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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Overview of the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)

The complete Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for the Dutton Meadows Project (Project) consists of the following:

- The *Dutton Meadows Project Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report* (Draft SEIR), Volumes I and II, State Clearinghouse Number 2002092016, dated January 2005, by the City of Santa Rosa, California.

- The responses to comments and revisions to the Draft SEIR contained in this document.

In addition, the following related environmental documents are incorporated into this SEIR by reference:

- *Santa Rosa Southwest Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development, dated April 1994; prepared by EIP Associates.

- *Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development, dated May 2000; prepared by EIP Associates.

- *Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development, dated June 2002; prepared by EIP Associates.

The following subsections outline the environmental review process for this document and summarize the Project’s environmental compliance.

1.2 Environmental Review Process

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.

The Draft SEIR was prepared based on input received during scoping. The Draft SEIR was circulated for review by the public and agencies for 45 days. Copies of the Draft SEIR were made available in the City of Santa Rosa Department of Community Development and in local libraries. Copies were also provided upon request to the City. The 45-day comment period ran through Friday, February 25, 2005; written comments postmarked by February
25 were accepted. In addition, a public hearing was held on Thursday, February 24, 2005 to take verbal comments from members of the public. This Final SEIR contains copies of all written and oral comments received on the Draft SEIR and responses to those comments in Section 2.0 Responses to Comments.

The City of Santa Rosa (City) will review the SEIR for adequacy and consider it for certification pursuant to the requirements of Section 15090 of the CEQA Guidelines. The City will consider whether or not to approve the Project. Prior to such an approval, the City will (1) adopt appropriate findings regarding the significant environmental effects identified in the Final SEIR, the availability of feasible alternatives and mitigation measures to reduce or avoid significant environmental effects, and other matters pursuant to Public Resources Code Sections 21002, 21002.1, 21081, and 21081.5 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15002, 15021, 15064, and 15091; (2) if necessary, adopt a statement of overriding considerations pursuant to Public Resources Sections 21002 and 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093; and (3) adopt a mitigation, monitoring and reporting program pursuant to Public Resources Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15097. After the City certifies the adequacy of the SEIR, approves the Project, and adopts the appropriate Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations and required Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, it will file a Notice of Determination (NOD) with the State Clearinghouse pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15094. Certification of the SEIR and Project approval by the City are expected to take place in May 2005.

1.3 Report Organization of the Final SEIR

1.3.1 Report Contents
This Final SEIR is organized as follows:
- Section 1.0 Introduction
- Section 2.0 List of Commenters and Responses to Comments
- Section 3.0 Errata and Revisions
- Section 4.0 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

1.3.2 List of Commenters and Responses to Comments
Section 2.0 includes a list of individuals and agencies that submitted comments on the Draft SEIR. Section 2.0 also includes a complete copy of all written comment letters, the minutes of the public hearing. The individual comments within each letter are marked and enumerated in the right-hand margin. Responses to comments follow each letter, numbered to correspond to the comments in the letter.

1.3.3 Errata and Revisions
Section 3.0 of the Final SEIR contains errata and revisions to the Draft SEIR and a figure replacement to the Draft SEIR. The errata and revisions are shown as strikeout for deletions and underline for new text in the pages from the Draft SEIR. Overall, the errata represent minor modifications to the text of the Draft SEIR.
1.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Chapter 5.0 Alternatives in the Draft SEIR includes analysis and comparison of the Project with each of the alternatives. As required by CEQA, Section 4.4 of the Draft SEIR also identifies the environmentally superior 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.

1.5 CEQA Compliance

This Final SEIR includes additional information that is intended to clarify and expand the information in the Draft SEIR. After a careful review of the comments received on the Draft SEIR, the responses to the comments, and the information added to the Final SEIR, the City has determined that recirculation of the document for additional public review and comment is not required. Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines governs recirculation of a Draft EIR prior to certification. Recirculation is only required when “significant new information” is included in the Final EIR, such as information showing that:

(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

(2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of significance.

(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.

Because the Final SEIR does not identify any new significant environmental impacts from the Project or from a new mitigation measure and does not identify a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact over that described in the Draft SEIR, the grounds for recirculation have not been met.
2.0 List of Commenters and Responses to Comments

2.1 List of Commenters

The Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for the Dutton Meadows Project was circulated for review by the public and agencies for 45 days. The 45-day comment period ran through Friday, February 25, 2005. Several written comments were submitted to the City of Santa Rosa during this review period, and one letter after the review period. In addition, a public hearing was held on Thursday, February 24, 2005 to take verbal comments from members of the public. The written and verbal comments received are as follows:

- Anne Crealock, Sonoma County Water Agency, dated February 8, 2005
- Anne Cronin Moore, AICP, Moore Consulting, dated February 24, 2005
- Christine Culver, Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition, dated February 25, 2005
- Mark E. Piros, P.E., Department of Toxics Substance Control, dated February 24, 2005
- Terry Roberts, State of California Governors Office of Planning and Research, dated February 25, 2005
- Donna Strom, Sonoma County Wetland Watch and Southwest Resident, dated February 9, 2005
- Ted P. Winfield, Ph.D., Ted Winfield & Associates, dated February 24, 2005
- Minutes of the Public Hearing, Dutton Meadows Project Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report, February 24, 2005; individuals making comments are identified in the hearing minutes
- Timothy C. Sable, California Department of Transportation, dated March 23, 2005

2.2 Comments and Responses

This section contains copies of the comment letters on the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR and the minutes of the public hearing. Individual comments within the letters and minutes have been enumerated, and responses to each comment are provided.
February 8, 2005

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

Re:  DUTTON MEADOWS DRAFT SUBSEQUENT EIR

Dear Mr. Kasimov:

Sonoma County Water Agency (Agency) staff has reviewed the application for the above-mentioned project. In response, the Agency submits the following comments.

1. For site-specific improvements, Agency staff recommends that the drainage design for the project be in compliance with the Agency’s Flood Control Design Criteria.

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

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

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

5. Additionally, please indicate the Agency’s Kawana Springs Pipeline along Hearn Avenue on the drawings.

6. In planning for water supply, please be aware that there are several constraints regarding the implementation of the Agency’s Water Supply and Transmission System Project (WSTSP). Under the WSTSP, the Agency’s water rights would be expanded from the current permit limit of 75,000 acre-feet per year (afy) to up to 101,000 afy. However, due to various constraints, the Agency cannot implement the WSTSP at this time. For further information regarding this issue, please refer to the letters sent to the Agency’s water contractors, customers, and water diverters under the Agency’s water rights, on August 11 and August 28, 2003.
In addition, in May 2004, demand on the Agency's water transmission system was approximately 75 million gallons per day (mgd). This is a significantly higher rate of delivery than in May of the prior year. Due to the possibility that summertime demands on the transmission system may exceed the reliable capacity of the transmission system, the Agency sent a letter to water transmission system customers on June 14, 2004 warning them of these potential shortfalls. This letter requests all water customers to implement water conservation measures, recycled water projects and/or increase the use of local ground water supplies immediately to reduce demand on the Agency's transmission system throughout this summer.

The above-mentioned letters are attached for your reference and use.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. For specific information regarding drainage, please contact Phil Wadsworth at 547-1945. For other questions regarding Agency comments, I can be contacted at 547-1998 or emailed at bautista@scwa.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Anne Crealock
Environmental Specialist

c Ken Goddard
Response to Comment Letter from Anne Crealock, Sonoma County Water Agency, dated February 8, 2005

Note: Response numbers correspond to comment numbers labeled in the margin of the letter.

1. Comment noted. Compliance of the project drainage design with the Agency’s Flood Control Design Criteria will be evaluated during design review.

2. Comment noted. Compliance of the project sanitation design with the Agency’s Design and Construction Standards for Sanitation Facilities and Sanitation Code will be evaluated during design review.

3. Comment noted. Design development will begin after the EIR is certified and the Master Development Plan is approved by the City of Santa Rosa. The project applicant plans to implement a coordinated Colgan Creek interface design that is acceptable to the Sonoma County Water Agency and the City of Santa Rosa.

4. The applicant will coordinate with Mike Tovani of the Sonoma County Water Agency to obtain all appropriate licensing prior to accessing the Agency’s property.

5. Design development will begin after the EIR is certified and the Master Development Plan is approved by the City of Santa Rosa. The detailed design drawings will show the Kawana Springs Pipeline.

6. Comment noted. The constraints on the Sonoma County Water Agency’s Water Supply and Transmission System Project (WSTSP) were noted in the City of Santa Rosa Water Supply Assessment for the Dutton Meadows Project, included as Appendix E in Volume II of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR. This assessment was completed pursuant to Senate Bill 610. Additional supply under the SWTSP was not included in the Water Supply Assessment. The analysis concluded that if all or part of the Dutton Meadows 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 in the impact evaluation.
February 25, 2005

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

Re: Comments on Dutton Meadows Project
Draft Subsequent EIR

cc: Andrea Gardner, CH2M Hill

Dear Frank,

This letter serves as comments from Dutton Meadows Associates, LLC, and Dutton Village Partners, LLC, on the above referenced Environmental Impact Report. We thank and commend you and the staff of CH2M Hill for the preparation of the EIR, necessary for projects proposed by the applicants named above.

Generally, we find the EIR complete and accurate and a good subsequent document for the prior Santa Rosa Southwest Area Plan Final EIR, the Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Plan Final EIR, and Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Final EIR. We have a few comments below and attached offered to assist in making the Dutton Meadows Project Final Subsequent EIR wholly accurate and complete.
Comments on Dutton Meadows Project Draft Subsequent EIR

Given multiple development sites within the larger Dutton Meadows project area, several property owners and applicants, and the timeframe required to complete the Draft EIR, it is not surprising that there are some comments offered by the project sponsors at this time. We appreciate the time you and Andrea spent with us yesterday going over our preliminary biotic comments.

The following comments are organized consistent with the page numbering of the Draft Subsequent EIR:

ES-1 Project Components
It needs to be clarified that the Phase I, Phase 2 Minoia and Phase 5 Dutton Village projects are not phases of development per se but rather sub-areas within the larger Dutton Meadows master plan area that are currently proposed for development. While use of the term "phase" is misleading, it is not practical to change the terminology throughout the EIR, so clarification in the Project Description sections of the EIR is in order.

ES-2 First paragraph after bullets, second and third sentences, &
2-22 2.4.4 Schedule and Construction:
Change to: "Phases 1, 2 (Minoia) and 5 (Dutton Village) are anticipated to start site improvements construction in Spring 2006 through 2006, with construction of residential units to follow in 2007 and 2008 construction seasons. The remaining phases (Phases 3, 4, and 6) are anticipated to start construction in Spring 2007 or later. Up to 20,000 cubic yards of material excavated from the Gobbi mitigation project site during construction there will likely be available in mid-2005 for later use as fill material at Dutton Meadows. Stockpiling excavated material at the Gobbi site would result in significant adverse impacts to CTS aestivation habitat there, and fill material is required at Dutton Meadow. A City permit to stockpile that material at Dutton Meadows Phase 1 or other phase areas will be applied for after certification of the SEIR and consistent with all other federal and state agency authorizations. The material will be spread evenly over the stockpile site, avoiding wetland areas. The stockpiling will be
subject to the appropriate BMPs to reduce erosion potential to acceptable levels.”

ES-3 Fourth bullet:
Add a sentence: “The USACE Section 404 process for the Dutton Meadows Project is currently ongoing and the USFWS Biological Opinion for the Section 7 consultation required by the Federal Endangered Species Act is expected by early March 2005.”

ES-4, 1-6, and 4-4, First bullets:
Change to: “Loss of approximately 58 acres of the total approximately 848 acres of farmland…”

ES-5 Last Mitigation Measure 3.2-6b is a typo. See page 3.2-26.

2-11 Table 2-2:
Current owner of Parcel 043-071-029 is Dutton Village Partners, LLC.

2-12 End of 2.4.2:
It is possible that circumstances may change over time and, therefore, possible adjustments may be made to phased project improvements that are reasonable and consistent with the orderly development of Dutton Meadow. The following sentence should be inserted at the end of section 2.4.2:
“Should the order of development phasing be affected by changing conditions or circumstances, or should a specified phased transportation improvement be funded from other than private sources, reasonable amendment of the ordered phasing of these transportation improvements consistent with the Final SEIR may be considered by the Director of the Department of Community Development.”

3.6 Vegetation, Wildlife, and Habitat Section:
Please refer to attached letter and comments dated February 24, 2005, prepared by Ted P. Winfield, Ph.D.
Comments on Dutton Meadows Project Draft Subsequent EIR

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Subsequent EIR. We would be pleased to meet with you and the EIR consultant if needed to clarify any of our comments.

Sincerely,

Anne Cronin Moore, AICP

cc: H. Rich (Dutton Village Partners, LLC)
    G. Hines (Trumark Companies)
Response to Comment Letter from Anne Cronin Moore, AICP, Moore Consulting, dated February 24, 2005

Note: Response numbers correspond to comment numbers labeled in the margin of the letter.

1. Comment noted.

2. The term “phase” was used to identify portions of the Master Development Plan area in the Draft SEIR, and does not refer to schedule-related characteristics. The Project Description has been clarified to reflect this as shown on Draft SEIR pages ES-1 and 2-12 in Section 3.0.

3. The Project Description has been changed to include the stockpiling of excavated material from the Gobbi Ranch site at the Dutton Meadows site (see Draft SEIR pages ES-2 and 2-22 in Section 3.0). Avoidance of wetlands and implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-11a, Protect Water Quality during Construction, as well as Mitigation Measures 3.2.2-2 (Water Quality) and 3.2.4-1 (Air Quality) from the Southwest Area Plan EIR (see Dutton Meadows Project Draft Subsequent EIR, Volume II, Appendix A), will reduce any impacts from stockpiling to a less than significant level.

4. The Executive Summary has been revised to include this sentence as shown on Draft SEIR page ES-3 in Section 3.0.

5. The Executive Summary and Required CEQA Considerations have been revised as shown on Draft SEIR pages ES-4 and 4-4 in Section 3.0. On page 1-6 in the Introduction, the bullet on loss of farmland refers to impacts in the whole of southwest Santa Rosa as evaluated in the Southwest Area Plan EIR, and has not been revised.

6. Mitigation Measure 3.2-6b in Table ES-2 has been corrected as noted (see Draft SEIR page ES-5 in Section 3.0).

7. Table 2-2 has been updated to reflect the correct owner of parcel 043-071-029 (see Draft SEIR page 2-11 in Section 3.0).

8. The Project Description has been changed to include this sentence as shown on Draft SEIR page 2-12 in Section 3.0.

9. The letter and comments from Ted. P. Winfield, Ph.D. are noted and addressed as a separate comment letter in this section.
February 25, 2005

City of Santa Rosa
Development of Community Development
Attn. Frank Kasimov
Via fax 707 543-3269

Re: Dutton Meadows Draft SEIR

Dear Mr. Kasimov:

Thank you for this opportunity to submit comments and questions regarding Dutton Meadows Draft Subsequent EIR, file number ST03-009.

The Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition is a non-profit organization who represents bike riders in Sonoma County. We have some concerns regarding proposed roadways and access points of the Colgan Creek Bike path in this project.

1. Why are there no class II bike lanes on proposed Dutton Extension?

2. Why are there no class II bike lanes on proposed Dutton Meadow?
   This is of major concern as it should be expected that children and bicycle commuters will be accessing the two schools and two parks in this and surrounding areas.

3. The document shows that the class II bike lanes on Hearn Avenue are to be removed, why is this? Is this consistent with the general plan?

4. How will traffic issues be handled near Meadow Ridge elementary?

5. Will appropriate traffic calming efforts be employed to make areas around the schools and parks safe for pedestrians and bike riders?

6. We are very concerned about what the speed will be on North Point Pkwy. We hope the planners will consider the importance of pedestrian and bike riders’ safety as they designate the speed along this corridor.

7. We’d like to point out that 5 percent of pedestrians hit by a vehicle traveling 20 mph will die, or that the fatality rate jumps to 40 percent for cars traveling 30 mph, 80 percent for cars going 40 mph, and 100 percent for cars going 50 mph or faster? (From Preusser Research Group for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration).

8. How will the plan enable children to walk to Meadow Ridge Elementary School or Elsie Allen High School from the new housing to the east?
9. Does the plan address traffic issues at the intersection of North Point Pkwy and Dutton Meadows? This intersection should expect very heavy use during the morning commute and school start times.

10. How will the bike and pedestrian crossing be handled from Colgan Creek to North Point Pkwy? It appears from the plan that bicycle riders traveling north on Colgan Creek are expected to cross North Point Pkwy by traveling against traffic (very dangerous and illegal) to get to the signal to cross. We suggest that the North Point Pkwy is built over the path to keep the path continuous and allow bike and pedestrian access from either side of the North Point Pkwy crossing.

11. Has the plan considered bike and pedestrian access to the proposed SMART rail line and the Bike/Ped path way that will travel parallel to the SMART rail corridor?

Again, thank you for your time and considering and addressing these concerns. Please feel free to contact me at the number above.

Sincerely,

Christine Culver
Executive Director

cc: Santa Rosa Planning Commission
February 25, 2005

City of Santa Rosa
Development of Community Development
Attn. Frank Kasimov
Via fax 707 543-3269

Re: Addition to previous comments on the Dutton Meadows Draft SEIR

Dear Mr. Kasimov:

I missed one other topic that we would like addressed.

It was stated by one of the presenters of the Dutton Meadows project that there will be a significant impact on Highway 101. Could you please address how this will be handled and what is Caltrans role and position in this project?

Once again, thank you for your time and considering and addressing these concerns. Please feel free to contact me at the number above.

Sincerely,

Christine Culver
Executive Director

cc: Santa Rosa Planning Commission
Response to Comment Letter from Christine Culver, Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition, dated February 25, 2005

Note: Response numbers correspond to comment numbers labeled in the margin of the letter.

1. The project includes a Class II bicycle lane on Dutton Extension between Northpoint Parkway and Hearn Avenue and a Class III bicycle route on Tuxhorn Drive between Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadow, consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and the 2001 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. To add or remove bicycle paths, lanes or routes from the bicycle circulation system, it would be necessary to amend, under a separate process, the transportation element of the General Plan, specifically Figure 5-2, Bicycle Corridors, which shows existing and planned bicycle facilities.

2. The project includes a Class III bicycle route on Dutton Meadow, consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and the 2001 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. To add or remove bicycle paths, lanes or routes from the bicycle circulation system, it would be necessary to amend, under a separate process, the transportation element of the General Plan, specifically Figure 5-2, Bicycle Corridors, which shows existing and planned bicycle facilities.

3. The existing Class II bicycle lanes on Hearn Avenue are to be maintained. Figure 2-6 in the Dutton Meadows Project Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report shows an error. The corrected figure is attached.

4. There will be a controlled, signalized intersection at the intersection of Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadow directly east of Meadow View Elementary School. No change is planned in the school’s existing driveway access.

5. The final configuration of the Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadow intersection will result in greater distance between traffic and Meadow View Elementary School than currently exists between Dutton Meadow and the school (see Figure 2-5 in the Draft SEIR). In addition, the Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadow intersection will be a controlled signalized intersection, allowing for safe pedestrian crossings. Although not required, consideration will be given to including a storage lane on Northpoint Parkway for vehicles to wait at the school. Additional calming measures are not within the scope of the project.

6. Northpoint Parkway is classified as a parkway in the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan circulation element. The General Plan (page 5-3) says that “[r]oadway speeds may be 45 mph or higher. When Parkways enter town, they become boulevards, and speeds are reduced to 30 to 35 mph.” Speed limits on streets in the Project area (including Northpoint Parkway) will be established consistent with design guidelines and local and state regulations.

7. Comment noted. Please refer to Response #6 above.

8. The intersection of the re-aligned Dutton Meadow at Northpoint Parkway will be a controlled, signalized intersection with pedestrian signals that will allow children to cross from the Dutton Meadows development to the west side of Dutton Meadow and to Meadow View Elementary School. No change is planned in the school’s existing...
driveway access on Dutton Meadow. Students attending Elsie Allen High School will continue south on Dutton Meadow, as shown in Figure 3.2-4, School Locations and Preferred Walking Routes, in the Draft SEIR.

