

RECEIVED

CARLSBAD CLOVIS IRVINE LOS ANGELES PALM SPRINGS POINT RICHMOND RIVERSIDE ROSEVILLE SAN LUIS OBISPO

MEMORANDUM

| DATE: | July 22, 2024 |
|----------|---|
| то: | Luana Vaetoe, Chief Executive Officer, Becoming Independent |
| FROM: | Florentina Craciun, AICP, Associate/Senior Environmental Planner Lauren Peachey, Environmental Planner |
| Subject: | 1455 Corporate Center Parkway (Becoming Independent) Project CEQA Consistency Analysis per <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15183 |

INTRODUCTION

The following is an evaluation of the proposed 1455 Corporate Center Parkway Project's (project) consistency with the scope of analysis provided in the program Environmental Impact Report (EIR)¹ prepared for the Santa Rosa General Plan 2035² (General Plan EIR), certified in November 2009 by the City of Santa Rosa (City). The purpose of this analysis is to determine whether the proposed project is within the scope of the General Plan EIR, including whether the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan EIR and whether the proposed project would result in any potential impacts from construction/operations of the proposed project site, pursuant to *State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* Section 15183.

PURPOSE OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15183 CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

A project requiring discretionary approval may use a certified EIR to comply with CEQA if the project area is encompassed by and consistent with the certified EIR. The City may determine whether the project is exempt from further environmental review or whether a supplemental or subsequent EIR is required. The CEQA statute and the *State CEQA Guidelines* provide guidance in this process by requiring an examination of whether, since the certification of the EIR, changes in the project or conditions have been made to an extent that the proposal may result in substantial changes in physical conditions that are considered significant under CEQA. If so, the City would be required to prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR. The examination of impacts is the first step taken by the City in reviewing the CEQA compliance process of the project.

CEQA provides, in Public Resources Code Section 21083.3, that if a parcel was zoned to accommodate a particular density of development or was designated in a community plan to accommodate a particular density of development and an EIR was certified for that zoning or

¹ City of Santa Rosa. 2009. Draft Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 Environmental Impact Report. March.

² City of Santa Rosa. 2009. *Santa Rosa General Plan 2035*. November 3.

planning action, the application of CEQA to the approval of other projects that are consistent with the zoning or community plan "shall be limited to effects upon the environment which are peculiar to the parcel or to the project and which were not addressed as significant effects in the prior environmental impact report, or which substantial new information shows will be more significant than described in the prior environmental impact report." In accordance with this provision, *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15183 (Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan, or Zoning) provides that projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site.

These provisions streamline the review of such projects and reduce the need to prepare repetitive environmental studies. Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15183, the public agency shall limit its examination of environmental effects to those which the agency determines, in an initial study or other analysis:

- 1. Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located;
- 2. Were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent;
- 3. Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action; or
- 4. Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information not known at the time of EIR certification, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR.

In addition, in accordance with CEQA, as set forth in Public Resources Code Section 21166 and *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162, no subsequent or supplemental EIR shall be required unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

- 1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR 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 adopted, shows any of the following:

- a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
- 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. (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162(a); see also Public Resources Code Section 21166).

SANTA ROSA GENERAL PLAN 2035 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The Santa Rosa General Plan EIR was certified in November 2009. The General Plan EIR analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with buildout of the Santa Rosa General Plan 2035, which replaced the previous General Plan 2030 in all elements, focusing on the Housing Element, and would be used to guide development-related decisions in the city. The General Plan 2035 would be implemented through the City's zoning code standard and design review to promote controlled housing growth to meet regional housing needs.

PROJECT SITE

The project site is located at 1455 Corporate Center Parkway (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 035-530-044) in the City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County. Most of the 3.77-acre parcel is currently developed with a commercial building that houses the nonprofit organization Becoming Independent, associated surface parking, and a landscaped garden area. The 1.26-acre project site is located in the western portion of the parcel and is relatively flat except for a graded berm and sidewalk along Northpoint Parkway, and elevations range from approximately 102 to 107 feet above mean sea level. The site is comprised mostly of non-native grassland, small seasonal wetlands, and several storm water drainage structures (drain inlets). There are three seasonal wetlands on the project site that are jurisdictional features³ and drain via three storm drain inlets; these drains outfall to a tributary to the Laguna de Santa Rosa. The project site is considered potential upland habitat for California tiger salamanders (CTS). The project site is within 1.3 miles of known CTS breeding sites; however, no potential breeding habitat is present on the site.⁴

The site is designated as General Industry in the City's General Plan 2035 and is within the General Industrial (IG) zoning district. The project site is bound by a commercial building and undeveloped land to the north, Corporate Center Parkway to the east, Northpoint Parkway to the south, and

³ Department of the Army, San Francisco District, United States Army Corps of Engineers. 2024. File No. SPN-2023-00355. February 15.

⁴ LSA. 2024. 2081 Incidental Take Permit Application, Becoming Independent Parking Lot Project, City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California. July.

vacant/undeveloped land to the west. Access to the project site is provided by two driveways, one from Corporate Center Parkway and the other from Northpoint Parkway.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would expand the parking facilities on the project site by adding 60 new parking spaces on 20,470 square feet (0.47 acre), to serve the existing Becoming Independent facility (social services organization). The new paved asphalt parking lot would be constructed on the unpaved lot located west of the existing parking lot and would connect to it. The project does not include any expansion of use for the existing facilities, which is experiencing parking shortages for its existing users. Figure 1 depicts the proposed project's conceptual plan (see Attachment B).

Because of the proximity to CTS breeding sites and the potential presence of CTS at the project site, the proposed project also includes the installation of a 9-inch-high concrete curb on the outside edge of the parking area designed to exclude CTS (and other small terrestrial wildlife) from the parking area.⁵ In addition, during construction, a wetland protection fence/wildlife exclusion fence would surround the perimeter of the project site.

The proposed project would also remove four existing trees located along the west side of the proposed parking lot. These trees are not considered protected trees and would not be replaced as part of the proposed project.

The project would manage stormwater on site to minimize changes in downstream conditions. Water quality treatment measures such as bio-swales would be incorporated into the site design to filter contaminants prior to discharge. The water quality treatment measures would include four bioretention basins totaling 1,609 square feet in area to filter contaminants prior to discharge via the 12-inch, 42-foot drainpipe. Detention basins would be constructed such that the post-development peak flows are 90 percent of the pre-development peak flows in a 15- and 100-year event, pursuant to City of Santa Rosa standards. High frequency storm flows such as 2- and 5-year events would be kept as close to pre-development flows as possible.

Stormwater collected on the project site would flow to an existing shallow linear basin constructed parallel to Northpoint Parkway, which drains into a slightly elevated concrete drain inlet at its western end; the flat grassland area to the north drains into this shallow basin. Another stormwater drain inlet surrounded by a rock apron is located just west of the Northpoint Parkway driveway into the Becoming Independent parking area. Both inlets drain to underground storm water piping under Northpoint Parkway, which ultimately drain southward into realigned segments of an intermittent blue-line creek that is tributary to the Laguna de Santa Rosa approximately 3 miles southwest of the study site. The Laguna de Santa Rosa drains northwestward to Mark West Creek and then to the Russian River, approximately 9 miles northwest of the study site.

