forests, oak and conifer woodlands, and grasslands and deserts, and high-elevation forests and meadows. Known nest sites include: limestone caves, lava tubes, mine tunnels, buildings, and other human-made structures.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eumops perotis californicus</em></td>
<td>Greater western mastiff bat</td>
<td>FSC/CSC</td>
<td>Designed in many open, semi-arid to arid habitats, including conifer and deciduous woodlands, coastal scrub, arroyal and perennial grasslands, palm oases, chaparral, desert scrub, and urban.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Myotis evotis</em></td>
<td>Long-eared myotis bat</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Found in nearly all brush, woodland, and forest habitats, from sea level to at least 2700 m (9000 ft), but dense hardwoods and forests seem to be preferred. This species roosts in buildings, crevices, spaces under bark, and snags.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Myotis graysoni</em></td>
<td>Fringed myotis bat</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Optimal habitats are pinyon-juniper, valley foothill hardwood and hardwood-conifer. Roosts in caves, mines, buildings, and crevices.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Myotis volans</em></td>
<td>Long-eared myotis bat</td>
<td>FSC/None</td>
<td>Woodlands and forests above 4,000 feet; also forages in chaparral, coastal scrub, Great Basin shrub habitats, and early successional woodlands and forests.</td>
<td>Potentially could occur. Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential to Occur

- **Suitable habitat not present:**
  - Suitable breeding habitat not present, could use grassland for foraging.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.
- **No suitable breeding habitat:**
  - Suitable breeding habitat not present, could use grassland for foraging.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.
- **Potentially could occur:**
  - Suitable breeding habitat not present, could use grassland for foraging.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.
  - Buildings provide potentially suitable habitat.

---

**Note:** The table above provides a summary of the potential occurrence of various wildlife species within the BSA, indicating their potential to occur in certain habitats. The potential for occurrence is assessed based on the species' requirements and the availability of suitable habitat within the specified geographic area. The table includes scientific names, common names, and habitat details, along with potential for occurrence categories. The potential for occurrence is categorized as 'Potentially could occur,' 'No suitable breeding habitat,' or 'No suitable nesting habitat.'
TABLE 3.6-3
Special Status Wildlife Species Potentially Occurring Within the BSA

Notes:
Likelihood of Occurrence codes:
Occurs: This species is known to occur on-site.
Likely to Occur: Although there are no known records of this species, the habitat and the species distribution make it likely that this species could occur on-site.
Potentially could occur: The general habitat used by this species could occur on some of the parcels, although due to habitat fragmentation, quality, and species distribution in is not likely to occur.
Unlikely to Occur: The type of habitat used by this species is unlikely to occur on-site, however not all of the parcels have been completely studied enough to completely exclude it as a possibility.
Not going to occur: This species will not occur on-site, the type of habitat used by this species does not occur in the project area.

Source
* = California Department of Fish and Game. California Natural Diversity Database "Rarefind", species presence confirmed within 5 miles. Sebastopol and Santa Rosa U.S. Geographical Survey 7.5' Quadrangles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Codes:</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Status</td>
<td>FE – Federally listed as endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FPE – Federally proposed as endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT – Federally listed as threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTP – Federally proposed as threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FC – Federal candidate species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO – Federal Delisted Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FSC – Federal species of concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FSOC – Federal species of local concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Status</td>
<td>CE – State listed as endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT – State listed as threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSC – State Special Concern Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Status Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A – Plants presumed extinct in California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B – Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Plants about which we need more information – a review list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Plants of limited distribution – a watch list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Codes: California Department of Fish and Game. California Natural Diversity Database "Rarefind", species presence confirmed within 5 miles. Sebastopol and Santa Rosa U.S. Geographical Survey 7.5' Quadrangles.
Adult and juvenile CTS surveys were conducted during the winter and spring of 2001 to 2002 within the BSA, except for the Phase 1 Project area, due to the lack of wetlands on that portion of the property. Larval studies were conducted during the 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 winter-spring survey periods. Survey methods are described in the BA, included in Appendix F.

No adult, juvenile or larval CTS were observed within the BSA during any of the surveys. Only one seasonal wetland, approximately 50 feet by 75 feet on parcel 043-191-019 (Nelson property), was identified as providing potential breeding habitat; however, no CTS have been recorded in this wetland feature during 3 years of surveying.

Barriers to CTS dispersal onto the BSA are discussed in detail in the BA. A known population of breeding CTS is located approximately 1,250 feet west of the Project Area located at the seasonal wetland in Southwest Community Park and potential breeding sites north of the Project site. Partial and full barriers to CTS dispersal from these areas exist around much of the Project site, including heavy traffic and curbs on Hearn Avenue and Bellevue Avenue, traffic on Dutton Meadow Avenue, office buildings, and walls and impassable fences in new adjacent developments.

The BSA 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 2003a). Mounds and debris piles were found in the immediate vicinity of buildings that included the abandoned homes and miscellaneous associated storage at the west end of the BSA, adjacent to Dutton Meadow Avenue. A relatively high density of mounds was also found at the northeastern end of the BSA adjacent to and within parcel 043-191-019 (Nelson property). The underground tunnels and burrows constitute potential aestivation habitat. There was a notable absence of small mammal (gopher or mole) mounds in the interior area of the BSA, suggesting that the BSA may not represent ideal CTS aestivation habitat (Olberding 2003a).

If CTS attempt to move from the east or south onto the Project site, 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. The Project site is surrounded by urban residential and commercially developed lands and does not contain particularly favorable CTS habitat characteristics. For example, it is separated from the only known CTS breeding pond in the immediate area by Meadow View Elementary School and Dutton Meadow, lacks well-developed aestivation habitat because of the absence of abundant burrows, and has no known on-site breeding. Surveys to date for larval, juvenile, and adult CTS, furthermore, have had only negative results. Potential physical barriers to inbound and outbound CTS migration exist in all directions around the Project site. Nevertheless, most of the Project site contains annual grassland habitat and burrows used by small mammals that cannot be ruled out as potentially suitable upland habitat. As a result, approximately 56.18 acres (54.43 acres on the BSA and 1.75 on the Curran parcel) of the Project site provides potentially suitable aestivation habitat for CTS adults and juveniles to spend the non-breeding season.
Raptors
A pair of white-tailed kites has been observed using the orchard trees on parcel 043-191-019 (Nelson property) to roost and preen. Potential nesting habitat includes the eucalyptus and oak trees within the BSA and in the trees east of the Project site.

Suitable nesting habitat for the Cooper’s and sharp-shinned hawk is not present on the Project site. The northern harrier could potentially nest within the grassland habitat at the site. However, given the continual disturbance created by discing, grazing, and similar activities, it is unlikely that the site would be used for nesting.

The eucalyptus trees on the southeastern side of the BSA and the grasslands are potential nest sites for red-tailed hawks. The American kestrel could potentially use the cavities in the eucalyptus and oak trees within the Project site for nesting, and may also use the grasslands for foraging.

The entire Project site is suitable for hunting raptor species due to the presence of grassland habitat.

California Linderiella
California linderiella occurs in vernal pools on the Santa Rosa Plain. The seasonal wetlands within the BSA occur in shallow topographic depressions that appear unlikely to provide habitat for this 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 Santa Rosa Plain Vernal Pool Ecosystem Preservation Plan (Olberding 2003a).

Seasonal wetlands within the BSA occur in shallow, topographic depressions that are unlikely to pond water into June. The deeper portions of the eastern-most wetland located on parcel 043-191-019 (Nelson property) may provide suitable habitat for California Linderiella. In 2003, the seasonal wetland at this location was observed to be inundated through May. This species has not been observed within the BSA. Invertebrate surveys were not conducted, and will need to be completed prior to construction.

Western Pond Turtle
The western pond turtle inhabits areas associated with primarily permanent or semipermanent 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 Project site’s uplands and wetlands, no suitable habitat for the western pond turtle occurs within the BSA.

However, Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel, located along the southeastern border of the Project site, 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 BSA.

3.6.2 Standards of Significance
An impact to vegetation, wildlife or habitat will be considered significant if implementation of the Project results in any of the following:
• Substantial loss of valley oaks
• Substantial loss of or damage to sensitive communities and/or threatened, endangered and special-status plants and animals and/or their habitat
• Substantial loss or alteration of wetlands or vernal pools
• Substantial reduction in the number or restriction in the range of California tiger salamander
• Substantial loss of raptor nesting habitat
• Introduction of exotic plants and domestic animals to sensitive habitat areas
• Substantial loss of grassland foraging area for sensitive bird species known to occur within the Project area

3.6.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potential impacts include direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to vegetation, wildlife or habitat. Direct impacts may be short- or long-term and occur when biological resources are altered, destroyed, or removed during the course of Project construction, including removal of vegetation by grading or filling, loss of individual trees from habitat clearing or construction-related activities, loss of wildlife foraging, nesting, or burrowing habitat, and habitat disturbance that results in unfavorable substrate conditions for natural vegetation regeneration. Indirect impacts may also be short-or long-term, and occur when Project-related activities affect biological resources indirectly through erosion, sedimentation, toxic spills, or increased levels of human disturbance.