9. Traffic issues at the intersection of Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadows were analyzed as part of the cumulative roadway arterial level of service for the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan. The General Plan specifies that the intersection will be signalized northbound and southbound along Northpoint Parkway and eastbound and westbound along Dutton Meadow. Northbound lanes will have one exclusive left turn lane, one through lane, and one exclusive right turn lane. Southbound lanes will have one exclusive left lane and one shared/through right turn lane. Eastbound and westbound lanes will have one exclusive left turn lane and one shared/through right turn lane. When Northpoint Parkway is extended southward, the intersection will be a controlled, signalized intersection with pedestrian signals.

10. The Colgan Creek path is planned for the west side of Colgan Creek. At a minimum, a Class I bike path will be provided between the Colgan Creek path and the Northpoint Parkway/Dutton Extension intersection. This will allow bicycles heading north along the Colgan Creek path to be safely routed to the intersection on a pathway separate from the roadway. Bicycles can then cross Northpoint Parkway and continue north along the west side of Colgan Creek. In lieu of this Class I bike bath, project applicants will be allowed to develop alternative crossings, such as constructing a continuous bike path under North Point Parkway, provided that the alternative also meets necessary safety requirements.

Prior to occupancy of Dutton Meadows Phase 3, Mitigation Measure 9-1 in the Dutton Meadows Project Initial Study requires that a bridge across Colgan Creek be constructed to connect the extension of Dutton Avenue and Northpoint Parkway to the existing Dutton Avenue south of the bridge (see page 34 of Volume II, Appendix A of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR).

11. The Project is not located near the rail line. All bicycle facilities in the project will be consistent with the facilities designated in the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and the 2001 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and therefore will support access to the proposed SMART rail line.

12. Local communities are contributing financially to address traffic issues on Highway 101. Money from Measure M, approximately $188 million, will be used to fund 50% of many Highway 101 projects, as described in Traffic Relief Act for Sonoma County, Expenditure Plan, Sonoma County Transportation Authority, June 28, 2004. Even though the local communities are contributing financially, the California Department of Transportation still retains jurisdiction over Highway 101.

1 See http://www.sonomacounty.org/scta/pdf/sonoma_co_expenditure_plan_2004_final.pdf
Mr. Frank Kasimov  
City of Santa Rosa  
Department of Community Development  
P.O. Box 1678  
Santa Rosa, California 95402  

Dear Mr. Kasimov:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Dutton Meadows Project Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR, SCH # 2002092016). As you may be aware, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) oversees the cleanup of sites where hazardous substances have been released pursuant to the California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.8. As a potential Responsible Agency, DTSC is submitting comments to ensure that the environmental documentation prepared for this project to address the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) adequately addresses any remediation of hazardous substance releases that may be necessary.

On page 3.4-1 of the Draft SEIR, there is a discussion about organochlorine pesticides being detected in soil samples collected during the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of parcels 043-191-018, -019, and -020 at concentrations above Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) in orchard areas. Several mitigation measures are included to address the organochlorine pesticides in soil, including Mitigation Measure 3.4-2d, Perform Phase III Remediation. The SEIR should address any potential impacts associated with remediation activities or discuss how the potential impacts will be addressed in the future if further characterization is to be performed to determine the extent of cleanup that is required. If soil excavation is conducted as part of the cleanup, the following may need to be addressed: (1) potential air impacts and health impacts; (2) identification of any applicable local standards which may be exceeded, including dust and noise levels; (3) transportation impacts from the removal activities; and (4) risk of upset should there be an accident at the site during implementation of cleanup activities.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-2b consists of the requirement that future applicants characterize the soil and groundwater conditions of the areas to be disturbed as part of future development projects. In a February 23, 2005 telephone conversation, you
Mr. Frank Kasimov  
February 24, 2005  
Page 2

conveyed to Claude Jemison of our office that the entire project site has been characterized. The SEIR should clarify why additional site assessment may be required under Mitigation Measure 3.4-2b. Also, the SEIR should discuss the range of concentrations of contaminants found in soil during the Phase I assessments and site investigations.

Please contact Claude Jemison of my staff at (510) 540-3803 if you have any questions. Thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Piros  
Mark E. Piros, P.E.  
Unit Chief  
Northern California Coastal  
Cleanup Operations Branch

cc:  Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
State Clearinghouse  
P.O. Box 3044  
Sacramento, California 95812-3044

Guenther Moskat  
CEQA Tracking Center  
Department of Toxic Substances Control  
P.O. Box 806  
Sacramento, California 95812-0806
Response to Comment Letter from Mark E. Piros, P.E., Department of Toxics Substance Control, dated February 24, 2005

Note: Response numbers correspond to comment numbers labeled in the margin of the letter.

1. As described in Section 1.2 of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR, the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR tiers from the Southwest Area Plan EIR. Therefore, as described in Section 3.1, the Lead Agency is responsible for implementing all appropriate and feasible mitigation measures for impacts evaluated in the Southwest Area Plan EIR and noted in the Dutton Meadows Project Initial Study (see Appendix A in Volume II of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR). If soil excavation is conducted as part of a Phase III remediation, mitigation measures described in the Dutton Meadows Project Initial Study would be implemented to address potential air and health impacts, including impacts from dust, noise, and risk of upset. The applicable mitigation measures are also listed below for reference; note that the mitigation measure numbers refer to their number in the Southwest Area Plan EIR.

Transportation impacts from removal activities, which are considered part of project construction activities, were evaluated in the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR in 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.) This potential impact is mitigated to a less than significant level through Mitigation Measure 3.2-6a Implement Construction Traffic Management Plan and Mitigation Measure 3.2-6b Promote safety of school-age children during construction.

Southwest Area Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.8-1 Construction in areas of Contamination or Potential Contamination:

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

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

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

Southwest Area Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.4-1 Air Quality

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Southwest Area Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.4-4 Air Quality

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

Southwest Area Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.5-1 Noise

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

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

2. The entire Master Development Plan site, as described in Section 2.4.2 of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR, has been characterized. The only portion of the project area that has not been characterized is the Curran Parcel, which is only in the rezoning action (see Section 2.4.1 of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR). Mitigation Measure 3.4-2b Characterize soil and groundwater conditions and remediate as necessary, would apply to this parcel.
February 25, 2005

Frank Kasimov
City of Santa Rosa
PO Box 1678
Santa Rosa, CA 95402

Subject: Dutton Meadows
SCH#: 2002092016

Dear Frank Kasimov:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Supplemental EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on February 24, 2005, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

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

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse
**SCH#** | 2002092016  
**Project Title** | Dutton Meadows  
**Lead Agency** | Santa Rosa, City of

**Type** | SIR Supplemental EIR  
**Description** | Master development plan for eleven parcels. Three specific proposed development projects (encompassing approximately 31 acres) within the Master Development Plan area. Modification of the Policy Statement for the Northpoint-Dutton Community Commons zoning district.

**Lead Agency Contact**

| Name | Frank Kasimov  
| Agency | City of Santa Rosa  
| Phone | 707 543-3258  
| email |  
| Address | PO Box 1678  
| City | Santa Rosa  
| State | CA  
| Zip | 95402

**Project Location**

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

**Proximity to:**

**Highways** | 12 & US101  
**Airports** | NWPRR  
**Railways** |  
**Waterways** | Colgan Creek Flood Control Channel  
**Schools** | Meadowview School  
**Land Use** | Rural Residential, agricultural, open space / PD Northpoint Parkway Community Commons, General Commercial-Planned Development / Mixed Use Retail, Medium Density Residential, Residential Medium Low Density, Residential Low Density, Community Commons, Office; Neighborhood Park

**Project Issues** | Archaeologic-Historic; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Toxic/Hazardous; Solid Waste; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife; Cumulative Effects

**Reviewing Agencies**

- Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 3; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Health Services; Department of Water Resources; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 1; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Caltrans, District 4; Native American Heritage Commission

**Date Received** | 01/11/2005  
**Start of Review** | 01/11/2005  
**End of Review** | 02/24/2005

*Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.*
Response to Comment Letter from Terry Roberts, State of California Governors Office of Planning and Research, dated February 25, 2005

Note: Response numbers correspond to comment numbers labeled in the margin of the letter.

1. Comment noted.
Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the above EIR.

Traffic Issues: I am referencing pp.ES-2, Summary Table of Impacts and Mitigations, Impact 3.2-2. “The project may decrease the average speed on Stony Point Rd., Hearn Ave, and Northpoint Parkway.” Due to the fact that this is a completely unmitigated impact, presented in a piecemeal fashion and presenting incomplete information, it is inadequate and unacceptable to me as an adjacent property owner who would be adversely affected by the impact.

This is illustrated by the fact that the project includes a portion of the projected extension/expansion of Northpoint Pkwy. Only sketchy information on same has ever been presented. As a SW resident, I can clearly say that not only do I not wish to see the Pkwy expanded to a 5 lane blvd., but that incomplete planning or cherry-picking typifies it.

Firstly, I am aghast to see that funding for the multi-million dollar project would come from the same CIP Budget from which the City could not find $97,000 to fund even the design phase of the Northpoint Pkwy Fire Station, clearly presenting bad faith. Next, the exact route of the extension is unacceptably vague as it would involve unknown amounts of private taking/condemnations. Also, I note that there is no acknowledgment of the fact that said expansion of the Parkway/Blvd. could easily include relocating the newly constructed and publicly funded Fire Station, clearly a misuse of public funds.

That's planning.

Similarly, Impact 3-2.6 is inadequately mitigated. “Construction of the project would lead to increased truck and construction vehicle activity on the local roadway network and create lane closures, causing traffic delays, transit delays, restricted access, increased traffic hazards, and rerouting of traffic, including emergency vehicles.”
Mitigation measure 3.2.6a, implement Construction Traffic Management Plan is inadequate for the following reasons: As a homeowner on a cul-de-sac community feeding Stony Point, I have had several unfortunate construction-related experiences involving total closures to Stony Point.

Welcome to the wonderful world of infill:

Although potential impacts to school children (mostly student/pedestrians going to/from Elsie Allen Hi School) are mentioned in Impact 3.2-4, and mitigated in several measures (#3.2-4a thru 3.2-4d) such impacts are also mentioned as construction hazards, presented as a significant impact and mitigated in measure 3.2-6a and referenced in a needed Construction Management Plan. While this reference is both novel and reassuring, it also illustrates the outstanding hazard involved. Basically, there is a serious hazard from construction activity, involving elementary school-aged children/pedestrians, waiting at designated bus stops or walking to or from home or school.

In this case, a construction related mishap could be fatal and very difficult/impossible to completely avoid. This is due to the many area school districts and schools besides Elsie Allen and the fact that there never was an adequate circulation pattern in SW Santa Rosa. As mentioned in the EIR, there are two elementary schools in the immediate area, three more in outlying areas, as well as the Santa Rosa Christian School on North Wright Rd.

The hazards to young children are referenced in Mitigation Measure 3.2-6b which includes creating a temporary construction road which may not always be possible. If there were, there would never be an impediment to emergency vehicles. Again, I reference, the lack of a circulation pattern in the Southwest originally presented by LAFCO as a deterrent to annexation and unfortunately forgotten. Emergency access, therefore, will not always be possible. As a person reliant on the personnel and services provided for me, I must insist that such access to emergency vehicles be available at all times.

This difficulty has been exacerbated by the SW Plan, high-density development and the arbitrary deletion of a north-south connector road, linking Yuba Dr. and Northpoint Pkwy. To this date, I have had my pooper shut down water turned off and found that traffic, including emergency vehicles that had no access whatsover.

Therefore, you are instructed to prepare a traffic management plan which will adequately address these issues.
PUBLIC SERVICES

Impacts 3.3.6 and 3.3-7 present the increased demand for fire/police services mitigated as measures 3.3-6 thru 3.3-7 which merely vaguely mentions the need to fund a new fire station and which inadequately references the inability to maintain General Plan service standards and acceptable deployment times. Until the installation/completion of General Plan mandated firestation on Northpoint Pkwy, deployment times will continue to be substandard. Therefore, these impacts are inadequately mitigated.

ODE TO MEASURE O: WHERE HAVE ALL THE FIRE STATIONS GONE?

As the beleagured citizen who was forced to go to the Grand Jury to seek redress of the indifference of the City Council as demonstrated by its’ refusal to fund even the design phase of the Northpoint Firestation, I wish to express my profoundest contempt for the emphasis on Gang Task Force recommendations, which has had the over-zealous seeking money before Measure O was even approved.

We don’t have 20 years to experiment on ‘mentoring’ based on pseudo-scientific jargon which resembles Bread and Circuses. Only strict enforcement, well-funded and equiped Police and Fire Fighters will do the job. How unfortunate that the people have been forced to fund their own safety. How badly this reflects on a City which blythe watched the population double for 20 years and neglected its’s own Fire Safety Standards. The reason that citizens have governments at all is so those governments will provide for their safety. If this is the case, if this Council would so ignore it’s foremost obligation to ‘provide for the common defense’ then this is a Council which does not need to exist.

This inability to maintain General Plan Service Standards is only vaguely mentioned in a “Community Services Program”, another paper and jargon answer to a very real problem. I am recommending that the timeline for the Northpoint Firestation be advanced and that that no further development precede it.

Further, approval of the project will put the lead agency, in this case, the City of Santa Rosa, in inconsistency with General Plan designated deployment times for fire response as required by CEQA section 21083.3.

A similar situation exists with the level of service standards for police protection services. “This is a potentially significant impact.” (P.3.3 10) The addition of 1,506 new residents who could not be adequately protected is a glaring deficiency. Again, I reference CEQA section 21083.3.
Impact 3.3.7 ‘The Project may increase the demand for fire and emergency services to such a degree that the General Plan service standard is not maintained.’ The vaguely referenced Community Services District Program would doubtless represent merely another smoke and mirrors approach to mask the City’s callous indifference to safety, particularly apparent in Southwest Santa Rosa where service times are the worst of anyplace in the City and where this project happens to be located.

WETLAND ISSUES

I had prepared extensive wetland-related comments, before my secretary found a lengthy letter buried in the back of Volume 11 of this EIR from RWQCB granting the needed waiver from an Individual Wetland Permit. Thanks.

However, I can state that the referenced Yuba Dr. Mitigation Bank is “maxed out” or at capacity per ACE Permit #22045N ( Permit Manager John Knudsen, 415-977-8437) recalling one of the original fears about Mitigation Banking, that it would be ‘over-utilized.’

Therefore, for the above reasons and glaring public safety deficiencies, I recommend against approval or this DEIR and project.

Sincerely,

Donna Strom
Sonoma County Wetland Watch
Southwest Resident
Santa Rosa, Ca. 95407
707-526-0820

c: Ed Flint, Police Chief, City of Santa Rosa
    Bruce Vargas, Fire Chief, City of Santa Rosa
    Carol Cooper, LAFCO
Response to Comment Letter from Donna Strom, Sonoma County Wetland Watch and Southwest Resident, dated February 9, 2005

Note: Response numbers correspond to comment numbers labeled in the margin of the letter.

1. As discussed on page 3.2-23 of the Draft SEIR, the projected decrease of the average speed on Stony Point Road, Hearn Avenue and Northpoint Parkway is approximately 4 miles per hour. This decrease would not cause the level of service (LOS) on any of these roadways to fall below LOS "D," which is the threshold of significance for traffic impacts on roadways (see page 3.2-19). Therefore, this is not a significant impact and no mitigation is required;

2. The Northpoint Parkway extension located within the Dutton Meadows project will be constructed as part of the project. The parkway extension and its location in the Dutton Meadows project are consistent with the General Plan circulation element and support the objectives of the circulation element for Southwest Santa Rosa.

3. An interim fire station will be constructed and running by late summer 2005 using Measure O funds. It is to be located in the area of Northpoint Parkway, Stony Point Road and Corporate Center Parkway. Funds for a permanent fire station are slated to primarily come from the Southwest Area Development Impact Fee program.

4. Impact 3.2-6, page 3.2-25, describes impacts to local traffic from construction of the project. As discussed under this impact, temporary lane closures could be required for some activities, which could cause traffic delays, transit delays, restricted access, increased traffic hazards, and rerouting of traffic. Mitigation measures that will be implemented include preparation and implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (Mitigation Measure 3.2-6a) that identifies strategies to maintain adequate service levels on local roadways and to provide access, including emergency access, to residential and business sites. Additional mitigation will be implemented to promote the safety of school-age children attending the Meadow View Elementary School (see Mitigation Measure 3.2-6b). These mitigation measures, which reduce the effects of lane closures during construction, will mitigate impacts to a less than significant level.

5. Please refer to Response #4 above. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will identify strategies to maintain adequate service levels on local roadways during construction. No total closures of any roadways during construction are planned.

6. Initially, a traffic signal will be located at Hearn Avenue and Dutton Meadow (to be renamed Northpoint Parkway). This intersection will have pedestrian push buttons and WALK/DON'T WALK signals. Later, when Northpoint Parkway is extended southward, the intersection of the re-aligned Dutton Meadow at Northpoint Parkway will be a controlled, signalized intersection with pedestrian signals that will allow children to cross from the Dutton Meadows development to the west side of Dutton Meadow and to Meadow View Elementary School. The final configuration of the Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadow intersection will result in greater distance between traffic and Meadow View Elementary School than currently exists between Dutton Meadow and the school (see Figure 2-5 in the Draft SEIR). Although not
required, consideration will be given to including a storage lane on Northpoint Parkway for vehicle stacking. No change is planned in the Meadow View Elementary School's existing driveway access on Dutton Meadow. Students attending Elsie Allen High School will continue south on Dutton Meadow, as shown in Figure 3.2-4, School Locations and Preferred Walking Routes, in the Draft SEIR.

No full road closures are planned during construction and emergency vehicle access will be maintained at all times.

7. A Traffic Management Plan will be implemented prior to construction as part of Mitigation Measure 3.2-6a, Implement Construction Traffic Management Plan. The 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 will be provided to the City and to affected homeowners. Please also refer to Response #4 above.

8. Please refer to Response #3 above. Potential impacts to fire and police services have been mitigated to less than significant levels through Mitigation Measure 3.3-6 Implement Community Services District Program and Mitigation Measure 3.3-7 Fund New Fire Station.

Under the City's Special Tax Financing Code, Chapter 4-56 of the Santa Rosa City Code, a Community Services District (a tax district) may be created to perpetually fund the City Police Department and City Fire Department and other City General Fund operations to mitigate significant service impacts. This tax district is a mitigation measure that is in addition to any other fees or tax districts that would normally be required for this type of project. A formula based on a per-unit/per-year or other criteria would have to be established and the timing of the recodation of said district would relate to the occupancy of units. The Community Services District is required to be established prior to the recodation of the Final Map.

9. Please refer to Response #3 above. An interim fire station will be constructed and operational by late summer 2005 using Measure O funds. It is to be located in the area of Northpoint Parkway, Stony Point Road and Corporate Center Parkway. Funds for a permanent fire station are slated to primarily come from the Southwest Area Development Impact Fee program.

Section 21083.3(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states than “[a]n effect of a project upon the environment shall not be considered peculiar to the parcel or to the project...if uniformly applied development policies or standards have been previously adopted by the city or county, with a finding based upon substantial evidence...that the development policies or standards will substantially mitigate that environmental effect when applied to future projects.” The Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report concluded that the General Plan policies mitigate potential increases in demand for police and fire services to a less than significant level. With the mitigation measures included in the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR, the project will meet General Plan service standards. Approval of the project is therefore consistent with Section 21083.3 of the CEQA Guidelines.
10. Funding from Measure O and Mitigation Measure 3.3-6 Implement Community Services District Program will reduce potential impacts from an increase in demand for police services to a less than significant level. Please see also Responses #8 and #9 above.