⁵ The entire concreate curb would be 24 inches; however, only 9 inches of curb would be exposed above ground.

Construction of the proposed project is expected to occur over approximately 6 months and is planned to begin in summer 2024 and continue into the fall of 2024.

The following permits would be required for the proposed project:

• 2081 Incidental Take Permit

GENERAL PLAN EIR AND PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACT COMPARISON EVALUATION

This analysis provides a summary of the environmental analysis from the General Plan EIR, addresses potential impacts associated with the proposed project, describes whether the proposed project is within the scope of the General Plan EIR such that no further environmental review is required, and whether the proposed project would be consistent with the findings of the General Plan EIR. See Table A, below.

This analysis is intended to provide a general overview that supports the City's findings that the proposed project is within the scope of the General Plan EIR and consistent with the General Plan EIR such that no additional environmental review is required pursuant to CEQA.

Effects Found Not to be Significant

Based on the General Plan EIR, implementation of the General Plan 2035 would result in no impact, and would not require mitigation measures, on the following resource area:

Mineral Resources

As such, this issue area was not analyzed further in the General Plan EIR. Based on the proposed location and project details as outlined above, the proposed project would not change the findings of no impact associated with mineral resources, as determined by the General Plan EIR.

EIR Impact Analysis Summary for Impacts Requiring Mitigation

Table B below includes an analysis of potential project impacts as they relate to the following resource areas and specific thresholds that were identified to result in potentially significant impacts prior to mitigation. With the mitigation identified in the General Plan EIR, and outlined in the table below, potential project impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The topic of biological resources is discussed as a stand-alone section of the proposed project impact comparison evaluation because the project site's sensitivity related to special-status species is a condition that is peculiar to the project site and therefore warrants further analysis. However, based on the analysis presented below the proposed project would not result in more significant or new impacts associated with biological resources than what was analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

Biological Resources

Special-Status Species and Significant Habitat Areas

To establish existing conditions related to biological resources, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB)⁶ was reviewed for lists of special-status species that are known to occur or potentially occur on the project site. Table B provides the special-status species known to occur or potentially occur on the project site.

Table A: Special-Status Species Known to Occur or Potentially Occur on theProject Site

| Species | CDFW Status ¹ | Habitat | Assessment of Occurrence |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Amphibians | | | |
| California tiger salamander Ambystoma californiense Sonoma County DPS | Т | Grasslands, rangelands, and prairie habitats that include vernal pools or similar seasonal wetlands that typically pond water for three to four months per year. | Potential: No breeding habitat on the project site. The project site is within the 1.3-mile maximum dispersal distance from the breeding ponds and may serve as a movement and/or upland habitat. |
| Plants | | | |
| Sonoma sunshine Blennosperma bakeri | E | Valley and foothill grassland (mesic), vernal pools. Blooms February to April. | Protocol rare plant surveys conducted 2023 and 2024; this species was not found. |
| Burke's goldfields Lasthenia burkei | E | Meadows and seeps (mesic), vernal pools. Blooms April to June. | Protocol rare plant surveys conducted 2023 and 2024; this species was not found. |
| Sebastopol meadowfoam Limnanthes vinculans | E | Meadows and seeps, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools. Blooms April to May | Protocol rare plant surveys conducted 2023 and 2024; this species was not found. |
| Many-flowered navarretia Navarretia leucocephala ssp. plieantha | E | Vernal pools (volcanic ash) | Protocol rare plant surveys conducted 2023 and 2024; this species was not found. |

Source: CNDBB, CDFW (LSA 2024).

¹ CDFW Status Definitions.

CDFW = California Department of Fish and Wildlife

CNDBB = California Natural Diversity Database

DPS = distinct population segments

E = Endangered (legally protected)

T = Threatened (legally protected)

Listed Plants. Botanical surveys following CDFW guidelines were conducted on the project site on April 5 and 7 and May 8, 2023, and April 11, 2024. The focus species of the botanical survey included Sonoma sunshine, Burke's goldfields, Sebastopol meadowfoam, and many-flowered navarretia;

⁶ California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2022. California Natural Diversity Database, commercial version dated April 30, 2022. Biogeographic Data Branch, Sacramento.

none of these species were found on the project site, and the proposed project would have no impact on these plants.

California Tiger Salamander. There is no suitable CTS breeding habitat within the boundaries of the project site or in the vicinity of the site. The wetlands on site do not pond to the depths or for the time durations needed for successful CTS breeding. However, the burrows of Botta's pocket gophers on the project site provide potential upland habitat for CTS.

The project site is also within the maximum CTS dispersal distance of 1.3 miles from known breeding sites. The closest confirmed CTS breeding site is 0.63 mile west of the project site and the closest potential breeding habitat is 0.2 mile to the southwest. Given that the project site is located within potential dispersal distance of a known/potential breeding sites, the project may affect CTS.

The proposed project would expand the parking facilities on the project site, which has the potential to impact upland habitat for CTS. All permanent direct impacts of the proposed project would be within the non-native grassland habitat. A total of 0.51-acre of potential CTS upland habitat would be directly and permanently impacted by development of the proposed project from construction of the parking lot and bioretention basin. The approximate 0.71-acre area to the north, west, and south of the area of direct project impacts would not be impacted by direct cut and fill activities; however, this area would be considered indirectly impacted with respect to long-term habitat suitability for CTS due to proximity to project activities.

As discussed in the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy,⁷ projects and other activities would generally be required to adopt measures to minimize their potential direct and indirect effects on CTS. As provided in the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy, for activities that may impact CTS upland habitat, fencing would be installed to exclude CTS from entering the project site prior to construction activities. Consistent with this requirement, the proposed project includes the installation of a 9-inch concrete curb and permanent fence designed to exclude CTS (and other small terrestrial wildlife) from the parking area. In addition, a wetland/wildlife protection fence would surround the proposed parking lot during project construction.

General Plan 2035 Policy OSC-D-3, which requires the preservation and restoration of elements of wildlife habitat within the city, would be applicable to the proposed project. In addition, in order to address potential impacts to biological resources with implementation of the General Plan 2035, the General Plan EIR prescribed Mitigation Measure 4.F-5, as provided below.

<u>OSC-D-3</u>: Preserve and restore the elements of wildlife habitats and corridors throughout the Planning Area.

Mitigation Measure 4.F-5: The City of Santa Rosa shall incorporate the avoidance and mitigation measures described in the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy and the USFWS Programmatic Biological Opinion, as conditions of approval for development in or near areas with suitable habitat for California tiger salamander, Burke's goldfields, Sonoma sunshine, Sebastopol meadowfoam, and many-flowered navarretia. However, in accordance with the USFWS

⁷ City of Santa Rosa. 2005. *Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy*. December 1.