Applicable impacts evaluated in the Master EIR and their mitigation measures are incorporated into this Draft SEIR by reference, and include the following:

**Master EIR Impact 3.2.3-5.** Introduction of exotic plants and domestic animals to sensitive wetlands outside of the direct impact area during grading activities, determined to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.3-5.** To minimize the expansion of exotic plants or animals into wetlands adjacent to proposed residential development, native plant species should be used for reseeding. Landscaping using native plant species near appropriate buffer areas, and control measures for domestic cats should be implemented in accordance with wetlands mitigation and management plans.

**Master EIR Impact 3.2.3-6.** Loss of grassland foraging area for sensitive bird species known to occur within the Southwest Area Plan, determined to be an unavoidable significant impact. No mitigation was provided.

**Master EIR Impact 3.2.3-10.** Adverse affects on water quality in creeks and intermittent drainages due to construction activity and activities associated with proposed Project and infrastructure improvements, determined to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

---

6 Per the 2004 amendment to Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.
Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.3-10. Construction practices which would avoid siltation or contamination of watercourses would reduce this impact to insignificant.

Applicable mitigation measures included in the Master EIR for these impacts will be implemented for the proposed Project. These mitigation measures are listed in the Initial Study, which is included as Appendix A to this document. Potential impacts from the proposed Project not previously evaluated in the Master EIR, including site-specific impacts, are discussed below.

3.6.3.1 Project Impacts

Impact 3.6-1 Implementation of the Project would result in loss of valley oaks and other native trees.

Analysis: Significant

As described above, the Phase 1 component of the proposed Project contains 47 trees, including 9 valley oaks and 14 other native trees (redwood \(\text{Sequoia sempervirens}\), Monterey pine \(\text{Pinus radiata}\), and willows \(\text{Salix sp}\)). Construction activities will require removal of 8 of the valley oaks and 10 of the other native trees (Horticultural Associates 2001). In addition, 11 of the 23 non-native trees present will be removed.

The Phase 2 Minoa site contains 30 trees, including one redwood, two valley oak \(\text{quercus lobata}\), and one Monterey pine. Construction of Phase 2 Minoa would result in the removal of 25 trees, including the redwood, valley oak, and Monterey pine (Horticultural Associates 2004b).

The Phase 5 Dutton Village site contains 8 trees. Construction of Phase 5 Dutton Village would result in the removal of one black walnut \(\text{Juglans nigra}\) and two eucalyptus trees \(\text{Eucalyptus globulus}\) (Horticultural Associates 2004a).

Other Project components may contain valley oaks and other native trees that would be removed during Project implementation.

Loss of valley oaks and other native trees is a potentially significant impact. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 below, potential impacts to oak trees and other native trees would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-1a. Replace trees in accordance the City Code Chapter 17-24-Trees (Redevelopment EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.3-1c as modified below.) All trees impacted by the Project will be replaced in accordance with City Code Chapter 17-24 – Trees, which 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. Based on the replacement ratio in effect at this time, a total of 190 mitigation replacement trees are required for the Phase 1 Project component. Native trees shall be replaced with native tree species. Non-native trees may be replaced by either native or non-native tree species. Trees will be replaced onsite where feasible, offsite when approved by the Department of Parks and Recreation, or by payment of cash in-lieu of tree replacement, as allowed by City Code Chapter 17-24.

The City Code replacement ratio shall also be implemented for tree removal from the other Project phases. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a tree replacement plan shall be
submitted to and approved by the Santa Rosa 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.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-1b. Use tree preservation notes on all improvement, grading and building plans. In order to protect trees that will not be removed as part of the Project, 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 by Horticultural Associates. Contact Horticultural Associates at (707) 935-3911 or Department of Community Development at (707) 543-3258 for a copy of the Guidelines."

The General Tree Preservation Guidelines are attached to the tree reports completed for the Phase 1, Phase 2 Minoia, and Phase 5 Dutton Village development projects. All trees to be preserved and trees to be removed shall be shown on improvement plans, grading plans and building plans.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-1c. Require application of Best Management Practices during construction (Redevelopment EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.3-1b as modified below). The City of Santa Rosa will require the application of Best Management Practices (BMP) during construction within the Southwest Plan Area to reduce impacts to valley oaks. The trees that shall be avoided and protected during construction include any isolated oak tree that has a diameter six inches or greater as measured 4.5 feet above the ground.

Best Management Practices should be included in the plans and specifications for the Southwest Plan Area projects. These should be reviewed in pre-construction meetings with the City of Santa Rosa staff, the City’s contractor, and qualified biologists and should, at a minimum, include the following provisions:

- Construction drawings shall accurately locate areas to be avoided such as tree trunks and root protection zones.
- Prior to construction, the root-protection zone (1.5 times the canopy area) of sensitive trees shall be fenced using wire mesh fencing.
- Construction staging areas shall be designated on plans and prohibit parking, loading, and grading during all construction activities within root zones of all trees.
- A pre-construction meeting conference shall be held with contractors to review BMPs and require bonding and fines to ensure the replacement of any inadvertently damaged trees.
- Existing grade shall be maintained within the fenced portion of the dripline. Route drainage swales and underground work outside the dripline where possible.
- A 4” layer of chipped bark mulch should be placed over the soil surface within the fenced dripline prior to installing temporary fencing. Suitable mulch must contain bark ‘fines’. Maintain this layer of mulch throughout construction.
3.0 SETTING, IMPACT ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES
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- If pruning is necessary, pruning should be done to clean and raise canopy per International Society of Arboriculture pruning standards.

- A tree specialist shall be consulted during design to accurately locate root protection zones and identify other specific measures that would limit potential indirect impacts on trees that may be encroached upon.

- A drainage plan shall be designed that will avoid oak trees to be preserved.

*After Mitigation: Less than Significant*

**Impact 3.6-2 Implementation of the Project would result in loss of wetland habitat.**

*Analysis: Significant*

Construction of residential, commercial and public and private infrastructure projects would require fill of the 4.37 acres of disturbed, low-quality seasonal wetlands present in the Master Development Plan Area. The wetlands do not support any state or federally listed threatened or endangered plants. The on-site and adjacent off-site wetlands are hydrologically and ecologically isolated from any high-quality wetlands and are isolated from surrounding natural open-space habitat. Nevertheless, loss of wetland habitat is a potentially significant impact. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-2 below, potential impacts to wetlands would be less than significant.

Offsite mitigation may be required for future projects on parcel 043-071-028 (Curran property), which is part of the Rezoning Action. The mitigation proposed here does not include mitigation for loss of any potential wetlands on this parcel.

**Mitigation Measure 3.6-2a. Avoid or minimize impacts to wetland resources (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.3-3a).** Impacts to wetland resources shall be avoided or minimized by the following measures:

- 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.

- Minimizing or reducing the size and area of site improvements within such wetland areas.

- Restricting the size and areas of construction sites within such wetland areas.