11. Please refer to Responses #8 and #9 above.

12. Comment noted. On the Phase 1 portion of the project (also referred to in the past as the Bellevue Phase 8 Project), 0.16 acres of seasonal wetlands have been previously filled under USACE File No. 24554N (Nationwide Permit 39 Residential, Commercial, and Institutional Developments), dated May 8, 2001. On February 1, 2002 the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region issued a Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements and Issuance of Clean Water Act Section 401 Conditional Certification for Bellevue Ranch Phase 8. Fill of these 0.16 acres of wetlands has already been permitted and mitigated at the Yuba Drive Mitigation Bank. See Dutton Meadows Project Draft Subsequent EIR, Volume II, Appendix F.

As described in Mitigation Measure 3.6-2d, Section 404 permits and Section 401 certification waivers will be obtained as necessary for fill of other wetlands on the project site. Fill of wetlands on the remainder of the project site, except for the Curran parcel, will be mitigated at the Gobbi Ranch site.

13. As described in the response to #12 above, only fill of the 0.16 acres of wetlands on the Phase 1 portion of the project site has been mitigated at the Yuba Drive Mitigation Bank. Fill of wetlands on the remainder of the project site, except for the Curran parcel, will be mitigated at the Gobbi Ranch site. No mitigation bank may use or sell mitigation credits beyond the capacity of the bank determined at the time of its establishment.

14. Potential public safety impacts have been addressed in Section 3.2, Traffic and Circulation; Section 3.3, Utilities and Public Services; and 3.4, Hazardous Materials. Mitigation measures have been included where necessary to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. The project would not result in any significant impacts to public safety.
February 24, 2005

Anne Moore
Moore Consulting
29 Surrey Lane, Suite 101
San Rafael, CA 94903-3226

RE: Comments on Vegetation, Wildlife and Habitat Section in Dutton Meadows Project DEIR

Dear Anne:

Attached is a copy of comments and suggested edits to the Vegetation, Wildlife and Habitat section (Section 3.6) of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2002092016). These comments are a compilation of separate comments on Section 3.6 prepared by Dr. Larry Stromberg, Jeff Olberding and me. Dr. Stromberg and Jeff Olberding performed or supervised the biological survey work completed for the Dutton Meadow Project site and prepared the subsequent reports that have been used as references for preparation of the DEIR.

I hope that the comments are clear but if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (925) 371-6379.

Sincerely,

Ted P. Winfield, Ph.D.

Cc: H. Rich (TRI Development)
    G. Hines (Trumark Companies)
    L. Stromberg
    J. Olberding (Olberding Environmental)
COMMENTS ON DRAFT SUBSEQUENT EIR
REGARDING VEGETATION, WILDLIFE AND WILDLIFE
FOR THE DUTTON MEADOWS PROJECT

NOTE: the page number that the comment is in reference to is listed first.

ES-11 (Table ES-2, Impact 3.6-6)

The project will not result in the loss of any special-status species. The surveys completed for the site were protocol-level surveys and the results were negative. Lobbs buttercup is a CNPS list 4 species and has no official government status. Therefore, the significance level should be changed to "Less than Significant."

3.6-1 (3.6.1.1 Existing Vegetation and Habitat Types)

The listing of habitat types appears to have been taken from Section 3.1 of the Biological Assessment (BA), which is appended to the DEIR (Appendix F). The list of habitat types in the BA does not contain the parenthetical reference to vernal pools. The BA identifies the seasonal wetlands as artificial habitats that support some plant species commonly found in vernal pools. In Section 3.6.1.1 of the DEIR (at page 3.6-2, first full paragraph) there is a discussion regarding the seasonal wetlands and the fact that they do not meet the definition of a vernal pool as defined in the Santa Rosa Plain Vernal Pool Ecosystem Preservation Plan and the USFWS programmatic agreement. Therefore, the parenthetical reference to vernal pools following the first item (Seasonal Wetlands) should be deleted.

3.6-1 (Section 3.6.1.1, Seasonal Wetlands, first paragraph)

The correct citation for the Biological Assessment is: Olberding Environmental, Inc. and L. Stromberg. 2003. Biological Assessment for the Dutton Meadows Development Project. Sonoma County, California. Prepared for Trumark Companies, June 11, 2003. The text citation should include both authors' names (Olberding Environmental and Stromberg 2003). Also, for completeness, the discussion of jurisdictional determinations should identify either in the text or in a table the specific authors and report citation for each of the different parcels, the date of the report and include the complete citation in the references section (Section 3.5.6 References). The reports submitted to the Corps regarding jurisdictional wetlands at the different parcels that make up the project site are as follows:


3.6-4 (Section 3.6.1.3 Special-status Species, Special-status Plants)

The surveys do meet the USFWS protocol for surveys for vernal pool endangered plant species as outlined in the Programmatic Consultation. As per the Service’s protocol, three visits were made to the project site during the growing season in each of the years in which a survey was conducted and the visits were made at the time when Sebastopol meadowfoam, Sonoma sunshine, and Burke’s goldfields were identifiable on one or more of several reference sites. No attempt was made to get USFWS approval of reference sites a priori but the target species have been observed on multiple occasions in the past on every reference site and the USFWS and California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff are aware of the presence of the species at the locations supporting what were used as reference populations.

Reference populations of Sebastopol meadowfoam, the species with the greatest probability of occurring on the Dutton Meadow site, included the following: Wright Preservation Bank (a mitigation bank site owned and protected by DFG), the Carinalli Todd Road Mitigation Bank site, the Gobbi Mitigation Site (a 31-acre mitigation site for the Courtside Village project), the Broadmoor North site (a mitigation site owned and protected by the Santa Rosa City School District), the Springfield (Toscana) site, and the adjacent Air Center.

Reference Sonoma sunshine populations were observed on: the Jacobson property (in northwest Santa Rosa between Fulton Road, San Miguel Avenue, and Francisco Avenue), the Woodbridge Site (north of and adjacent to the Jacobson property), the North Village site (north of and adjacent to the Woodbridge site), the Gobbi Mitigation Site, the Bertolone property (on Wood Road), the Alton Lane Preserve (a mitigation site protected by easement granted to DFG), and the Porter Mitigation Site (adjacent to the Alton Lane Preserve).

Reference Burke’s goldfields populations were observed on: property owned by Stewart and Sachs on Francisco Avenue in northwest Santa Rosa, the Westwind Business Park in northwest Santa Rosa, Arata property on NW corner Fulton Road - Wood Road intersection, the Alton Lane Preserve, and the Porter Mitigation Site.

Surveys for the endangered species were conducted on many of these reference sites at the same time surveys were conducted on the project site. In each year, the site visits were conducted when the species were identifiable and all potential habitat (seasonal wetland) at the project site was surveyed thoroughly. Comprehensive species lists were included in each report with identifications made to taxonomic levels that permitted rarity to be determined. Following is a list of the reports that present the results of the protocol surveys for special-status plant species at the Project site:

Olberding, J.A. 2003a. Results of Special Status Plant Species, Minoia and Nelson Properties, Santa Rosa, California.

Stromberg, L.P. 2000a. Results of survey for Special-Status Plant Species, Hearn Properties, Santa Rosa, California.
Stromberg, L.P. 2000c. Results of survey for Special-Status Plant Species, Lechmanski Property (A. P. No.043-171-029), Santa Rosa, California.


Stromberg, L.P. 2001b. Results of survey for Special-Status Plant Species, Nelson Property, Santa Rosa, California.

There is no need to conduct additional surveys for the endangered plant species since the results of all the protocol plant surveys are negative.

3.6-5 (Section 3.6.1.3 Special-status Species, Special-status Plants, third full paragraph)

The first sentence should be revised as follows to remove reference to vernal pools:

(Of the plants 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 seasonal wetlands and non-native grassland. (emphasis added)

3.6-13 (Section 3.6.1.3 Special-status Species, Special-status Wildlife, first paragraph)

The USFWS assumed that the project site and surrounding undeveloped lands were aestivation habitat for the CTS because of the proximity of these lands to the Southwest Community Park CTS breeding pond. Therefore, protocol surveys for CTS on these lands were either not conducted or were not allowed to proceed by the USFWS.

3.6-14 (Section 3.6.1.3 Special-status Species, Special-status Wildlife, California Linderiella, last sentence of second paragraph)

California linderiella is not listed as threatened or endangered by either the state or federal government but the species remains a species of concern. The agencies traditionally do not require surveys for this species. For the Dutton Meadows Project, the proposed mitigation will provide high quality potential habitat for this species and the habitat will be protected. Pre-construction surveys for this species are warranted given the poor quality of the existing potential habitat at the Project site and the higher quality potential habitat that will be provided and protected at the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 (mitigation site);

3.6-17 (Mitigation Measure 3.6-1b)

Because the CEQA document is used to make decisions about the acceptability of a project based on its impacts, the DEIR should present all the pertinent information. Where other documents are incorporated by reference that contain guidance that is to be followed, such as the General Tree Preservation Guidelines by Horticultural Associates, the text of the DEIR should contain a summary of the guidance since not all the readers, including those responsible for determining the acceptability of the project, will have easy access to the referenced document. Therefore, the key elements of the General Tree Preservation Guidelines should be summarized in this section.
Meeting the project purpose does not always allow for the avoidance or minimization of impacts to wetland resources and in many cases avoidance of impacts could have a longer-term adverse impact on the avoided resource. The mitigation measure needs to be modified as follows:

**Avoid or minimize impacts to wetland resources to the maximum extent practicable.** (emphasis added)

The same qualifying phrase should also be added to the statement in the first bullet.

Avoidance of wetland resources is not always the best approach, especially if the wetlands are disturbed and located as isolated features with little or no connectivity with other wetland resources in the area or at the site. Ideally, avoided wetlands would be sufficiently buffered with surrounding upland habitat, possess effective ecological connections with other wetlands and types of habitat, and have the hydrologic setting necessary to maintain the existing water balance. The areas containing the avoided wetlands would also be large enough to be internally resistant to the demographic and genetic events that cause local extinctions (eliminate species populations) and, via eliminations, reduce community diversity and the associated functions.

No work has been reported in the scientific literature or has been prescribed with respect to the minimum acceptable size of seasonal wetland preserves on the Santa Rosa Plain. The Vernal Pool Task Force recognized that (1) preservation of small wetland areas in urbanized settings leads to losses of function, (2) surrounding upland habitat is required to buffer a wetland preserve, and (3) large preserves are superior to small preserves. No effort was made to quantify preserve and buffer size, minimum viable population size, or satisfactory connectivity, but the vernal pool ecosystem preservation plan (CH2M Hill 1996) and the Mitigation Bank Review Team support large areas as places where mitigation for impacts on seasonal wetland habitat should take place. Mitigation Banks removed from the direct and immediate influence of urban land uses offer a preferable alternative to patchwork arrays of small (“postage stamp” is a commonly used descriptor) preserves stranded as islands within developed or urbanized landscapes. In such islands, preserved values cannot be expected to persist.

In spite of the size of the project site, the proposed project would completely surround any avoided wetlands, leaving them as unmanageable islands. Grazing would not be practical in the avoided areas given the difficulty of access and a tendency for residential landowners to complain about the odors associated with cattle grazing. Lacking grazing, the wetlands would gradually no longer function in the manner necessary to retain the current functions however compromised they already are. Although fuel reduction through mowing to meet local fire department requirements would remove excess thatch from the mowed areas, the entire preserve area would not have to be mowed to satisfy fuel reduction requirements. Eventually, the accumulation of grass thatch would eliminate the smaller annual species. Alternatively, discing could temporarily improve conditions by opening sites for their establishment, but it would destroy the vegetation annually, cause partial burial of seed, and (contrary to regulatory assumptions) gradually result in wetland filling and/or outlet lowering. Ecological isolation would reduce further the chances of establishment of native plant species.
No other existing or potential preserves occur near the project site and even the proposed on-site and nearby mitigation sites would offer minimal opportunities for the exchange of propagules with wetlands in any on-site preserves. The altered and unprotectable hydrologic function of the wetlands also suggests that wetland species preservation would be difficult at best. Non-native grasses, particularly ryegrass, form dense stands in wetlands that are not inundated for long periods, such as the wetlands on the project site. Isolation and altered hydrologic function have more significant effects on small populations. For these and the above reasons, preservation of the wetlands would be ecologically improbable. Even partial avoidance would yield little in terms of long-term preservation of wetland functions.

The overall direct impacts achieved by partial or full avoidance on the project site would be reduced but none of the wetlands could be properly managed. Neither DFG nor SCAPOS would accept fee title, a conservation easement, or management responsibilities over the avoided areas. The avoided wetlands would gradually decline. Preservation of their functions would be ecologically improbable. The long-term result would be the net loss of wetland area and function, which would violate both the federal and state wetland policy of no net loss of wetlands.

3.6-18 (Mitigation Measure 3.6-2b)

The mitigation obligation at a ratio of 1.25:1 is 5.46 acres and the text needs to be changed to state that a minimum of 5.46 acres of vernal pool and other seasonal wetland habitat will be created or restored (this total does not include enhancement). Additionally, other wetlands will be enhanced by the mitigation project. Also, the Gobbi mitigation plan is being modified slightly through ongoing negotiations with the resource agencies and the number of acres of wetland that will be restored and created is 5.66 acres.

3.6-19 (Mitigation Measure 3.6-2d)

The agencies with control over wetland mitigation and monitoring are the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the RWQCB, not the US FWS and DFG. Although the USFWS and DFG can offer comments on the mitigation and monitoring plan, the Corps and RWQCB are the agencies that set the standards that must be met. This mitigation measure needs to be re-written to reflect the proper process of review and approval.

3.6-21 (first paragraph)

The applicant is in the process of finalizing agreements with the Service regarding mitigation for impacts to CTS and the elements of this agreement will be presented in the Biological Opinion being prepared by the USFWS. The Reasonable and Prudent Measures identified in the Biological Opinion will reflect the USFWS opinion of the quality of the habitat at the Gobbi Preserve No. 2. The mitigation conditions presented in the Biological Opinion will be incorporated into the conditions attached to the Section 404 permit issued by the Corps.

Regarding the sentence in the middle of the first paragraph (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 and its consultants have been working with the USFWS in the
development of the mitigation plan. We suggest revising the sentence as follows:

The applicant has been working with the USFWS regarding the quality of the habitat values present at the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 for CTS and listed plant species and the Biological Opinion, which is being prepared by the USFWS, will reflect its opinion of the quality of the habitat.

In the last sentence, the number of acres of wetland to be restored should be revised to state that...

3.6-21 (third paragraph)

All of the upland habitat, swales, and seasonal wetland habitat, including the vernal pools that are not inundated at the time CTS larvae leave their natal breeding ponds can be considered suitable aestivation habitat. CTS aestivation is not restricted to upland habitat only. Therefore, far more than 86 acres of the 108.8-acre Gobbi Preserve No. 2 is aestivation habitat. If the known CTS breeding ponds are not considered suitable aestivation habitat and their combined area (1.98 acres) is subtracted from the total 108.8 acres, then 106.8 acres would be aestivation habitat.

3.6-22 (Mitigation Measure 3-6.5, first paragraph)

While there are several ground nesting birds that could nest at the Project site, none of the species are known to return to the same nest. Therefore, if a nest is encountered during the pre-construction surveys and the nest does not contain eggs or young, there is no need to have a qualified biologist move the nest.

3.6-23 (Impact 3.6-6, Analysis [on top of page 3.6-23])

The conclusion that the impact is significant is not supported by the analysis of the available information pertaining to the rare plant surveys. Protocol-level special-status plant species surveys were conducted and the findings for listed species were negative. Lobb's buttercup is a CNPS list 4 species, which should not be considered or equated to a special-status species. This species is relatively common in the region with a relatively limited distribution at the Project site (in one small degraded seasonal wetland). The loss of this small number of individuals would not result in a substantial impact on the population of this species in the area. The small number of individuals at the project site cannot be considered a population so any analysis must look and the impact of the loss on the population of this species in the area. Under the section on Mandatory Findings of Significance in CEQA (Section 15065), such a finding of significance must be found if the project has the potential to "...substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species;..." There is nothing in this "definition" that would support a finding of significance related to the loss of Lobb's buttercup as a result of the Project.
3.6-23 (Mitigation Measure 3.6-6)

Protocol surveys for special-status plant species were conducted at the Project site and the findings were negative. Therefore, no additional surveys are necessary. Refer to the above discussion on the adequacy of the special-status plant surveys (see response 3.6-4 on page 2 for a more complete discussion).

3.6-25 (Mitigation Measure 3.6-8a, last bullet at top of page)

The mitigation measure does not identify the recipients of the construction monitoring and compliance reports. The last bullet item should be revised as follows:

- Prepare construction monitoring and compliance reports that analyze the effectiveness of the mitigation measures and submit to the City of Santa Rosa, California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and USFWS.

3.6-25 (Mitigation Measure 3.6-8b)

The mitigation measure cites a Draft Biological Opinion (Olberding 2003d). This document has no official standing and should not be presented as an official reference.

3.6-27 (Section 3.6.3.2 Cumulative Impacts)

This section needs to be revised to recognize the development of a conservation strategy by the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy Team planning effort to address conservation and recovery of CTS populations in Sonoma County that is currently underway. The Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy Team is a broad-based group consisting of private/public endeavor involving the development community, environmental community, city government (including the City of Santa Rosa), and state and federal government officials.

3.6-29 (Mitigation Measure 3.6-12, first paragraph)

The second sentence implies that CTS habitat can be created ("creation .... of large areas of CTS habitat"). While CTS breeding habitat can be created, the only action that would create large areas of CTS aestivation habitat would be the large-scale removal of hardscape, which is unlikely to occur.

3.6-30 (Section 3.6.4 Gobbi Preserve No. 2 Wetlands and CTS Mitigation Site)

The mitigation plan cited in the reference section and used to prepare this section has been updated following discussions with the USFWS, Regional Board and Corps. A copy of this plan has been forwarded to the City. The correct citation for the updated mitigation report is as follows:


Also, the date on the mitigation plan summary was inadvertently dated November 11, 2003 but
the correct date of this report is November 11, 2004. Citation of these reports in the text needs to be updated to reflect the correct date and the reference section revised to reflect the correct date and title.

3.6-32 (Biological Resources, Wetlands)

An additional 5,802 s.f. of wetland habitat would be affected by the plan as a result of the wetlands added to the jurisdictional determination by the Corps. The total wetland area affected would be 6,949 s.f. Of this total, only the original 1,147 s.f. would be filled. The remainder would either remain unaffected or be enhanced because they are part of wetlands to be restored or constructed and the hydrologic conditions would improve. No habitat would be lost or adversely affected by the inclusion of the 5,802 s.f. of existing wetland within the footprints of the proposed mitigation.

3.6-32 (Biological Resources, California tiger salamander)

A minor point regarding accuracy: the general exclusion procedure is as described but the ramps were ultimately made of plywood rather than soil.

3.6-33 (Biological Resources, Special-status plants)

The proposed wetland enhancement, restoration, and construction would have no impact on listed plant species. A multi-year, special-status plant species survey of the site has been conducted and the results have yielded a map showing the locations of the vernal pools and swales in which the mapped endangered plant species colonies occur. None of the proposed work is near these wetlands. The ditch that would be filled does not provide suitable habitat for any of the listed species. Likewise, the small wetlands that would be within the limits of excavation of the vernal pools and swales to be enhanced do not provide suitable habitat. Nonetheless, topsoil excavated from within the limits of the wetland habitat will be stockpiled separately from upland topsoil and will be re-spread in the swales and on the lower slopes of the vernal pools. Any seed of the three endangered plant species present in that topsoil will be replaced into habitat that exceeds in quality the habitat from which it was salvaged.

The potential impact should be considered less-than-significant (as is the case with California linderiella). No pre-construction survey is necessary.
Response to Comment Letter from Ted P. Winfield, Ph.D, Ted Winfield & Associates, dated February 24, 2005

Note: Response numbers correspond to comment numbers labeled in the margin of the letter.