Programmatic Biological Opinion, projects within the Southwest Santa Rosa Preserve System will be evaluated individually and mitigation may not necessarily adhere to the ratios described in the Conservation Strategy.

Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.F-5, the following minimization measure and mitigation measure prescribed in the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy would be applicable to the proposed project.

Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy Minimization Measure 1. Generally, the following minimization measures will be implemented, as appropriate, depending on the specific site situation:

- A. A USFWS approved biological monitor will be on site each day during wetland restoration and construction, and during initial site grading of development sites where CTS have been found.
- B. The biological monitor will conduct a training session for all construction workers before work is started on the project.
- C. Before the start of work each morning, the biological monitor will check for animals under any equipment such as vehicles and stored pipes. The biological monitor will check all excavated steep-walled holes or trenches greater than one foot deep for any CTS. CTS will be removed by the biological monitor and translocated as described in Section 4.7.2.
- D. An erosion and sediment control plan will be implemented to prevent impacts of wetland restoration and construction on habitat outside the work areas.
- E. Access routes and number and size of staging and work areas will be limited to the minimum necessary to achieve the project goals. Routes and boundaries of the roadwork will be clearly marked prior to initiating construction/grading.
- F. All foods and food-related trash items will be enclosed in sealed trash containers at the end of each day, and removed completely from the site once every three days.
- G. No pets will be allowed anywhere in the project site during construction.
- H. A speed limit of 15 mph on dirt roads will be maintained.
- I. All equipment will be maintained such that there will be no leaks of automotive fluids such as gasoline, oils, or solvents.
- J. Hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, etc., will be stored in sealable containers in a designated location that is at least 200 feet from aquatic habitats. All fueling and maintenance of vehicles and other equipment and staging areas will occur at least 200 feet from any aquatic habitat.

- K. Grading and clearing will typically be conducted between April 15 and October 15, of any given year, depending on the level of rainfall and/or site conditions.
- L. Project areas temporarily disturbed by construction activities will be re-vegetated with native plants approved by USFWS/CDFW.

Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy Mitigation Measure 1. Compensatory mitigation for project impacts will consist of upland preservation, enhancement, and restoration, and is designed to follow the compensatory mitigation ratios prescribed in the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy. The proposed project would be required to compensate for impacts on CTS upland habitat at a ratio of two acres of mitigation to every one acre of impact (2:1) for the whole 1.26-acre project site.

In addition, the proposed project would include a Section 2081 Incidental Take Permit (ITP) to comply with the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Authorization Process (Title 14, Section 783.2) and to provide the required documentation for the proposed project.

With compliance with General Plan 2035 Policy OSC-D-3, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.F-5, and certification of the project-specific ITP, impacts to CTS with implementation of the proposed project would be **less than significant with mitigation**.

