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SECTION 1

Background

Introduction

The Santa Rosa City Council certified the environmental impact report (EIR) for the Toscana Subdivision (the “Original Project”) in August 2007. The Original Project consisted of the development of 243 single-family homes and a designated habitat conservation area in the southwestern portion of the City of Santa Rosa (see Figure 1-1). The approximately 68 acre site, consisting of 12 parcels, is located just north and east of the urban growth boundary at South Wright Road and Ludwig Avenue (see Figure 1-2).

The project sponsor, Santa Rosa Toscana Partners LLC, is now proposing the addition of four acres on two parcels for the development of 40 affordable housing units (hereinafter, the “Modified Project”). The project sponsor is proposing to relinquish 11 units from the Original Project, and revise the mix of alley-access and conventional units. The Modified Project would include the addition of a mix of duplexes and single family detached homes. Additional access to the project site would be available from Pyle Drive and a stub-street proposed under the Original Project. In addition, the Modified Project would seek a General Plan Amendment, changing the two parcels currently designated for commercial/residential mixed use and a Neighborhood Shopping Center in the General Plan, to Medium Low Density Residential. In order to address the future need for retail uses in this part of the City, the applicant is proposing to relocate the mixed use; Neighborhood Shopping Center designation to a 2.32 gross acre site located approximately 920 feet south to the northeast corner of South Wright Road and Ludwig Avenue.

Purpose of this Addendum

The purpose of this Addendum to the 2007 FEIR for the Toscana Subdivision is to update the environmental analysis contained in the FEIR and evaluate potential differences between the environmental effects identified as part of the Original Project and the potential environmental effects resulting from the Modified Project. As part of this evaluation, the Addendum considers changes in the circumstances under which the Modified Project would be developed, examines whether the Modified Project would result in any new significant effects, and whether all feasible mitigation measures have been identified. This Addendum, together with the FEIR, will be used by staff, the Planning Commission, and the City Council when considering approval of the Modified Project.
Figure 1.1

Project Location
Figure 1.2
Original Project Site Plan

SOURCE: Carlile Macy
**CEQA Framework for an Addendum**

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, once an EIR has been certified, no subsequent or supplemental EIR shall be prepared for a project unless the lead agency determines that one or more of the following occurs (emphasis added):

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
   
   A. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
   
   B. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
   
   C. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
   
   D. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

An Addendum may be prepared if some changes or additions are necessary to a certified EIR and none of the above-stated conditions apply (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164). Based on a review of the Modified Project (as described in Section 2, Project Description) and surrounding circumstances (i.e. the Environmental Setting), this Addendum concludes that there is no substantial change proposed that would require major revisions to the previous EIR; that there is no substantial change in circumstances as a result of project modifications that would cause new or more intense significant impacts (see Section 3, Impacts and Mitigation); and, that there is no new information of substantial importance that identifies new or more intense significant impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162).
Summary of Original Project

The Original Project consists of a residential subdivision and designation of a habitat conservation area in the southwestern portion of the City of Santa Rosa, California. The irregularly shaped project site is approximately 67.7 acres, and is a combination of twelve parcels (see Figure 1-2). The project site comprises a total of seven parcels totaling approximately 38.6 acres for residential development (Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 035-201-006, 035-201-011, 035-201-012, 035-201-041, 035-201-058, 035-201-035, and 035-201-045) and all or portions of 6 parcels totaling approximately 29.1 acres for habitat conservation (Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 035-201-016, 035-201-018, 035-201-037, 035-201-038, 035-201-041, and 035-241-006). The Original Project includes the development of 243 residential lots, acreage set aside for California Tiger Salamander Habitat, internal roadways, extension of utilities (water, sewer, electricity, gas, telephone, and cable), and neighborhood parks.

The EIR for the Original Project identified the following project objectives:

- Provide new housing units in Southwest Santa Rosa on these parcels consistent with the land uses designated in the Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan and the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan (SWAP).
- 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.
- Create a habitat corridor for the endangered California Tiger Salamander (CTS) in conjunction with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and California Department of Fish and Game.
- Provide financial viability and an income return that recompenses the time, financial investment and the risk associated with the project.

Summary of Modified Project

The proposed Modified Project would include the development of two additional parcels for a total of 40 below market rate residential units. The approximately four acre site is comprised of two properties at the southeast corner of South Wright Road and Pyle Drive (1620 and 1632 South Wright Road, APN 05-201-025 and APN 035-2041-049, respectively). Two unit designs would be constructed which would include a mix of duplexes and single family detached homes. The proposed conceptual site plan is presented in Figure 1-3. Five home types are proposed on the additional parcels that would offer three and four bedroom homes ranging from 1,100 square feet to 1,470 square feet in size. The preliminary floor plans for the Modified Project addition are illustrated in Figure 1-4.

The additional parcels added to the Modified Project are bounded on the west side by South Wright Road, on the north side by Pyle Drive, on the east side by the Original Project site, and on the south side by a single-family residential parcel (the Blackwell property). A conceptual site plan illustrates how proposed roadways would connect the additional two parcels to the Original Project via an extension of P Street, connecting to a new road designated Q Street. Q Street would also connect with Pyle Drive to the north (see Figure 1-5).
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Figure 1.4
Modified Project: Additional Parcels Floor Plans
The Modified Project addition, like the Original Project, would include on-site landscaping, which would generally be comprised of shrubs and small trees. Landscaped areas would be located adjacent to the project roadways, as well as along the sidewalks. The yard areas of individual lots will be required to be landscaped. A neighborhood pocket park is proposed at the corner of P Street and Q Street, and would be approximately 5,000 square feet. The park would preserve a large oak tree by design.

The two properties are currently designated for mixed use in the General Plan (Medium Density Residential, 8.0 to 18.0 units per gross acre, and Retail and Business Services). A Neighborhood Shopping Center designation is associated with these two parcels which requires development of commercial uses on the site. The Modified Project would require a General Plan Amendment to designate the properties as Medium Low Density Residential (8.0 to 13.0 units per gross acre). In addition, as part of the Modified Project, the Original Project would relinquish 11 units, and revise the mix of alley-access and conventional units.

In order to address the future need for retail uses in this part of the City, the applicant is proposing to relocate the mixed use/Neighborhood Shopping Center designation to a 2.32 gross acre site located approximately 920 feet south to the northeast corner of South Wright Road and Ludwig Avenue (APNs 035-201-055 & 035-201-056).
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SECTION 2
Project Description

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

The area addressed in the Southwest Area Plan (SWAP), where the project is situated, is located within incorporated and unincorporated portions of southwest Santa Rosa, south of State Route 12, west of U.S. Highway 101, east of South Wright Road, and north of Todd Road, Bellevue and Ludwig Avenues. The 29 specific projects discussed in the SWAP are distributed throughout southwest Santa Rosa. Current land uses in the general project area include rural/orchard, rural residential, recent residential developments, industrial areas, a large commercial/business park development, and the former U.S. Naval Air Station runway.

The Modified Project addition is adjacent to the Original Project and is located in the southwest corner of the City of Santa Rosa at South Wright Road and Pyle Drive. The project site lies within the jurisdiction of the SWAP (see Figure 2-1). The Modified Project addition is bounded on the west side by South Wright Road, on the north side by Pyle Drive, on the east side by the Original Project site, and on the south side by a single-family residential parcel (the Blackwell property). A conceptual site plan illustrates how proposed roadways in the addition would connect to the Original Project via an extension of P Street, connecting to a new road designated Q Street. Q Street would also connect with Pyle Drive to the north.

The proposed Modified Project would add the development of two additional parcels for a total of 40 below market rate residential units to the Original Project. The approximately four acre site is comprised of two properties at the southeast corner of South Wright Road and Pyle Drive (1620 and 1632 South Wright Road, APN 05-201-025 and APN 035-2041-049, respectively). Two unit designs, a mix of duplexes and single family detached homes, would be constructed on these parcels. The proposed conceptual site plan is presented in Figure 1-3. The homes are either three or four bedroom homes ranging from 1,100 square feet to 1,470 square feet in size. The preliminary floor plans for the Modified Project addition are illustrated in Figure 1-4.

The two additional parcels are currently developed residentially, with occupied homes on each parcel. The project site vicinity is characterized by rural and agricultural land uses. The two properties to be added are currently designated for mixed uses in the General Plan (Medium Toscana Subdivision EIR Addendum March 2008)
Density Residential, 8.0 to 18.0 units per gross acre, with Retail and Business Services). A
Neighborhood Shopping Center designation is associated with these two parcels. The Modified
Project would require a General Plan Amendment to designate the properties as Medium Low
Density Residential (8.0 to 13.0 units per gross acre). In addition, as part of the Modified Project,
the Original Project would relinquish 11 units, and revise the mix of alley-loaded and
conventional units. The Modified Project would include 115 front loaded homes, 117 alley-access
homes, and 40 below-market rate dwelling units.

The project would include on-site landscaping, which would generally be comprised of shrubs
and small trees, mimicking what was proposed under the Original Project. Landscaped areas
would be located adjacent to the project roadways, as well as along the sidewalks. The yard areas
of individual lots will be required to be landscaped. A neighborhood pocket park is proposed at
the corner of P Street and Q Street, and would be approximately 5,000 square feet. The park
would preserve a large oak tree by design.

The Original and Modified Project development characteristics are presented in Table 2-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2-1</th>
<th>ORIGINAL AND MODIFIED PROJECT DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original Project (July 2007)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Addition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Homes</td>
<td>243 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>3 parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels</td>
<td>12 parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>68 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Preserve</td>
<td>29 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Project Site Plans (Santa Rosa Toscana Partners LLC, 2007 and 2008)

Project construction of the below-market rate units would occur during Phase One of the Original
Project Construction Phasing.