1. Review of the following documents confirmed that protocol-level surveys for special-status plants were completed for all parcels in the Master Development Plan area and that the results were negative.
   - Olberding, J.A. 2003. Results of Special Status Plant Species, Minoia and Nelson Properties, Santa Rosa, California.

   Therefore, no special-status plant species are present in the Master Development Plan area, and no potentially significant impacts to special-status plant species would occur in this area. However, no surveys have been done on the Curran parcel, and special status plant species and/or habitat may be present on that parcel. Therefore, this impact and mitigation still apply to the project.

2. Discussion with the project wetlands biologist (Larry Stromberg, February 24, 2005) confirmed that the seasonal wetlands on the project site do not meet the definition of vernal pool as defined in the Santa Rosa Plain Vernal Pool Ecosystem Preservation Plan and the USFWS Programmatic agreement. Therefore, the parenthetical reference to vernal pools on Draft SEIR page 3.6-1 in Section 3.0 has been deleted; the reference to vernal pools has also been deleted from Draft SEIR page 3.6-18 in Section 3.0.

3. Comment noted. Section 3.6.5 References has been updated with the correct citation and with the additional report citations noted, as shown on Draft SEIR pages 3.6-34 and 3.6-35 in Section 3.0; citations have also been updated as shown on Draft SEIR pages 3.6-1, 2, 6, 13, 14, 24 and 25 in Section 3.0. Table 3.6-1 on Draft SEIR page 3.6-2 in Section 3.0 has been updated to indicate the report citations for the jurisdictional determinations.

4. Comment noted. The listed reports were reviewed and confirmed that protocol-level surveys for special-status plants were completed and that the results were negative. No additional surveys are required to be conducted for endangered plant species. The text in Section 3.6.1.3 has been updated as shown on Draft SEIR pages 3.5-4 and 3.6-5 in Section 3.0. The references have been updated as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-35 in Section 3.0.
5. Comment noted. Because vernal pools are not present in the Master Development area, the words “vernal pools” have been replaced with “seasonal wetlands” as shown in on Draft SEIR page 3.6-5 in Section 3.0.

6. Comment noted. Text referring to CTS surveys has been modified as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-24 in Section 3.0.

7. Comment noted. The sentence requiring surveys for invertebrates prior to construction has been deleted as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-14 in Section 3.0.

8. Comment noted. The General Tree Preservation Guidelines are appended to this document in Appendix A.

9. Comment noted. The phrase “to the maximum extent practicable” has been added to Mitigation Measure 3.6-2a as shown on Draft SEIR pages ES-10 and 3.6-18 in Section 3.0.

10. Comment noted. The mitigation acreage in Mitigation Measure 3.6-2b has been revised as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-18 in Section 3.0.

11. Comment noted. Mitigation Measure 3.6-2d has been revised as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-19 in Section 3.0.

12. Comment noted. Mitigation Measure 3.6-3 has been revised as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-21 in Section 3.0.

13. Comment noted. The acreage of wetlands to be restored has been revised in Mitigation Measure 3.6-3 as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-21 in Section 3.0.

14. Comment noted. The aestivation acreage in the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 has been revised as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-21 in Section 3.0.

15. Comment noted. Mitigation Measure 3.6-5 has been revised as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-22 in Section 3.0.

16. Comment noted. Impact 3.6-6 has been revised to eliminate impacts to Lobb’s buttercup as a potentially significant impact as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-23 in Section 3.0. Because no surveys have been done on the Curran parcel, special status plant species and/or habitat may be present on that parcel. Impact 3.6-6 and Mitigation Measure 3.6-6 have been revised as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-23 in Section 3.0 to indicate that this impact and mitigation apply to the Curran parcel.

17. Please refer to Responses #1 and #15 above.

18. Comment noted. Mitigation Measure 3.6-8a has been revised as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-25 in Section 3.0.

19. Comment noted. Mitigation Measure 3.6-8b has been revised as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-25 in Section 3.0.

20. Comment noted. Section 3.6.3.2 has been revised to include a reference to the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy Team as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-28 in Section 3.0.

21. Comment noted. Mitigation Measure 3.6-12 has been revised to eliminate “creation” of CTS habitat as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-29 in Section 3.0.
22. Citation corrections noted. The correct citations are shown on Draft SEIR pages 3.6-31, 3.6-32, and 3.6-35 in Section 3.0.

23. Comment noted. The description of potential impacts to wetlands on the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 site has been revised as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-32 in Section 3.0.

24. Comment noted. The description of the ramps has been revised as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-32 in Section 3.0.

25. Comment noted. Because mitigation wetland construction activities will avoid impacts to special status plant species on the Gobbi Preserve No. 2, no mitigation is required. The discussion of impacts to special-status plant species has been revised as shown on Draft SEIR page 3.6-33 in Section 3.0.
6. PLANNING COMMISSIONERS’ REPORT
Chairman Bartley commended the Commissioners for their efforts on the workplan and indicated that he would provide a written summary outlining the workplan for the newly appointed Commissioners.

7. STATEMENTS OF ABSTENSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS
Commissioner Arendt stated that he would abstain from discussion and vote on items 9 (Dutton Meadows Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report), 10 (Meadow Park II) and 13 (Stonehouse Manor) because his company has a business relationship with one of the parties to the applications.

8. CONSENT AGENDA
None.

9. PUBLIC HEARING – DUTTON MEADOWS DRAFT SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DSEIR) – Proposed residential and commercial development on +/- 58 acres located south of Hearn Avenue and east of Dutton Meadow - File No. ST03-009
Commissioner Arendt abstained from discussion and vote on this item. He was absent from the chamber during its discussion.

City Planner Frank Kasimov reported that the proposed project includes 586 residential units, 97,000 square feet of commercial uses, and 4 acres of neighborhood park uses.

The Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) has been circulated for a 45-day public review period that began on January 11, 2005, and will end on February 25, 2005. The Planning Commission will hold and close a public hearing allowing the public to comment on the adequacy of the EIR.

City Planner Kasimov introduced Andrea Gardner of CH2M Hill, the EIR consultant.


Chairman Bartley opened the public hearing.

Michael Eunice of 2734 Canterbury Drive and Chair of the Santa Rosa Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee requested that the following information be included in the final EIR:

1. Bike parking requirements for residential and commercial development.
2. How are people on the Colgan Creek bike path going to cross Northpoint Parkway?
3. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee would like to have Bike lanes on Dutton Meadow.
4. Why does the Class 2 bike lane on Dutton extension not continue past Northpoint Parkway?
5. Why are there no bike lanes on Hearn Avenue?
Are there measures on Dutton extension and Dutton Meadows to prevent traffic from cutting through the area to get to Highway 101?

Gary Wysocky of Beaver Street and member of the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition expressed the following questions and concerns:

What will be the speed limit on Northpoint Parkway?

How will students be able to walk or bike to Meadow Ridge Elementary School and to Elsie Allen High School?

What is the plan for rush-hour traffic flow and for safe crossing of pedestrians (particular school students) for the intersection of Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Avenue? Bicycle routes to the schools would reduce the automobile traffic of parents dropping off their children.

The major collector streets within the project area should have Class 2 bike lanes instead of Class 3 bike routes.

Why are there no bike lanes proposed on Dutton extension and Dutton Meadow?

Has facilitating bike and mass transit access to the SMART station been considered to mitigate the unavoidable impact to Highway 101?

How will bike and pedestrian traffic on Colgan Creek cross Northpoint Parkway? The Coalition will oppose any recommendation wherein bicycle traffic would travel in the opposite direction of cars.

The Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition is available for questions and consultation.

G.P. Radich of Victoria Drive indicated that she is representing four families on Victoria Drive. She commended Trumark (Dutton Meadows applicant) for addressing their issues. Concerns regarding the EIR include:

Quality of life—homes on Victoria Drive currently back up to open area and residents are concerned about backyard privacy. They request that a significant greenbelt separate their yards from future development.

Increased traffic; there is only one access to Hearn Avenue.

Noise pollution.

Duane DeWitt, P.O. Box 3068 indicated the following questions and concerns:

3 minutes per speaker during the public hearing is an inadequate amount of time.

The EIR inadequate because it is based on outdated documents.

Inadequate review of groundwater and the impacts of the impermeable surfaces over it.

Inadequate review of water supply; aquifer recharge should be addressed; the county may be overreaching in its ability to provide water.

Inadequate review of wetlands.

Traffic impacts not adequate reviewed; the traffic counts are outdated.
• Inadequate survey of wildlife in the California tiger salamander (CTS) range: CTS mitigation measures are not guaranteed and the lawsuit involving the Center for Biological Diversity is not yet resolved.

Don Wright, owner of property adjacent to the project area, noted that Trumark has agreed to install a bike path on Colgan Creek, but there is no mention of this in EIR. There being no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Bartley closed the public hearing.

Responding to Mr. DeWitt’s concern regarding time allowed for public speakers, Chairman Bartley noted that written comments regarding the EIR may also be submitted.

The Planning Commissioners had the following comments, questions and concerns regarding the Subsequent Draft Environmental Impact Report:

• Will the historical survey that will be required for the structures on Assessor’s Parcel no. 043-171-028 (which is part of the rezoning but not part of the Development Plan) be included in the final EIR?

• How will modification of the PC policy statement impact options for adaptive reuse of the existing structure on the same parcel (043-171-028)?

• Clarify how the traffic flow on Hearn Avenue and Northpoint Parkway would impact Sally Ann Street and its interaction with Hearn Avenue.

• Include more detail describing a Community Facilities District, including how such a District would operate and how Measure O funds would be used.

• Date of traffic counts, volume and speeds: The counts were done in 2000; can current counts be extrapolated from the 2000 counts?

• How will students access Meadow Bridge School, particularly across Northpoint Parkway?

• How will the Colgan Creek bikeway cross Northpoint Parkway and how will cyclists and pedestrians to access the shopping center?

• Clarify how the bicycle route proposed along Hearn Avenue would be maintained

• Dutton Meadow is listed as having a bike route; this street connects shopping and parks/schools/neighborhoods—why is it not proposed to have a bike lane?
Response to Comments from Public Hearing for Dutton Meadows Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR), February 24, 2005

Note: Response numbers correspond to comment numbers in the public hearing notes.

1. The bicycle parking requirements and design standards are set forth in the zoning code (City Code Section 20-36.90). The code requires a multi-family residential project to provide bicycle parking equal to a minimum of 10 percent of the required vehicle spaces, unless separate secured garage space is provided for each unit. The bicycle spaces shall be distributed throughout the project. The code also requires that a retail commercial project provide bicycle parking spaces equal to a minimum of five percent. Other non-residential uses providing employment are required to provide bicycle parking spaces equal to a minimum of 10 percent of the required vehicle spaces, distributed to serve employees and visitors of the project. Compliance of the project with the bicycle parking requirements and design standards will be evaluated during the design review process.

2. The Colgan Creek path is planned for the west side of Colgan Creek. At a minimum, a Class 1 bike path will be provided between the Colgan Creek path and the Northpoint Parkway/Dutton Extension intersection. This will allow bicycles heading north along the Colgan Creek path to be safely routed to the intersection on a pathway separate from the roadway. Bicycles can then cross Northpoint Parkway and continue north along the west side of Colgan Creek. In lieu of this Class I bike path, project applicants will be allowed to develop alternative crossings, such as constructing a continuous bike path under North Point Parkway, provided that the alternative also meets necessary safety requirements.

Prior to occupancy of Dutton Meadows Phase 3, Mitigation Measure 9-1 in the Dutton Meadows Project Initial Study requires that a bridge across Colgan Creek be constructed to connect the extension of Dutton Avenue and Northpoint Parkway to the existing Dutton Avenue south of the bridge (see page 34 of Volume II, Appendix A of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR).

3. The project includes a Class III bicycle route on Dutton Meadow, consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and the 2001 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. To add or remove bicycle paths, lanes or routes from the bicycle circulation system, it would be necessary to amend, under a separate process, the transportation element of the General Plan, specifically Figure 5-2, Bicycle Corridors, which shows existing and planned bicycle facilities.

4. The project includes a Class II bicycle lane on Dutton Extension between Northpoint Parkway and Hearn Avenue and a Class III bicycle route on Tuxhorn Drive between Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadow, consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and the 2001 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. To add or remove bicycle paths, lanes or routes from the bicycle circulation system, it would be necessary to amend, under a separate process, the transportation element of the General Plan, specifically Figure 5-2, Bicycle Corridors, which shows existing and planned bicycle facilities.

5. The existing Class II bicycle lanes on Hearn Avenue are to be maintained. Figure 2-6 in the Dutton Meadows Project Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report shows an error. The corrected figure is attached.
6. The use of Dutton Meadow and Dutton Extension to reach US 101 by drivers cannot be prevented. However, by making Northpoint Parkway an attractive route (as described in Mitigation Measure 3.2-10a Implement traffic improvements on City streets), a convenient route for drivers to reach US 101 will be available.

7. Northpoint Parkway is classified as a parkway in the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan circulation element. The General Plan (page 5-3) says that “[r]oadway speeds may be 45 mph or higher. When Parkways enter town, they become boulevards, and speeds are reduced to 30 to 35 mph.” Speed limits on streets in the Project area (including Northpoint Parkway) will be established consistent with design guidelines and local and state regulations.

8. The intersection of the re-aligned Dutton Meadow at Northpoint Parkway will be a controlled, signalized intersection with pedestrian signals that will allow children to cross from the Dutton Meadows development to the west side of Dutton Meadow and to Meadow View Elementary School. No change is planned in the school’s existing driveway access on Dutton Meadow. Students attending Elsie Allen High School will continue south on Dutton Meadow, as shown in Figure 3.2-4, School Locations and Preferred Walking Routes, in the Draft SEIR.

9. Traffic issues at the intersection of Northpoint Parkway and Dutton Meadows were analyzed as part of the cumulative roadway arterial level of service for the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan. The General Plan specifies that the intersection will be signalized northbound and southbound along Northpoint Parkway and eastbound and westbound along Dutton Meadow. Northbound lanes will have one exclusive left turn lane, one through lane, and one exclusive right turn lane. Southbound lanes will have one exclusive left lane and one shared/through right turn lane. Eastbound and westbound lanes will have one exclusive left turn lane and one shared/through right turn lane. When Northpoint Parkway is extended southward, the intersection will be a controlled, signalized intersection with pedestrian signals.

10. Collector streets in the project area include Dutton Meadow and Hearn Avenue. The location of Class II bike lanes and Class III bike routes on collector streets in the project area is consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and the 2001 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Please refer to Responses #3 and #5 above.

11. The inclusion of Class III bike routes on Dutton Meadow and Dutton Extension is consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and the 2001 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Please refer to Responses #3 and #4 above.

12. The Project is not located near the rail line. All bicycle facilities in the project will be consistent with the facilities designated in the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and the 2001 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and therefore will support access to the proposed SMART rail line.

13. Please see Public Hearing Response #2 above.

14. Comment noted.

15. A 10-foot landscaped setback buffer zone between the Victoria Drive rear property lines and the Dutton Meadows Phase 3a two-story buildings (see Figure 2-5 in Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR) is proposed as part of the project. A new decorative good-
neighbor fence or wall will be built along the entire Victoria Drive rear property line to the satisfaction of the Santa Rosa Design Review Board. Screen trees will be planted in strategic locations to maximize privacy to Victoria Drive rear yards.

16. The intersection of Victoria Drive and Hearn Avenue was evaluated during the traffic analysis. Because of the increase in traffic on Hearn due to overall development in southwest Santa Rosa, vehicles exiting Victoria Drive may experience increased delays, especially for left turns onto westbound Hearn Avenue. The timing of the traffic light at Dutton Extension and Hearn Avenue could be modified to reduce turning delays at Victoria Drive.

17. As described in Section 1.2 of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR, the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR tiers from the Southwest Area Plan EIR. Therefore, as described in Section 3.1, the Lead Agency is responsible for implementing all appropriate and feasible mitigation measures for impacts evaluated in the Southwest Area Plan EIR and noted in the Dutton Meadows Project Initial Study (see Appendix A in Volume II of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR). These measures include the following.

Southwest Area Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.5-1 Noise

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

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

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

Southwest Area Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.5-2 Noise

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

Southwest Area Plan EIR Mitigation Measure 3.2.5-3 Noise

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

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

(c) Construct soundwalls or berms at playgrounds and neighborhood parks to reduce noise levels for the year 2010 to 70 L_{dn} or below.
(d) Construct soundwalls or berms at office buildings and commercial areas to reduce noise levels for the year 2010 to 65 $L_{dn}$ or below.

The following mitigation measure was also included in the Initial Study to further reduce potential noise impacts.

**Dutton Meadows Project Initial Study Mitigation Measure 5-1 Noise**

Future Indoor Noise Environment. To maintain a habitable interior noise environment, units exposed to noise levels greater than 60 dBA $L_{dn}$ shall be provided with forced-air mechanical ventilation to adequately ventilate the interior spaces of the units.

18. Comment noted.

19. As described in Section 1.2 of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR, this Draft SEIR tiers from the Southwest Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (Southwest Area Plan EIR), a 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), certified in 2002. The use of these environmental documents as Master EIRs for tiering is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15175 through 15179.5. Specifically, Section 15179 limits the use of Master EIRs only if the certification of the Master EIR occurred within 5 years of the filing of an application for a later project, unless the lead agency reviews the Master EIR and finds that no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Master EIR was certified. The Redevelopment Plan EIR and the General Plan EIR were certified within five years of the filing of the application for the Dutton Meadows Project. The Southwest Area Plan EIR was reviewed for currency in 2000 and it was found that no substantial change had occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Southwest Area Plan EIR had been certified. This review occurred within five years of the filing of the application for the Dutton Meadows Project.

20. As described in Section 1.2 of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR, the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR tiers from the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan EIR. The impact of development on the infiltration in a natural groundwater recharge zone was analyzed in the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan EIR, and that evaluation was determined in the Dutton Meadows Project Initial Study to be adequate for the Dutton Meadows Project. Impact 3.2.2-5 in the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan EIR states that development permitted by the Southwest Area Plan will reduce infiltration in a natural groundwater recharge zone by about 25 percent. Mitigation proposed for this impact (Mitigation Measure 3.2.2-5 in the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan EIR) includes encouraging the use of detention ponds to partially offset the loss of groundwater recharge areas. Such artificial recharge programs shall be coordinated through the Sonoma County Water Agency to ensure a rational, consistent and systematic approach. Maintenance of the detention ponds and potential for long-term accumulation of pollutants in the ponds shall be considered in the design of mitigation programs that includes ponds.

21. A Water Supply Assessment, consistent with the requirements of Senate Bill 610, was completed by the City of Santa Rosa for the Dutton Meadows project (see Volume II, Appendix E of the Dutton Meadows Draft SEIR). The assessment included consideration
of the availability of supplies from Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA) as well as other supply options for the City of Santa Rosa. SCWA’s water rights were assumed to be the existing secure rights to 75,000 acre-feet per year (afy) from the Russian River, not the 101,000 afy included in SCWA’s proposed Water Supply and Transmission System Project. The assessment concluded that the City’s water supplies are currently sufficient to meet the present and future demand associated with this project. In addition, 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.

Please refer to Response #20 above regarding aquifer recharge.

22. The size, extent and quality of wetlands on the Master Development Plan portion of the project site were determined through appropriate field studies and jurisdictional determinations; please see Response #3 to the Ted Winfield & Associates letter above. Impacts to wetlands are evaluated in Section 3.63.1 of the Dutton Meadows Draft SEIR, and are mitigated to a less than significant level through Mitigation Measures 3.6-2a (Avoid or minimize impacts to wetland resources to the extent practicable), 3.6-2b (Preserve and create new wetland habitat offsite), 3.6-2c (Transfer mitigation responsibilities to new property owners), and 3.6-2d (Obtain appropriate permits for fill of wetlands). Note that offsite mitigation may be required for future projects on parcel 043-071-028 (Curran property), which is part of the Rezoning Action; no development has been proposed for this parcel at this time.