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|--|--|---|--|
| A. Land Use Consistency and Con | npatibility | • | |
| | | - | inge or increase the capacity of the existing use at |
| | | | re of the proposed project (expanded parking |
| | | | s with surrounding land uses identified in the |
| | | blicies apply to the proposed project, | and the proposed project would have no impact as |
| it relates to land use consistency and | | | |
| B. Population, Housing, and Emp | • | | |
| | - · · | | opulation or employment growth at the project site |
| • | | the proposed project would result in | no impacts associated with population, housing, |
| and employment, consistent with th | | | |
| C. Transportation and Circulation | | 1 | |
| Traffic and Level of Service | Impact 4.C-1: Implementation of the | | None recommended beyond implementation of |
| Standards | proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | intended to serve the existing use | General Plan 2035 Policy T-E-2, if the City deems |
| | 2035 would result in increased traffic | at the project site and is not | such fees are needed for the project. |
| | volumes, delay, and a decrease in LOS | anticipated to result in a | |
| | on area intersections during the peak | substantial increase in traffic | <u><i>T-E-2</i></u> : Require development projects to pay a fair |
| | hours. Implementation of the policy | volumes, delays, or a decrease in | share of costs for transportation system |
| | provisions outlined the proposed | LOS on intersections in the | improvements. Periodically update the city's |
| | | surrounding area during the peak | impact fees to assure the adequacy of funding for |
| | through T-A-6, T-B, T-B-1 through T-B-4, | | needed transportation system improvements. |
| | T-C, T-C-1 through T-C-4, T-D, T-D-1 | current use. In addition, General | |
| | through T-D-5, T-E, T-E-1 through T-E- | Plan 2035 Policy T-E-2 would be | |
| | 3, T-F, and T-F-1 through T-F-3, | applicable to the proposed project | |
| | together with improvements to the | and would ensure impacts would | |
| | transportation network when funding | be less than significant. | |
| | becomes available would provide for | | |
| | acceptable operation and capacity on | | |
| | most roadways in the city. However, | | |
| | because it cannot be assumed that | | |
| | additional funding sources will be | | |
| | available within the General Plan 2035 | | |
| | timeframe to mitigate capacity | | |
| | deficiencies on all the roadways, this | | |
| | impact is significant and unavoidable. | | |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Transit Service | Impact 4.C-2: Implementation of the | Consistent. The proposed project is | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan |
| | proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | intended to serve the existing use | 2035 policies. |
| | 2035 would result in an increased | at the project site and is not | |
| | demand for transit service. However, | anticipated to result in a | |
| | implementation of General Plan 2035 | substantial increase in demand for | |
| | policies, including T-H, T-H-1 through | transit service. In addition, the | |
| | T-H-5, T-H-8, T-I, T-I-1, and T-I-2, would | proposed project would not be | |
| | provide for continued and expanded | subject to the General Plan 2035 | |
| | transit service opportunities and would | policies required to reduce | |
| | reduce potential transit impacts to less | potential transit impacts. Impacts | |
| | than significant. | would be less than significant. | |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities | Impact 4.C-3: Implementation of the | Consistent. The proposed project is | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan |
| | proposed General Plan 2035 would | intended to serve the existing use | 2035 policies. |
| | result in an increased demand for | at the project site and is not | |
| | bicycle and pedestrian facilities. | anticipated to result in a | |
| | However, implementation of the | substantial increase in demand on | |
| | Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and | pedestrian and bicycle facilities. In | |
| | General Plan 2035 policies, including | addition, the proposed project | |
| | UB-B-7, UD-B-8, UD-D-2, UD-D-4, UD- | would not conflict with | |
| | D-5, UD-G-2, UD-G-9, T-H-1, T-J, T-J-1 | implementation of the City's | |
| | through T-J-3, T-K, T-K-1 through T-K-6, | Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan | |
| | T-L, and T-L-1 through T-L-9, would | and would not be subject to the | |
| | provide for continued and improved | General Plan 2035 policies required | |
| | pedestrian and bicycle opportunities | to reduce potential impacts to | |
| | and would reduce potential impacts to | bicycle and pedestrian facilities. | |
| | bicycle and pedestrian facilities to less | Impacts would be less than | |
| | than significant. | significant. | |
| Roadway Safety and Emergency | Impact 4.C-4: Implementation of the | Consistent. The proposed project is | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan |
| Access | proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | intended to serve the existing use | 2035 policies. |
| | 2035 would result in an increase in | at the project site and is not | |
| | traffic volumes, which would increase | anticipated to result in a | |
| | the potential opportunities for safety | substantial increase in traffic | |
| | conflicts. However, implementation of | volumes. In addition, the proposed | |
| | the policy provisions to maintain | project would not modify any | |
| | roadways and improve traffic flow in | | |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| | the proposed General Plan 2035, in | roadways. Impacts would be less | |
| | conjunction with enforcement of | than significant. | |
| | modern design standards in the | | |
| | construction of new roadway facilities, | | |
| | would ensure that construction of | | |
| | roadway facilities associated with the | | |
| | proposed General Plan 2035 would not | | |
| | result in unacceptable safety conflicts. | | |
| | Impacts would be less than significant. | | |
| Parking Demand | Impact 4.C-5: Implementation of the | Consistent. The proposed project | None recommended beyond implementation of |
| | proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | would expand the parking facilities | General Plan 2035 Policy UD-D-2. |
| | 2035 would result in an increase in | on the project site by adding 60 | |
| | parking demand due to additional | new parking spaces west of the | UD-D-2: Maintain a uniform setback of structures |
| | residential and non-residential vehicle | existing parking lot and commercial | from the street. Require parking areas to be placed |
| | trips. However, the City's development | building to address existing parking | to the side or rear of structures, not in front. |
| | review process implements parking | shortage for the current use. In | |
| | requirements that are intended to | addition, General Plan 2035 Policy | |
| | ensure that adequate numbers of | UD-D-2, would be applicable to the | |
| | parking spaces are provided. In | proposed project and would ensure | |
| | addition to the reduction measures | impacts would be less than | |
| | identified under General Plan 2035 | significant. | |
| | Policy T-A-1, which includes programs | | |
| | designed to reduce the demand for | | |
| | vehicle trips and, consequently, | | |
| | parking, General Plan 2035 policies, | | |
| | including LUL-C-2, LUL-D-2, UD-D-2, | | |
| | LUL-Q-3, LUL-X-5, and H-F-7, would | | |
| | ensure adequate parking for future | | |
| | uses. Impacts would be less than | | |
| | significant. | | |
| Cumulative Traffic Impacts | Impact 4.C-6: Implementation of the | | None recommended beyond implementation of |
| | proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | intended to serve the existing use | General Plan 2035 Policies T-E-2 and UD-D-2, as |
| | 2035 would result in increased motor | at the project site and is not | outlined above. |
| | vehicle traffic, which would contribute | anticipated to result in a | |
| | to an unacceptable LOS on US-101 and | substantial increase in traffic | |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | SR-12. Implementation of the policy | volumes, delays, or a decrease in | |
| | provisions outlined the proposed | LOS on US-101 and SR-12. In | |
| | General Plan 2035 together with | addition, General Plan 2035 Policy | |
| | improvements to the transportation | T-E-2 would be applicable to the | |
| | network when funding becomes | proposed project and would ensure | |
| | available would provide for acceptable | impacts would be less than | |
| | operation and capacity on most | significant. | |
| | roadways in the city or acceptable | | |
| | operation and capacity on most | | |
| | segments of US-101 within the city. | | |
| | Therefore, this impact is considered | | |
| | cumulatively considerable and | | |
| | significant and unavoidable. | | |
| D. Air Quality and Climate Chang | <u>e</u> | | |
| Conflict with Applicable Air Quality | Impact 4.D-1: New development under | <u>Consistent.</u> The proposed project is | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan |
| Plan | the proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | intended to serve the existing use | 2035 policies. |
| | 2035 could increase population and | at the project site and is not | |
| | VMT in the area at a rate greater than | anticipated to result in a | |
| | that assumed in regional air quality | substantial increase in VMT, as it | |
| | planning and therefore conflict with | would not increase the existing use | |
| | the implementation of the Bay Area | capacity. In addition, the proposed | |
| | Ozone Strategy. General Plan 2035 | project would not be subject to the | |
| | policies, including LUL-A-1, LUL-A-2, | General Plan 2035 policies required | |
| | UD-B-2, UD-D-1, UD-E-2, UD-E-3, UD- | to reduce potential VMT impacts. | |
| | G-2, H-C-5, H-C6, T-A-1. T-A-2, T-A-6, T- | Impacts would be less than | |
| | B-1, T-B-4, T-H-1 through T-H-5, T-I-1, | significant. | |
| | T-I-2, T-J-1, T-K-1, T-K-6, T-L-1, T-L-2, T- | | |
| | L-7, PF-A-7, PSF-A-8, PSF-C-2, and OSC- | | |
| | J-2, would reduce VMT through land | | |
| | use planning and alternative modes of | | |
| | transportation. However, the proposed | | |
| | General Plan 2035 would not be | | |
| | consistent with the 2005 Bay Area | | |
| | Ozone Strategy and this impact would | | |
| | therefore remain significant. Notably, | | |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|----------------|--|---|--|
| | when a jurisdiction develops updated | | |
| | growth forecasts for General Plan | | |
| | revisions that exceed ABAG growth | | |
| | projections, until those forecasts could | | |
| | be incorporated into the next update | | |
| | of the applicable Clean Air Plan, the | | |
| | result is going to be inconsistent with | | |
| | the applicable Clean Air Plan. Impacts | | |
| | would be significant and unavoidable. | | |
| | Impact 4.D-2: The proposed Santa Rosa | Consistent. The proposed project is | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan |
| | General Plan 2035 could be | intended to serve the existing use | 2035 policies. |
| | inconsistent with the Transportation | at the project site and is not | |
| | Control Measures in the 2005 Bay Area | anticipated to result in increased | |
| | Ozone Strategy. However, | motor vehicle use, as it would not | |
| | development under the proposed | expand existing use capacity at the | |
| | General Plan 2035 would be subject to | site. In addition, the proposed | |
| | policies, including T-A-1, UD-E-2, UD-E- | project would not conflict with the | |
| | 3, UD-G-2, T-A-6. T-J-1, T-K-1, T-K-6, T- | TCMs in the Ozone Strategy and | |
| | L-1, T-L2, T-L-7, PSF-A-8, PSF-C-2, T-A-2, | would not be subject to the | |
| | T-B-1, T-B-4, T-H-1, T-C-1, T-C-2, T-C-3, | General Plan 2035 policies. Impact | |
| | and T-C-4, that are consistent with the | would be less than significant. | |
| | TCMs in the Ozone Strategy, and which | | |
| | encourage alternative modes of | | |
| | transportation such as use of transit, | | |
| | bicycling, and walking. They also | | |
| | encourage mixed-use development, a | | |
| | concept that places residential, | | |
| | commercial, industrial, and | | |
| | employment activities close to each | | |
| | other thereby reducing the commute | | |
| | distances of residences in the | | |
| | proposed General Plan 2035. This | | |
| | would reduce adverse impacts | | |
| | associated with motor vehicle use, | | |
| | such as poor air quality, and promote | | |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | use of transit and other modes of | | |
| | travel, such as bicycling and walking. | | |
| | Therefore, the proposed General Plan | | |
| | 2035 is considered to be consistent | | |
| | with the TCMs in the 2005 Bay Area | | |
| | Ozone Strategy and this impact is less | | |
| | than significant. | | |
| Generate Air Pollution in | Impact 4.D-3: Construction activities | Consistent. Construction of the | None recommended beyond implementation of |
| Exceedance of State or Federal | associated with new development | proposed project is expected to | General Plan 2035 Policy OSC-J-1. |
| Standards | included in the proposed Santa Rosa | occur over approximately 6 months | |
| | General Plan 2035 could generate air | and is planned to begin in summer | OSC-J-1: Review all new construction projects and |
| | pollution that exceeds state or federal | 2024 and continue into the fall of | require dust abatement actions as contained in the |
| | standards. However, implementation | 2024. General Plan 2035 Policy | CEQA Handbook of the Bay Area Air Quality |
| | of General Plan 2035 Policy OSC-J-1 | OSC-J-1 would be applicable to the | Management District. |
| | would reduce air pollutant emissions | proposed project to reduce air | |
| | during construction and ensure this | pollutant emissions during | |
| | impact would be less than significant. | construction and ensure less than | |
| | | significant impacts. | |
| Expose Sensitive Receptors to Air | Impact 4.D-4: Implementation of the | Consistent. The project site is | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan |
| Toxics or Objectionable Odors | proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | bound by a commercial building | 2035 policies. |
| | 2035 could expose existing and | and undeveloped land to the north, | |
| | proposed sensitive receptors to air | Corporate Center Parkway to the | |
| | toxics or objectionable odors. | east, Northpoint Parkway to the | |
| | Implementation of policies included in | south, and vacant/ undeveloped | |
| | the proposed General Plan 2035, | land (ruderal grassland) to the | |
| | including Policies LUL-K-1, OSC-J-2, and | west. Additional | |
| | PSC-J-4, would reduce potential DPM | vacant/undeveloped land exists | |
| | exposure and ensure appropriate land | east of Corporate Center Parkway | |
| | use compatibility. The city would also | and additional commercial uses | |
| | protect existing sensitive land uses | exist south of Northpoint Parkway. | |
| | from the encroachment of | No sensitive receptors are located | |
| | | in the vicinity of the project site. | |
| | air pollution to the extent possible | The project would not include any | |
| | during the development permitting | demolition activities, and | |
| | process. In addition, implementation | construction would be typical of | |