Like the Original Project, the Modified Project would include architectural features that reflect
rural Mediterranean regions, with muted earth-tone stone colors, terra-cotta inspired roofs, timber
beams, and worn textures.

The Modified Project would require a General Plan Amendment for the two additional parcels to
change the designation from mixed use to Medium Low Density Residential. Additional planning
approvals that may be required include, but are not limited to, a Conditional Use Permit, Design
Review, Variances, and a Subdivision Map.
Figure 2.1
Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan Boundary and Project Location

SOURCE: EIP

Toscana Subdivision, 207575
SECTION 3
Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

As noted in Section 1, Purpose of This Addendum, this Addendum compares the potential environmental impacts from the proposed Modified Project with the environmental documentation prepared previously for the Original Project. The purpose of this analysis is to determine if the Modified Project would require major revisions of the 2007 FEIR due to:

- new significant impacts or substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects as a result of either change to the project or due to substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken,

- a determination that new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not reasonably have been known at the time the FEIR was certified, has become available and would necessitate the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR.

The environmental issues analyzed in the 2007 FEIR are discussed below to document that no subsequent changes have occurred since certification of the Original Project EIR.

Table 3-1, at the end of this section, compares the impacts from the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project and impacts anticipated under the proposed Modified Project.

A. Aesthetics

The FEIR prepared for the Original Project determined that the project would have less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas, would not cause significant damage to scenic resources, or produce significant additional light and glare. The FEIR analyzed potential impacts of the Original Project on the visual character of the site and surroundings. Existing conditions on the project site and in the project vicinity are unchanged from the rural residential land uses described in the FEIR.

The visual impacts of the Modified Project would be similar to, or less substantial than, those discussed in the FEIR for the Original Project. The Original Project would convert parcels that are currently semi-rural to rural in character by constructing a 243 single-family home subdivision on the project site. The project would include two home types. Architectural features would reflect rural Mediterranean regions, with muted earth-tone stone colors, terra-cotta inspired roofs, timber beams, and worn textures. The project would include on-site landscaping, which would generally be comprised of shrubs and small trees. Three onsite parks and a roadway
roundabout would preserve mature oak trees by design. Landscaped areas would be located adjacent to the project roadways, as well as along sidewalks. In addition, the parcels set aside for the California Tiger Salamander preserve would be cleared of any structures and left to return to a natural state.

As currently proposed, the Modified Project proposes to develop an additional four acres, two parcels, for residential development to the northwest of the Original Project.

The additional parcels that make up the Modified Project would be similar in aesthetic nature to the Original Project, with residential units constructed in similar design, color and textures. Landscaping materials would unify the Original and Modified Projects visually.

The Modified Project would include project frontage along South Wright Road which was not part of the Original Project. Views from the public right-of-way on South Wright Road would be altered, however given the developed setting in which the project site is located, the current low visual quality of the project site, and the dynamic and temporary nature for motorists traveling along the roadway, impacts to short-range views from public vantage points are considered to be less than significant. This determination is consistent with impacts to Ludwig Road and Pyle Drive under the Original project. As with the Original project, adjacent residential parcels along the project site property line would be shielded from views of the proposed subdivision with a six-foot wood fence, replacing the existing dilapidated fencing.

In summary, the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project found no significant impacts from the project to visual quality and the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts. Mitigation Measures required under the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project would be required under the Modified Project.

**Applicable 2007 FEIR Mitigation Measures – Aesthetics**

The following mitigation measures, restated from the 2007 FEIR, are applicable to this Addendum.

**Mitigation Measure A-1:** The project shall incorporate in to all construction contracts for the proposed project and ensure implementation of the following measures:

- Main construction staging areas and the storage of large equipment shall occur in the interior of the project site, away from adjacent residents and Ludwig Avenue.
- Construction staging areas shall be on-site and remain clear of all trash, weeds and debris etc. Construction staging areas shall be located away from adjacent residents to minimize visibility from public view to the extent feasible.

**Required under the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan SEIR**

**Mitigation Measure 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.
Mitigation Measure 3.1.5-2b: Compensate for the removal of trees necessary to install infrastructure consistent with the Street Design Standard Policies contained in the Community Design Program Chapter of the Southwest Area Plan.

Mitigation Measure 3.1.5-1: 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.

B. Air Quality

The following section assesses local and regional air quality impacts during both construction and operational phases of the Modified Project and compares these impacts to those identified in the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project. There are no changes in the physical and regulatory environment since the certification of the 2007 FEIR. The Modified Project analysis is based on the traffic analysis conducted by W-Trans Traffic Engineers for the Original Project (March 2006).

Construction Impacts. As discussed in the 2007 FEIR, construction impacts would be considered to be significant without mitigation. Implementation of the dust control measures outlined in Mitigation Measure B.1 of the FEIR would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. No substantial change is anticipated in construction techniques, nor has the size of the area where construction would occur changed substantially, as the proposed addition is four-acres and 29 net new residential units (40 units on the added parcels minus 11 units from the original proposed number of units). Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in any new or substantially more severe construction-related air quality impacts than those identified in the 2007 FEIR.

Operation Impacts. As identified in the 2007 FEIR, motor vehicle traffic associated with the project would generate increased emissions in the regional air basin. Increases in traffic at congested intersections and along busy roadways could also lead to local violations of the carbon monoxide standard. Both these impacts were analyzed in the 2007 FEIR for 300 residential units; with mitigation, neither was determined to be significant.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The Modified Project would incrementally increase Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions associated with traffic increases, residential space heating, and increased energy demand over the Original Project. These incremental increases would contribute to regional and global increases in GHG emissions and associated climate change effects. Neither the BAAQMD nor any other agency has adopted significance criteria or methodologies for estimating a project’s contribution of GHGs or evaluating its significance, therefore, no significance determination can be made at this time. As with the Original Project, it can be fairly
stated that enhancements to transit service in the project area and vicinity, provision of other alternatives to automobile travel, and measures to permit employees to live closer to their workplaces and to provide employment opportunities for nearby residents would all combine to reduce GHG emissions that would otherwise be generated by increased vehicle travel.

**Cumulative Impacts.** The contribution of the Modified Project to the cumulative air quality impact of the region would be similar to that for the Original Project. The traffic analysis for the Original Project used a cumulative year of 2025. With improvements to fuel mixtures, better emission control technology resulting from more stringent emission standards, background carbon monoxide levels in the project area are expected to further decline by 2025. This decline is expected to offset the increase in emissions from cumulative traffic.

In summary, the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project found no significant impacts from the project on air quality, and the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts. Mitigation Measures required under the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project would be required under the Modified Project.

**Applicable 2007 FEIR Mitigation Measures – Air Quality**

The following mitigation measures, restated from the 2007 FEIR, are applicable to this Addendum.

**Mitigation Measure B-1:** During construction, the project sponsor shall require the construction contractor to implement the following measures required as part of BAAQMD’s basic and enhanced dust control procedures required for sites larger than four acres. These include:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.

- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer).

- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.

- Sweep daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.

- Sweep streets (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads.

- Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for one month or more).
3. Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.
- Limit the amount of the disturbed area at any one time, where feasible.
- Pave all roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. as soon as feasible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as feasible.
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.
- Designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the BAAQMD prior to the start of construction as well as posted on-site over the duration of construction.

C. Biological Resources

The biological resource impacts resulting from the Original Project, as discussed in the 2007 FEIR are applicable to the Modified Project. A biological assessment (Stromberg 2007) and tree survey (Horticultural Associates 2007) were conducted for the four additional acres that make up the Modified Project in order to document any additional biological resources on the site. No additional impacts beyond those identified in the 2007 FEIR were identified.

Habitat on the two parcels added under the Modified Project site is similar to that of the Original Project. The impacts to California tiger salamander are largely limited to upland (non-breeding) habitat, a few wetland areas would be affected, and a handful of trees (fewer than ten) would additionally be impacted. The mitigation measures outlined in the 2007 FEIR would cover potential impacts to these resources at the appropriate ratios.

A total of eight additional trees were evaluated on the four acres based on their trunk diameter and location in relation to the proposed construction. Three of the trees, which are Monterey pines, are exempt from preservation. Four trees would require removal based on the development plan for the additional residential units. One tree would be preserved, and due to its age no construction or development activities would occur beneath its dripline. Mitigation measures outlined in the 2007 FEIR related to trees would cover potential impacts to these resources at the appropriate ratios.

In summary, the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project found no significant impacts from the project on biological resources, and the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts.
Mitigation Measures required under the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project would be required under the Modified Project.

**Applicable 2007 FEIR Mitigation Measures – Biological Resources**

The following mitigation measures, restated from the 2007 FEIR, are applicable to this Addendum.

**Mitigation Measure C-1a: Wetland Avoidance.** To the extent feasible, final project design will minimize effects to wetlands and other waters. Areas that are avoided will be subject to Best Management Practices (BMPs), as described in Mitigation Measure C-1b below.

**Mitigation Measure C-1b: Implement Standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) to Maintain Water Quality and Control Erosion and Sedimentation.** Standard measures to maintain water quality and to control erosion and sedimentation shall be implemented for the project and in drainage ways, as required by compliance with the General NPDES Permit for Construction Activities and established by Mitigation Measure 3.2.2-2.

**Mitigation Measure C-1c:** Temporary impacts to waters of the U.S. from project construction will be mitigated by the implementation of measures listed below. Construction within jurisdictional features would require permit approval from the Corps for fill in wetlands and other waters of the U.S. pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Water quality certification from the RWQCB will also be required pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA. Terms and conditions of the permits will include measures to protect and maintain water quality, restoration of work sites, and mitigation to offset permanent and temporary wetland impacts.