23. Travel volumes have changed in several places since the counts were taken in 1999 through 2002, depending on street segment (see Table 3.2-1 in the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR). Compared to the latest traffic volumes posted on the City’s website, counts have fallen in some locations (e.g., on Bellevue Avenue, Corby Avenue), possibly due to the peak economic conditions that occurred in 2000-2001 and the widening of US 101 in south Santa Rosa, which opened in November 2002. Traffic volumes on Dutton Meadow are virtually unchanged. Hearn Avenue traffic volumes have grown moderately, approximately 6 to 11 percent. Stony Point Road counts dropped south of Hearn, but increased up to 22 percent between Hearn and Sebastopol Road; this segment of Stony Point Road, however, is outside the project site. Volumes on US 101 increased approximately 4-5 percent between 2000 and 2003 (the latest year for which Caltrans has published count data). These changes do not fundamentally alter any of the conclusions or mitigations in the Draft SEIR.

24. Adult and juvenile CTS surveys were conducted during the winter and spring of 2001 to 2002 within the Master Development Plan Area, except for the Phase 1 Project area due to the lack of wetlands on that portion of that property. Larval studies were conducted during the 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 winter-spring survey periods. No adult, juvenile or larval CTS were observed during any of the surveys. The USFWS however, has assumed that the project site and surrounding undeveloped lands were aestivation habitat for the CTS because of the proximity of these lands to the Southwest Community Park CTS breeding pond. Therefore, protocol surveys for CTS on these lands were either not conducted or not allowed to proceed by the USFWS.
Loss of the 54.43 acres of potential CTS aestivation habitat in the Master Development Plan area, as well as potential indirect impacts to CTS, will be mitigated to a less than significant level through Mitigation Measure 3.6-3 (Preserve/enhance California tiger salamander aestivation habitat). Potential impacts to CTS individuals during construction are mitigated through 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).

25. Please refer to Figure 2-6 in the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR, which shows the Dutton Meadows Bicycle Circulation Plan. The project plan includes a Class 1 bicycle trail located along Colgan Creek, consistent with the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and the 2001 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. The portion of this trail located in the project area will be constructed as part of the project.

26. Because no development is proposed for parcel 043-071-028 (Curran property) as part of the Dutton Meadows project, no historical survey for the structure on that parcel is required at this time. An historical survey will be required if and when a future development project is proposed. If the structure is determined to be historical, additional environmental review may be required at that time.

27. The modification of the PC policy statement is not expected to affect options for adaptive reuse of the existing structure on parcel 043-071-028 (Curran property) compared to the current PC policy statement.

28. Sally Ann Street is an approved but not-yet-constructed street designed to provide access from Hearn Avenue to the Western Gardens project. This is a temporary access until such time as Aloise Avenue connects easterly to Street "A," which will connect to Hearn Avenue as shown in the tentative map for the proposed Phase 2 Minoia project (see Figure 2-5 in the Dutton Meadows Draft SEIR). Aloise Avenue is planned to ultimately connect further east to Dutton Extension and westerly to Northpoint Parkway Extension.

29. Measure O funds will be used as required by the ballot measure. The adopting ordinance provides very specific requirements as to how the revenues and funds will be spent. Forty percent of the tax revenues from Measure O must be used for Police Department purposes, 40% for Fire Department purposes, and 20% for gang prevention and youth programs. Police uses include police patrol and traffic control services, gang enforcement, school resource services, and bicycle patrols; Downtown, Railroad Square and Prince Greenway police services; and police support services, including facilities and equipment. Fire Department uses include hiring additional firefighters; establishment of additional Fire Department paramedic units; and construction and relocation of fire stations and the purchase of specialized equipment for Fire Department use.

Under the City’s Special Tax Financing Code, Chapter 4-56 of the Santa Rosa City Code, a Community Services District (a tax district) may be created to perpetually fund the City Police Department and City Fire Department and other City General Fund operations to mitigate significant service impacts. This tax district is a mitigation measure that is in addition to any other fees or tax districts that would normally be
required for this type of project. A formula based on a per-unit/per-year or other criteria would have to be established and the timing of the recordation of said district would relate to the occupancy of units. The Community Services District is required to be established prior to the recordation of the Final Map.

30. Please refer to Public Hearing Response #23 above.
31. Please refer to Public Hearing Responses #8 and #9 above
32. Please refer to Public Hearing Response #2 above.
33. Please refer to Public Hearing Response #5 above.
34. Please refer to Public Hearing Response #3 above.
March 23, 2005

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

Dear Mr. Kasimov:

Dutton Meadows — Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR)

Thank you for continuing to include the California Department of Transportation (Transportation) in the environmental review process for the proposed project. We have reviewed the DSEIR and have the following comments to offer:

1. Impact 3.2-7 notes, "...an estimated 60 to 250 trips would be added to each freeway direction in the peak hours." Since the additional trips would substantially increase delays or create a new bottleneck on US 101 south of State Route (SR) 12 the DSEIR should identify the ramps that would be impacted by these trips. Any significant project impacts to freeway ramps should be mitigated.

2. An illustration of intersection geometrics should be included in the intersection level of service (LOS) analyses and associated traffic data contained in the DSEIR so that we can assess the traffic impacts of the proposed project on State highway facilities. The DSEIR should include analysis of the following intersections during the AM and PM peak hours for the General Plan Build-out Only and General Plan Build-out Plus Proposed Project scenarios:
   - US 101 southbound ramps/ Corby Avenue
   - Hearn Avenue/ Corby Avenue
   - US 101 northbound ramps/ Yolanda Avenue/ Santa Rosa Avenue
   - Hearn Avenue/ Santa Rosa Avenue
   - SR 12 eastbound ramps/ Dutton Avenue
   - SR 12 westbound ramps/ Dutton Avenue

3. Mitigation Measure 3.2-6b in Table ES-2 on page ES-5 is not a mitigation measure, but rather an impact (Impact 3.2-7). Revise the table to be consistent with Page 3.2-26.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
4. The main ingress and egress of the project to US 101 is Hearn Avenue. Per Table 3.2-8 one of the highest inbound and outbound PM peak hour trip distributions occurs at US 101. According to Impact 3.2-7 the project would add traffic to the freeway and the projected additional trips would have a significant impact on US 101. However, no mitigation measures were proposed for this impact. Please explain why the project sponsor and City are not mitigating this impact. Also, explain why Impact 3.2-8 would be less than significant considering the Hearn Avenue interchange serves as the project's primary access to and from US 101.

5. Explain how the LOS for westbound Hearn Avenue from Stony Point Road to Santa Rosa Avenue would be improved from LOS D to LOS C in both the Existing Plus Approved and Existing Plus Approved Plus Project scenarios given the following: a) no mitigation measures or improvements were discussed in the DSEIR for this segment, b) the assumption for the analysis did not include the Hearn Avenue widening from Dutton Avenue to the Railroad Tracks described on page 3.2-8, c) the proposed project will be adding traffic to Hearn Avenue, and d) Table 3.2-10 shows the projected 2020 LOS at this segment as LOS D (with mitigation).

6. According to Cumulative Impact 3.2-11 on page 3.2-31 auxiliary lanes must be added to SR 12 between the Stony Point Road and Dutton Avenue interchanges. Why is this auxiliary lane mitigation on SR 12 not included elsewhere in the DSEIR, specifically in the Summary Table ES-2?

7. For the Mitigation Measure 3.2-10a on page 3.2-29 the SR 12/ Dutton Avenue interchange is presently signalized. Was the traffic analysis prepared with the assumption that this intersection is not signalized? If so, revision of the traffic analysis is needed.

8. The DSEIR does not specifically state which of the proposed transportation-related mitigation measures the project sponsor will be responsible for implementing. Nor does it discuss mitigation scheduling, financing, and monitoring responsibilities. The DSEIR needs to be revised to include this information, and should discuss how the proposed mitigation measures for transportation impacts would be phased as the project is constructed. As lead agency, the City of Santa Rosa is responsible for all project mitigation, including improvements to State highways. Financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures as well as roadway improvements that are assumed to be complete prior to project implementation, even where responsibility for these improvements does not involve the project sponsor. Discussion of project-sponsored improvements should also include the project's fair share contribution. Significant project-related impacts might result if improvements that are assumed in the analysis are not completed prior to issuance of the project's building permits. Additional environmental review may be required where these potential impacts have not been disclosed in the project's environmental review.

9. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as amended on January 1, 2001 by Assembly Bill 1807, amended Public Resources Code Section 21081.7 to now require that "transportation information resulting from the reporting or monitoring program adopted by a public agency" be submitted to the Department for a project of statewide, regional, or
area-wide significance. To aid your agency in fulfilling this CEQA reporting requirement, the enclosed Guidelines for Submitting Transportation Information from a Reporting or Monitoring Program to the Department of Transportation and Mitigation Monitoring Certification Checklist are provided. The DSEIR lists 16 mitigation measures for transportation-related impacts (Mitigation Measures 3.2-1 through 3.2-16). Please complete and sign the Certification Checklist form for the proposed project that includes the above-mentioned transportation-related mitigation measures and return it to this office once the mitigation measures are approved, and again when they are completed.

We look forward to receiving a response to our comments at least ten days prior to certification of the DSEIR pursuant to Section 21092.5(a) of the CEQA.

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

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY C. SABLE
District Branch Chief
IGR/CEQA

Attachment

c: State Clearinghouse
Guidelines for Submitting Transportation Information from a Reporting or Monitoring Program to the California Department of Transportation

for a

Project of Statewide, Regional, or Area-wide Significance

California Department of Transportation

July 9, 2004
GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING TRANSPORTATION INFORMATION FROM A REPORTING OR MONITORING PROGRAM TO THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (DEPARTMENT)

INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires, under Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21081.6, the adoption of reporting or monitoring programs when public agencies include environmental impact mitigation as a condition of project approval. Reporting or monitoring takes place after project approval to ensure implementation of the project in accordance with mitigation adopted during the CEQA review process.

Assembly Bill 1807 (effective January 1, 2001) amended the PRC in a number of ways. Section 21080.4 was amended to add a requirement that lead agencies submit Notices of Preparation (NOPs) to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research when they determine that an environmental impact report will be required to approve a project.

Section 21081.7 was amended with two additional provisions. The first provision required that transportation information resulting from a reporting or monitoring program adopted by a public agency in accordance with Section 21081.6 be submitted to the Department of Transportation (Department) when a project has impacts that are of statewide, regional, or area-wide significance. The second provision required that the Department adopt guidelines for the submittal of those reporting or monitoring programs.

PURPOSE

The purpose of these guidelines is to establish clear and consistent statewide procedures to be used by both Department District Intergovernmental Review (IGR) Program Coordinators to identify the scope and timing of transportation information needed from lead agencies, and public agencies when submitting transportation information to the Department, in accordance with Section 21081.7.
PROCEDURES

A. The District IGR Program Managers and/or Coordinators shall:

1. Prior to implementation of mitigation measures:

   a. Notify the CEQA lead agency by letter during “early consultation,” the Notice of Preparation (NOP) stage, or the Initial Study (IS) phase of the CEQA review process that the transportation information included in the reporting or monitoring program will need to be provided to the Department following project mitigation agreement.

   b. Provide the name, address, and telephone number of the District IGR contact to the lead agency.

   c. Provide, as an enclosure to the notification letter, a copy of these “Guidelines” and the Department’s “CEQA Lead Agency Checklist/Certification” form. (Part 1 of the form, Checklist, is to be signed by the lead agency following project approval, and a copy submitted to the District along with the transportation reporting or monitoring information. Part 2 of the form, Certification, is to be signed by the lead agency and the District upon implementation of all agreed-upon mitigation measures.)

2. Following implementation of mitigation measures as identified in Part 1, Checklist, of the CEQA Lead Agency Checklist/Certification form, and certification of implementation by the lead agency in Part 2, Certification:

   Ensure sign off of Part 2, indicating that the mitigation measures have been implemented.

   1) If the project required encroachment onto a state highway, obtain the District Permit Engineer’s signature in Part 2.

   2) If the project did not involve encroachment onto a state highway, the District IGR Coordinator shall sign Part 2.
3) The District IGR Coordinator shall: (a) Retain the original document; (b) forward a copy to the District Permit Engineer (if the Permit Engineer signed Part 2); (c) forward a copy to the Department's Headquarters IGR Program Manager; and, (d) send a copy to the lead agency.

B. The CEQA lead agency shall:

1. Following project approval:

Submit the following information to the Department District IGR contact:

1) Name, address, and telephone number of the CEQA lead agency contact responsible for the mitigation reporting or monitoring program.

2) Location and custodian of the documents or other material, which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the lead agency's decision to approve the project is based.

3) Assurances that the Department can obtain copies of the aforementioned documents and materials, if needed, to clarify details or resolve issues related to the mitigation adopted.

4) Detailed information on impact assessment methods, the type of mitigation, specific location, and implementation schedule for each transportation impact mitigation measure included in the reporting or monitoring program.

5) A copy of the "CEQA Lead Agency Checklist/Certification" form, with Part 1, Checklist, signed and dated, and the reporting or monitoring program transportation information attached or enclosed. The CEQA lead agency, at its discretion, may submit the complete reporting or monitoring program with the required transportation information highlighted.
Mitigation Reporting or Monitoring Submittal Guidelines
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2. Following implementation of mitigation measures:

a. Sign and date Part 2, Certification, of the "CEQA Lead Agency Checklist/Certification" form.

b. Forward the "CEQA Lead Agency Checklist/Certification" form, with appropriate completion documents attached, to the District IGR contact, certifying that the mitigation measures agreed upon and identified in the reporting or monitoring program have been implemented, and that all other reporting requirements have been adhered to, in accordance with PRC Sections 21081.6 and 21081.7.

APPROVED:

BRIAN J. SMITH
Deputy Director
Planning and Modal Programs

Date 5-29-04

L.H. ORCUTT
Acting Deputy Director
Maintenance and Operations

Date 7-9-04
CEQA LEAD AGENCY CHECKLIST/CERTIFICATION
TRANSPORTATION INFORMATION FROM A REPORTING OR MONITORING PROGRAM

Project Name: ____________________________
Lead Agency: ______________________________
Lead Agency Contact (Name, Title, Agency, Address & Phone): ________________________________

State Clearinghouse (SCH) File #/s: ______________________________
Document Type/s: ____________________________________________
Findings & Approval Date/s: ________________________________

Project Proponent (Name, Title, Company, Address & Phone): ________________________________

For each specific Transportation Related Mitigation Measure associated with this Project, the following information items are included in the attached materials:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Location/Custodian Of CEQA Documents, Proceedings, Records
- Description Of How To Obtain Copies Of Above Documents
- Mitigation Measure Name & Identifying Number
- Detailed Description of Measure & its Purpose (attach blueprints if necessary)
- Measure Location Description, Latitude/Longitude, & Vicinity Map
- Location of Impacted State Highway Component (County, Route, Postmile)
- Caltrans Encroachment Permit Number (if one was needed)
- Copy of Other Agency Permits required for this Measure (if needed)
- Completion Criteria (including detailed performance objectives)
- Implementation Schedule
- Estimated Monetary Value of Completed Measure & % Local Agency Funded
- Responsible Contractor (Name, Company, Address & Phone)

The above project mitigation measures will be implemented as indicated in the adopted reporting or monitoring program, and the California Department of Transportation will be notified upon implementation.

CEQA Lead Agency ____________________________ Date ____________________________

We certify that the agreed upon mitigation measures have been implemented, and all other requirements been adhered to, in accordance with PRC Sections 21081.6 and 21081.7. Attached: 1. Completion evaluation reports; 2. Photograph of completed measure.

Signature & Date: ____________________________
Name: ____________________________
Title: CEQA Lead Agency

California Department of Transportation

* This form is to be used by public agencies to submit their mitigation reporting or monitoring programs to the California Department of Transportation. When a CEQA project has been found to have transportation or circulation impacts that are of statewide, regional, or area wide significance, copies of this form, and the Department Guidelines developed pursuant to PRC Section 21081.7, can be downloaded from our website (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpo/offices/ceqa_guidelines_procedures.htm). Completed form with attached materials may be post-mailed, e-mailed, or faxed to the appropriate Department District Planning Office. A completed form is due at the time of project certification. The Department will not accept any late filing for CEQA certification.

** The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires agencies to identify and evaluate the environmental effects of certain projects before they may proceed with any construction or operation. The Lead Agency is responsible for certifying that the project has been evaluated and that all necessary mitigation measures have been implemented.**
Response to Comment Letter from California Department of Transportation, dated March 23, 2005

Note: The comment letter from the California Department of Transportation was submitted to the lead agency 30 days after the close of the public comment period, and does not require a response. However, the lead agency has chosen to provide responses in the administrative record. Response numbers correspond to comment numbers labeled in the margin of the letter.

1. Several EIRs, going back at least to 1993, have identified a significant impact that development of the Southwest Area will have on US 101. The City of Santa Rosa has been committed to mitigating many of the impacts on US 101 and Highway 12, and has paid most of the costs of past improvements to the Hearn Avenue and Stony Point Road interchanges with City funds.

The future traffic impacts on ramps to US 101 are proposed for mitigation by:

- Making intersection improvements at ramp junctions with city streets, as detailed most recently in the Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Plan EIR, Figure 3.1.3-10
- Constructing a new interchange and ramps at Bellevue Avenue/US 101 and at Fulton Road/Highway 12
- Supporting transit use in the corridor, including a commuter rail and park-and-ride lot near Bellevue Avenue and the Northwestern Pacific Railroad tracks

2. The proposed intersection geometrics and future traffic volumes are provided in the Cumulative Traffic Study in Volume II, Appendix D of the Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR, as well as in the Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment EIR.

The analyses focused on the PM peak hour. The City’s traffic model for long range (General Plan and Area Plan) forecasting has been developed to project year 2020 PM peak hour volumes. In nearly all areas of Santa Rosa, traffic volumes and level of service are better in the AM peak hour than the PM peak hour. Therefore, providing sufficient capacity to accommodate PM peak hour demand will also meet AM peak hour demand at an acceptable level of service.

3. Mitigation Measure 3.2-6b in Table ES-2 has been corrected as noted (see Draft SEIR page ES-5 in Section 3.0).

4. Local communities are contributing financially to address traffic issues on Highway 101. Money from Measure M, approximately $188 million over the next 20 years, will be used to fund 50% of many Highway 101 projects, as described in Traffic Relief Act for Sonoma County, Expenditure Plan, Sonoma County Transportation Authority, June 28, 2004. Contributions from Measure M will include up to $9 million for improvements to the Hearn Avenue interchange and up to $19 million for Fulton Road improvements and an interchange at Highway 12. Even though the local communities are contributing financially, the California Department of Transportation still retains jurisdiction over Highway 101.

Impact 3.2-8 regarding impacts to US 101/Hearn Avenue Interchange is less than significant based on evaluation using the standards of significance included in Section 3.2.2. In addition, as noted above, Measure M funds will be used for improvements to this interchange and will further reduce the level of impact.

5. Widening Stony Point Road to four lanes, a committed and funded project, would reduce delay on the Hearn Avenue approaches at Stony Point Road intersection. The Dutton Meadows Project also includes signalization of the intersection of Hearn Avenue and Dutton Meadow (future Northpoint Parkway Extension), replacing the existing all-way stop control, prior to or concurrent with construction of Phase 1 of the Project. The signal would be interconnected to the Stony Point Road and Dutton Avenue signals to minimize delay. These improvements are expected to improve the existing level of service along westbound Hearn between Stony Point Road and Santa Rosa Avenue from LOS D to LOS C in the near term, as shown in Table 3.2-9. However, addition of cumulative traffic through 2020 is expected to gradually degrade the level of service along this road segment to LOS D by the year 2020, as shown in Table 3.2-10.