| Table B: EIR Im | npact Analysis Su | immary for Impacts | Requiring Mitigation |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | of Mitigation Measure 4.D-4 would | parking lot construction activities | |
| | ensure that sensitive land uses | like grading and paving. | |
| | proposed near high volume traffic | | |
| | corridors would have acceptable | As such, implementation of the | |
| | indoor air quality. With | proposed project would not expose | |
| | implementation of General Plan 2035 | sensitive receptors to air toxics or | |
| | Policies and Mitigation Measure 4.D-4, | objectionable odors and would not | |
| | impact would be less than significant | be subject to the General Plan | |
| | with mitigation incorporated. | 2035 policies. In addition, the | |
| | | proposed project would expand | |
| | | the parking facilities on the project | |
| | | site by adding 60 new parking | |
| | | spaces on the project site and is | |
| | | therefore not considered a | |
| | | sensitive use. Therefore, Mitigation | |
| | | Measure 4.D-4 would not be | |
| | | applicable to the proposed project. | |
| | | Impact would be less than | |
| Currenteting Air Quelity and Climete | luces at 4 D. F. The successed Courts Deco | significant. | Na angliachta mitigation maganna an Canonal Dlan |
| Cumulative Air Quality and Climate | Impact 4.D-5: The proposed Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 could conflict with | <u>Consistent.</u> The proposed project is | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan |
| Change Impact | | intended to serve the existing use | 2035 policies. |
| | implementation of state or local goals | at the project site and is not | |
| | for reducing greenhouse gas emissions | anticipated to result in a substantial increase in VMT or | |
| | or generate greenhouse gas emissions | increased motor vehicle use. In | |
| | (directly or indirectly) that would | | |
| | exceed any applicable threshold of | addition, due to the nature of the | |
| | significance and thereby have a | proposed project (expanded | |
| | negative effect on Global Climate | parking facilities), the proposed | |
| | Change. General Plan 2035 policies, including OSC-K-1 through OSC-K-3, | project would not be subject to the General Plan 2035 policies to | |
| | | • | |
| | OSC-L, and OSC-L-2, would encourage energy conservation and alternative | address greenhouse gas emissions or energy use. Impacts would be | |
| | •. | | |
| | energy sources in projects | less than significant. | |
| | developments. Depending on the | | |
| | feasibility and level of implementation | | |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | as applied to individual development | | |
| | projects consistent with the General | | |
| | Plan 2035, the inclusion of additional | | |
| | trip reduction measures (described in | | |
| | Impacts D-1 and D-2) would help to | | |
| | further reduce vehicle-related CO ₂ | | |
| | emissions. Future project-specific | | |
| | compliance with BAAQMD permitting | | |
| | would also help to reduce air quality | | |
| | emissions associated with individual | | |
| | projects. However, the increase in | | |
| | greenhouse gases by the proposed | | |
| | General Plan 2035 of 0.2 percent of the | | |
| | state AB 32 reduction goal places the | | |
| | project in conflict with the goal of the | | |
| | state to reduce up to 174 million | | |
| | metric tons CO ₂ e/yr. Therefore, as a | | |
| | conservative determination, this | | |
| | impact would remain significant. | | |
| | Implementation of the proposed | | |
| | General Plan 2035 including the | | |
| | adoption of the policies listed above | | |
| | would still result in a significant and | | |
| | unavoidable impact. | | |
| E. Noise | | | |
| | | | However, project construction noise would be |
| | | | ratory equipment or emergency generators. In |
| | | | al noise. As such, no mitigation measures or General |
| | osed project and impacts would be less t | han significant. | |
| F. Biological Resources | 1 | I | |
| Degradation of Riparian Habitat or | Impact 4.F-1: New development | <u>Consistent.</u> No riparian or other | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan |
| Other Sensitive Natural | permitted under the proposed Santa | sensitive communities exist on the | 2035 policies. |
| Communities | Rosa General Plan 2035 would impact | project site (impacts to wetlands | |
| | the habitat quality of streambeds, | are discussed under Threshold F-4, | |
| | riparian areas, and other sensitive | below). In addition, the proposed | |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|------------------------|--|---|--|
| | communities, due to increased runoff, | project would include on site | |
| | siltation, and encroachment (impacts | stormwater features to minimize | |
| | to wetlands are discussed under | changes in downstream conditions. | |
| | Impact F-4, below). However, | Water quality treatment measures | |
| | implementation of General Plan 2035 | such as bio-swales would be | |
| | policies, including OSC-A-2, OSC-B-3, | incorporated into the site design to | |
| | OSC-D-1, OSC-D-2, OSC-D-4 through | filter contaminants prior to | |
| | OSC-D-9, OSC-D-11, OSC-D-12, OSC-E- | discharge. Detention basins would | |
| | 1, and OSC-E-2, would mitigate | be constructed such that the post- | |
| | degradation of creek, riparian, and | development peak flows are 90 | |
| | other sensitive communities. In | percent of the pre-development | |
| | addition, Citywide Creek Master Plan | peak flows in a 15- and 100-year | |
| | Policies, including HA-1-1 and HA-1-2, | event, pursuant to City of Santa | |
| | would also mitigate potential | Rosa standards. Therefore, | |
| | degradation of creek, riparian, and | implementation of the proposed | |
| | other sensitive communities. | project would not impact the | |
| | Implementation of the proposed | habitat quality of streambeds, | |
| | General Plan 2035 and Citywide Creek | riparian areas, and other sensitive | |
| | Master Plan policies would reduce | communities and the General Plan | |
| | potential degradation of creek, | 2035 policies designed to reduce | |
| | riparian, and other water-related | potential impacts would not be | |
| | habitat to less than significant. | applicable to the proposed project. | |
| | | Impacts would be less than | |
| | | significant. | |
| Special-Status Species | Impact 4.F-2: New development | Consistent. See the Biological | Mitigation Measure 4.F.5 and General Plan 2035 |
| | anticipated under the proposed Santa | Resources section before this table | OSC-D-3 |
| | Rosa General Plan 2035 would impact | for a discussion of the proposed | |
| | special-status species, including | project's potential impact on | OSC-D-3: Preserve and restore the elements of |
| | aquatic species (e.g., steelhead) and | special-status species and | wildlife habitats and corridors throughout the |
| | vernal pool species (e.g., California | consistency with the General Plan | Planning Area. |
| | tiger salamander, Burke's goldfield, | EIR. As outlined above, due to on- | |
| | Sonoma sunshine, Sebastopol | site conservation measures, as | Mitigation Measure 4.F-5: The City of Santa Rosa |
| | meadowfoam, and many-flowered | outlined in the Santa Rosa Plain | shall incorporate the avoidance and mitigation |
| | navarretia), through reduction or | Conservation Strategy, project | measures described in the Santa Rosa Plain |
| | fragmentation of habitat. However, | | Conservation Strategy and the USFWS |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|--|--|--|---|
| | implementation of General Plan 2035 policies, including OSC-A-2, OSC-D-1 through OSC-D-4, OSC-E-1, and OSC-E- 2, and Citywide Creek Master Plan Policies HA-5-1 and HA-5-2 would reduce potential loss of special-status plants or animals to less than significant . | impacts would be less than significant. | Programmatic Biological Opinion, as conditions of approval for development in or near areas with suitable habitat for California tiger salamander, Burke's goldfields, Sonoma sunshine, Sebastopol meadowfoam, and many-flowered navarretia. However, in accordance with the USFWS Programmatic Biological Opinion, projects within the Southwest Santa Rosa Preserve System will be evaluated individually and mitigation may not necessarily adhere to the ratios described in the Conservation Strategy. |