**Mitigation Measure C-1d:** To offset the permanent impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. that will be impacted as a result of the proposed project, compensatory mitigation will be provided as required by regulatory permits. Mitigation would be provided through one of the following mechanisms.

- The purchase and/or dedication of land to provide suitable wetland restoration or creation. If restoration is available and feasible, Stromberg (2006) cites that a 1:1 impact to mitigation ratio would apply to projects for which mitigation is provided in advance. This would result in a minimum credited area of 2.32 acres of enhanced, restored, and/or created vernal pool. If mitigation is not provided in advance of impacts then a greater ratio (e.g., 1.5: 1 or 2:1) may be imposed; however, this decision is at the discretion of the Corps, RWQCB, and USFWS.

- A Wetland Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (WMMP) will be developed that will outline mitigation and monitoring obligations for temporary and permanent impacts to wetlands and other waters as a result of construction activities. The WMMP would include thresholds of success, monitoring and reporting requirements, and site specific plans to compensate for wetland losses resulting from the project.

- The WMMP will be submitted to the appropriate regulatory agencies for approval.
If an access easement is maintained to the Keech property (APN No. 035-201-038) through the mitigation parcels, the applicant shall take action to minimize public access before project construction. Recommendations to minimize public access through the site include, but are not limited to, moving the easement to the edge of the mitigation parcel (i.e., the northern side) or the installation of a solar-powered electronic access gate at the intersection of Ludwig Avenue.

**Mitigation Measure C-2a: Measures to minimize impacts to California tiger salamander and its habitat.** Measures would be implemented to minimize and avoid “take” of California tiger salamander. The following measures were derived from the project Biological Assessment (Stromberg, 2006) and the *Southwest Santa Rosa Redevelopment Plan EIR* (City of Santa Rosa, 2000), Southwest Area Plan Final EIR (City of Santa Rosa 1994), and Southwest Area Project DSEIR (2005) and FSEIR (2006).

Prior to and during project implementation the following actions will be performed to minimize adverse effects to California tiger salamander:

- The name and credentials of a biologist qualified to act as construction monitor will be submitted to USFWS for approval at least 15 days prior to commencement of work.

- Within two weeks prior to the onset of construction, California tiger salamanders will be salvaged by a qualified, Service-approved biologist. If California tiger salamander larvae or eggs are found, the approved biologist shall contact the Service to determine if moving any of these life-stages is appropriate. If the Service approves moving the animals, the approved biologist shall be allowed sufficient time to move animals from the work sites before work activities begin.

- All work activities within or adjacent to potential California tiger salamander aquatic habitat shall be completed between May 1 and November 1.

- Exclusionary fencing (i.e. silt fences) shall be installed around all construction areas that are within 100 feet of or adjacent to potential California tiger salamander habitat. Fences shall be equipped with one-way exit ramps or passageways at 100-foot intervals to allow trapped individuals to escape.

- A Service–approved biologist shall conduct a training session for all construction personnel. At a minimum, the training shall include a description of the California tiger salamander and its habitat, the importance of the California tiger salamander and its habitat, general measures that are being implemented to conserve the this species as they relate to the project, and the boundaries within which the project may be accomplished.

- A Service-approved biologist shall be present at the active work sites until such time that the removal of California tiger salamanders, instruction of workers, and habitat disturbance have been completed. After that time, and if allowed by the forthcoming project Biological Opinion to be issued by the USFWS, the contractor or permittee may designate and train a person to monitor on-site compliance with minimization measures.
• During work activities, all trash that may attract predators shall be properly contained, removed from the work site and disposed of regularly. Following construction, all trash and construction debris shall be removed from work areas.

• All fueling and maintenance of vehicles and other equipment and staging areas shall occur at least 20 meters from any riparian habitat or water body. The Corps and permittee shall ensure contamination of habitat does not occur during such operations. Prior to the onset of work, the Corps shall ensure that the permittee has prepared a plan to allow a prompt and effective response to any accidental spills.

Mitigation Measure C-2b: Consultation with USFWS. To complete project elements that are located within occupied California tiger salamander habitat, formal Section 7 consultation under the Endangered Species Act would be required. Consultation with the USFWS will likely establish additional reasonable and prudent measures to minimize California tiger salamander take, and will require compensatory mitigation for temporary and permanent impacts to salamander habitat. These measures would be in addition to those minimization measures implemented under Measure C-2a.

Mitigation Measure C-2c: Habitat compensation, creation, and permanent conservation. In consultation with CDFG and the USFWS, Mission Valley Properties shall provide compensation for the permanent loss of California tiger salamander habitat through the following actions (subject to CDFG and USFWS approval):

• Develop a permanent conservation easement (Preserve) north and south of Ludwig Avenue that would contain 30.26 acres of gross California tiger salamander upland and aquatic habitat, and would be contiguous with the Air Center.

• Remove all hardscape, structures and associated underground facilities (e.g., septic systems, pipes, etc.) will be removed and at least 0.25 feet of topsoil from other areas within the proposed development envelope will be placed over the surface of the recovered area.

• Using ponds at the Air Center as reference pools, construct at least three (3) artificial California tiger salamander breeding pools in the Preserve with sufficient inundation depth and periods of ponding to support larval development and metamorphosis in a normal rainfall year (at least 15 inches deep; hold water continuously for 126 days).

• A Mitigation, Monitoring and Management Plan will be development and implemented for the Preserve Conservation Easement with input from regulatory agencies. This plan will outline long term management strategies and mitigation thresholds to be attained to compensate for habitat losses resulting from the project, and stipulate the endowment needed to fund management of the Preserve in perpetuity.

Mitigation Measure C-2d: Facility design and operations. In order to minimize the potential for loss of individual California tiger salamanders during project operations, the following measures shall be implemented for all areas within the Toscana development.

• Outdoor lighting and street lighting along “A” Street will be minimized, and street lights shielded away from the Preserve, since artificial light is known to affect amphibian populations.
- A salamander-proof barrier will be constructed along the east side of “A” Street. The barrier will stand at least one foot above the native soil grade in the Preserve and prevent CTS from entering the developed subdivision.

- The project proponent will remove barriers to California tiger salamander movements along Ludwig Avenue between the two portions of the Preserve. Salamanders traveling north to south across Ludwig Avenue will be directed into one or more roadway under crossings (e.g., large box culverts) that will be designed and installed by the project proponent to minimize salamander road mortality.

- Facilities on the sites shall be kept clean from exposed garbage to avoid attracting potential salamander predators and other nuisance animals. Domestic animals (i.e., dogs and cats) shall not be allowed as regular residents to the Preserve and their management will be specifically addressed in the Mitigation, Monitoring and Management Plan.

- The Mitigation, Monitoring and Management Plan will specifically address allowable recreational activities within the preserve, if any. If conflicting uses are identified (e.g., the spontaneous creation of BMX jumps) the mitigation fund endowment would provide funding to construct a fenced barrier around the Preserve, if necessary to minimize impacts.

**Mitigation Measure C-3:** Preserve, restore, and create habitat for Sebastopol meadowfoam within proposed Preserves. In addition to measures identified for California tiger salamander (Mitigation Measure C-2c), the following measures would be implemented by the project proponent in conjunction with formal Section 7 consultation with the USFWS to address project impacts to the federally listed Sebastopol meadowfoam:

- Preserve 2.23 acres of occupied and potentially suitable habitat for Sebastopol meadowfoam in the Preserve located north of Ludwig Avenue, and enhance existing habitat where necessary.

- Enhance 2.5 acres of potentially suitable habitat on the Casorotti property.

- Create and restore new vernal pool habitat designed to possess optimal physical and hydrologic characteristics for Sebastopol meadowfoam.

- Collect seed from occupied habitat affected by the proposed project and from protected habitat.

- Inoculate, enhance, restore, and create vernal pools to increase the size of the protected colonies and increase the abundance of plants above pre-project levels.

This mitigation measure would additionally protect populations of Lobb’s aquatic buttercup, which occur principally within the Preserve area; and California freshwater shrimp, if present.

**Mitigation Measure C-4a:** Preserve and replace trees on the project site in accordance with City Code 17-24-Trees. In accordance with City Code, all trees impacted by the project will be replaced on-site, where feasible, or off-site if approved by the Department of
Parks and Recreation, or by payment of in-lieu fee for tree replacement as allowed by City Code Chapter 17-24. Subject to City revision and final approval, two 15-gallon trees will be planted for each 6-inches or fraction thereof of trunk diameter that is removed. Native trees shall be replaced with native tree species, valley oak trees will be replaced in-kind, and non-natives may be replaced with either natives or non-natives. The final number of mitigation trees will be determined concurrent with final plan approval by the City of Santa Rosa.

A Tree Replacement Plan (Plan) shall be submitted to and approved by the Santa Rosa Department of Community Development prior to issuance of a grading permit. The Plan will identify heritage trees on the project site, identify the number and type of trees that would be removed, the number of required replacement trees by species, and planting locations on the site (or cash in-lieu of tree replacement as allowed by City Code Chapter 17-24).

**Mitigation Measure C-4b. Use tree preservation notes on all improvement, grading and building plans.** To protect trees that will not be removed as part of the project, the following tree preservation notes shall be attached to all improvement plans, grading plans, and building plans:

> “Obtain a copy of and follow the guidelines contained in the General Tree Preservation Guidelines by Horticultural Associates. Contact Horticultural Associates at (707) 935-3911 or Department of Community Development at (707) 543-3258 for a copy of the Guidelines.”

All trees to be preserved and trees to be removed shall be shown on improvement plans, grading plans and building plans.