6. The addition of auxiliary lanes to State Route 12 has been added as a mitigation measure to table ES-2 and to Impact 3.2-11 as noted (see Draft SEIR page ES-6 and pages 3.2-32 and 3.2-33, respectively, in Section 3.0).

7. The traffic analysis assumed that the intersections were signalized, as they currently are. The text has been corrected as shown on Draft SEIR pages 3.2-29 and 3.2-30 in Section 3.0.

8. The City has developed a citywide and southwest area capital improvement fee program so that development will help mitigate the impact of new development. The project sponsor will be responsible for constructing all roads, to City standards, within the development area, including the portion of Northpoint Parkway Extension within the Project area. The project sponsor will also be responsible for signalizing the Dutton Meadow (future Northpoint Parkway) intersection, which is presently all-way STOP controlled.

Other mitigation responsibilities and schedules for implementation are described in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) in Section 4.0 of this Final EIR. The MMRP includes description of additional permit enforcement that will require project sponsors to implement traffic mitigation in order to implement the Project.

Responsibility for some of the mitigation measures includes the following:

- Mitigation Measure 3.2-1: City of Santa Rosa
- Mitigation Measure 3.2-4a: Project sponsor
- Mitigation Measure 3.2-4b: Project sponsor
- Mitigation Measure 3.2-4c: City of Santa Rosa
- Mitigation Measure 3.2-6a: Project sponsor and construction contractor
- Mitigation Measure 3.2-10a: City of Santa Rosa and its Redevelopment Agency

9. The Dutton Meadows Project, which includes 586 proposed housing units, meets the threshold of 500 dwelling units for project of statewide, regional, or areawide
significance per CEQA Guidelines Section 15206(b)(2)(A). Mitigation information required to be submitted to a responsible agency or an agency having jurisdiction over a resource affected by the project under Public Resources Code Section 21081.7 is limited to measures which mitigate impacts to resources which are subject to the statutory authority of that agency. Therefore, this reporting requirement is limited to item k (Highway 12/Wright-Fulton Roads interchange) in Mitigation Measure 3.2-10a (see DSEIR page 3.2-30 in Section 3.0) and Mitigation Measure 3.2-11. All other traffic mitigations in the Dutton Meadows Draft EIR are under the jurisdiction of the City of Santa Rosa. The Certification Checklist form will be completed as requested for these two mitigation measures.
3.0 Errata and Revisions

This section contains those pages of the *Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR* that have been revised based on the comments received during the public review period. Text deleted from the Draft SEIR is shown in strike-out mode; text that has been added is shown in underline. These revisions supersede the *Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR* dated January 2005.

The following pages of the *Dutton Meadows Project Draft SEIR* are included in this section:

- ES-1
- ES-2
- ES-3
- ES-4
- ES-5
- ES-6
- ES-10
- 2-11
- 2-12
- 2-17 (Figure 2-6)
- 2-22
- 3.2-29
- 3.2-30
- 3.2-32
- 3.2-33
- 3.6-1
- 3.6-2
- 3.6-4
- 3.6-5
- 3.6-6
- 3.6-13
- 3.6-14
- 3.6-18
- 3.6-19
- 3.6-21
- 3.6-22
- 3.6-23
- 3.6-24
- 3.6-25
- 3.6-28
- 3.6-27
- 3.6-29
- 3.6-31
- 3.6-32
- 3.6-33
- 3.6-34
- 3.6-35
- 4-4
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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 Minoa, and Phase 5 Dutton Village Projects are three of the six proposed residential development plans within the Master Development Plan area. The term "phase" does not refer to the development schedule, but rather to a proposed residential development within the larger Dutton Meadows Master Plan.
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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. Phases 1, 2 (Minoia) and 5 (Dutton Village) are anticipated to start site improvements construction in Spring 2006 through 2006, with construction of residential units to follow in 2007 and 2008 construction seasons. The remaining phases (Phases 3, 4, and 6) are anticipated to start construction in Spring 2007 or later. Up to 20,000 cubic yards of material excavated from the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 mitigation site during wetlands construction will likely be available in mid-2005 for later use as fill material at the Dutton Meadows project site. Stockpiling excavated material at the Gobbi site would result in significant adverse impacts to CTS aestivation habitat there, and fill material is required at Dutton Meadow. A City permit to stockpile that material at Dutton Meadows Phase 1 or other phase areas will be applied for after certification of the SEIR and consistent with all other federal and state agency authorizations. The material will be spread evenly over the stockpile site, avoiding wetland areas. The stockpiling will be subject to the appropriate BMPs to reduce erosion potential to acceptable levels. 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>TABLE ES-1</th>
<th>Project Total Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residential</td>
<td>586 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Residential</td>
<td>97,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE ES-1
Project Total Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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. The USACE Section 404 process for the Dutton Meadows Project is currently ongoing and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion for the Section 7 consultation required by the Federal Endangered Species Act is expected by July 31, 2005.

• 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 58 acres of the total 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.
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- **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>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.</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>Impact 3.2-2. 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>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 Minola development</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No mitigation necessary</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-4. 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>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4b. Add a road within Dutton Meadows parallel to Hearn Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4c. Encourage or expedite construction of Tuxhorn Drive between Dutton Meadow and Burgess Drive/Rain Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4d. Improve bicycle and pedestrian travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-5. 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>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</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-6a. Implement Construction Traffic Management Plan</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-6b. The Project would result in a measurable addition of traffic to US-101 Promote safety of school-age children during construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Significance after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-7. 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/Heam 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</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 3.2-11a. 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>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>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>3.6 Vegetation, Wildlife, and Habitat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.6-1. Implementation of the Project would result in the loss of valley oaks and other native trees</strong></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1a. Replace trees in accordance with the City Code (Chapter 17-24 - Trees)</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1b. Use tree preservation notes on all improvement, grading, 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 construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.6-2. Implementation of the Project would result in loss of wetland habitat</strong></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2a. Avoid or minimize impacts to wetland resources to the maximum extent practicable</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2b. Preserve and create new wetland habitat onsite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2c. Transfer mitigation responsibilities to new property 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><strong>Impact 3.6-3. Implementation of the Project would result in loss of California tiger salamander aestivation habitat</strong></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></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-3. Preserve/enhance California tiger salamander aestivation habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 3.6-4. Implementation of the Project would result in the loss of potential California linderiella habitat</strong></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><strong>Impact 3.6-5. Implementation of the Project would result in the loss of raptor nesting habitat</strong></td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures 3.6-1a and 3.6-1b described above</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-5. Provide protection of migratory birds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DUTTON MEADOWS PROJECT 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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.

2.4.1 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. Loschanski Tr et al, Dutton Village Partners, LLC</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 Caskadon Tr</td>
<td>976 Hearn Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 043-191-019</td>
<td>5.65 acres</td>
<td>Dorothy Caskadon 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>
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The development areas within the Master Development Plan include the following (see Figure 2-5): note that the term “phase” does not refer to the development schedule, but rather to a proposed residential development within the larger Dutton Meadows Master Plan:

- 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. Should the order of development phasing be affected by changing conditions or circumstances, or should a specified phased transportation improvement be funded from other than private sources, reasonable amendment of the ordered phasing of these transportation improvements consistent with the Final SEIR may be considered by the Director of the Department of Community Development.

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.
Figure 2-6
Dutton Meadows Master Development Plan
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.0.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

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

Before the 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 2.4.3 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. Phases 1, 2 (Minoia) and 5 (Dutton Village) are anticipated to start site improvements construction in Spring 2006 through 2006, with construction of residential units to follow in 2007 and 2008 construction seasons. The remaining phases (Phases 3, 4, and 6) are anticipated to start construction in Spring 2007 or later. Up to 20,000 cubic yards of material excavated from the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 mitigation site during wetlands construction will likely be available in mid-2005 for later use as fill material at the Dutton Meadows project site. Stockpiling excavated material at the Gobbi site would result in significant adverse impacts to CTS aestivation habitat there, and fill material is required at Dutton Meadow. A City permit to stockpile that material at Dutton Meadows Phase 1 or other phase areas will be applied for after certification of the SEIR and consistent with all other federal and state agency authorizations. The material will be spread evenly over the stockpile site, avoiding wetland areas. The stockpiling will be subject to the appropriate BMPs to reduce erosion potential to acceptable levels.

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
TABLE 3.2-10
Year 2020 Arterial Levels of Service with Mitigation, PM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road – Dutton Extension</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Road (Class II)</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point Road—Moorland</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby Avenue (Class III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Street - Hearn Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue - Bellevue Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>28.9</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 (EBT) 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.

(ge) 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.

(gi) 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).

(hj) Hearn Avenue/Corby Avenue: Add NBL, WBT, WBR, SBL, SBR, EBL, and EBT lanes.

(ik) 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.

(jl) 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.

(km) 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.

(ln) 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.

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

(np) 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.

(oq) 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,
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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Dir</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Todd-Bellevue*</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>4,200m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>975h</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,850m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200h</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Bellevue-Hearn (Yolanda)*</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>3,700m</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>850h</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,700m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,075h</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Hearn Avenue-Baker Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>4,150m</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1,100h</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,700m</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200h</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Baker Ave – Highway 12</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>4,900m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>925h</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,400m</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200h</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 3.2-11a. 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
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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.

**Mitigation Measure 3.2-11b. Add auxiliary lanes to State Route 12.** Auxiliary lanes will be added between the Stony Point Road and Dutton Avenue interchanges.

**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
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 and Stromberg 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
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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 (*Pleurospora californicolor*). With the exception of the deepest topographic depressions, Mediterranean barley (*Hordeum marinum gussoneanum*) is also a subdominant species. Other subdominant species include bristly oxtongue (*Picris echinoidea*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), six-weeks fescue (*Vulpia bromoides*), meadow barley (*Hordeum brachyantherum*), little rattlesnake grass (*Briza minor*), spiny-fruit buttercup (*Ranunculus muricatus*), purple loosestrife (*Lythrum hyssopifolium*), fringed downingia (*Downingia concolor*), and popcorn flower (*Plagiobothrys stipitatus var. micrantha*). In addition, species that were normally associated with the annual grassland were observed in the seasonal wetlands such as parentucellia (*Parentucellia viscosa*), soft chess (*Bromus 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>Wetland Acreage within the BSA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parcel Numbers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>043-071-007, -022, -023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 (Minoia)</td>
<td>043-191-016, -024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>043-191-018, -019, -020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4/6</td>
<td>043-200-004; 043-191-021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5 (Dutton Village) and Curran parcel</td>
<td>043-071-029, -028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Wetlands</td>
<td></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 and Stromberg 2003a). The non-native grassland type is heterogeneous in physiognomy and species composition and includes
3.0 SETTING, IMPACT ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.6 SETTING, IMPACT ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES DUTTON MEADOWS PROJECT

• (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 catus). 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
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the General Permit. Results of all the protocol plant surveys were negative. 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 Minoia 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 seasonal wetlands, 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 (*Blenosperma 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.
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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 and Stromberg 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.
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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 and Stromberg 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 and Stromberg 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.
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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 and Stromberg 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:
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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 to the maximum extent practicable (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 a 1.25:1 ratio (1.25 acre of mitigation for 1 acre of impact) for a total creation or restoration of a minimum of 5.46 acres of vernal pool and other seasonal wetland habitat 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 USACE and the RWQCB 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
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 has been working with the USFWS regarding the quality of the habitat values present at the Gobbi Preserve No. 2 for CTS and listed plant species and the Biological Opinion, which is being prepared by the USFWS, will reflect its opinion of the quality of the habitat 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 at least 5.46 S^TT-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 106.8 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.
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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 protocol-level 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 minimum 5.46 acre 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.

However, no surveys have been done on the Curran parcel, and special status plant species and/or habitat may be present on that parcel. Future development on that parcel could result in potentially significant impacts to special status plant species or habitat. Implementation of the mitigation below would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

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 and Stromberg 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 the negative survey results and the 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
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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 and submit as appropriate to the City of Santa Rosa, CDFG, RWQCB, USACE, and USWFS

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 and Stromberg 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
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).

The Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy Team, a broad-based group consisting of private/public endeavor involving the development community, environmental community, city government (including the City of Santa Rosa), and state and federal governments, is working to develop a conservation strategy for CTS on the Santa Rosa Plain.

**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
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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 2004a2004a):

- **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.
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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 6,949 square feet of wetlands on the Gobbi Preserve site may be affected by establishment of the preserve; of this, up to 1,147 square feet of existing wetland habitat may be filled during wetland construction and restoration on Gobbi Preserve No. 2 (Stromberg 2004b: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 2004a: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 2004a:2003a). Passive salvage measures would involve installing “fence-and-exit” ramp barriers. These barriers consist of drift fences of plywood 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.
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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. A multi-year, special status plant species survey of the site was conducted and the results yielded a map showing the locations of the vernal pools and swales in which the mapped endangered plant species colonies occur. None of the proposed work, including grading, is located near these wetlands. Potential impacts would be less than significant. 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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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 58 acres of the total 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 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

### 4.2 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
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4.0 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Table 4-1 on the following pages is the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Dutton Meadows Project.
TABLE 4-1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic and Circulation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1.</strong> Add a traffic signal to the intersection at Bellevue Avenue and Dutton Avenue.</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Prior to completion of Phase 1 of the Project</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-4. The Project would result in increased traffic at the unsignalized crossing of Heam Avenue by student pedestrians</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4a.</strong> Signalize intersection of Dutton Meadow (Northpoint Parkway) and Heam Avenue.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to or concurrent with construction of Phase 1</td>
<td>Design review; construction inspection</td>
<td>Design documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4b.</strong> Add a road within Dutton Meadows parallel to Heam Avenue. As part of the proposed Project, an interior road south of and parallel to Heam Avenue will be constructed (Aloise Avenue). As an interim measure, an asphalt path will be constructed connecting Dutton Meadow and the Project.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to or concurrent with construction of Phase 2</td>
<td>Design review; construction inspection</td>
<td>Design documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4c.</strong> 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 to Elsie Allen High School. An interim asphalt path will be constructed along this alignment, along the informal path already worn in this location.</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Prior to or concurrent with development west of Dutton Meadow</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 3.2-4d.</strong> 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 Heam Avenue. The pedestrian needs addressed through the policies of the Area Plan include the following:</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to or concurrent with construction</td>
<td>Development plan approval; Design review; construction inspection</td>
<td>Subdivision Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A well-connected internal circulation system that, to the extent possible, minimizes pedestrian crossings at major streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mixed land uses that minimize distances for daily trip activities, and thus promote walking and cycling as alternatives to the automobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sidewalks provided on streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 3.2-6a.</strong> Implement Construction Traffic Management Plan. 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.</td>
<td>Project applicant and Construction contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>Permit to construct</td>
<td>Construction Traffic Management Plan; Construction contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure 3.2-6b.</strong> 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</td>
<td>Project applicant and Construction contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>Permit to construct</td>
<td>Construction Traffic Management Plan; Construction contract; Notes on the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Implementation Schedule</td>
<td>Additional Permit Enforcement</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-9. The Project would result in increased demand for transit services</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-9. Provide transit service improvements. 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 &quot;sea&quot; 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</td>
<td>Transit service improvements by City of Santa Rosa Construction of bus turnouts by Project applicant</td>
<td>Transit service improvements prior to, during, and after Project construction Bus turnout construction prior to or during Phase 1, Phase 6, Phase 4, and Phase 3, respectively</td>
<td>Development plan approval; design review; construction inspection</td>
<td>Improvement plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-10. Cumulative traffic growth may result in increased traffic volumes exceeding the LOS objective for roadway segments</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.2-10a. Implement traffic improvements on City streets (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.4.1). To implement this mitigation, the proposed development will pay the Southwest Area Development Impact Fee for area-wide improvements, thereby mitigating its proportional share of the cumulative traffic impacts on local street systems. The following improvement projects, or portions thereof, may also be appropriate as conditions of approval for various projects. (a) Northpoint Parkway/Stony Point Road: Add north-bound turn (NBT), south-bound turn (SBT), south-bound left (SBL), and east-bound turn (EBT) 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 (SBR/RT) 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.</td>
<td>Fees paid by Project applicant Improvements made by City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Fees paid by Project applicant Improvements made by City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Building permit not issued until fees paid</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4-1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Dutton Avenue/Sebastopol Road: Add NBT, WBT, SBT/R, EBL, and EBT lanes to this intersection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Heam 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. Heam will need to have added WBL, WBT, and WBR lanes; the existing southbound Dutton approach widened by adding a SBT lane; and the existing Heam eastbound approach widened by including an EBL lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>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 'G' to 'F' (WBT).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>Heam Avenue/Corby Avenue: Add NBL, WBT, WBR, SBL, SBR, EBL, and EBT lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>Corporate Center Parkway/Sebastopol Road: Add a NBT, WBT, WBR, SBL, and SBT 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>Corporate Center Parkway/Northpoint Parkway: Convert existing flashing red (effectively, all way STOP) operation to normal signal operation. No additional physical improvements required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o)</td>
<td>Northpoint Parkway/Dutton Avenue: Provide signalization at this future intersection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation Measure 3.3-10b: Improve residential street environment. 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.

Project applicant | Prior to or concurrent with construction | Design review; construction inspection | Improvement Plans
TABLE 4-1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed humps, or &quot;undulations&quot; - These differ from more traditional &quot;speed bumps&quot; 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).</td>
<td>Speed humps, or &quot;undulations&quot; - These differ from more traditional &quot;speed bumps&quot; 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).</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to occupancy of Dutton Meadows Phase 3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Design and construction documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-11a. 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

California Department of Transportation; Sonoma County Transit Authority

Ongoing

N/A

Traffic Relief Act for Sonoma County Expenditure Plan for SCTA participation

Mitigation Measure 3.2-11b. Add auxiliary lanes to State Route 12. Auxiliary lanes will be added between the Stony Point Road and Dutton Avenue Interchanges.