| Significant Habitat Areas and Animal Movement Corridors | Impact 4.F-3: Expansion of urban land uses envisioned under the proposed Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 would adversely affect significant habitat areas and wildlife movement corridors. However, implementation of the proposed General Plan 2035 policies outlined for Impact F-2, above (OSC-A- 2, OSC-D-1, OSC-D-2, OSC-D-3, OSC-D- 4, OSC-E-1, and OSC-E-2) would reduce impacts to habitat areas and wildlife movement corridors to less than significant . | <u>Consistent.</u> See the Biological Resources section before this table for a discussion of the proposed project's potential impact on special-status species and consistency with the General Plan EIR. As outlined above, due to on site conservation measures, as outlined in the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy, project impacts would be less than significant . | None recommended beyond implementation of General Plan 2035 OSC-D-3 and Mitigation Measure 4.F.5. |
| Wetlands and Other Aquatic Resource | Impact 4.F-4: Expansion of urban land uses envisioned under the proposed Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 would remove or alter wetlands, marshes, or vernal pools. However, implementation of proposed General Plan 2035 policies, including OSC-D-1, OSC-D-2, OSC-D-4, and OSC-D-5, would mitigate potential loss of vernal pool habitat, and potential impacts to | | None recommended beyond implementation of General Plan 2035 Policies OSC-D-1, OSC-D-2, and OSC-D-5. <u>OSC-D-1</u> : Utilize existing regulations and procedures, including Subdivision Guidelines, Zoning, Design Review, and environmental law, to conserve wetlands and rare plants. Comply with the federal policy of no net loss of wetlands using mitigation measures such as: • Avoidance of sensitive habitat, |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|--|--|---|--|
| | wetlands and other aquatic resources would be less than significant . | proposed project and would reduce potential impacts on the wetlands present on the project site. Consistent with General Plan 2035 policies, the proposed project would avoid all impacts to wetlands and all direct impacts would occur within the non-native grassland habitat. In addition, the proposed project includes the installation of a wetland protection fence along the southern edge and the northwest corner of the proposed parking area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant . | Clustered development, Transfer of development rights, and/or Compensatory mitigation, such as restoration or creation. <u>OSC-D-2:</u> Protect high quality wetlands and vernal pools from development or other activities as determined by the Vernal Pool Ecosystem Preservation Plan. <u>OSC-D-5:</u> Consult with North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board staff as part of the CEQA process for proposed developments to help them identify wetland and vernal pool habitat that has candidacy for restoration/protection based on actual and potential beneficial uses, and determine |
| Conflicts with Local, Regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plans | Impact 4.F-5: Expansion of urban land uses envisioned under the proposed Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 would conflict with local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.F-5, which requires the incorporation of the avoidance and mitigation measures described in the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy and the USFWS Programmatic Biological Opinion as conditions of approval for development in or near areas with suitable habitat for special-status species, including CTS, would reduce impacts to less than significant with mitigation incorporated. | <u>Significant</u> . The proposed project has the potential to impact upland habitat for CTS and Mitigation Measure 4.F-5 would be required to reduce impacts. As discussed in Biological Resources section below, and required by Mitigation Measure 4.F-5, the proposed project would incorporate all avoidance and mitigation measures related to CTS described in the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy and the USFWS Programmatic Biological Opinion as conditions of approval for development of the project site. Impacts would be less than | appropriate locations for mitigation banking. Mitigation Measure 4.F-5. |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | significant with mitigation incorporated. | |
| Cumulative Biological Resources Impact | Impact 4.F-6: The implementation of the Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 in combination with other reasonably foreseeable projects would result in minimal direct mortality and loss of habitat for special-status species, wetlands, and waters of the United States. In addition, General Plan 2035 policies, including OSC-A-2, OSC-B-3, OSC-D-1, OSC-D-2, OSC-D-4 through OSC-D-9, OSC-D-11, OSC-D-12, OSC-E- 1, and OSC-E-2, Citywide Creek Master Plan policies, including HA-1-1 and HA- 1-2, and Mitigation Measure 4.F-5, would ensure potential impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable . | <u>Consistent.</u> With implementation of applicable General Plan 2035 Policies, including OSC-D-1, OSC-D- 2, and OSC-D-5, and Mitigation Measure 4.F-5, potential impacts related to direct mortality and loss of habitat for special-status species (e.g., CTS) and wetlands associated with the proposed project would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant . | Mitigation Measure 4.F-5 and General Plan 2035 Policies OSC-D-1, OSC-D-2, and OSC-D-5. |
| G. Utilities and Service Systems | | · | |
| | lementation of the proposed project wou | | ew or expanded utility infrastructure or increase icts associated with utilities and service systems, |
| Alteration of an Existing Drainage Pattern or Creek | Impact 4.H-1: New development and intensification anticipated under the proposed Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 would alter existing drainage patterns or creeks, causing downstream flooding or erosion. However, implementation of General Plan 2035 policies, including PSF-I, PSF- I-1 through PSF-I-9, OSC-B-3, OSC-D-6, OSC-D-7, NS-D, NS-D-1 through NS-D-6, | parking lot, increasing the amount of impervious surface area at the project site by 20,470 square feet. This increase in impervious surface area would alter the existing | None recommended beyond implementation of General Plan 2035 Policies PSF-I, PSF-I-1 through PSF-I-3, PSF-I-6, NS-D, NS-D-3, and NS-D-5. Some of the General Plan 2035 policies require action on the part of the City; however, the project would implement Best Management Practices to reduce run off. <u>PSF-I:</u> Manage, maintain, and improve stormwater drainage and capacity. |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | NS-E, and NS-E-1, would ensure that | increase stormwater runoff, which | |
| | new development and redevelopment | could result in downstream | PSF-I-1: Require dedication, improvement, and |
| | projects included as part of the | flooding or erosion. However, | maintenance of stormwater flow and retention |
| | proposed growth in the General Plan | General Plan 2025 Policies PSF-I, | areas as a condition of approval. |
| | 2035 would limit the amount of runoff | PSF-I-1 through PSF-I-3, PSF-I-6, NS- | |
| | that would be directed off-site that | D, NS-D-3, and NS-D-5 would be | PSF-I-2: Require developers to cover the costs of |
| | might impact downstream receiving | applicable to the proposed project | drainage facilities needed for surface runoff |
| | waters. Therefore, impacts would be | to address potential project | generated as a result of new development. |
| | less than significant. | impacts. Consistent with these | |
| | | policies, the proposed project | PSF-I-3: Require erosion and sedimentation control |
| | | would manage stormwater on-site | measures to maintain an operational drainage |
| | | to minimize changes in | system, preserve drainage capacity, and protect |
| | | downstream conditions. Water | water quality. |
| | | quality treatment measures such as | |
| | | bio-swales would be incorporated | PSF-I-6: Require implementation of Best |
| | | into the site design to filter | Management Practices to reduce drainage system |
| | | contaminants prior to discharge. | discharge of non-point source pollutants |
| | | The water quality treatment | originating from streets, parking lots, residential |
| | | measures would include four | areas, businesses, industrial operations, and those |
| | | bioretention basins totaling 1,609 | open space areas involved with pesticide |