**Mitigation Measure C-4c. Require application of Best Management Practices during construction.** The implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be required during construction to reduce impacts to valley oaks and other Heritage Trees. The trees that shall be avoided and protected during construction include any isolated oak tree that has a diameter 6-inches or greater as measured 4.5 feet above the ground.

BMPs should be included in the plans and specifications for the project. These BMPs 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, digging (especially trenching), 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.

• Whenever possible, existing grade shall be maintained within the fenced portion of the dripline.

• A 4-inch-layer of chipped bark mulch should be placed over the soil surface within the fenced dripline prior to installing temporary fencing. Suitable mulch must contain bark “fines.” Maintain this layer of mulch throughout construction.

• If pruning is necessary, pruning should be done to clean and raise canopy per International Society of Arboriculture pruning standards.

• A certified arborist 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.

**Mitigation Measure C-5a:** To the extent feasible, tree removal and grading activities shall avoid active the nesting and breeding season (from March 1 through August 15) to avoid impacts to nesting birds and raptors. If seasonal avoidance is not feasible, then Mitigation Measure C-6b shall be implemented to minimize impacts to nesting birds and raptors.

**Mitigation Measure C-5b:** Prior to any potential nest-disturbing activities during the period from March 1 through August 15, the project proponent shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting birds. The survey shall be conducted no more than one week prior to the start of work activities and would cover all affected areas including a 500-foot buffer area around the active project area, staging areas, and access road improvement areas where substantial ground disturbance or vegetation clearing is required.

• Additional pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for each new phase of project implementation that occurs during the nesting season, no more than two weeks prior to construction (e.g., prior to tree removal, and again prior to major grading).

• If any active nests are found, an appropriate nest buffer area shall be established. The following guidelines for protection zones shall be used: For passerine birds, a 50 – 100-foot protection zone shall be established around active nests; For raptors, a 300-foot protection zone and for golden eagles a 500 foot protection zone shall be established around active nests. These protection zones may be modified on a site-specific basis as determined by the qualified biologist or in coordination with CDFG.

• Active nests within the project area would be monitored for signs of disturbance. If the qualified biologist determines that a disturbance is occurring, construction shall be halted, and CDFG shall be contacted to determine the need for additional protection measures.

**Mitigation Measure C-6:** Implement protection measures to avoid and minimize impacts to special-status bats during construction. Concurrent with breeding bird surveys
(Mitigation Measure C-5) a qualified biologist will conduct preconstruction surveys for special-status bats within suitable open structures and large trees (e.g., > 24 inch diameter at breast height) on the site. If bat species identified in Table 4.C-1 are identified on-site, the biologist will evaluate whether breeding adults or juveniles are present. If present, a suitably sized buffer (e.g., 100 to 150 feet) will be placed around the roost if it appears that grading, tree removal or other project activities may cause abandonment. If it appears that demolition activities may cause nest abandonment, demolition activities must cease until juvenile bats are self-sufficient and would not be directly impacted by project activities.

**Mitigation Measure C-8:** None required beyond Mitigation Measures C-2a through C-2d.

### D. Cultural Resources

The historic architectural resource impacts resulting from the Original Project, as discussed in the 2007 FEIR are applicable to the Modified Project. An archeological evaluation was conducted for the additional two properties by Archeological Resource Services (October 2007).

The properties that would be added to the Modified Project contain structures greater than 45 years of age, these have been determined not to retain historic integrity or meet any of the local, California Register or National Register criteria. All of the structures have severe alterations, and none are a good example of architecture of the period in which they were originally constructed. Furthermore, even prior to alterations, they did not represent a significant construction style or method. None of these structures retain historic appearance. These structures are not historically or architecturally significant and are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, The California Register of Historic Places or as a local resource.

No previously recorded archaeological sites in the region will be impacted by the Modified Project. While there was no evidence of a prehistoric site on the parcels, caution should be exercised since the alluvial soils of the Laguna area could obscure subsurface sites or isolated artifacts, as was required with the Original Project.

The types of artifacts that are typically found associated with prehistoric sites in the general Sonoma region include humanly modified stone, shell, bone or other cultural materials such as charcoal, ash and burned rock indicative of food procurement or processing activities. Prehistoric domestic features include hearths, firepits, or house floor depressions whereas typical mortuary features are represented by human skeletal remains. Historic artifacts potentially include all by-products of human land use greater than 50 years of age.

While encountering human remains is unlikely, if human remains are encountered at any time during earth disturbing activities, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovered remains, as was required with the Original Project.

In summary, the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project found no significant impacts from the project on cultural resources, and the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts.
Mitigation Measures required under the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project would be required under the Modified Project.

Applicable 2007 FEIR Mitigation Measures – Cultural Resources

The following mitigation measures, restated from the 2007 FEIR, are applicable to this Addendum.

**Mitigation Measure D-1:** The City will provide that if discovery is made of items of historical, archaeological, or paleontologic interest, the contractor will immediately cease all work activities in the area (within approximately 50-feet) of discovery. Archaeological indicators may include, but are not limited to, dwelling sites, locally darkened soils, stone implements or other artifacts, fragments of glass or ceramics, animal bones, human bones. Items of paleontologic interest would include, but are not limited to, fossilized shell deposits, ancient mammalian or fish skeletal remains, and fossilized plant remains. After cessation of excavation the contractor will immediately contact the project proponent and lead agency. The contractor will not resume work until authorization is received from the lead agency.

- In the event of unanticipated discovery of archaeological indicators during construction, the District shall retain the services of a qualified professional archaeologist to evaluate the significance of the items prior to resuming any activities that could impact the site.

- In the event of unanticipated paleontologic discoveries during construction, the District shall notify a qualified paleontologist (per Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards, SVP 1995) who will document the discovery as needed, evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in *CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5*.

- In either the case of an unanticipated archeological or paleontologic discovery, if it is determined that the find is unique under CEQA and/or potentially eligible for listing in the California Register, and the site cannot be avoided, the District shall provide a research design and excavation plan, prepared by an archeologist (or paleontologist), outlining recovery of the resource, analysis, and reporting of the find. The research design and excavation plan will be submitted to the lead agency and approved prior to construction being resumed.

- If potential human remains are encountered, the District shall halt work in the vicinity of the find and contact the county coroner in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner will contact the NAHC. As provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, the NAHC will identify the person or persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent makes recommendations for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

**Mitigation Measure D-2:** An appointed representative of the lead agency will notify a qualified paleontologist of unanticipated discoveries, document the discovery as needed, evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set...
forth in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. In the event a fossil is discovered during construction, excavations within 50 feet of the find will be temporarily halted or diverted until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (SVP, 1995). The paleontologist will notify the lead agency to determine procedures to be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the lead agency determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist will prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the project on the qualities that make the resource important, and the plan will be implemented. The plan will be submitted to the lead agency for review and approval.

E. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

An assessment of geologic conditions prepared for the two additional parcels by Engeo Incorporated (October 2007). The Modified Project, like the Original Project, is located in a region of significant seismic activity. The project site could experience a range of ground shaking effects during an earthquake on one of the active earthquake faults in the San Francisco Bay Area. The site may also be susceptible to secondary seismic hazards such as liquefaction. Earthquakes and groundshaking in the Bay Area are unavoidable and expected to occur at some time during the life of the project. Although some structural damage is typically not avoidable, building codes and local construction requirements have been established to protect against building collapse and major injury during a seismic event.

Soils containing a high percentage of clays are generally most susceptible to expansion. Expansive soils can damage foundations, paved roads and streets, and concrete slabs. Expansive soils are known to occur throughout the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan area, including the project site.

Because the project area is currently developed and because future projects considered under the proposed Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan would be required to comply with the most recent seismic requirements contained in the 1998 CBC, NPDES permit requirements, the local grading ordinance, and the City of Santa Rosa Municipal Code, which requires the preparation of a site-specific geotechnical investigation for subdivision projects, cumulative impacts to seismic and geologic hazards of the Modified Project would be less-than-significant.

In summary, the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project found no significant geological impacts from the project, and the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts. Mitigation Measures required under the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project would be required under the Modified Project.

Applicable 2007 FEIR Mitigation Measures – Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The following mitigation measures, restated from the 2007 FEIR, are applicable to this Addendum.
Required under the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan EIR

Mitigation Measure 3.2.1-2:

- Conformance with Seismic Zone 4 standards contained in the CBC;

- Incorporation of additional seismic-resistant earthwork and construction design criteria, based on preparation of a site-specific geotechnical investigation that indicates the presence of liquefiable soils, and other soil problems which, if not corrected, may lead to defects in structures, buildings, or other improvements.

- During site preparation, a registered geotechnical professional must be present on site to supervise implementation of recommended criteria.

- Preparation of an “as built” map/report that includes the details of the site geology, location and type of seismic-restraint facilities, a site-specific engineering analysis that demonstrates satisfactory performance of alluvium and fill, analysis of soil expansion potential, analysis of potential settlement and compaction, and appropriate building design and construction standards to offset any of these hazards.

Mitigation Measure 3.2.1-4:

- A site-specific soil suitability analysis must be prepared by the soil engineer and provided to the City. The analysis must establish the design criteria for appropriate foundation type and support and these recommendations must be incorporated into the design of the foundation.

- The registered soils professional shall be on site during grading activities.

- Preparation of an “as built” map that shows details of site soils, location of foundations, sub-drains, and clean-outs, and the result of suitability analyses and compaction tests.

Mitigation Measure 3.2.1-3: If grading or construction are to occur during the wet season, require an erosion and sediment transport control plan, designed by an erosion control profession, or landscape architect, or civil engineer specializing in erosion control, that would meet the following objectives for the grading and construction period.