- Using Best Management Practices to control erosion and sedimentation

**Mitigation Measure 3.6-2b. Preserve and create new wetland habitat offsite.** The total area of wetlands to be impacted by development of the Project is 4.37 acres. Onsite mitigation (construction or restoration) is not considered preferable because the Project area is isolated from all surrounding wetlands. Mitigation for wetland impacts would be offset at an approximately 1.25:1 ratio (1.25 acre of mitigation for 1 acre of impact) for a total creation or enhancement of 5.77 acres of seasonal wetlands and/or vernal pools (Rich 2004). Wetland mitigation would involve the creation and restoration of wetlands, which would also serve as potential CTS breeding ponds, on the Gobbi Ranch property to create the Gobbi Preserve No. 2. Maps showing the location of the preserve site are included in Attachment 1 of the BA. Additional information on the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 is included in Section 3.6.4 below.
Mitigation Measure 3.6-2c. Transfer mitigation responsibilities to new property owners. The following conditions of approval (or similar conditions that have the same purpose and intent as determined by the Director of the Department of Community Development) shall be incorporated as part of the project approval:

a. **Advisement.** The applicant, its successors, heirs, assigns or transferees are advised in writing that this approval or permit prior to the start of any construction may be subject to certain other clearances, approvals, permits, or authorizations by state and/or federal agencies. The applicant shall acknowledge in writing receipt of the above advisement.

b. **Mitigation requirement.** The City's approval or permit is valid only if the applicant, its successors, heirs, assigns or transferees, comply with the terms, conditions and mitigations set forth in any clearance, permit or approval except that any permit condition or mitigation that requires project redesign shall trigger a review by the City of Santa Rosa Director of Community Development to determine if the project as redesigned is consistent with the original approval. A project that the City determines is not consistent with the City approval shall not be granted subsequent entitlements, such as approval of improvement plans and final maps, but excluding grading or building permits of any type. Such a project would have to be resubmitted to the City and reviewed by the City as a new project, including the submittal of a new application and fees.

c. **Power to stop work if violation occurs.** Nothing in this approval shall prevent the City of Santa Rosa from exercising its power to stop work in instances where a violation of state or federal law is brought to the City's attention.

d. **No building or grading permit of any type shall be issued by the City until a required federal or state, as applicable, clearance or authorization, with or without conditions, has been filed with the City.**

Mitigation Measure 3.6-2d. Obtain appropriate permits for fill of wetlands. (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.3-3b as modified below). For wetland impacts that cannot be avoided or minimized, project developers will prepare a mitigation and monitoring plan in consultation with USFWS and CDFG to replace or restore lost wetland according standards set forth by these agencies, and obtain as necessary a Section 404 permit to place fill in wetlands from the USACE. If a Section 404 permit is required, a Section 401 certification or waiver will be obtained from the RWQCB. If wetlands are determined to be not jurisdictional, the RWQCB may establish Waste Discharge Requirements or provide a Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements under the state Porter-Cologne Act.

**After Mitigation: Less than Significant**

**Impact 3.6-3 Implementation of the Project would result in loss of California tiger salamander aestivation habitat.**

**Analysis: Significant**

The Project site is surrounded by urban residential and commercially developed lands and does not provide particularly good habitat for the CTS. For example, it is separated from the only known CTS breeding pond in the immediate area by Meadow View Elementary School and Dutton Meadows Avenue and lacks well-developed aestivation habitat because...
of the absence of abundant burrows. The BSA has no known on-site breeding, and surveys to date for larval, juvenile, and adult CTS have had only negative results. Nevertheless, most of the Project site contains annual grassland habitat and burrows used by small mammals that cannot be ruled out as potentially suitable upland habitat. Therefore, approximately 54.43 acres of potential CTS aestivation habitat in the BSA would be removed by construction of the proposed Project.

Loss of the potential CTS aestivation habitat would be a significant impact. Mitigation Measure 3.6-3 described below and Mitigation Measure 3.6-2b (Preserve and create new wetland habitat offsite) and 3.6-2c (Transfer mitigation responsibilities to new property owners) described above would reduce the level of impacts.

Up to an additional 1.75 acres of CTS aestivation habitat is present on parcel 043-071-028 (Curran property); however, no surveys of the Curran property have been conducted to date, and potential impacts to the habitat are unknown. Future evaluation of potential impacts and mitigation will be required if and when a project moves forward on this parcel.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-3. Preserve/enhance California tiger salamander aestivation habitat. Two possible alternatives to mitigate for loss of the remaining potential CTS aestivation habitat are onsite and offsite mitigation. The USFWS has identified variables that are critical in assessing CTS habitat quality, which include the following:

- Size of the site
- Past and current onsite land use
- Surrounding land use
- Traffic volumes on surrounding roads
- Onsite 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, onsite 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 potential habitat in the Project area 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 Project, several potential barriers to CTS dispersal occur between the Project area and the preserve. Furthermore, the area around Dutton Meadows represents habitat that has been fragmented by several recent urban developments, and the Project area is unlikely to be considered suitable aestivation habitat over the long term.

The location of the Project 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 Project area in the recovery of CTS is marginal due to the isolation of the Property from sustainable CTS breeding habitats. The Project area would not be considered the best choice to develop a CTS mitigation site due to the cumulative lack of required criteria as outlined above.
Therefore, offsite mitigation shall be required to offset the loss of potential CTS aestivation habitat. Mitigation of the 54.43 acres of assumed potential aestivation habitat in the Master Development Plan area is proposed that would result in the preservation of habitat currently occupied by CTS. The Project applicant shall preserve and enhance approximately 86 acres of aestivation habitat on the new Gobbi Preserve No. 2 mitigation site. The 108.8-acre preserve site currently contains 15.9 acres of wetlands/vernal pools and 92.9 acres of upland areas/annual grasslands. See Section 3.6.4 below for more information on the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 site. The Project applicant shall work with USFWS staff to substantiate and document the habitat quality at the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 site. The Project applicant has conducted the necessary surveys to complete the assessment needed for the USFWS to approve the use of the site for CTS mitigation (Rich 2004). Mitigation of wetlands and aestivation habitat at one site will have the added benefit of preserving aestivation habitat contiguous with existing seasonal wetlands and 5.77 acres of new and restored seasonal wetlands that could provide CTS breeding pond habitat.

Offsite mitigation for up to 1.75 acres of potential aestivation habitat will be required for future projects on parcel 043-071-028 (Curran property), which is part of the Rezoning Action. The mitigation proposed here does not include mitigation for loss of any potential aestivation habitat on this parcel from any future development.

The mitigation described above would preserve a greater amount of much higher quality CTS aestivation habitat than is found on the Project site. The Gobbi Preserve No. 2 currently contains three known and several potential CTS breeding ponds, approximately 86 acres of aestivation habitat, and known occurrences of CTS. The Gobbi Preserve No. 2 can support a much higher density of CTS than the Project site could. The Master Development Plan area does not contain breeding habitat; contains many barriers to CTS dispersal; and has no recorded sightings of CTS, including in two years of surveys. The mitigation would offset the impacts from the loss of the 54.43 acres in the Master Development Plan area. Although mitigation for loss of potential habitat on the Curran property has not been identified, should such loss occur, it is expected that a similar mitigation approach would offset the 1.75 acre loss. Therefore, with mitigation, implementation of the Project would not result in a substantial reduction in the number or restriction in the range of CTS (Jennings 2004b).

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.6-4. Implementation of the Project would result in the loss of potential California linderiella habitat.

Analysis: Significant

Because some of the wetlands in the BSA meet the criteria for suitable habitat for listed plants, the wetlands in the BSA may be potential California linderiella habitat. Potential impacts to California linderiella habitat are similar to those described under Impact 3.6-2 above for wetlands. Up to a total of 4.37 acres of potential California linderiella habitat would be filled for the proposed Project. However, Mitigation Measure 3.6-2 described above would provide new potential California linderiella habitat, and impacts to potential California linderiella habitat would be less than significant.
Mitigation Measures 3.6-2b (Preserve and create new wetland habitat offsite) and 3.6-2c (Transfer mitigation responsibilities to new property owners) described above would provide mitigation for California linderiella habitat.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.6-5. The Project would result in the loss of raptor nesting habitat.

Analysis: Less than Significant

The Project would result in the loss of individual trees potentially used for nesting by raptors. Impacts to trees are addressed in detail above under Impact 3.6-1. Tree habitat within the Project area is minimal and its loss as potential nesting habitat is not a significant impact. In addition, mitigation for trees described in Mitigation Measures 3.6-1a and 3.6-1b above and Mitigation Measure 3.6-5 below will further reduce this impact.

Mitigation Measures 3.6-1a (Replace trees in accordance the City Code Chapter 17-24-Trees) and 3.6-1b (Use tree preservation notes on all improvement, grading and building plans) described above would provide mitigation for raptor nesting habitat.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-5. Provide protection of nesting migratory birds (Redevelopment EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.3-9 as modified below.) Pre-construction surveys will be conducted for nesting raptors within 500 feet of construction activities a minimum of 48 and 24 hours before Project construction activities. Nest searches will be conducted in December/January (if not earlier) before site construction begins and the vegetation within construction area will be removed and/or mowed between August 31 and February 1 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 moved by a qualified biologist. If nesting birds with eggs or young are found during the surveys, one or more of the following measures may be implemented:

- An exclusion zone will be established around nests with eggs or young; the need for and size of the exclusion zone is based on factors such as species sensitivity, topography, and proximity to roads and buildings
- Construction activities in the area will be postponed until young are fledged
- The Biological Monitor will monitor the birds on the nest and stop construction if it appears that the birds will abandon the nest or young
- In consultation with CDFG, the nests could be relocated to a nearby area or to an approved wildlife rehabilitation center

To minimize the potential for birds to nest in the construction area, nest searches can be conducted and tree removal and other vegetation removal can be done between October 1 and February 1. This shall be noted on improvement plans, grading plans and building plans.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.6-6. Implementation of the Project could result in the loss of special-status plant species and special-status plant habitat.
Analysis: Significant

Lobb’s aquatic buttercup, a non-listed special-status species (CNPS List 4), occurs in a single seasonal wetland within the Project area. The wetland would be filled during Project construction and loss of this special-status plant population could be a potentially significant impact. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-6 (below), as well as Mitigation Measures 3.6-2 and 3.6-3 described above, potential impacts would be less than significant.