California Department of Transportation; Sonoma County Transit Authority

TBD

N/A

N/A

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

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

City of Santa Rosa; Sonoma County Transit Authority

Ongoing

N/A

Traffic Relief Act for Sonoma County Expenditure Plan for SCTA participation

City's Long Range Transit Plan


### TABLE 4-1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as long-term service need areas. This plan notes that, &quot;beyond the baseline system, additional revenue sources are needed to implement most of the short term improvements and all of the long term improvements&quot; (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 &quot;sea&quot; 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.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Review for compliance to occur when future development proposals submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.2-16. Project buildout, along with cumulative buildout, may result in parking demand exceeding the available capacity for the Project area. Mitigation Measure 3.2-16. The applicants of future development proposals shall comply with the Santa Rosa Zoning Code parking requirements.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Review for compliance to occur when future development proposals submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development plan approval</td>
<td>Design documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.3-3. The Project may increase demand for schools to such a degree that enrollment is greater than school capacity Mitigation Measure 3.3-3. Implement payment of mitigation fees. 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.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of building permit</td>
<td>Building permits not issued until school fees are paid</td>
<td>Receipt of fee payment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.3-4. The Project may increase demand for parks and recreation facilities to Mitigation Measure 3.3-4. Require park land dedication and park development or in-lieu park fees. Prior to issuance of a building permit, require that each project sponsor</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of building permit</td>
<td>Building permits not issued until park fees are paid</td>
<td>Receipt of fee payment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Impacts

- **such a degree that General Plan service standards are not maintained**
  - **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.
  - Responsible Party: Project applicant
  - Implementation Schedule: Prior to occupancy
  - Additional Permit Enforcement: Occupancy Permit or Recordation of Final Map
  - Documentation: N/A

- **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
  - **Mitigation Measure 3.3-7.** Fund new fire station. 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.
  - Responsible Party: City of Santa Rosa
  - Implementation Schedule: Construction completed by mid-2006
  - Additional Permit Enforcement: N/A
  - Documentation: N/A

- **Impact 3.3-8.** The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Area Plan, may increase demand for water supply to such a degree that the City cannot commit to providing adequate service
  - **Mitigation Measure 3.3-8a.** Implement water conservation measures. Incorporate drought-tolerant landscaping and other water efficient landscape standards included in the City of Santa Rosa Water Efficient Landscape Policy. Incorporate low-flow plumbing fixtures to minimize water use.
  - Responsible Party: Project applicant
  - Implementation Schedule: Prior to issuance of building permit
  - Additional Permit Enforcement: Design Review
  - Documentation: Building plans

- **Mitigation Measure 3.3-8b.** Develop alternative sources of water. 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.
  - Responsible Party: City of Santa Rosa
  - Implementation Schedule: Ongoing
  - Additional Permit Enforcement: Water supply regulations
  - Documentation: SCWA Urban Water Management Plan; Eleventh Amended Agreement for Water Supply

- **Impact 3.3-9.** The Project, in combination with other development in the Southwest Area Plan, may increase demand for wastewater treatment and disposal to such a degree that the City cannot commit to providing adequate service
  - **Mitigation Measure 3.3-9a.** Collect sanitary sewer connection fee. To fund additional infrastructure required to serve the developments in southwest Santa Rosa, the sanitary sewer connection fee will be collected.
  - Responsible Party: Project applicant
  - Implementation Schedule: Prior to issuance of building permit
  - Additional Permit Enforcement: Building permits not issued until park fees are paid
  - Documentation: Receipt of fee payment

#### 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
  - **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.
  - Responsible Party: Project applicant and Construction contractor
  - Implementation Schedule: Prior to and during demolition/construction
  - Additional Permit Enforcement: Demolition Permit
  - Documentation: OSHA Standards

  - **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
  - Responsible Party: Project applicant and Construction contractor
  - Implementation Schedule: Prior to and during demolition/construction
  - Additional Permit Enforcement: BAAQMD approval
  - Documentation: Demolition Permit
4.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

TABLE 4-1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4-2. The Project could expose workers, the public and the environment to hazards resulting from hazardous contaminants in soils</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2a. Notify agencies regarding contamination. 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 contamination is encountered during construction activities.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>Local and state regulations</td>
<td>Construction documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2b. Characterize soil and groundwater conditions and remediate as necessary. 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 sources, 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.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>Development Plan approval</td>
<td>Site Safety and Health Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4-1
 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risks associated with aboveground fuel tank and 55-gallon drums on the</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2c. Perform Phase II investigation. Prior to approval of a</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>Development Plan approval</td>
<td>Fire Department approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 parcels</td>
<td>development project, a Phase II investigation (soil sampling and analysis) for any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>known contaminated areas shall be prepared. These include the contaminated areas near the</td>
<td>known hazardous areas shall be prepared. These include the contaminated areas near the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above-ground fuel tank and the 55-gallon drums on parcels 043-191-018,</td>
<td>above-ground fuel tank and the 55-gallon drums on parcels 043-191-018, -019, and -020,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-019, and the identified oil staining in the driveway(s) on parcels 043-191-021, 043-071-029</td>
<td>and -020 shall also include soil sampling in the area of the irrigation well/pump for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 043-200-004. The Phase II investigation for parcels 043-191-018, -019</td>
<td>organochlorine pesticides. Each Phase II report shall be submitted to the Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and -020, shall also include soil sampling 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2d. Perform Phase III remediation. If a Phase III (remediation)</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>Fire Department permit</td>
<td>Phase III reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4.3. The Project could expose workers, the public and the environment to</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4-3. Remove aboveground fuel tank and oil in 55-gallon drums</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>Fire Department Permit</td>
<td>Disposition documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hazards resulting from aboveground fuel tank and oil in the 55-gallon drums on the Phase 3</td>
<td>located on the Phase 3 development site. Prior to approval of the development project, a Fire Department permit shall be obtained to remove the contaminated areas. The Fire Department also requires the soils in the 55-gallon drums to be removed and properly disposed to an appropriate location, with proper documentation of disposition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.4.4. Support proper disposal of household hazardous waste. 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.4.4. The Project may result in increased use and disposal of household</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit, Subdivision Map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4-1  
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<th>Impacts</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California Public Resources Code Sections 5024.1, 7050.5, and 5097.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Historic and Cultural Resources

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

Mitigation Measure 3.5-1a. Monitor ground-disturbing activities during construction. 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 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.
### TABLE 4-1
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.5-2. Construction of the Project could result in impacts to potential historic structures</td>
<td>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 historic 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.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to demolition</td>
<td>Development Plan approval</td>
<td>Historic evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-1a. Replace trees in accordance with the City Code (Chapter 17-24 – Trees). All trees impacted by the Project will be replaced in accordance with the 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</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1a.</td>
<td>Project applicant, Construction contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, tree replacement plan shall be approved by the Dept. of City Code (Chapter 17-24 – Trees)</td>
<td>Tree replacement plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mitigation Measures

**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 Joel Galbraith, Santa Rosa Department of Community Development, at (707) 543-3256 when he/she begins the inspection. The spot checker shall submit a report of findings to Joel Galbraith, 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."

#### Implementation Schedule

- Prior to and during construction
- Prior to demolition
- Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, tree replacement plan shall be approved by the Dept. of City Code (Chapter 17-24 – Trees)

#### Additional Permit Enforcement

- California Public Resources Code Sections 5024.1, 7050.5, and 5097.94
- Grading and improvement plans

#### Documentation

- Grading and improvement plans
- City Code (Chapter 17-24 – Trees)
**TABLE 4-1**
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
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<th>Documentation</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Project applicant, Construction contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>Approval of improvement plans, grading plans, and building plans</td>
<td>General Tree Preservation Guidelines, improvement plans, grading plans, and building plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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) 543-3256 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.</td>
<td>Construction contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>City Code Chapter 17-24-Trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1c. Require application of Best Management Practices during construction. The City of Santa Rosa will require the application of Best Management Practices (BMPs) 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</td>
<td>Construction contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>City Code Chapter 17-24-Trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 4-1
### Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6-2. Implementation of the Project would result in loss of wetland habitat</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2a. Avoid or minimize impacts to wetland resources to the maximum extent practicable. Impacts to wetland resources shall be avoided or minimized by the following measures:</td>
<td>Project applicant, Construction contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>Development Plan approval</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimizing or reducing the size and area of site improvements within such wetland areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Restricting the size and areas of construction sites within such wetland areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Using Best Management Practices to control erosion and sedimentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 a 1.25:1 ratio (1.25 acre of mitigation for 1 acre of impact) for a total creation or restoration of a minimum of 5.46 acres of vernal pool and other seasonal wetland habitat. 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 Biological Assessment.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>Improvement plans will not be approved until mitigation is completed or otherwise approved by the state and federal agencies</td>
<td>Mitigation monitoring reports as required in agency permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>Project applicant, property owner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Issuance of building or grading permits</td>
<td>Legal documents associated with property transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation of the Project

Impact 3.6.5: Implementation of the Project would result in the loss of raptor nesting habitat

Mitigation Measure 3.6-5: Provide protection of migratory birds. 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

Additional Permit Enforcement

USACE Section 404, RWQCB Section 401 authorizations

Documentation

Section 404 and 401 permit documents
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<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mitigation measures 3.6-2d: Obtain appropriate permits for filling of wetlands. For wetland impacts that cannot be avoided or minimized, project developers will prepare a mitigation and monitoring plan in consultation with USACE and the RWQCB 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.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>USACE Section 404, RWQCB Section 401 authorizations</td>
<td>Section 404 and 401 permit documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure 3.6-6.</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete special status plant species pre-construction surveys and plant salvage.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction, where special-status plant species are confirmed to be present; spring time</td>
<td>State and Federal Endangered Species Acts; USACE Section 404 permit, Biological Opinion</td>
<td>Improvement plans, grading plans, and building plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure 3.6-8a.</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>USACE Section 404 permit, Biological Opinion</td>
<td>Construction monitoring and compliance reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Be present onsite during initial construction activities to identify sensitive resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Monitor mitigation construction near sensitive habitats and resources, i.e., Colgan Creek and Gobbi Ranch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Prohibit ground disturbance until sensitive areas are cleared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Be present during open trench work construction activities that require special attention in sensitive areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Prepare construction monitoring and compliance reports that analyze the effectiveness of the mitigation measures and submit as appropriate to the City of Santa Rosa, CDFG, RWQCB, USACE, and USFWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4-1
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<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
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<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-8b.</td>
<td>Project applicant, City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>USACE Section 404 permit, Biological Opinion</td>
<td>Construction monitoring and compliance reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. 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 sieved for CTS larvae from March to May prior to construction. Any CTS larvae found during sieving 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 life stage 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 any 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-8c.</td>
<td>Project applicant, City of Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Plan preparation prior to construction</td>
<td>USACE Section 404 permit, Biological Opinion</td>
<td>Biological Resource Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan Daily logs and monthly compliance reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a Biological Resource 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-9.</td>
<td>Project applicant, Construction contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>State and Federal Endangered Species Acts Improvement plans, grading plans, and building plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project construction activities could result in impacts to western pond turtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect 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 turtles 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 3.6-11.</td>
<td>Construction contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>USACE Section 404 permit</td>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project construction activities could result in impacts to sensitive habitats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure 3.6-11a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. A SWPPP incorporating Best Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4-1
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practices will be developed and implemented. 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 3.6.11-b. Implement NPDES Permit requirements. Implement the NPDES permit requirements regarding the implementation of non-point pollution source control of stormwater runoff through the application of Best Management Practices. This would reduce vernal pool/wetland pollution and sedimentation impacts to a level of insignificance. 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. 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, Carrinall-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. The Alton Lane site was formerly used for vineyards and orchards and was planted with CTS approximately 19 years ago. 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. Mitigation Measure 5-1 from Initial Study. Future Indoor Noise Environment. To maintain a habitable interior noise environment, units exposed to noise levels greater than 60 dBA Ldn shall be provided with forced-air mechanical ventilation to adequately ventilate the interior spaces of the units. Mitigation monitoring reports as required in agency permits.</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa; future project applicants</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>State and Federal Endangered Species Acts</td>
<td>Mitigation monitoring reports as required in agency permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>Compliance with noise report shall be reviewed and approved by an acoustical consultant</td>
<td>Noise barriers and forced-air ventilation systems to be shown on building plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
### TABLE 4-1
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual Quality &amp; Community Character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5-1 Overall Project Design: Comply with the Goals, Objectives and Policies for Community Design in the Community Design Chapter of the Southwest Area Plan. Conformance review shall occur with each development decision utilizing the General Plan Urban Design Element, the Community Design Program of the Southwest Area Plan, and the City’s Subdivision Design Guidelines to make decisions regarding proposed developments. Conformance review shall also occur during the City’s Design Review process prior to the issuance of grading and construction permits.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>Conformance review during City’s Design Review process prior to issuance of grading and construction permits</td>
<td>Plans and specifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5-2a. Minimize the stockpiling of sewer and water supply equipment to the extent practicable prior to installation of the infrastructure. Only materials required for several days of construction should be stockpiled at any given site at one time.</td>
<td>Project applicant; Construction contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Specifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solids, Geology and Seismicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1-2 Seismic Requirements: Incorporate seismic-restraint criteria in the design of slopes, foundations and structures for projects within the Plan Area as outlined in the measures listed below:</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>Conformance review during City’s Design Review process prior to issuance of grading and construction permits</td>
<td>Plans and specifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The minimum seismic-resistant design standards for all proposed facilities shall conform to the CUBC Seismic Zone 4 Standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Additional seismic-restraint earthwork and construction design criteria shall be incorporated as necessary, based on the site-specific recommendations of California-registered geotechnical and structural engineering professionals, recommended to be in cooperation with a California Certified Engineering Geologist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) During site preparation, the registered geotechnical professional shall be on the site to supervise implementation of the recommended criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) The California-registered Geotechnical Engineer consultant shall prepare an &quot;as built&quot; map/report, to be filed with the City, showing details of the site geology, the location and type of seismic-restraint facilities, and documenting the following requirements, as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Engineering analyses shall demonstrate satisfactory performance of alluvium and fill where they form part or all of the support for structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Analysis of soil expansion potential and appropriate remediation (compaction, removal, etc.) shall be completed prior to using expansive soils for foundation support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Roads, foundations and underground utilities in fill or alluvium shall be designed to accommodate settlement or compaction estimated by the site-specific investigations of the geotechnical consultant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1-3 Erosion Control - Grading during Wet Season: If grading or construction are to occur during the wet season, require an erosion and sediment transport control plan, designed by an erosion control professional, or landscape architect or civil engineer specializing in erosion control, that shall meet the following objectives for the grading and construction period of projects proposed for the Southwest Plan Area.</td>
<td>Project applicant; Construction contractor</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The erosion and sediment transport control plan shall be submitted, reviewed, implemented and inspected as part of the approval process for the grading plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for each project.</td>
<td>(b) The plan shall be designed by the developers' erosion control consultant, using concepts similar to those developed by the Association of Bay Area Governments, as appropriate, based on the specific erosion and sediment transport control needs of each area in which grading and construction is to occur. Those concepts include some which apply generally to the Southwest Plan Area (see bullet items on list below), and some that would be appropriate only for specific sites. The possible methods are not necessarily limited to the following items.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Confining grading and activities related to grading (demolition, construction, preparation and use of equipment and material storage areas (staging areas), preparation of access roads,) to the dry season, whenever possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If grading or activities related to grading need to be scheduled for the wet season, ensure that structural erosion and sediment transport control measures are ready for implementation prior to the onset of the first major storm of the season.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Locate staging areas outside major streams and drainage ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Keep disturbed areas (areas of grading and related activities) to the minimum necessary for demolition or construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Keep runoff away from disturbed areas during grading and related activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Direct runoff over vegetated areas prior to discharge into public storm drainage systems, whenever possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trap sediment before it leaves the site with such techniques as check dams, sediment ponds, or siltation fences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Make the contractor responsible for the removal and disposal of all sedimentation in off-site retention ponds, that is generated by grading and related activities of the project. Use landscaping and grading methods that lower the potential for downstream sedimentation. Modified drainage patterns, longer flow paths, encouraging infiltration into the ground, and slower storm-water conveyance velocities are examples of effective methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Control landscaping activities carefully with regard to the application of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides or other hazardous substances. Provide proper instruction to all landscaping personnel on the construction team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) During the installation of the erosion and sediment transport control structures, the erosion control professional shall be on the site to supervise the implementation of the designs, and the maintenance of the facilities throughout the demolition, grading and construction period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) The erosion control professional shall prepare an &quot;as built&quot; erosion and sediment control facility map, to be filed with the City, showing details of the structural elements of the plan and providing an operating and maintenance schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4-1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.2.1-4 Construction where soil suitability is in question | Require site-specific soil suitability analysis and stabilization procedures, and design criteria for foundations, as recommended by a California-registered soil engineer during the design phase for each site where the existence of unsuitable soil conditions is known or suspected.  
(a) During the design phase for each site where the existence of unsuitable soil conditions is known or suspected, the developer's registered soil engineering consultant shall provide documentation to the City that:  
1. site-specific soil suitability analyses has been conducted in the area of the proposed foundation to establish the design criteria for appropriate foundation type and support, and  
2. the recommended criteria have been incorporated in the design of foundation.  
(b) During grading for these sites, the registered soils professional shall be on the site:  
1. to observe areas of potential soil unsuitability,  
2. to supervise the implementation of soil remediation programs, and  
3. to verify final soil conditions prior to setting the foundations.  
(c) The registered soils engineering consultant shall prepare an "as built" map, to be filed with the City, showing details of the site soils, the location of foundations, sub-drains and clean-outs, the results of suitability analyses and compaction tests. | Project applicant | Prior to and during construction | Conformance review during City's Design Review process prior to issuance of grading and construction permits | Plans and specifications; as-buils |
| 3.2.2-1 Drainage Improvements: | SCWA                                                                                  | Ongoing            | N/A                                           | N/A                                                                                          | N/A                           |
| (a) The Colgan Creek channel west of U.S. 101 shall be enlarged and modified if necessary for a length of 2,450 feet so that it can convey the design storm runoff from the Southwest and Southwestern Plan Areas. This improvement shall be undertaken under the direction of the Sonoma County Water Agency. | SCWA | Ongoing | N/A | N/A |
| (b) The Roseland Creek channel, and portions of the Naval Creek channel in the vicinity of the Air Center, shall be widened and reconfigured to accommodate the design storm runoff, under the direction of the Sonoma County Water Agency. | SCWA | Ongoing | N/A | N/A |
| (c) Improvements which may be necessary to the natural drainage which cross or are downstream from the Southwest Plan Area shall be undertaken with the approval of the Sonoma County Water Agency and to the design standards specified in the Sonoma County Flood Control Design Manual. These improvements shall take the form of a naturalized channel to the specifications of the city of Santa Rosa. (See also Section 3.2.3, Vegetation and Wildlife, for additional information regarding stream modification.) | SCWA | Ongoing | N/A | N/A |
| 3.2.2-2 Water Quality - Grading: | Project applicant; Construction contractor | Prior to and during construction | Clean Water Act | SWPPP |
| (a) Construction shall be scheduled for the dry season. | Project applicant; Construction contractor | Prior to and during construction | Clean Water Act | SWPPP |
| (b) Any projects that result in grading of an area greater 5 acres shall be subject to an NPDES permit from the RWQCB. This permit requires that the applicant develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. The permit requirements of the | Project applicant; Construction contractor | Prior to and during construction | Clean Water Act | SWPPP |
### TABLE 4-1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB shall be satisfied prior to granting</td>
<td>RWQCB shall be satisfied prior to granting of a building permit by the City of</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
<td>Design documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of a building permit by the City of Santa</td>
<td>Santa Rosa. (c) A soil erosion and sedimentation control plan shall be submitted to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa by the applicant for individual projects</td>
<td>the City of Santa Rosa by the applicant for individual projects proposed under the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed under the Southwest Area Plan</td>
<td>Southwest Area Plan prior to grading. This plan may include, but not limited to, the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior to grading. This plan may include, but</td>
<td>following erosion control methods:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not limited to, the following</td>
<td>1. During construction, soil on graded areas shall be revegetated as soon as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erosion control methods:</td>
<td>1. During construction, soil on graded areas shall be revegetated as soon as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>possible following disruption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Use of interceptor ditches or drainage swales to intercept storm runoff from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transporting sediment into drainages and to prevent sediment laden runoff from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leaving the disturbed area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Construction shall be restricted in the months of November through April.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Silt fences shall be constructed to prevent sheet flow across adjacent areas and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>down gradient into drainages. These and further measures shall be designed through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the use of the Universal Soil Loss Equation to calculate the proper storage capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>required of silt fences or gravel bags, and shall be implemented by the contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prior to mass grading and other soil disturbing construction activities on-site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Disturbed areas, that have been graded for construction, shall be replanted as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as feasible after the completion of construction. Plantings shall be used on surfaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of cut and fill areas to collect surface runoff and reduce erosion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2-3 Water Quality; Easily cleanable</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catch-basins, debris screens, and grease</td>
<td>Easily cleanable catch-basins, debris screens, and grease separators or similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separators or similar water quality</td>
<td>water quality protection devices shall be installed in the channels and drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection devices shall be installed in the</td>
<td>facilities serving the Plan area. Maintenance of the facilities shall be ensured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>channels and drainage facilities serving the</td>
<td>through in-lieu fees paid to the City, or the establishment of homeowner associations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan area. Maintenance of the facilities</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall be ensured through in-lieu fees paid to</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the City, or the establishment of homeowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associations.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2-4 Construction Standards for areas with</td>
<td>Construction Standards for areas with High Groundwater: Projects proposed within the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Groundwater: Projects proposed within</td>
<td>the Southwest Santa Rosa Plan within areas of high groundwater shall submit a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Southwest Santa Rosa Plan within areas</td>
<td>geotechnical report which designates specific groundwater conditions and subrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of high groundwater shall submit a geotechnical</td>
<td>requirements and incorporates them in the project design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report which designates specific groundwater</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa; Project applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditions and subrain requirements and</td>
<td>As feasible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incorporates them in the project design.</td>
<td>City of Santa Rosa; Project applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2-5 Groundwater Recharge: The City shall</td>
<td>Groundwater Recharge: The City shall encourage the use of detention ponds to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage the use of detention ponds to</td>
<td>partially offset the loss of groundwater recharged area within the Plan Area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partially offset the loss of groundwater</td>
<td>Such artificial recharge programs shall be coordinated through the Sonoma County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recharged area within the Plan Area.</td>
<td>County Water Agency to ensure a rational, consistent and systematic approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformance review during City's Design Review process prior to issuance of grading and</td>
<td>Conformance review during City's Design Review process prior to issuance of grading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction permits</td>
<td>and construction permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and specifications; as-buils</td>
<td>Plans and specifications; as-buils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Air Quality