| | | square feet in area to filter | application. |
| | | contaminants prior to discharge via | |
| | | the 12-inch, 42-foot drainpipe. | <u>NS-D</u> : Minimize hazards associated with storm |
| | | Detention basins would be | flooding. |
| | | constructed such that the post- | |
| | | development peak flows are 90% | <u>NS-D-3</u> : Require that new development incorporate |
| | | of the pre-development peak flows | features that are consistent with the Standard |
| | | in a 15- and 100-year event, | Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) into |
| | | pursuant to City of Santa Rosa | site drainage plans that would reduce impermeable |
| | | standards. High frequency storm | surface area, increase surface water infiltration, |
| | | flows such as 2- and 5-year events | and minimize surface water runoff during storm |
| | | will be kept as close to pre- | events. Such features may include: |
| | | development flows as possible. | Additional landscape areas; |
| | | Therefore, impacts would be less | Parking lots with bio-infiltration systems; |
| | | than significant. | Permeable paving designs; and |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | Stormwater detention basins. |
| | | | |
| | | | <u>NS-D-5</u> : Apply design standards to new |
| | | | development that help reduce project runoff into |
| | | | local creeks, tributaries, and drainage ways. |
| Water Quality (Nonpoint Source | Impact 4.H-2: New development | Consistent. As discussed above | None recommended beyond implementation of |
| Pollutants in Stormwater Runoff) | anticipated under the proposed Santa | under Threshold 4.H-1, General | General Plan 2035 Policies PSF-I, PSF-I-1 through |
| | Rosa General Plan 2035 would degrade | | PSF-I-3, PSF-I-6, NS-D, NS-D-3, and NS-D-5. |
| | water quality by increasing nonpoint | through PSF-I-3, PSF-I-6, NS-D, NS- | |
| | source pollutants in stormwater | D-3, and NS-D-5 would be | |
| | runoff. However, implementation of | applicable to the proposed project | |
| | General Plan 2035 policies, including | and would address potential water | |
| | PSF-I, PSF-I-1 through PSF-I-3, PSF-6, | quality impacts associated with | |
| | PSF-7, NS-D, NS-D-1, NS-D-3, and NS-D- | stormwater runoff from the project | |
| | 5, would reduce the total volume and | site. In addition, the proposed | |
| | improve the water quality of the runoff | project would be required to | |
| | would be directed off-site that might | comply with the City's Grading and | |
| | impact downstream receiving waters. | Drainage Ordinance. Therefore, | |
| | In addition, all future development | impacts would be less than | |
| | projects would be required to comply | significant. | |
| | with the City's Grading and Drainage | | |
| | Ordinance. Therefore, impacts would | | |
| | be less than significant. | | |
| Flooding | Impact 4.H-3: Urban development | Consistent. The proposed project | None recommended beyond implementation of |
| | anticipated under the proposed Santa | would increase the amount of | General Plan 2035 Policies PSF-I, PSF-I-1 through |
| | Rosa General Plan 2035 would increase | impervious surface area at the | PSF-I-3, NS-D, NS-D-3, and NS-D-5. |
| | drainage flows as a result of | project site by 20,470 square feet, | |
| | impervious surfaces, resulting in | which could result in downstream | |
| | localized and cumulative flooding. | flooding. However, General Plan | |
| | However, implementation of General | 2025 Policies PSF-I, PSF-I-1 through | |
| | Plan 2035 policies, including PSF-I, PSF- | PSF-I-3, NS-D, NS-D-3, and NS-D-5 | |
| | I-1 through PSF-I-5, OSC-B-3, OSC-D-6, | would be applicable to the | |
| | OSC-D-7, NS-D, and NS-D-3 through | proposed project would limit the | |
| | NS-D-5, would limit the amount of | amount of runoff directed off-site | |
| | runoff directed off-site that might | that might impact downstream | |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | impact downstream receiving waters. | receiving waters. Therefore, | |
| | Therefore, impacts would be less than | impacts would be less than | |
| | significant. | significant. | |
| Dam Inundation | Impact 4.H-4: Proposed new | Consistent. The project site is not | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan |
| | development anticipated under the | located within a dam inundation | 2035 policies. |
| | proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | hazard zone. Therefore, | |
| | 2035 would expose people or | implementation of the proposed | |
| | structures to risk of flooding due to the | project would not expose people or | |
| | failure of a dam. However, several | structures to risk of flooding due to | |
| | General Plan 2035 policies, including | the failure of a dam and General | |
| | NS-C-7, NS-D-6, NS-E, and NS-E-1, | Plan 2035 Policies NS-C-7, NS-D-6, | |
| | would minimizing the risk associated | NS-E, and NS-E-1 would not be | |
| | with dams. Therefore, the risk of | applicable and the project would | |
| | flooding due to dam failure would be | have no impact . | |
| | less than significant. | | |
| Cumulative Hydrology and Water | Impact 4.H-5: Land uses and growth | Consistent. As discussed above | None recommended beyond implementation of |
| Quality Impact | under the proposed Santa Rosa | under Threshold 4.H-1, General | General Pan 2035 Policies PSF-I, PSF-I-1 through |
| | General Plan 2035, in combination | Plan 2025 Policies PSF-I, PSF-I-1 | PSF-I-3, PSF-I-6, NS-D, NS-D-3, and NS-D-5. |
| | with current land uses in the | through PSF-I-3, PSF-I-6, NS-D, NS- | |
| | surrounding communities and land use | D-3, and NS-D-5 would be | |
| | activities and development of the cities | applicable to the proposed project | |
| | and other agencies in the County, | and would address potential water | |
| | could introduce additional non-point | quality impacts associated with | |
| | source pollutants to surface waters. | stormwater runoff from the project | |
| | However, implementation of General | site. In addition, the proposed | |
| | Plan 2035 Policies PSF-I, PSF-I-1 | project would be required to | |
| | through PSF-I-3, PSF-6, PSF-7, NS-D, | comply with the City's Grading and | |
| | NS-D-1, NS-D-3, and NS-D-5, would | Drainage Ordinance. Therefore, | |
| | reduce the total volume and improve | impacts would be less than | |
| | the water quality of the runoff would | significant. | |
| | be directed off-site that might impact | | |
| | downstream receiving waters. In | | |
| | addition, all future development | | |
| | projects would be required to comply | | |
| | with the City's Grading and Drainage | | |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measure and General Plan Policies |
|----------------|--|---|---|
| | Ordinance. Therefore, this impact is | | |
| | mitigated through the use of effective | | |
| | BMPs that include site preparation, | | |
| | runoff control, sediment retention, and | | |
| | other similar features. Therefore, | | |
| | impacts would be less than | | |
| | cumulatively considerable. | | |
| | Impact 4.H-6: Implementation of the | Consistent. As discussed above | None recommended beyond implementation of |
| | proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | under Threshold 4.H-1, General | General Plan 2035 Policies PSF-I, PSF-I-1 through |
| | 2035 along with potential | Plan 2025 Policies PSF-I, PSF-I-1 | PSF-I-3, PSF-I-6, NS-D, NS-D-3, and NS-D-5. |
| | development in the surrounding region | through PSF-I-3, PSF-I-6, NS-D, NS- | |
| | would increase impervious surfaces | D-3, and NS-D-5 would be | |
| | and alter drainage conditions and rates | applicable to the proposed project | |
| | in the Planning Area, which would | to address potential project | |
| | contribute to cumulative flood | impacts associated with the | |
| | conditions in creeks in the Planning | alteration of drainage patterns. | |
| | Area. However, implementation of | Therefore, impacts would be less | |
| | General Plan 2035 policies, including | than significant. | |
| | PSF-I, PSF-I-1 through PSF-I-9, OSC-B-3, | | |
| | OSC-D-6, OSC-D-7, NS-D, NS-D-1 | | |
| | through NS-D-6, NS-E, and NS-E-1, | | |
| | would ensure that new development | | |
| | and redevelopment projects included | | |
| | as part of the proposed growth in the | | |
| | General Plan 2035 would limit the | | |
| | amount of runoff that would be | | |
| | directed off-site that might impact | | |
| | downstream receiving waters. | | |
| | Therefore, impacts would be less than | | |
| | cumulatively considerable. | | |