No other special-status plant species have been observed within the BSA during special status-species surveys. However, some of the seasonal wetlands on the BSA may provide suitable habitat in which special-status species could occur, including Burke’s goldfields, Sonoma sunshine, and Sebastopol meadowfoam. Loss of potential habitat for special-status wetland plants could be a potentially significant impact. However, the proposed mitigation site for wetlands impacts (Mitigation Measure 3.6-2) on the Gobbi Ranch property currently supports Sebastopol meadowfoam, and potential habitat for all three species will be constructed or restored through the wetland creation process. The 5.77 acres of wetland mitigation will provide habitat in which these special-status plant species could occur. Preservation of uplands habitat through Mitigation Measure 3.6-3 would also help protect special-status plant habitat on the mitigation site. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-2b, 3.6-2c, and 3.6-3 described above, these impacts to potentially suitable habitat would be less than significant.

The grassland habitat at the site is dominated by non-native species, is highly disturbed by agricultural activities (discing, plowing, etc.), and is considered marginal or low-quality habitat for special-status grassland species. Therefore, potential impacts to special-status species grassland plant habitats are less than significant. Although all areas have been surveyed for special-status plant species, they are not USFWS protocol for the three listed species with potential to occur. Surveys for these species will need to be conducted prior to construction.

Mitigation Measures 3.6-2b (Preserve and create new wetland habitat offsite), 3.6-2c (Transfer mitigation responsibilities to new property owners), and 3.6-3 (Preserve/enhance California tiger salamander aestivation habitat) described above would also provide mitigation for special-status plant species and special-status plant habitat.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-6. Complete special-status plant species pre-construction surveys and plant salvage. In order to salvage any special-status plant species that may be present, pre-construction plant surveys will be conducted. Surveys will be conducted in the spring for the full blooming season. USFWS and CDFG will be notified of any special-status plants (other than the known population of Lobb’s aquatic buttercup) observed prior to commencing with project construction. A 10-day notification to CDFG prior to starting construction activities on the site containing Lobb’s aquatic buttercup will be provided to salvage the plant(s) and topsoil. Any other special-status plant species identified in pre-construction surveys will also be salvaged. The salvaged plants and topsoil will be placed onto suitable habitat outside the Project area, preferably in the Gobbi Ranch mitigation site. Selection of the location will be coordinated with CDFG and/or USFWS. This mitigation requirement shall be noted on improvement plans, grading plans and building plans.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant
Impact 3.6-7 Implementation of the Project could result in indirect impacts to California tiger salamander.

*Analysis: Significant*

Indirect impacts on CTS include 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 (Olberding 2003a). 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 8 inches high. Development on the Project site would include the construction of curbs and gutters along Dutton Meadow Road that would limit potential future CTS movement from other sites.

Although CTS surveys have not identified any CTS occurrences within the BSA or along adjacent roadways, creation of barriers to CTS dispersal could be a potentially significant impact.

**Mitigation Measure 3.6-3 (Preserve/enhance California tiger salamander aestivation habitat)** described above would provide mitigation for indirect impacts to California tiger salamander.

*After Mitigation: Less than Significant*

Impact 3.6-8. Project construction activities could result in impacts to California tiger salamander.

*Analysis: Significant*

Impacts to CTS during construction are unlikely given their presumed absence from the site based on survey results and absence of breeding ponds. However, any direct impacts to CTS that migrate to the site during construction, should such migration occur, would be significant. Should consultation with USFWS result in additional mitigation measures in the Biological Opinion to be issued for this Project, these additional measures will be implemented.

**Mitigation Measure 3.6-8a. Perform onsite monitoring during construction.** As described in the BA, 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 the mitigation activities described in this Draft SEIR as well as additional mitigation that may be required in project permits. Reports on non-compliance with environmental requirements may result in temporary halting of construction activity to examine the noncompliance and prevent further resource damage. Biological monitors will implement the following measures:

- Provide worker environmental awareness training for all construction personnel that identifies sensitive biological resources that may occur in or adjacent to 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

Mitigation Measure 3.6-8b. Protect California tiger salamander during construction.

Consultation with USFWS will be conducted to address potential impacts to and mitigation measures for CTS. The following summarizes mitigation measures described in the BA (Olberding 2003a) and the Draft Biological Opinion (Olberding 2003d). Any modifications to these mitigation measures developed during consultation with USFWS, USACE, and CDFG will be incorporated.

Prior to pre-construction surveys, the construction area will be enclosed with a 3-foot high silt fence that will remain in place during construction. A qualified biological monitor will be present during fence installation. The fencing will be inspected daily by the Biological Monitor to verify that it is maintained in good repair. After the silt fence is installed, extant rain-filled ponds within the Project area will be seined for CTS larvae from March to May prior to construction. Any CTS larvae found during seining will be salvaged and relocated to appropriate existing or created CTS breeding ponds within approved mitigation banks, conservation easements, or otherwise protected areas.

A USFWS-approved biologist shall survey the construction area for CTS a minimum of 48 and 24 hours before the onset of construction activities. If CTS of any lifestage is found, the organism will be moved to a designated area by the approved biologist. The designated habitat area will be located either within the fenced area on the Project site or at an offsite location, as determined by USFWS. During construction, if CTS is observed within the construction area, construction activities within the area will be stopped immediately and until the CTS is moved to a designated area by a USFWS-approved biologist. No other individuals will handle CTS individuals.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-8c. Prepare a Biological Resources Mitigation Implementation Plan. To help avoid and minimize incidental mortality and injury to plants and wildlife, a Biological Resource Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan (BRMIMP) will be prepared. The BRMIMP will outline how these 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 will prepare and submit daily logs and monthly compliance reports.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.6-9. Project construction activities could result in impacts to western pond turtle.

Analysis: Significant
Although habitat for western pond turtle is not present on the Project site, impacts to western pond turtle during construction could occur from sediments and construction debris entering the nearby Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel. In addition, western pond turtle could potentially migrate to the Project area during construction. These could be potentially significant impacts. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-8a (Perform onsite monitoring during construction) and 3.6-8c (Prepare a Biological Resources Mitigation Implementation Plan) described above and Mitigation Measure 3.6-9 below, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-9. Provide protection for western pond turtle during construction. Surveys for western pond turtle have not been completed. Pre-construction surveys for the western pond turtle should be completed. As described in the BA, any individual western pond turtles found on the Project site during pre-construction surveys will be relocated by a qualified biologist. Construction zone limits along the Project boundary near Colgan Creek channel banks will be set up using silt fencing. The fencing will restrict access by turtles into construction areas. Signage will be placed indicating that the Colgan Creek channel area is protected and not accessible for construction equipment and materials. Any turtle found in the construction area will be relocated by a qualified biologist outside the construction zone limits. This mitigation requirement shall be noted on improvement plans, grading plans and building plans.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.6-10. Project construction activities could result in impacts to nesting and migratory birds.

Analysis: Significant

Resident and migratory raptors, herons, egrets and waterfowl may be located in the Project area or adjacent areas during construction. These species are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code. Disturbance of nest sites could result in abandonment of eggs or young or actual destruction of nests. This would be a potentially significant impact. However, most birds such as waterfowl, songbirds, raptors, and shorebirds observed on the Project site have large home ranges, and existing adjacent habitat could provide alternative habitat during Project construction. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-5 (Provide protection of nesting migratory birds) described above, potential impacts would be less than significant.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

Impact 3.6-11. Project construction activities could result in impacts to sensitive habitats.

Analysis: Significant

Temporary increases in erosion could occur during construction and could affect onsite or adjacent wetlands, Colgan Creek channel, or other sensitive habitats. These impacts could be potentially significant. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-11, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-11a. Protect water quality during construction. To mitigate for construction-related 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 downslope 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. An SWPPP incorporating Best Management Practices will be developed and implemented.