The erosion and sediment transport control plan shall be submitted, reviewed, implements, and inspected as part of the approval process for the grading plans.

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 occurring.

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.
The erosion control professional shall prepare an “as built” erosion and sediment control facility map, to be filed with the City, showing details of the structural elements of the plan and providing an operating and maintenance schedule throughout the operational period the of the project.

F. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A hazards assessment was prepared for the two additional parcels by Engeo Incorporated (October 2007). The Modified Project, like the Original Project:

- would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- would not cause hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;
- would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment;
- would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; and
- would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, nor is it within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The additional parcels are similar to those in the Original Project and site conditions have not changed.

In summary, the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project found no significant impacts from hazards or hazardous materials from the project, and the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts. Mitigation Measures required under the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project would be required under the Modified Project.

Applicable 2007 FEIR Mitigation Measures – Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The following mitigation measures, restated from the 2007 FEIR, are applicable to this Addendum.

**Mitigation Measure F-1a:** As recommended in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ENGEIO Incorporated, 2006), a Cal OSHA certified asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint contractor shall be retained to assess the existing structures prior to any renovation or demolition activities. If any hazardous materials are found to be
present, the materials shall be properly separated for disposal. Drums with unidentified material shall be characterized and removed by a licensed contractor.

**Mitigation Measure F-1b:** In the event contaminated soils or groundwater is encountered during construction, the project sponsor shall contact the California DTSC, Sonoma County Environmental Health Division, and Santa Rosa Fire Department.

**Mitigation Measure F-1c:** Prior to future development or demolition on the parcels containing residences, the well and system systems will be located and abandoned after consulting and obtain a permit approval from the Sonoma County Permit and Resources Management Department.

**Mitigation Measure F-2a:** The construction contractor shall implement standard prevention and control measures as part of construction best management practices. These shall include but not be limited to the following:

- Follow manufacturer’s recommendations on use, storage and disposal of chemical products used in construction;

- Avoid overtopping construction equipment fuel gas tanks;

- During routine maintenance of construction equipment, properly contain and remove grease and oils.

- Properly dispose of discarded containers of fuels and other chemicals.

**G. Hydrology and Water Quality**

An assessment of hydrology and water quality was prepared for the two additional parcels by Engeo Incorporated (October 2007). The Modified Project, like the Original Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge, would not substantially alter drainage patterns, would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, and would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Construction activities on one acre or more are subject to the permitting requirements of the (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Runoff Associated with Construction Activity. The General Construction Permit requires the preparation and implementation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan, which includes specifications for best management practices implemented during construction.

All future projects in the area of the proposed project would be required to comply with the NPDES General Construction Permit, the Santa Rosa Area SUSMP, and the SCWA Drainage Design Criteria. Cumulative development in the project area is projected to exceed the capacity of existing drainage facilities along Roseland Creek. Stormwater management measures that would
be required for all development within the Southwest Plan Area would be expected to reduce all impacts to less than significant.

Like the Original Project, the Modified Project would not place housing or other structures within a 100-year flood hazard area or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam or result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Given that site conditions have not changed, the Modified Project would not result in new environmental effects on hydrology or water quality. In summary, the Modified Project would not result in any new or substantially more severe hydrology or water quality impacts than those reported in the 2007 FEIR.

**Applicable 2007 FEIR Mitigation Measures – Hydrology and Water Quality**

The following mitigation measures, restated from the 2007 FEIR, are applicable to this Addendum.

**Required under the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan EIR**

**Mitigation Measure 3.2.2-2:**

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

(b) [Revised to Reflect Current NPDES General Construction Requirements] Any projects that result in grading of an area greater than 1 acre shall be subject to a NPDES permit from the RWQCB. This permit requires that the applicant develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The permit requirements of the RWQCB shall be satisfied prior to granting of a building permit by the City of Santa Rosa.

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

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

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

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

iv. Silt fences shall be constructed to prevent sheet flow across adjacent areas and down gradient into drainages. These and further measures shall be designed through the use of the Universal Soil Loss Equation to calculate the proper storage capacity required of silt fences
Mitigation Measure 3.2.2-1:

(b) The Roseland Creek channel, and portions of the Naval Creek channel in the vicinity of the Air Center, would be widened and reconfigured to accommodate the design storm runoff, under the direction of the Sonoma County Water Agency.

Mitigation Measure G-2: The project applicant shall comply with the Santa Rosa Area SUSMP. The Santa Rosa Area SUSMP, adopted in June 2005, was developed by the City of Santa Rosa and County of Sonoma to prevent and control the detrimental effects of new and redevelopment projects on post-construction stormwater quality and runoff. The Santa Rosa Area SUSMP requires the preparation and submittal of a preliminary Stormwater Mitigation Plan, final Stormwater Mitigation Plan, and Written Certification of BMP Installation during the project approval process. The Stormwater Mitigation Plan shall provide specific information regarding post-construction source and treatment control BMPs that will be incorporated in the project to infiltrate and treat 85 percent of stormwater runoff. The Written Certification of BMPs is a document verifying that the BMPs were installed as intended by the designer and/or as recommended by the manufacturer. The SUSMP further requires property owners to conduct maintenance inspection of all source and treatment control BMPs at least once a year or as specified by the designer or manufacturer. Also, the project applicant is required to provide to the City or County a signed statement accepting responsibility for maintenance until the responsibility is legally transferred.

Mitigation Measure G-3: Prior to project approval, the project applicant shall prepare a drainage plan for the proposed project. The project drainage plan shall include measures to detain a portion of stormwater generated by new impervious coverage in accordance with the requirements of the SCWA Flood Control Design Criteria and the SUSMP. Stormwater infiltration basins or other appropriate methods of detention shall be included in the project design as an integral contingency measure to reduce flooding impacts and to improve downstream water quality. The locations of such improvements shall coincide with the outfalls of specific drainage conduits or other locations deemed suitable by SCWA.

Commencement of the project shall not proceed without the approval of the drainage plan by the SCWA.

Mitigation Measure G-4: During project review, the City of Santa Rosa should encourage the use of detention basins/ponds, where feasible, to induce groundwater infiltration and partially offset the loss of groundwater recharge area within the project area. Such artificial recharge programs shall be coordinated with project compliance with the Santa Rosa Area SUSMP as discussed above under Mitigation Measure G-2.
H. Land Use

The applicable land use policies and setting for the project site are unchanged from those described and analyzed in the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project. As discussed in the 2007 FEIR, the project site is located in southwest Santa Rosa, within the jurisdiction of the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan (SWAP), adopted as part of the Santa Rosa General Plan. The project site is also within the Santa Rosa Urban Growth Boundary, approved by voters in 1996. In the project site vicinity, Ludwig Avenue serves as the southern boundary of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and South Wright Avenue as the western boundary, and urban development would not extend beyond the boundary until at least 2016.

The two properties that comprise the Modified Project site are currently designated for mixed uses in the General Plan (Medium Density Residential, 8.0 to 18.0 units per gross acre and Retail and Business Services). A Neighborhood Shopping Center requirement is associated with these two parcels (Figure 2-1 of the General Plan). The Modified Project would require a General Plan Amendment to remove the Neighborhood Shopping Center designation and to redesignate the properties as Medium Low Density Residential (8.0 to 13.0 units per gross acre). The Neighborhood Shopping Center and mixed use designations would be relocated on the two parcels at the northeast corner of South Wright Road and Ludwig Avenue. In addition, as part of the Modified Project, the Original Project would relinquish 11 units, and revise the mix of alley-access and conventional units.

Conflicts with a General Plan or other relevant plans do not inherently result in a significant effect on the environment within the context of CEQA. Section 15358(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that “effects analyzed under CEQA must be related to a physical change.” Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines makes explicit the focus on physical environmental policies and plans, asking if the project would “conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation…adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect” (emphasis added). As such, like the Original Project, the Modified Project’s conflict or inconsistency with a policy could indicate that an environmental threshold has been exceeded. To the extent that the project exceeds an environmental threshold and physical impacts may result from a policy conflict or inconsistency, such physical impacts have been identified and fully analyzed in the relevant topical sections of this EIR.

When collectively considering the elements of the Modified Project, it appears consistent with the guidance provided by the goals and objectives of the General Plan, including the SWAP, and the Zoning Ordinance, similar to the Original Project. The site’s General Plan land use designation of Medium Density Residential/Retail Business Services would allow residential development, subject to the guidance provided in the General Plan and the SWAP, but would require a neighborhood shopping center commercial component to be included in the project. The proposed amendment would allow a residential project to be built, absent a commercial component, at a density of approximately 10 units per acre on the 4-acre residential portion of the site. The project would be within the City’s UGB.
The *Land Use and Livability* chapter of the General Plan outlines the need for future retail/commercial land uses. A Neighborhood Shopping Center is illustrated in Figure 2-1 on the Modified Project in the General Plan. Neighborhood Shopping Center is defined as:

“A small complex of retail and service enterprises providing shopping and services to satisfy the day-to-day needs of local neighborhoods and workplaces. Typical neighborhood center uses include small food stores, restaurants, barber of beauty shops, cleaners, shoe repair, and shops offering convenience goods. Residential uses shall be incorporated into the overall design. Proposed new neighborhood shopping centers include five in southwest and three in southeast Santa Rosa. New neighborhood centers in other areas of the city are not shown on the Land Use Diagram and are allowed in any land use designation where they can be supported.”