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

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

(b) The contractor shall use tarps or other effective covers for haul trucks that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>Clean Air Act</td>
<td>Specifications, construction contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
<td>Design documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>Conformance review during City's Design Review process prior to issuance of grading and construction permits</td>
<td>Plans and specifications; as-buils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>As feasible</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>Clean Air Act</td>
<td>Specifications, construction contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4.1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Additional Permit Enforcement</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel on public streets.</td>
<td>(c) The contractor shall sweep streets adjacent to the project at the end of the day.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to Final Map approval</td>
<td>Final Map approval</td>
<td>Design and construction documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) The contractor shall schedule clearing, grading, and earthmoving activities during periods of low wind speeds and restrict those construction activities during high wind conditions with wind speeds greater than 20 mph average during an hour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) The contractor shall control construction and site vehicle speed to 15 mph on unpaved roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) The contractor shall minimize open burning of wood/vegetative waste materials from both construction and operation of the project. No open burning shall occur unless it can be demonstrated to the Bay area AQMD that alternatives have been explored. These alternatives may include, but are not limited to, chipping, mulching, and conversion to biomass fuel. For any open burning, an AQMD permit must be obtained and done in conformance with AQMD regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>(a) To minimize construction noise impacts of nearby residents, limit construction hours to between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekends for projects within 1,600 feet of inhabited dwelling unit(s). Any work outside of these hours shall require a special permit from the City of Santa Rosa. There shall be compelling reasons for permitting construction outside of the designated hours.</td>
<td>Project applicant; Construction contractor</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>City noise ordinance</td>
<td>Construction contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Construction equipment shall be properly outfitted and maintained with noise reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) The contractor shall locate stationary noise sources away from residents and developed areas, and require use of acoustic shielding with such equipment when feasible and appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.5-2: Project developers shall propose noise mitigation consistent with General Plan Noise and Area Plan Community Design Policies to reduce year 2010 exterior noise levels on proposed residential and school land uses to 60 Ldn or below, on proposed playgrounds and neighborhood park land uses to 70 Ldn or below, and on proposed office buildings and commercial areas to 65 Ldn or below.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to construction</td>
<td>Design review for consistency with General Plan Noise and Area Plan Community Design Policies</td>
<td>Design documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Implementation Schedule</td>
<td>Additional Permit Enforcement</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.5-3:</td>
<td>(a) Retrofit existing residential land uses with acoustical attenuation materials, or relocate residences, to reduce interior noise levels for the year 2010 to below 45 Ldn.</td>
<td>Project applicant</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction</td>
<td>Design review for consistency with General Plan Noise and Area Plan Community Design Policies</td>
<td>Design documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A
General Tree Preservation Guidelines
GENERAL TREE
PRESERVATION GUIDELINES

Introduction to Tree Preservation

Great care must be exercised when development is proposed in the vicinity of established trees of any type. The trees present at this proposed construction site will require specialized protection techniques during all construction activities to minimize negative impact on their health and vigor. The area immediately under canopy driplines of these trees is especially critical, and for these reasons the requirements, procedures, and recommendations which follow have been established for short and long term tree protection. The purpose of this preservation guideline is therefore to define the procedures which must be followed during any and all phases of development in the immediate vicinity of these trees.

Established, mature trees respond in a number of different ways to disruption of their natural conditions. Change of grade within the dripline or near the root crown, damage to the bark of the tree, soil compaction above the root system, root system reduction or damage, or alteration of summer soil moisture levels may individually or collectively cause physiological stress leading to tree decline and death. The individual effects of these procedures may cause trees to immediately exhibit symptoms and begin to decline, but more commonly the process may take many years, with symptoms appearing slowly over a period of time. Trees may not begin to show obvious signs of decline until many years after construction is completed. It is not appropriate to wait for symptoms to appear, as this may be too late to correct the conditions at fault and to halt decline.

It is therefore critical to the long term health of all tree species that a well conceived management program be agreed upon before implementation of any construction activities. Once agreed upon at the design level, it is imperative that contractors and construction personnel understand the importance of guidelines and their potential implications. The following guidelines are meant to be utilized by project managers and those supervising any construction in the vicinity of these trees including grading contractors, underground contractors, all equipment operators, construction personnel, and landscape contractors. Guidelines are presented in a brief outline form to be applied to each individual circumstance which occurs during development activities. It is left to the project supervisor to apply and enforce these protection measures. Questions which arise, or interpretation of guidelines as they apply to site activities, should be referred to the office of Horticultural Associates as they occur.

It should be understood by all those involved in this project that by altering natural conditions around any existing, healthy tree, the potential for root damage and eventual tree decline is increased. A well written and implemented protection specification will minimize to an acceptable level but not necessarily eliminate negative impacts on trees. Compromise or deviation from protection specifications will significantly increase the chance of tree decline or failure.

The term dripline has different meanings and should be defined for use at this project. Tree dripline is defined as the perimeter of each tree canopy at the widest point from the main
trunk. This traditionally is applied to the actual field condition, however, where a one-sided tree structure exists and the tree is not structurally uniform, the dripline shall be assumed to be the widest distance to the edge of canopy extending equally around tree circumference. The area below ground within the dripline is the location of only approximately 70% of the root system, primarily in the top two feet of the soil surface. Tree protection guidelines are focused on minimizing intrusion, soil cut or fill, and all activities causing compaction within this area. Site supervision should be completely familiar with this definition and these guidelines, as well as utilizing common sense when working near this critical area.

The following guidelines will cover most circumstances which might arise during construction and will require application to the particular circumstances at the development site based on the actual conditions present.

**Protection Within Dripline of Individual Trees**

1) Prior to initiating any construction activity in the area, including demolition or grading, temporary protective fencing shall be installed at each site tree in the immediate vicinity of construction. Fencing is to be located a minimum of one foot beyond the canopy dripline. If available space and logistics allow, fence shall be placed at a greater distance or up to twice the diameter of the dripline.

2) Fencing shall be minimum four foot height at all locations, and shall form a continuous barrier without entry points around all individual trees, or groups of trees. Barrier type fencing such as chain link or Tensar plastic fencing is suggested, but any fencing system which adequately prevents the entry of equipment and activity will be acceptable. The use of simple post and cable fencing is not recommended as this provides minimal protection and is easily removed or moved by construction personnel. Fencing shall be installed in a professional manner with adequate uprights and appropriate attachments. Concrete footings are not required due to the temporary nature of the fencing. Any encroachment into the dripline for fencing or construction purposes should be discussed and agreed upon in advance.

3) This fencing shall serve as a barrier to prevent dripline encroachment of any type by construction activities, equipment, materials storage, and personnel.

4) Contractors and subcontractors shall direct all equipment and personnel to remain outside the fenced area at all times until project is complete, and shall instruct personnel and subcontractors as to the purpose and importance of fencing and preservation.

5) Fencing should remain in place and not be removed until all construction activities are completed. This shall include grading and compaction activities, installation of underground, all construction activities, and any other construction or activity which is scheduled prior to landscape installation. There may be occasion when access is required, and fencing may temporarily be moved to facilitate the work.

6) Roots of single standing trees often extend two to three times the distance of the actual dripline and function primarily in the uptake of nutrients and water. The dripline is arbitrarily established as the minimum root area generally required to preserve tree health. As much area around the circumference of the tree beyond the dripline should have minimum intrusion to further ensure tree survival and health.
Grade Changes

1) Grade changes within tree dripline are to be minimized wherever possible. Grade should not change from that which existed prior to grading activities without approval from the project arborist.

2) Maximum cut or fill within actual or estimated dripline not to exceed 6 inches. All cut activities should be done in conjunction with the project arborist, even those under 6", to minimize root damage.

3) Estimated dripline is defined as the widest distance from main trunk to furthest branch tip applied around the entire circumference of each individual tree. This definition specifically applies to all trees where a one-sided or unbalanced structure exists and the actual dripline is not truly representative of the area of the root zone requiring protection. Cut and fill activities apply to this definition.

4) No more than 6 inches of fill soil shall occur without specifically developed mitigation measures. Removal of soil within tree dripline is also limited to 6 inches, or a lesser amount which can be removed without contacting major roots. Detailed mitigation is required to remove a greater amount. The amount of cut and fill is to be determined by actual tree species, rooting characteristics, soil conditions, and purpose of grade change.

5) All cut and fill activities within tree dripline increases percentage of short and long term tree decline and loss, and approval of these activities, or compromise in this area, shall be done with full knowledge of the negative potential that is incurred.

6) Original grade shall be maintained in immediate area of the root crown, where the soil contacts tree bole, at all times. No increase in grade shall be allowed under any circumstances in this area.

7) Physical retaining structures are required where any fill operation is approved and exceeds 6 inches above original grade. Retaining structures function to prevent soil grade from being raised in the root crown area.

8) Retaining structures shall be permanent in nature and may be constructed from any material which is appropriate in function to hold raised grade away from root crown on a long term basis. Engineering may be required in some instances.

9) Tree retaining structures shall be installed a minimum distance of four feet from any tree trunk and may completely or partially surround the tree depending on location of grade change. If grade is raised on 50% of the dripline, then retaining structures must be installed to prevent that soil from moving to the immediate root crown in that area. If 100% of the grade is raised, structure must surround the tree entirely. It is the responsibility of the project designer to develop an appropriate structure for this purpose.

10) If site conditions exist which necessitate installation of retaining structures closer than four feet to tree trunk, the project arborist shall be consulted for details of this installation.
11) No part of the dry well structure shall be placed below original grade to minimize impact on root system. If necessary, structural posts may be installed to hold walls in place, providing that care is taken during installation to minimize damage to the root system, and that post hole size is minimized. The excavation and pouring of footings and other structural support is not compatible with tree preservation.

12) Grade changes outside the retaining structure shall be such that drainage water of any type or source is not diverted toward or around the root crown in any manner. Grade shall drain away from root crown at a minimum of 2%.

13) If grading toward root crown is required, appropriate surface and/or subsurface drain facilities shall be installed so that water is effectively diverted away from root crown area.

14) Where fill is approved and/or where paving of any type is planned within the dripline, aeration tubes shall be installed from the dry well or retaining structure to the limit of the dripline and placed at a depth corresponding to slightly below original grade. A description of aeration tube use and construction follows:

In all areas where paving, impermeable or semipermeable surfaces, or fill over 6 inches is to be installed within any tree dripline, aeration tubes shall be required to the limit of the dripline or beyond where possible. Tubes shall radiate horizontally from each dry well or the root crown area to the limit of the dripline, and shall be located on 4 foot centers. Ends of tubes shall be connected to one another. A proportional number of tubes shall be installed when partial paving or filling within dripline is required.

Aeration tubes shall consist of rigid and perforated PVC pipe, minimum class 200, styrene plastic, or molded ABS, minimum 3 inch diameter, 10 perforations per foot. Pipe shall be placed slightly below original grade. Each tube shall be wrapped in suitable filter fabric securely fastened with waterproof tape. Aeration tubes shall daylight within the retaining structure around tree trunk, and a grate shall be attached, but not glued, to the end of each daylighted tube to prevent the entry of debris. Aeration tubes shall also daylight near the outer perimeter of the dripline with a fitted metal grate properly installed slightly above finished grade. Tubes and grate shall not be installed such that water of any type or source backdrains into dry well.

15) The installation of aeration tubes is meant to facilitate the normal exchange of atmospheric gasses with the soil and root system. When impermeable or semi-permeable paving is installed, or when soil grade is raised, this normal exchange is limited and commonly becomes a source of root damage and potential disease.

16) Tree roots will be expected to grow into areas of soil fill, and quality of imported soil should be considered. Ideally, fill soil should be site soil that closely matches that present within tree dripline. If import soil is utilized it should be the same or slightly coarser texture than existing site soil, should have a pH range comparable to site soils, and generally should have acceptable chemical properties for appropriate plant growth. A soil analysis is recommended prior to importation to evaluate import soil for these criteria.

17) All approved soil cuts should be made outside the immediate dripline for minimal negative impact on trees. If approved within dripline, crown foliage shall be reduced
accordingly to balance the estimated root loss. Any construction activity which necessitates soil excavation in the vicinity of preserved trees should be avoided where possible, or mitigated under the guidance of the project arborist. Roots are to be hand cut and sealed wherever possible when major structural roots are encountered over one inch in diameter. The tearing of roots by equipment of any type within the dripline shall not be allowed.

**Underground Construction**

1) All underground work within tree driplines shall be avoided wherever possible to reduce negative impact on trees. The location of underground utilities well outside dripline is recommended as part of tree preservation.

2) Weakened anchorage, root system integrity, and the ability to acquire moisture from the root soil areas are the most critical issues when considering any type of root impact or removal.

3) Underground work in the area of site trees has a potentially serious impact on tree health and tree stability. Underground trenching for a variety of utilities will sever large structural roots reducing nutrient and water uptake and more seriously affecting the ability of each tree to remain appropriately anchored.

4) The existing root system within the dripline should not be severed by construction activities of any type. If undergrounding within dripline is required for unavoidable logistical reasons, the project arborist shall be consulted to determine whether the impact on tree health.

5) All underground work required within the dripline of the trees and below original grade should be previewed by the project arborist to determine potential impact on trees and to prepare mitigation measures.

**Pruning Requirements**

1) The removal of dead wood, damaged branches, structurally unsound wood including bark included wood, narrow crotches, and crossing branches shall be the goal of the climbing tree worker. Co-dominant leaders or lateral branches shall be removed, pruned to retard growth, or cabled wherever possible.

2) The removal of significant live wood is discouraged at all times. Where removal of significant wood is required to mitigate the loss of roots, careful coordination between project arborist and tree workers is required. Severity of pruning should be restricted wherever possible while still modifying unhealthy or inadequate structure appropriately. The use of drop crotching and thinning techniques to restore balance is preferred when necessary to accomplish pruning goals, over heading type cuts. The use of heading type cuts shall be minimized or eliminated whenever possible.

Pruning shall be as minimal as possible, removing dead or damaged branches, crossing or rubbing branches, or correcting other structural deficiencies which may be present. Removal of lower branches may be required to allow for access and clearance following construction. Minimal pruning is the desired approach to all trees.
3) The following general guidelines shall be used during all pruning procedures:

**Lateral Branch Removal**

All laterals shall be removed immediately beyond the branch bark ridge, always preserving the branch collar.

No stub cuts should be made which leave an inch or more beyond the branch collar.

No flush cuts through the branch collar shall occur.

**Triple Cuts**

All branches too large to be hand held shall be removed by means of the triple cut; undercutting branch 4 to 8 inches beyond base, removing branch beyond undercut, and removing remaining stub utilizing a shoulder cut.

**Terminal Pruning**

**Thinning**

Cut back terminal portions of branches by cutting back to laterals with a basal diameter 1/3 the size of the terminal being removed. Removal of many smaller terminals is preferred over removal of a few large ones.

**Size Reduction**

Remove portions of the crown for reducing height by removing terminals back to laterals. Each lateral remaining should be located to serve as a new terminal. This will establish the crown at a lower level. The diameter at the base of a remaining lateral should be 1/3 the diameter of the terminal being removed.

4) Pruning to reduce the amount of top growth in relation to root severance shall occur on all trees where approved trenching or underground work is to occur. Pruning is required to directly compensate for the amount of roots being damaged and removed by this work. This shall be determined after plans and construction techniques are determined.

5) Pruning may also be required to create appropriate access for construction equipment where low limb presence may obstruct access. This pruning is to be done by a qualified arborist, and shall by no means be done by construction personnel under any circumstances.

6) Pruning shall occur prior to initiation of any/all approved underground trenching. No ground shall be broken within the dripline of street trees without having pruning completed.

7) Project arborist shall be consulted prior to initiation of any pruning procedures to coordinate activities with the working arborist.
Additional Recommended Procedures

Continued discussion and coordination between project arborist, owners, designers, and general contractor should occur to further discuss and define these guidelines based on the actual work planned in the vicinity of these trees.

Fertilization

Fertilization is not generally recommended unless a specific nutrient deficiency symptom is visible. Following completion of construction activities, a determination of tree health should be conducted to visually evaluate tree performance and to recommend fertilization or mitigation if it is required based on the appearance of each individual tree. Owners additionally should monitor visible tree appearance and contact the project arborist should any tree exhibit unusual growth or characteristics.

Pest Control

A close visual examination for tree pests shall be conducted by the climbing arborist as he completes pruning procedures. If a serious infestation is present which was not apparent from ground observation then pesticide application should be considered at that time. However, the simple presence of tree pests does not warrant the use of chemical pesticides, and it should clear that a serious infestation capable of causing tree decline must be present to warrant their use. The use of organic sprays or pesticidal soaps is the preferred method for treating any serious pest infestation. If infestations should occur, discussion with the project arborist is recommended.

Weed Control

No specific measures are recommended for weed control, and the presence of weeds should not be considered a problem in relation to continued tree health.

Disease Control

No specific measures are recommended for disease control unless noted in the Individual Tree Evaluations. The tree pruning specialist should note any serious problem during his climbing procedures if they become evident.

Paving Reference

The use of asphalt or concrete as a primary paving surface within the canopy dripline is generally discouraged. Utilization of a permeable substance which does not impede the natural percolation of water or limit the nature of gaseous exchange is recommended. Materials such as decomposed gravel or cobble are ideal for this purpose, however, generally do not function satisfactorily as a parking or driving surface.

Interlocking pavers come in a variety of shapes, colors and sizes and provide a suitable surface for driving, parking and walking. At the same time they will allow some infiltration of water and air to the original soil level. Functionally and aesthetically they are appropriate for consideration at many projects. Utilization of an installation method which excludes fine sand
joints must be used however, to maintain infiltration. A coarse sand leveling bed and course sand joints are recommended to increase water infiltration and aeration.

**Planting Under Existing Trees**

The installation of lawn beneath established native trees is strongly discouraged. The ideal treatment under natives is the use of an organic or inert mulch. Redwood chips, gravel, or stone cobble are all excellent materials. If planting is required for aesthetic or functional purposes, the use of drought tolerant, woody species is most appropriate. Species should be selected for their ability to survive with minimal or no water through the summer months after initial establishment period. Only drip irrigation should be utilized within the canopy dripline to minimize summer water in the root zone.

**Nature of Work**

All work to date has been intended to be general in nature and comments and recommendations are based on obvious external conditions and symptoms. This inspection and evaluation did not include root crown excavation or inspection, nor did it include the use of instruments to determine unseen cavities or inherent weakness in trunk or branch structure. This inspection and evaluation did not include the climbing of each tree or inspection at that level. Underground portions of the root system cannot be viewed, and roots have not been excavated. Structural stability, root crown health, and root health are all inferred from external growth characteristics only. Many of these trees have cavities present and this is a normal occurrence which may or may not affect tree health and structural stability in the future. It is the recommendation of this firm that regular annual inspections be performed to determine whether any tree on site is in a declining state and may become a hazard. Trees are living, changing organisms which can be affected by any number of environmental conditions and biotic factors beyond our control. Construction activities, even when rigidly supervised, may lead to a quick decline or to unseen hazards within the tree and should be considered potentially damaging to the natural balance present before development began.