As described in the BA and the Draft Biological Opinion (Olberding 2003d), the refueling or storage of hazardous materials will be prohibited within 200 feet of flagged sensitive plant species or sensitive wildlife habitat features (e.g. raptor nests or burrows) that could be affected by such activities and within 100 feet of wetlands or waters of the U.S. (e.g. Colgan Creek, wetlands on adjacent undeveloped Project phases) that will not be directly impacted by immediate construction activities. For portable equipment that uses fuels or lubricants, Visqueen or other containment material will be used under the equipment to capture leaks or spills.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-11b. Implement NPDES Permit Requirements. (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 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.

After Mitigation: Less than Significant

3.6.3.2 Cumulative Impacts

The CTS is an endemic California species that is native to Sonoma County, and at least 66 known breeding sites occur in the County (California Department of Fish and Game, as cited in Jennings 2004a). The vast majority of the presently identified locations for CTS in Sonoma County are located within part of the Santa Rosa Plain, an area that has undergone a considerable amount of urban development during the past 25 years. The portion of the Plain that is known to historically contain CTS extends from just south of Cotati, north to the Santa Rosa Flood Control Channel (which lies directly west of the end of Collage Avenue), west to Laguna De Santa Rosa, and east to the vicinity of Hwy 101 (LSA Associates, as cited in Jennings 2004a).

The approximately 3,800-acre Southwest Plan Area encompasses approximately 20% of the currently known extant CTS breeding sites in Sonoma County (LSA Associates, as cited in Jennings 2004a). The Plan area is composed of undeveloped remnant portions of former grassland/vernal pool habitats, which are bordered upon or broken up to a large degree by urban development, including roads, buildings, and flood control channels. Land use in the southwestern quarter of the Southwest Plan Area is planned to be a combination of low-density residential (2-8 units/acre), schools, and parks/open space. Denser residential and commercial areas are planned in the eastern and northern quarters of the Southwest Plan Area where infrastructure like roads and power lines are more integrated with existing conditions. Like many isolated yet undeveloped areas in Sonoma County, the current open space in the Southwest Plan Area has historically been used for agricultural pursuits, including livestock grazing, dairy farms, and fruit/nut production. Existing land-use practices common to agriculture (i.e. discing, mowing, irrigating, and grazing) as well as fire-control measures have
disturbed the vegetation, hydrology and topography within much of the Southwest Plan Area.

The remaining vacant open space is currently dominated by ruderal habitat (non-native grassland), the habitat type typically associated with human occupation and intense disturbance (Jennings 2004a). The most abundant and widespread plant species found in the Southwest Plan Area is Italian rye grass (*Lolium multiflorum*). Harding grass (*Phalaris aquatica*), an invasive, introduced bunchgrass, now occupies a significant amount of acreage within the Southwest Plan Area, and is expected to continue increasing in density in grazing areas as it has been doing throughout the Santa Rosa Plain over the past 20 years.

Approximately 1,200 acres of potential CTS aestivation habitat currently remain within the Southwest Plan Area (Jennings 2004a). The rest of the 2,600 acres has already been developed. The present amount (acreage) of seasonal wetlands within this remaining undeveloped area is currently unknown; however, only about 25 distinct ponds and drainage ditches are considered potentially suitable for CTS breeding, with the majority of those being present on lands of the former Santa Rosa Air Center in the southwest corner of the Plan area (Jennings 2004a). The remaining CTS breeding habitat is marginal with very few known breeding ponds being deep enough to hold water for sufficient periods of time to allow for CTS to complete metamorphosis during years of less than average rainfall (Jennings 2004a). Additionally, current human activities such as allowing domestic waterfowl and chickens to forage in vernal pool habitats, the ditching of fields to drain excess water, the dumping of livestock manure in vernal pools, and the spread and establishment of Harding grass via domestic livestock, have all negatively affected CTS populations in the area (Jennings 2004a).

The isolated and artificially constructed CTS breeding pond at Southwest Community Park has not had any successful recruitment of juvenile CTS into the population during the past three years due to low water levels and the resulting consumption of all CTS larvae by avian predators (Jennings 2004a).

**Impact 3.6-12. The Project, in combination with other development in Southwest Santa Rosa, would result in a substantial loss of California tiger salamander habitat.**

*Analysis: Significant*

Activities associated with development of Southwest Santa Rosa, including the Dutton Meadows Project, within the Southwest Area Plan could result in direct impacts to CTS. These impacts could include eliminating up to half of the known and potentially suitable breeding ponds in Southwest Santa Rosa, as well as eliminating approximately half (600 acres) of the potentially suitable aestivation habitat available around these ponds based on the proximity of the developments within the Plan area. Further direct impacts to CTS would be caused by roadways and drainage ditches which result in direct mortality to juvenile and/or adult CTS moving about within the Plan area during winter rains. The remaining approximately 600 acres of potential habitat would be scattered throughout Southwest Santa Rosa as open space, parks, and yards in low-density development. In summary, remaining CTS populations within the Southwest Plan Area will probably disappear within the next 25 years with present development plans, land use, and weather patterns.

If attempts are to be made to support long-term survival of CTS within Southwest Santa Rosa, efforts should be concentrated within the southwestern quarter of this area, where CTS
continue to successfully reproduce and recruit into the population during most normal or better than normal rainfall years. As long as sufficient breeding and aestivation habitat are present and the layout of any additional development and roads are compatible with the species’ long-term survival, the local CTS population may remain viable. However, development in this portion of Southwest Santa Rosa would still contribute to cumulative impacts to CTS.

Development in the Southwest Plan Area could also result in indirect impacts to CTS, including creation of barriers, such as the widening of Ludwig Avenue, to dispersal or movement away from or toward breeding ponds, or the creation of underground flood control structures.

Impacts from the proposed Project, when considered in conjunction with impacts from other projects in Southwest Santa Rosa, have the potential to result in a collective (or cumulative) adverse effect to the environment that are of greater significance than the individual impact(s) of the proposed project. Specifically, activities associated with the development of the Southwest Area Plan could contribute further to the isolation of CTS breeding and aestivation habitats known to occur at Southwest Community Park, along Ludwig Avenue, along South Wright Road, and within the former Santa Rosa Air Center area of southwest Santa Rosa, thereby adversely affecting the long-term viability of CTS populations in the area. This is a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-12. Create California tiger salamander habitat outside of the Southwest Plan Area. Although the loss of CTS habitat in the Southwest Plan Area cannot be fully mitigated, some measures can be taken to reduce the significance of the impacts. Creation and preservation of large areas of CTS habitat outside the Southwest Plan Area, within Sonoma County, would reduce impacts to this species. Four of the focal points being considered by the USFWS for developing CTS preserves are within the general area of the City of Santa Rosa boundaries: 1) the area around the 183-acre Wright Preservation Bank (between Hall and Occidental Roads west of Fulton Road); 2) the area bounded by Llano Road, the Santa Rosa urban boundary, Highway 12, and Colgan Creek; 3) lands around the City of Santa Rosa’s Kelly Farm south of Occidental Road and north of Highway 12; and 4) the artificial wetlands created adjacent to Alton Lane (in the northwestern part of Santa Rosa).

Consistent with the expressed objectives of the USFWS in creating large preserves, the mitigation for the proposed Project includes the acquisition of approximately 108.8 acres of land straddling Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel south of Todd Road and west of Stony Point Road. The 108.8-acre area, Gobbi Preserve No. 2, is contiguous with the 31-acre Gobbi Wetland Mitigation Site, which contains approximately 9 acres of vernal pools and swales and documented CTS occurrences. The two combined properties will form a contiguous 139.8-acre preserve. The enlarged preserve site would be located near the Beretta Dairy and a number of other listed plant and CTS mitigation banks (Engle Bank, Carinalli-Todd Road Mitigation Bank, Hale Bank and the Hazel Mitigation Bank). Several vernal pools at the Engle Bank Mitigation Site also appear to be deep enough to provide CTS breeding habitat (Jennings 2004a).

The Alton Lane site was formerly used for vineyards and orchards and was planted with CTS approximately 19 years ago (Jennings 2004a). Since then, CTS have been documented breeding on site and within the artificially created breeding ponds. The USFWS has
suggested to project applicants within the general Santa Rosa area that CTS salvaged from other sites be transplanted to the Alton Lane site and that wetlands at the latter be expanded.

In addition to this mitigation, Mitigation Measures 3.6-2b (Preserve and create new wetland habitat offsite) and 3.6-2c (Transfer mitigation responsibilities to new property owners) would reduce impacts to CTS habitat to the maximum extent practicable; however, the planned development of Southwest Santa Rosa would still result in a loss of approximately 600 acres of potential CTS aestivation habitat, and would contribute to cumulative impacts to CTS habitat. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact. It is possible that in the future, an overall mitigation program could be developed by state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over CTS, or by other parties, that would reduce cumulative impacts to CTS habitat to a less than significant level.