The Southwest Area Plan designated the location of future Neighborhood Shopping Centers to ensure that new residential areas would be within close proximity to shopping opportunities as part of creating walkable communities. The proposal to relocate the Neighborhood Shopping Center designation approximately 920 feet to the south is not inconsistent with the General Plan or Southwest Area Plan, and would maintain future opportunities for mixed use commercial development in the southwest corner of the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a significant impact to commercial land uses.

Although the proposed Modified Project requires an amendment to the General Plan, as well as other planning approvals, no significant land use impacts requiring mitigation were found in the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project. The Modified Project would remain consistent with applicable plans and policies, and would be compatible with other existing and planned land uses in the project vicinity. Accordingly, no new land use impacts would result from the proposed Modified Project.

### I. Noise

The following section assesses changes to the noise impacts during both construction and operational phases of the proposed Modified Project and compares it to the analysis in the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project. No changes in the physical and regulatory environment have occurred since the certification of the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project. The Modified Project analysis is based on the traffic analysis conducted by W-Trans Traffic Engineers for the Original Project (March 2006).

Existing noise levels in the vicinity of the project area have more or less remained the same since the 2007 FEIR. As discussed in the 2007 FEIR, the predominant source of noise in the vicinity of project site is motor vehicle traffic traveling on local streets. The noise standards applicable to the Modified Project are the same as those used in the analysis of the Original Project. The project would be subject to Title 24 of the *California Code of Regulations* (for new residential developments), City of Santa Rosa General Plan policies, and Santa Rosa Noise Ordinance standards.
Construction Impacts. As discussed in the 2007 FEIR, noise impacts during construction would be dominated by diesel engine noise if there wasn’t sufficient muffling. Construction-related noise levels generally fluctuate depending on the construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of barriers between noise source and receptor.

Noise from construction activity generally attenuates (decreases) at a rate of 6 to 7.5 dBA per doubling of distance. Given the generally low background ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, this noise would be clearly audible over the background noise and therefore would be considered significant. Though the City Noise Ordinance does not have quantitative standards for construction noise, these noise levels of greater than 80 dBA would be disruptive to nearby receptors as they would be well above the existing ambient noise levels. Consequently, during the noisiest phases of construction, ambient noise levels would increase by greater than 5 dBA over existing levels. Without mitigation, this impact, though temporary, would be considered significant.

Operational Impacts. Once developed, the Modified Project, like the Original Project, would generate noise primarily from the increased motor vehicle trips. As the noise analysis for the Original Project was based on the transportation analysis for 300 residential units, no new noise impacts would occur under the Modified Project conditions.

Noise from cumulative development in the area would primarily occur from increase in motor vehicle traffic. The cumulative analysis for this project is based on the analysis contained in the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan (SWAP) EIR (EIP, 1993). The SWAP EIR analysis found that cumulative traffic noise levels along Wright Road between North Point and Ludwig Avenue would be about 63 dBA. Existing modeled noise levels along this segment of Wright Road north of Ludwig Avenue is 59.6 dBA. Generally it was found that the modeled future noise levels in the SWAP EIR along roadway segments around the project site were not greater than 5 dBA over existing traffic noise levels estimated in this analysis. Therefore the increase in noise due to cumulative development would not constitute a significant impact.

In summary, the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project found no significant noise impacts from the project, and the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts. Mitigation Measures required under the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project would be required under the Modified Project.

Applicable 2007 FEIR Mitigation Measures - Noise

The following mitigation measures, restated from the 2007 FEIR, are applicable to this Addendum.

Mitigation Measure I-1a: Consistent with the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan EIR, to minimize construction noise impacts to nearby residents, the project sponsor shall require construction contractors to limit construction activity 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. Any work outside these hours shall require a special permit from the City of Santa Rosa.

**Mitigation Measure I-1b:** To reduce daytime noise impacts due to construction, the project sponsor shall require construction contractors to implement the following measures:

- Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).

- Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible, and this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible.

- Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures I.1a and I.1b would reduce construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level, and would ensure that the Modified Project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than those identified in the 2007 FEIR.

**J. Population and Housing**

Two single family homes exist on the additional four acres that would be added by the Modified Project. Using ABAG’s population projection of 2.57 people per single family unit, the two parcels house approximately five people. The Modified Project would add an additional 29 residential units to the Original Project or approximately 75 people. This is an incremental change over the Original Project and would not increase the overall population projection in the *Southwest Area Plan* or *General Plan*. This increase would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than those identified in the 2007 FEIR.

The Modified Project would result in the demolition of two additional housing units on the project site, necessitating the displacement of approximately five people associated with current residential uses, which is not considered a substantial number of people. Furthermore, as with the Original Project, the project sponsor would compensate the owners of the existing housing units with funds that could be used toward relocation costs.

Future development within the project vicinity could occur to the north and east of the site, but would not be expected to occur in areas to the south and west of the site since they are located
outside of the urban limit line. There are a number of approved, but not yet constructed, residential projects in the vicinity as outlined in the SWAP that would result in population growth, and future new development within the SWAP area and the surrounding areas would be subject to development guidance contained within the General Plan.

When considered cumulatively with other potential future development in the SWAP Area and the vicinity, the Modified Project would not, by itself, induce a substantial resident or employment population increase, and the project therefore would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to cumulative population growth.

In summary, the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project found no significant population and housing impacts from the project, and the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts. Mitigation Measures required under the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project would be required under the Modified Project.

K. Public Services

Public Services: The Original Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for governmental facilities or services. The Modified Project would not result in new environmental effects on the provision of or need for public services, because the project site is within a developed area where all services are currently provided. In addition, the Modified Project would add 29 additional homes and four acres over the Original Project, or approximately 75 people. Services provided by the Police and Fire Departments would be incrementally increased, but not so that it would affect services beyond what was described in the 2007 FEIR.

Schools: The Original Project would not result in significant effects to schools. The Modified Project would result in 29 additional residential units which would result in additional residents and school-age children on the site. The increase in students could potentially impact the school districts facilities in the project vicinity. The Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, or Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), restricts the ability of local agencies such as the City of Santa Rosa to deny land use approvals on the basis that public school facilities are inadequate. SB 50 establishes the base amount of allowable developer fees at $2.24 per square foot of residential construction. These fees are intended to address local school facility needs resulting from new development. Public school districts can, however, impose higher fees provided they meet the conditions outlined in the act. Private schools are not eligible for fees collected pursuant to SB 50. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in a new significant impact to public schools.

Recreation: The Original Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of any facility would occur or be accelerated. The Modified Project would add an additional neighborhood park on an approximately 5,000 square feet parcel. The Modified Project would result in no new environmental effects on public parks or recreational facilities. The Modified
Project would be required to pay park in-lieu fees as required by SWAP Mitigation Measure 3.3-4 (restated below).

In summary, the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project found no significant public services impacts from the project, and the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts. Mitigation Measures required under the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project would be required under the Modified Project.

**Applicable 2007 FEIR Mitigation Measures – Public Services**

The following mitigation measures, restated from the 2007 FEIR, are applicable to this Addendum.

**Required under the Southwest Santa Rosa Area Projects SEIR**

**Mitigation Measure3.3-6: Implement Community Services District Program.** Prior to approval of final development plans, the Project applicant shall participate in the Community Services District Program as a condition of approval.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-7: Southwest Area Plan Infrastructure Fee (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.17-3, as modified below).** 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 SWAP and can be utilized to fund City needs relating to public safety in the SWAP area. Timing of this action would be justified by residential and commercial development in the area, with the standard of providing satisfactory police and fire protection for the full southwest area.

For the project, the Santa Rosa Police and Fire Departments do not anticipate the need for any new physical facilities to adequately service the resulting increase in daytime and nighttime population on the project site (Flint, 2006; Lewis, 2006). As noted above, the project’s contribution to the SWAP significant cumulative impact on police services and fire protection/emergency services would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-4: Require park land dedication and park development or in-lieu park fees (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.17-5 and Redevelopment EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-4).** Prior to issuance of a building permit, require that each project sponsor in the Southwest Area provide adequate park land dedication in their project proposal or pay in-lieu Land Dedication Fees and pay the Park Development Fees. Park Development fees levied by the City should be adequate to cover the cost of park maintenance, both for existing and proposed new parks. Where possible, funds for park maintenance should also be supplemented through additional funding sources, including, but not limited to, Homeowner’s Associations, Benefit Assessment Districts, and CFDs. City staff shall work with project sponsors to secure additional funding for park maintenance through such means.
L. Traffic, Circulation and Parking

The following section assesses changes to transportation impacts of the proposed Modified Project and compares it to the analysis in the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project. The changes in the physical environment since the certification of the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project are minimal. The transportation analysis for the Original Project was prepared by W-Trans Transportation Consultants (March 2006).

Traffic. The transportation analysis conducted for the Original Project looked at the impact of constructing 300 residential units, although the Original Project was designed to construct 243 units. This was considered a conservative estimate of transportation impacts to the area. The Modified Project would construct an additional 29 residential units, for a total of 272 units, still below the 300 units analyzed in the transportation analysis. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than those identified for the Original Project. Mitigation Measures required in the 2007 FEIR would apply.

The Modified Project would be considered part of the buildout of the SWAP area which would generate a substantial increase in traffic on City streets. However, if the traffic improvement mitigation measures included in the Master EIR and Subsequent EIR are implemented, cumulative traffic growth would have no significant level of service impacts (i.e., result in conditions below City standards) on City streets, as was found in the 2007 FEIR.

Transit. The 2007 FEIR found that the increase in ridership associated with the project on Santa Rosa CityBus and Sonoma County Transit (SCT). The Long Range Transit Plan proposes expansion areas in the quadrant bounded by South Wright Road, Ludwig Avenue, and the existing Route 20; and the area bounded by Hearn Avenue, South Dutton Avenue, Bellevue Avenue, and Corby Avenue. These are identified as long-term service need areas.