After Mitigation: Significant and unavoidable

Cumulative Impact 3.6-13. The Project, in combination with other development in Southwest Santa Rosa, could result in a substantial reduction in the number of California tiger salamanders.

Analysis: Significant

As described above, impacts to CTS during Project construction are unlikely given their presumed absence from the site based on survey results, the presence of many barriers to CTS dispersal, and the absence of breeding ponds. Any direct impacts to CTS that migrate to the site during construction, should such migration occur, would be mitigated through appropriate mitigation measures during construction, and no direct loss of CTS is expected from the Project. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-8a (Perform onsite monitoring during construction), 3.6-8b (Protect California tiger salamander during construction), and 3.6-8c (Prepare a Biological Resources Mitigation Implementation Plan) described above would help reduce direct impacts to CTS during construction of projects in the Southwest Plan Area. However, direct loss of CTS from development in Southwest Santa Rosa may occur from other causes such as increased traffic on area roadways. Indirect loss of CTS from development in Southwest Santa Rosa may occur due to increased barriers to dispersal and human activities such as planting exotic species and allowing domestic waterfowl to use vernal pools. Determining the contribution of the Project to cumulative indirect loss of actual individual CTS cannot be determined and, under CEQA, is too speculative. It is possible that in the future, an overall mitigation program could be developed by state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over CTS, or by other parties, that would reduce cumulative indirect loss of CTS.

After Mitigation: Significant and unavoidable

3.6.4 Gobbi Preserve No. 2 Wetlands and CTS Mitigation Site

In complete satisfaction of its mitigation obligations for wetlands and CTS on the Dutton Meadows Development project, fee title to the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 will be transferred to CDFG for the protection and management of CTS aestivation and breeding habitat and vernal pool habitat to mitigation for impacts to CTS habitat (Rich 2004). In addition, 5.77 acres of wetlands will be created on the site to address impacts to wetlands at Dutton Meadows. A management plan, approved by USFWS and CDFG, will be established to
guide long-term protection and management of the preserve. To assist in implementation, an endowment shall be established by the Project sponsor when CDFG takes title to the property.

The 108.8-acre Gobbi Preserve No. 2 would be established on part of the Gobbi Ranch, which is located immediately south of the City of Santa Rosa, California, between Stony Point and Llano Roads. The Gobbi Preserve No. 2 would straddle the Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel and consist of a mosaic of vernal pools, seasonal wetlands, two endangered plant species, and CTS aestivation habitat all distributed throughout an area of non-jurisdictional annual grasslands. Habitat features of the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 include (Rich 2004 and Stromberg 2003a):

- **On-site high-quality wetlands.** Gobbi Preserve No. 2 currently contains 15.9 acres of jurisdictional wetlands, which includes 11.8 acres of vernal pools, 2.6 acres of swales, and 1.4 acres of seasonal wetlands. Most are in excellent condition and have been affected primarily by cattle grazing.

- **On-site CTS habitat.** Three known and several potential CTS breeding ponds are currently located on Gobbi Preserve No. 2. The CTS surveys demonstrated that the site is an excellent area for breeding CTS and for providing aestivation habitat for CTS. The quality of CTS aestivation habitat (as determined by the abundance of gopher burrows) is high in the Gobbi Ranch area.

- **No identified barriers to CTS movement.** No barriers to CTS migration between breeding ponds and aestivation habitat have been identified within the proposed Gobbi Preserve No. 2 area, or between the preserve and the adjacent preserve.

- **Habitat for special-status plants.** Sebastopol Meadowfoam and Sonoma Sunshine were found in the vernal pools and swales on Gobbi Preserve No. 2. Nineteen Sebastopol Meadowfoam colonies and 5 Sonoma Sunshine colonies, ranging in size from 20 to 9,400 plants each, were found on the site. Of the vernal pool and swales, approximately 12.55 acres provide suitable habitat for these two species. Lobb's aquatic buttercup colonies were found in eight vernal pools; of these, six also supported Sebastopol Meadowfoam.

- **High-quality surrounding habitat.** The existing 31-acre Gobbi Wetland Mitigation Site (also known as Gobbi Preserve No. 1) is located northwest of the proposed Gobbi Preserve No. 2 and would be contiguous with this new preserve. Gobbi Preserve No. 1 contains a network of vernal pools and swales, 16 known CTS breeding pools and swales, and several special-status plant species. Other preserves present or underway in the immediate area include the Christina Preserve (35 acres), Engle Bank (40 acres), Hale Bank (41 acres), Hazel Bank (103 acres), and Margaret Preserve (12 acres). With Gobbi Preserve Nos. 1 and 2, a total of approximately 372 acres would be preserved in the immediate area.

Restoring and constructing new wetland habitat on the Gobbi Preserve to mitigate for wetlands impacts from the Project would require four steps. First, surface material would be excavated and stockpiled, either near the excavated areas or in upland areas outside of the preserve. Second, the area would be excavated to rough grade, with the subsurface excavated soil placed in nearby mounds or removed to offsite upland areas. Third, topsoil would be added to cover constructed mounds and attain the final bottom grades of pools.
and swales, although the bottom of some vernal pools may not be covered. Finally, native plant seeds, mulch, tubers, and bulbs will be added to the vernal pools. Once constructed, periodic maintenance and monitoring activities on the site would be done.

**Potential Impacts of Preserve Implementation**

Potential impacts of developing the Gobbi Preserve would occur primarily to wetlands, special-status plant and wildlife species, land use, and cultural resources; these are discussed below. Any potential impacts to water quality would be mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-11a (Protect water quality during construction) and 3.6-11b (Implement NPDES Permit Requirements) described above. Minor impacts to air quality would occur due to temporary increases in vehicular traffic and activity during construction and occasional vehicular trips during monitoring; no mitigation would be required. Similarly, minor impacts to traffic would occur during construction and monitoring activities, and no mitigation for traffic would be required.

**Biological Resources**

**Wetlands.** Up to 1,147 square feet of existing wetland habitat may be filled during wetland construction and restoration on Gobbi Preserve No. 2 (Stromberg 2003b). However, fill would occur in order to improve or enlarge existing wetlands, and final wetlands would be of higher quality than existing wetland habitat. The restored and constructed wetland habitat on the preserve would feature improved hydrologic function and plant species composition and would provide suitable habitat for Sonoma sunshine and Sebastopol meadowfoam, two special-status plant species (Stromberg 2003a). Impacts to wetlands would be less than significant.

**California tiger salamander.** The Gobbi Preserve No. 2 is considered "active" habitat for CTS, and passive salvage operations would be used to exclude CTS from areas where earthwork is conducted (Stromberg 2003a). Passive salvage measures would involve installing "fence-and-exit" ramp barriers. These barriers consist of drift fences of silt (or similar material) in a zig-zag pattern and soil ramps to facilitate CTS movement toward the barrier exits. CTS would move through exits in the barrier and would be prevented from re-entering the construction area by the barrier system. Design and installation of the barrier system would be supervised by an authorized CTS biologist. In addition, implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-8a (Perform onsite monitoring during construction), 3.6-8b (Protect California tiger salamander during construction), and 3.6-8c (Prepare a Biological Resources Mitigation Implementation Plan) described above would reduce impacts to CTS to a less than significant level.

**Western pond turtle.** Suitable habitat for the western pond turtle is present along the Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel and basking sites may be present on the preserve site. Impacts to western pond turtle during construction could occur from sediments and construction debris entering the flood control channel. In addition, western pond turtle could potentially migrate to the preserve site during construction. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-8a (Perform onsite monitoring during construction), 3.6-8c (Prepare a Biological Resources Mitigation Implementation Plan), and 3.6-9 (Provide protection for western pond turtle during construction) described above, potential impacts would be less than significant.
California linderiella. California linderiella may be found on the Gobbi Preserve No. 2. Potential impacts to this species include filling of up to 0.5 acres of vernal pools during construction. However, construction of new wetlands on the preserve would result in an increase of potential habitat for linderiella. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-11a (Protect water quality during construction) described above would help protect adjacent wetlands from construction-related erosion. Impacts would be less than significant.

Special-status plants. Special-status plant species (Sebastopol Meadowfoam, Sonoma Sunshine, Lobb’s aquatic buttercup) are known to occur on the preserve site. Grading activities to construct or restore wetlands could impact these species. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-6 (Complete special-status plant species pre-construction surveys and plant salvage) described above to complete pre-construction surveys and plant salvage would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.

Nesting and migratory birds. Potential impacts to nesting and migratory birds could occur during wetland construction on the preserve. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-5 (Provide protection of nesting migratory birds) described above would minimize any impacts to nesting birds, including raptors, to a less than significant level.

Land Use
The Gobbi Preserve No. 2 is zoned for “Diverse Agriculture” under Sonoma County’s General Plan and zoning ordinance (County of Sonoma 1989 and 2004). The General Plan Diverse Agriculture land use allows production of all food, fiber and plant materials. The preserve would support the General Plan goal to avoid the conversion of agricultural lands to residential or nonagricultural commercial uses. Permitted activities on parcels zoned Diverse Agriculture and exceeding two acres include the raising, feeding, maintaining and breeding of farm animals; growing and harvesting of crops, including wholesale nurseries; and management of land for watersheds and for fish and wildlife habitat where these uses are incidental to the primary use. Cattle currently are grazed on portions of Preserve No. 2, and grazing would be allowed to continue following establishment of the new Preserve. No new activities would be introduced on the preserve that would be inconsistent with the preserve’s zoning. The use of the site for habitat preservation and grading would be consistent with existing land uses on adjacent parcels. Land uses on adjacent and nearby parcels include agricultural uses and other mitigation preserves. No significant land use impacts would occur as a result of implementing the Gobbi Preserve No. 2. No mitigation would be required.

Cultural Resources/Hazardous Materials
A cultural survey and phase 1 environmental assessment were done on the preserve site and no cultural resources or hazardous materials were reported to be onsite. As a result, no significant impacts to cultural resources or to worker/public health from contaminated soils are expected. However, because a high potential exists for cultural resources to occur in Southwest Santa Rosa, potential impacts could occur to cultural resources during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-1a (Monitor ground-disturbing activities during construction) described above would reduce any impacts to cultural resources to a less-than-significant level.
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4.0 Required CEQA Considerations

4.1 Cumulative Impacts

CEQA requires that an EIR examine cumulative impacts. As discussed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(1), a cumulative impact "consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts." The analysis of cumulative impacts need not provide the level of detail required of the analysis of impacts from the project itself, but shall "reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)).

In order to assess cumulative impacts, an EIR must analyze either a list of past, present, and probable future projects or a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document. Because this Draft SEIR is tiering from the Master EIR, the Area Plan and Master EIR provide the summary of projections for assessing cumulative impacts. In this case, the projections are buildout of the Southwest Plan Area as described in the Southwest Area Plan and as updated in the Redevelopment Plan and Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan.

One additional project was included in consideration of cumulative impacts.

4.1.1 Conceptual Design for Colgan Creek Stream Restoration

The Colgan Creek stream restoration conceptual design provides guidance on restoring a 1.3-mile section of Colgan Creek that flows from Victoria Drive to Bellevue Avenue in southwest Santa Rosa, California (Prunuske Chatham, Inc. 2002). The creek channel is adjacent to the southeast edge of the Dutton Meadows Project. The Colgan Creek conceptual design includes modifications to the structure and function of the Creek that will achieve the following objectives:

- Develop approximate bankfull channel dimensions that will maintain sediment transport through the project site with in-stream enhancements such as pools and riffles.
- Create flood plains to contain the 100-year storm and help minimize channel erosion.
- Restore the riparian corridor to improve water quality while providing aquatic and wildlife habitat enhancement.
- Provide a bike path and public access for recreational opportunities.
- Provide an educational opportunity for Elsie Allen High School students.

The Dutton Meadows Project is consistent with the objectives of the Colgan Creek restoration plan.

As described in Section 1 Introduction, potentially significant cumulative impacts not addressed in the Master EIR include impacts to CTS, traffic, and utilities/public services. The following impact areas do not have any new potentially significant cumulative impacts.
not addressed in the Master EIR, and therefore cumulative impact analysis in the Master EIR is adequate for the following:

- Land Use
- Visual Quality and Community Character
- Hazardous Materials
- Cultural Resources
- Soils, Geology and Seismicity
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Vegetation and Wetlands
- Air Quality
- Noise

Cumulative impact analyses for traffic, utilities and public services, and California tiger salamander are included, respectively, in Section 3.2, Section 3.3, and Section 3.6.

4.2 Growth-Inducing Impacts

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR should discuss “the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth.” Direct and indirect growth can be induced in a number of ways, including through the elimination of obstacles to growth or through the stimulation of economic activity within the region.

The Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan accommodates future projected growth and development in the City. General Plan Growth Management Goal GM-B specifically calls for programming infrastructure improvements to keep pace with new residential growth. The allowable growth pattern of the area identified in the General Plan and the expansion or updating of the various regional infrastructure systems can be scheduled more specifically to maintain adequate services throughout the planning horizon of the General Plan. Without such growth management practices, any expansion of an infrastructure system could be considered growth inducing. Unplanned and uncontrolled growth generally is considered to have significant adverse impacts on the environment.

The 58-acre Dutton Meadows Project area is included in the Santa Rosa General Plan and its impacts analyzed at the mid-point densities of the various Land Use Designations within the project boundary. The Dutton Meadows Project is also approximately at the mid-point density level, and is expected to add 586 housing units, or about 1,506 persons to the Southwest Plan Area. This assumes a household size of about 2.57 persons per unit in the year 2020 (City of Santa Rosa 2002a). By the year 2020, this population increase would represent approximately four percent of the projected 40,920 total population growth in Santa Rosa and would incrementally contribute to stimulating the local economy through increased direct and indirect investment and spending (City of Santa Rosa 2000).

Project construction would generate temporary jobs in the construction, materials, fabrication, and supply industries up until time of construction completion. However, given the nature of the construction industry, project construction would be expected to employ
workers already living and working in the Bay Area. In addition, new employment would be expected from the future school and commercial uses. No significant labor pool from outside the Bay Area would be expected to temporarily or permanently relocate as a result of buildout of the Dutton Meadows Project.

Growth in a geographic area also may be induced by removing infrastructure barriers through the construction of new infrastructure and improving transportation and circulation systems. The growth-inducing potential of the Dutton Meadows Project would be significant if the improvements necessary to serve the Project and cumulative development within the area exceeded the capacity to accommodate growth above and beyond what was provided for under the Santa Rosa General Plan. New residents would result in an increased demand for utility and public services in the Project area. However, infrastructure provided for the Project, while lessening potential obstacles to growth, is considered growth-accommodating and not directly growth-inducing. Infrastructure would be provided to serve the needs of the Project, with emphasis on transportation improvements to serve the project in addition to cumulative area-wide development consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan.

The Dutton Meadows Project would be constructed within the City’s Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Santa Rosa’s UGB was adopted in 1996 by Santa Rosa voters and is the boundary in which urban development is to be contained until 2016. Growth within the UGB is expected to be consistent with the City’s General Plan to accommodate growth. General Plan Growth Management Policy GM-A-1 acknowledges that “current projections indicate that there is sufficient land available within the UGB to accommodate growth needs beyond 2020.” The Dutton Meadows Project therefore would be consistent with Growth Management Goal GM-A to “Prevent urban sprawl by focusing growth within the Urban Growth Boundary” and Policy GM-A-1 to “Contain urban development in the Santa Rosa area within the City’s Urban Growth Boundary.”

Implementation of the General Plan would advance the policies of the City to promote and facilitate growth within the UGB that would minimize the cost and extent of providing infrastructure services by producing a more compact and efficient pattern of development. Impacts associated with the Project have been analyzed in the Master EIR, Redevelopment EIR, and General Plan EIR and mitigation provided to reduce impacts. The Dutton Meadows Project could be considered growth-inducing because it would represent a contribution to growth and it would incrementally contribute to stimulating the local economy. However, the Project is part of an ongoing and coordinated regional planning program that anticipates the demands of projected population growth and accompanying land use changes. The Project’s contribution to growth would be urban growth within the context of the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan. The Project would not generate significant growth-inducing impacts.

4.3 Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Although the Project has the potential to result in a number of significant environmental impacts, the impacts can be avoided through the adoption of appropriate mitigation measures that will reduce those effects to a less-than-significant level. Section 2100(b)(2)(A)
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of CEQA requires that an EIR identify any significant environmental effects than cannot be avoided if the project were implemented.