The project would result in an incremental increase in demand for transit services compared to the Original Project due to the increased number of residences. However, the SWAP EIR included mitigation to address increased demand for transit services, which reduces the project’s impact to less than significant. Thus, the Modified Project would not result in any new significant transit impacts or any transit impacts that would be substantially more severe than those reported in the 2007 FEIR.

Circulation and Parking. As with the Original Project, Pyle Avenue would be improved along the frontage of the project. Improvements will include the widening of the roadway width by 18-feet and also include an eight-foot park strip and five-foot sidewalk. The Modified Project would create an additional access point on Pyle Drive via a new road currently designed “New Road”. It would connect to the Original Project via P Street at C Street. Internal roadways would include sidewalks for pedestrian circulation. The internal roadway system would continue to be a “grid system” to allow for the maximum circulation options within the proposed neighborhood.
The Modified Project, like the Original Project would provide off-street parking in the form of a two-car garage for each dwelling unit. Guest parking would be accommodated on the internal street network in the form of curb-side parking.

In summary, the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project found no significant transportation impacts from the project, and the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts. Mitigation Measures required under the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project would be required under the Modified Project.

Applicable 2007 FEIR Mitigation Measures – Transportation

The following mitigation measures, restated from the 2007 FEIR, are applicable to this Addendum.

**Mitigation Measure L-1:** The project sponsor and construction contractor(s) shall develop a construction management plan for review and approval by the City’s Public Works Department. The plan shall include at least the following items and requirements to reduce, to the maximum extent feasible and traffic congestion during construction:

- A set of comprehensive traffic control measures, including scheduling of major truck trips and deliveries to avoid peak traffic hours, detour signs if required, lane closure procedures, signs, cones for drivers, and designated construction access routes.

- Identification of haul routes for movement of construction vehicles that would minimize impacts on motor vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, circulation and safety, and specifically to minimize impacts to the greatest extent possible on streets in the project area.

- Notification procedures for adjacent property owners and public safety personnel regarding when major deliveries, detours, and lane closures would occur.

- Provisions for accommodation of bicycle flow, particularly along Ludwig Avenue.

- Provisions for monitoring surface streets used for haul routes so that any damage and debris attributable to the haul trucks can be identified and corrected by the project sponsor.

**Mitigation Measure L-2a:** Prior to occupancy, the project sponsor shall pay its fair-share towards the construction cost of the Stony Point Road widening project.

**Mitigation Measure L-2b:** Prior to occupancy, the project sponsor shall pay its fair-share towards the construction cost of the Stony Point Road and Ludwig Avenue signalization project. (See SWAP EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-1d)

As outlined in the SWAP EIR (See SWAP EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-1d) and as discussed under *Future Roadway Improvements*, the intersection of Bellevue Avenue would be realigned so that it enters Stony Point Road at the existing Ludwig Avenue intersection. The intersection would be signalized, with the new westbound approach consisting of a shared through-left turn and a right-turn lane. Other lanes to be added would
include a northbound left-turn lane, northbound through-lane, southbound left-turn lane, southbound through lane, and an eastbound right-turn lane. The timing for the realignment project should be considered during the implementation phases of Mitigation Measure L-2b.

**Mitigation Measure L-3:** The project sponsor shall implement Mitigation Measures L-2a and L-2b.

The widening of Stony Point Road, as discussed under Future Roadway Improvements, would increase the capacity of the intersection of Stony Point Road and Hearn Avenue. The intersection would operate at an acceptable level of service once the planned widening is completed.

**Mitigation Measure L-6:** The project sponsor shall design vehicular traffic features of project development (e.g., turning radii for service vehicles, project access driveways, and circulation aisles within the parking areas) to meet the design standards set forth by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) in *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, or other design standards deemed appropriate by the City of Santa Rosa.

**Mitigation Measure L-7:** The project sponsor shall comply with the Santa Rosa Zoning Code parking requirements.

**Required under the Southwest Area Plan SEIR**

**Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-3:** The project sponsor shall provide transit service improvements along the project frontage if required by CityBus or SCT staff. Potential transit service improvements could include the bus turnouts along major streets with existing/potential bus service in the Southwest Area. Bus stop locations shall be coordinated with CityBus and SCT staff.

**Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-4:** The project sponsor shall use techniques such as street design and neighborhood traffic management to improve the residential street environment.

**Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-4:** 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:
3. Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

- **Traffic chokers at intersections.** These create a “bulbed” effect at intersections, reduce pedestrian street crossing distances, and tend to reduce vehicle speeds. These should be used primarily on residential and minor collector streets.

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

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

**Mitigation Measure 3.1.4-2:** Add auxiliary lanes to U.S. 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:

- Widening U.S. 101 to eight basic lanes in critical areas (Wilfred Avenue-Golf Course Drive to SR 12).
- Implementing Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (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. Over-riding considerations have been previously adopted for this significant and unavoidable impact.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures required in the 2007 FEIR would ensure that project would not adversely affect traffic and circulation in the project vicinity.

**M. Utilities and Service Systems**

The utility and service system impacts resulting from the Original Project, as discussed in the 2007 FEIR would be similar to the Modified Project. As the Modified Project site is sparsely developed, like the Original Project site, the proposed development would increase water supply demands. The increased residential density and associated water demand of the project is
consistent with the *General Plan* evaluation of water supply. While water demand would increase as a result of the Modified Project based on the City’s available water rights and the current level of citywide water demand, it is expected that existing water supplies would be sufficient to serve the proposed project, and no new or expanded entitlements would be needed.

Construction of the Modified Project would result in an incremental increase in impervious surfaces as compared to the Original Project. However, Mitigation Measures outlined in the *SWAP Subsequent EIR* would ensure acceptable water supply service to all residents in the Southwest Projects Area including the Original and Modified Project areas.

In summary, the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project found no significant utilities and service system impacts from the project, and the Modified Project would not result in any new significant impacts. Mitigation Measures required under the 2007 FEIR for the Original Project would be required under the Modified Project.

**Applicable 2007 FEIR Mitigation Measures – Utilities and Service Systems**

The following mitigation measures, restated from the 2007 FEIR, are applicable to this Addendum.

**Required under the Southwest Area Projects SEIR**

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-1: Connect residences to City water supply.** Residences or businesses on private water supply wells will be connected to the City water supply system if well production becomes inadequate to provide the needed service.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-2. Collect sanitary sewer connection fee (summarized below).** To fund additional infrastructure required to serve the proposed project as well as other developments in the Southwest Area, a significant increase in the sanitary sewer connection fee was implemented on July 1, 2004. With this change, the average sanitary sewer connection fee for a single-family residence in the Southwest Area became approximately $7,000 to $10,000. More recent adjustments to the City’s Utilities Department Fee Schedule bring this average up to between $8,000 and $12,000.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-8a. Implement water conservation measures (Master EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.6-1 as modified below).** Incorporate drought-tolerant landscaping and other water efficient landscape standards included in the City of Santa Rosa Water Efficient Landscape Policy. Incorporate low-flow plumbing fixtures to minimize water use.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-8b. Develop alternative sources of water (Redevelopment EIR Mitigation Measure 3.1.5-1).** SCWA is experiencing a regional constrain to water supply because of regulatory 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 pursue implementation of the Incremental Recycled Water
Program. In addition, the Santa Rosa Utilities Department will continue to encourage water conservation and use of water conserving devices.

N. Initial Study Checklist

Impacts of Modified Project

The Initial Study for the Original Project identified environmental issues to be addressed in the 2007 FEIR and environmental issues that would be excluded from further analysis. Issues fully analyzed in the Initial Study and determined to result in less-than-significant effects, and therefore not analyzed in the 2007 FEIR, are briefly summarized below.

Agricultural Resources: The additional four acres contain minimal agricultural uses and are not zoned for such uses, thus the Modified Project would not convert any prime farmland, unique farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use, and it would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural land use or a Williamson contract, nor would it involve any changes to the environment that could result in the conversion of active farmland.

Mineral Resources: The Original Project would have no effect on known valuable mineral resources. Given that the Modified Project is adjacent to the Original project, entirely within an area that is not an area of significant mineral deposits there are no new impacts on mineral resources.

Recreation: Currently, the Santa Rosa Recreation and Parks Department operates and maintains 57 parks totaling over 514 Acres. This amounts to 3.48 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, with a city standard set at 6 acres per 1,000 residents (Santa Rosa, 2006).

With the development of 29 additional housing units, which would have a population of approximately 75 (assumes 2.57 people per unit) the project would be required to provide 0.45 of an acre of recreational facilities. The Modified Project includes one additional parcel dedicated to recreational facilities for residents that total approximately 0.13 acres. The project requirement for an additional 0.32 acre of park land will be provided by the applicant’s agreement to pay park in-leis fees required under SWAP Mitigation Measure 3.3-4. These fees will be used to purchase park lands else where in the region. Thus the project’s impact on regional and local recreational facilities would be less than significant. The Modified Project would have a less than significant impact on the physical environment.