Unavoidable significant adverse impacts have been identified for the Project in five subject areas: Land Use, Visual Quality and Community Character, Noise, Biological Resources, Air Quality, and Traffic. As described in Section 3.1, some of these unavoidable adverse impacts were identified in the Master EIR, Redevelopment EIR, and General Plan EIR. The identified unavoidable adverse impacts are as follows:

- Loss of approximately 848 acres of farmland of Local Importance as designated by the State Department of Conservation and Sonoma County
- Addition of traffic to US 101, which is already congested; traffic Level of Service (LOS) would be LOS “F” in some areas, primarily south of the Hearn interchange, with “stop and go” traffic conditions and an average speed of about 8 to 10 miles per hour
- Increased traffic volumes exceeding the LOS objective for roadway segments
- Significant change in visual character from conversion of land that is currently semi-rural and rural land in character to an urban condition
- The proposed Fulton/Wright Road overcrossing and interchange at Highway 12 would be seen as increased urbanization in an area that currently appears semi-rural in character; the transition from rural to urban conditions to the eastbound Highway 12 motorist would be sudden and abrupt
- Loss of grassland foraging area for sensitive bird species known to occur within the Southwest Area Plan
- Loss of California tiger salamander (CTS) aestivation habitat and indirect loss of individual CTS
- Degradation of air quality to levels inconsistent with State standards, specifically PM10 and CO
- Increased traffic noise impacts on existing Area Plan land uses from development of the Area Plan and its infrastructure improvements, in conjunction with cumulative traffic

4.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines specifies that an EIR must evaluate the comparative merits of a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or project location that feasibly could attain most of the basic project objectives, and that would avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. Additionally, a Draft EIR must evaluate potential environmental effects of the No Project Alternative, defined as the case where the proposed Project, as specified and located, would not occur.

There are three main objectives of the proposed Project:

- To provide new housing units in Southwest Santa Rosa, consistent with the Area Plan
- To develop the Community Commons, as identified in the Area Plan
To promote implementation of the Area Plan goals, objectives, and policies for infrastructure and public services

The Dutton Meadows Project Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report evaluates four project alternatives:

- No Project Alternative
- Alternative Location
- Reduced Density Alternative
- Maximum Density Alternative

As discussed in Section 5.0, all alternatives except Reduced Density would be expected to have impacts similar to or greater than the proposed Project impacts. The Reduced Density Alternative likely would have fewer impacts to local traffic, wetlands, and some utilities and public services compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, Reduced Density is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, this alternative would not meet Project objectives, and would still result in significant unavoidable cumulative impacts.
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5.0 Alternatives

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines specify that an EIR must describe a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the project or project location that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Additionally, the No-Project Alternative (see below) must also be analyzed in a Draft EIR. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is also not required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The purpose of the discussion of alternatives is to focus on alternatives capable of eliminating any significant adverse environmental effects or reducing them to a level of insignificance, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives or would be more costly.

This section of the SEIR describes several alternatives to the Project. These include alternatives that have been considered by the City of Santa Rosa and the SEIR preparers. The objectives of the Project are to provide new housing units in Southwest Santa Rosa consistent with the Area Plan; to develop the Community Commons as identified in the Area Plan; and to promote implementation of Area Plan goals, objectives and policies for infrastructure and public services. These objectives were considered in selecting a range of alternatives to evaluate. Alternatives to the Area Plan, evaluated in the Master EIR, were also considered. In accordance with the CEQA guidelines and the stated objectives of the Project, the following alternatives were selected for evaluation in this section of the SEIR:

- No Project Alternative
- Alternative Location
- Reduced Density Alternative
- Maximum Density Alternative

5.1 No Project Alternative

The purpose of describing and analyzing a No Project Alternative is to allow decision-makers the opportunity to compare the impacts of approving the proposed Project with the impacts of not approving the proposed Project. The No Project Alternative represents ongoing activities and operations as outlined in the state CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126, as "a condition that would be reasonably expected to occur if the project were not approved," based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. In the case of this Project, the No Project Alternative is the case where the proposed Project, as defined and located, would not occur.

Normally, under a No Project scenario, a potential development site would remain in its condition and the identified environmental impacts associated with a proposed project would not occur for the time being. Without the Project, the Southwest quadrant of Santa Rosa would be expected to build out according to the provisions of the General Plan, Area
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5.1 Plan, and Redevelopment Plan. Thus, the situation of no development on the parcels included in the proposed Project would not be anticipated. In the No Project scenario, development under the General Plan, Redevelopment Plan, and Area Plan would be expected to generate a level of development and environmental impacts similar to the Project as proposed. This would include significant unavoidable cumulative traffic impacts and loss of CTS habitat.

5.2 Alternative Location

The preparation of the Area Plan was required under the General Plan; therefore, the Area Plan boundary is defined and fixed as described in the Area Plan. Alternative locations for the Area Plan do not exist, with the Plan Area lying within the City’s Urban Boundary established under existing law. Because the Project is located within the Area Plan, alternative locations for the Project do not exist outside the Area Plan boundary.

An alternative location refers to alternatives located outside the proposed Project boundary but within the Area Plan planning boundaries. To meet the objective of implementing a Community Commons consistent with the Area Plan, only two other locations for the Project are possible, based on the two additional Community Commons identified in the Area Plan. One of the additional proposed Community Commons would involve revitalization of the existing Roseland Village Center located in the northeastern portion of the Plan Area on Sebastopol Road. However, because this area is already partially developed, it cannot accommodate the new housing units included in the Project objectives. The other Community Commons is located in the western portion of the Area Plan on the north side of Northpoint Parkway. Although this Community Commons site has available land for development, the site is smaller than the proposed Community Commons site and could not accommodate the number of housing units or commercial/retail square footage, and thus would not meet all the Project objectives.

5.3 Reduced Density Alternative

Reduced Density would entail development at the low end of the planned range of development density which could be accomplished by either lower-density housing or a greater concentration of housing with increased open space. This alternative may reduce some proposed Project impacts such as localized traffic congestion, wetlands fill, and demand for public services. It would not be expected, however, to noticeably reduce any of the cumulative impacts, for example, to traffic and CTS habitat. In addition, it would not support Project objectives for number of new housing units and development of the Community Commons, which necessitates denser adjacent development to support the appropriate level of commercial/retail development.

5.4 Maximum Density Alternative

Maximum Density would entail development at the high end of the planned range of development density, greater than the mid-point density assumed in the General Plan and Area Plan. This alternative, with its higher density development, would meet objectives for new housing units and development of the Community Center. It would result in greater...
impacts than the proposed Project, however, including greater demand for public services, more traffic impacts, and possibly less park space. Additional mitigation measures would be required. Moreover, if planned density was not reduced elsewhere in the Plan Area to offset the alternative's increased density, greater cumulative impacts could occur.

5.5 Alternatives Analysis

Of the four alternatives described above, only the Maximum Density Alternative meets the three primary Project objectives to provide new housing units in Southwest Santa Rosa consistent with the Area Plan; to develop the Community Commons as identified in the Area Plan; and to promote implementation of Area Plan goals, objectives and policies for infrastructure and public services. However, the Maximum Density Alternative would have greater overall impacts than the proposed Project and would have the same significant unavoidable impacts as the proposed Project.

The Reduced Density Alternative likely would have fewer localized impacts than the proposed Project. This alternative, however, would not be expected to reduce any of the significant unavoidable cumulative impacts. In addition, the Reduced Density Alternative does not meet the key Project objectives.

The No Project Alternative and the Alternative Location would be expected to have similar impacts as the proposed Project, but would not meet all Project objectives.

A summary of the alternatives analysis is provided in Table 5-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Meets Project Objectives?</th>
<th>Level of Impacts Compared to Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Location</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Density</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fewer Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Greater Impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.0 Report Preparation

6.1 Lead agency

The City of Santa Rosa, California, is the lead agency under CEQA for the preparation of the Burbank Avenue Annexation EIR.

<table>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank Kasimov</td>
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<td>Deputy Director, Santa Rosa Department of Community Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Project Coordinator

CH2M HILL was retained to prepare the Dutton Meadows Project EIR.

CH2M HILL
155 Grand Avenue, Suite 1000
Oakland, California 94612
510-251-2426

CH2M HILL Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Member</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Gardner, MA</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Hosley, MS</td>
<td>Senior Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Davy, PhD</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Swain, BA</td>
<td>Environmental Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Waller, BS</td>
<td>Biologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Falzone, MLA</td>
<td>Environmental Planner, Biologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren Bloomberg, MS</td>
<td>Traffic Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subconsultants
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<tr>
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<th>Staff Member</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<tr>
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<td>Steve Colman, Principal Associate</td>
<td>Traffic Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana Resources</td>
<td>Mark Jennings, Principal Associate</td>
<td>Biologist, CTS Specialist</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Davis, CA 95616-9456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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