No changes with respect to the environmental issues listed above have occurred, and the impacts associated with these issues would continue to be less than significant with implementation of the Modified Project.
# TABLE 3-1
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: ORIGINAL PROJECT AND MODIFIED PROJECT**

**NOTE:** Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance *after mitigation* and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Aesthetics</th>
<th>Original Project</th>
<th>Modified Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-1:</strong> Construction of the proposed project would create temporary aesthetic nuisances associated with project construction and grading activities.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-2:</strong> The proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially damage scenic resources.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-3:</strong> Implementation of the proposed project would alter, but would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-4:</strong> Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in light and glare at the project site.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-5:</strong> The proposed project, in conjunction with cumulative development, would alter the visual character in the project vicinity.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Air Quality</th>
<th>Original Project</th>
<th>Modified Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-1:</strong> Construction activities associated with development of the project would generate short-term emissions of criteria pollutants, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-2:</strong> The project would result in an increase in operational emissions of criteria air pollutants (ROG, NOx, CO and PM-10) from on-road motor vehicle traffic traveling to and from the project area and onsite area sources associated with the project.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-3:</strong> Mobile emissions generated by project traffic would increase carbon monoxide concentrations at intersections in the project vicinity.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-4:</strong> The proposed project together with anticipated future development in the area could result in long-term traffic increases and could cumulatively increase regional air pollutant emissions and conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Bay Area Clean Air Plan.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Biological Resources</th>
<th>Original Project</th>
<th>Modified Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-1:</strong> Construction of the Proposed Project could result in impacts to potentially jurisdictional wetlands under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and waters of the State under the jurisdiction of the State Water Resources Control Board or Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed project could also result in impacts to the streambed and banks under jurisdiction of CDFG.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-2:</strong> Implementation of the project may cause a loss or harassment of California tiger salamanders.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-3:</strong> Implementation of the project could result in the loss of or damage to sensitive vegetation communities or special-status plant species and their habitat.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons to Setting
- **LS** Less-than-significant impact and does not require mitigation
- **LSM** Less-than-significant impact after mitigation
- **SU** Significant unavoidable impact
- ↑ Impact of Modified Project *more severe* than that of FEIR Project
- ↓ Impact of Modified Project *less severe* than that of FEIR Project

*Significance levels for the Approved and Modified Projects reflect the levels of significance after mitigation. Symbols indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.*
### TABLE 3-1 (continued)
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: ORIGINAL PROJECT AND MODIFIED PROJECT**

**NOTE:** Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Modified Project</th>
<th>Original Project</th>
<th>Modified Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-4: Implementation of the project may result in the loss of valley oaks, coast redwoods, alders, and other native trees considered significant by local municipalities.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5: Project construction activities, such as tree removal and trimming, grading, and the operation of heavy equipment could disturb nesting birds, including raptors.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-6: Construction of the Proposed Project has the potential to affect roosting or breeding special-status bats in and near the project alignments.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-7: Future development in the SWPA may result in the cumulative loss of grassland foraging area for sensitive bird species known to occur within the Project area.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-8: The Project, in combination with other planned development in Southwest Santa Rosa, could result in a substantial loss of California tiger salamander habitat, or considerable reduction in their overall numbers and/or range.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Cultural Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Modified Project</th>
<th>Original Project</th>
<th>Modified Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-1: The project could adversely affect unknown or undocumented historical resources or unique archaeological resources.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-2: The project would adversely affect paleontological resources.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-3: The project would have an adverse impact to architectural resources or built historical resources.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-4: Project construction of could contribute to cumulative impacts on cultural resources.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Geology, Soils and Seismicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Modified Project</th>
<th>Original Project</th>
<th>Modified Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-1: Implementation of the proposed project would expose people and structures to seismic hazards such as ground shaking and liquefaction.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2: Structures, buildings, or other proposed improvements could be subject to soil hazards, including expansive soils and differential settlement.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-3: Implementation of the proposed project could increase soil erosion during grading, excavation, and construction activities.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-4: The proposed project, together with other developments in the immediate vicinity, would contribute to potential cumulative geologic and seismic hazards including increased soil erosion, slope failure, ground shaking, soil settlement, and liquefaction.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Modified Project</th>
<th>Original Project</th>
<th>Modified Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-1: Project construction would include site preparation and excavation activities that could expose construction workers to unidentified chemicals or contaminated soils.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons to Setting

- **LS** Less-than-significant impact and does not require mitigation
- **LSM** Less-than-significant impact after mitigation
- **SU** Significant unavoidable impact
- **↑** Impact of Modified Project more severe than that of FEIR Project
- **↓** Impact of Modified Project less severe than that of FEIR Project

*a Significance levels for the Approved and Modified Projects reflect the levels of significance after mitigation. Symbols indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.*
### TABLE 3-1 (continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: ORIGINAL PROJECT AND MODIFIED PROJECT

**NOTE:** Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Original Project</th>
<th>Modified Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-2: Use of hazardous materials during project construction could adversely impact soil, and surface and groundwater.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-3: Project operations would generate and involve the handling of general household hazardous waste in small quantities, and therefore would not cause an adverse effect on the environment.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-4: The proposed project in combination with other developmental projects in the site vicinity would not contribute to cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts in the project area.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-5: Project site would be located in a wetland area and could result in significant unavoidable impacts to the wetland area.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Hydrology and Water Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-1: Project development could result in construction-related erosion.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-2: Project development could result in increased Non-Point Source Pollution (NPS).</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-3: Project development would result in an increase in impervious surface area and a corresponding increase in runoff from the project site.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-4: Project development would increase the demand for water treatment services, but would not result in the need for the provision of new or physically altered facilities.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J. Population and Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-1: Development proposed project would result in an increase in the residential population within the Southwest Area Plan.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-2: The project could result in an increase in employment within the Southwest Plan Area.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-3: The proposed project would result in the displacement of existing housing or the displacement of substantial numbers of people.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-4: The proposed project would increase the on-site population, but would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to population growth in Southwest Plan Area or the vicinity.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. Public Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-1: The proposed project would increase the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services, but would not result in the need for the provision of new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-2: The proposed project would increase the demand for police protection services, but would not result in the need for the provision of new or physically altered facilities.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3: The proposed project could increase the demand for public school services, but would not result in the need for the provision of new or physically altered facilities.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-4: The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, nor include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons to Setting
- LS: Less-than-significant impact and does not require mitigation
- LSM: Less-than-significant impact after mitigation
- SU: Significant unavoidable impact
- †: Impact of Modified Project more severe than that of FEIR Project
- ‡: Impact of Modified Project less severe than that of FEIR Project

* Significance levels for the Approved and Modified Projects reflect the levels of significance after mitigation. Symbols indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.
### TABLE 3-1 (continued)
#### SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: ORIGINAL PROJECT AND MODIFIED PROJECT

<p>| NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Project</th>
<th>Modified Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**K-5:** The increased population and density resulting from the project, in conjunction with population and density of other foreseeable development in the Southwest area of the City of Santa Rosa, would result in a cumulative increase in the demand for public services. However, the project’s contribution to such impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

**K-6:** Increased population resulting from the project, in conjunction with that generated by other foreseeable development in the city and the project vicinity, would increase the cumulative demand for existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that new facilities could be needed in order to maintain acceptable citywide service ratios.

**L. Transportation**

**L-1:** Project construction would result in temporary increases in truck traffic and construction worker traffic.

**L-2:** The project would increase traffic at local intersections and arterial roadway segments in the project site vicinity under existing plus project conditions.

**L-3:** The project would increase traffic at local intersections and arterial roadway segments in the project site vicinity under existing plus project plus approved project conditions.

**L-4:** The project would create potential conflicts among vehicles on roadways in the project vicinity.

**L-5:** The project would increase the demand for transit service.

**L-6:** The proposed project could result in inadequate site access and circulation.

**L-7:** The project would result in parking demand exceeding the available capacity for the project area.

**L-8:** The proposed project would contribute to cumulative increases in traffic at in the project area in 2025.

**L-9:** The proposed project, along with cumulative traffic growth, may have a significant impact (on U.S. 101 at certain areas from Wilfred Avenue to State Route 12).

**L-10:** The proposed project, along with cumulative traffic growth, may increase vehicular traffic.

**M. Utilities and Service Systems**

**M-1:** The project would not exceed water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, nor require or result in construction of water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

---

Comparisons to Setting

- **LS** Less-than-significant impact and does not require mitigation
- **LSM** Less-than-significant impact after mitigation
- **SU** Significant unavoidable impact
- **⇑** Impact of Modified Project more severe than that of FEIR Project
- **⇓** Impact of Modified Project less severe than that of FEIR Project

*a* Significance levels for the Approved and Modified Projects reflect the levels of significance after mitigation. Symbols indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.
### TABLE 3-1 (continued)
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: ORIGINAL PROJECT AND MODIFIED PROJECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Original Project</th>
<th>Modified Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-2:</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-3:</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-4:</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-5:</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance *after mitigation* and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

Comparisons to Setting
- **LS** - Less-than-significant impact and does not require mitigation
- **LSM** - Less-than-significant impact after mitigation
- **SU** - Significant unavoidable impact

† Impact of Modified Project *more severe* than that of FEIR Project
‖ Impact of Modified Project *less severe* than that of FEIR Project

a Significance levels for the Approved and Modified Projects reflect the levels of significance after mitigation. Symbols indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.
SECTION 4
Conclusion

The Modified Project, compared to the Original Project would result in development of 29 additional units overall, and the addition of four acres. As discussed above, impacts attributed to the Modified Project would be comparable to those impacts identified in the 2007 FEIR for all resource areas. None of the project changes or additions would result in new significant environmental impacts, or impacts that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the 2007 FEIR. Mitigation measures included in the FEIR for the Original Project would continue to be applicable to the Modified Project.

Based on the above analysis and discussion, no substantive revisions are needed to the 2007 Toscana FEIR because no new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts would result from the Modified Project; because there have been no changes in circumstances in the project area that would result in new significant environmental impacts or substantially more severe impacts; and because no new information has come to light that would indicate the potential for new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts than were discussed in the 2007 FEIR. Therefore, no further evaluation is required, and no Subsequent EIR is needed pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. This EIR Addendum has therefore appropriately been prepared, pursuant to Section 15164.
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