The proposed project is intended to serve the existing commercial use at the project site and would not increase demand on public services. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in **less than significant** impacts associated with public services, consistent with the General Plan EIR.

| Table B: EIR Impact Analysis Summary | y for Impacts Requiring Mitigation |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|---|---|--|---|
| J. Cultural Resources | · | · · | |
| Archaeological Resources | Impact 4.J-1: Implementation of the proposed Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 would generally help protect Santa Rosa's Native American archaeological resources. However, revisions to proposed General Plan 2035 policies would ensure protection of historic-era archaeological resources and to Native American human remains. General Plan 2035 Policies HP-A-1 through HP-A-5 would reduce potential impacts on archaeological resources, including human remains, and impacts would be less than significant . | reduce potential impacts on archaeological resources. Consistent with Policy HP-A-1, a cultural records search was conducted on July 2, 2024. With implementation of policies HP-A-3 and HP-A-5, the project would have | None recommended beyond implementation of General Plan 2035 policies |
| Historic Resources | Impact 4.J-2:Implementation of the proposed Santa Rosa General Plan2035 would help preserve Santa Rosa's historic structures and neighborhoods and would help to increase public involvement in the historic preservation process. General Plan2035 Policies HP-B-1, HP-B-2, HP-B-4, HP-B-7 would reduce potential impacts on historical resources, impacts would be less than significant. | a less than significant impact. <u>Consistent.</u> No historical resources are present on the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not impact any historical resources and General Plan 2035 Policies HP-B-1, HP-B-2, HP-B-4, HP-B-7 would not be applicable, and the project would have no impact . | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan 2035 policies. |
| Cumulative Cultural Resources Impact | Impact 4.J-3: Implementation of the proposed Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 along with potential development in the surrounding region would result in cumulative impacts to cultural resources in the region. General Plan 2035 Policies HP-A-1 | <u>Consistent.</u> Construction of the proposed project has the potential to impact previously undiscovered archaeological resources, including human remains. However, General Plan 2035 Policies HP-A-3 and HP- A-5 would be applicable to the | None recommended beyond implementation of General Plan 2035 Policies HP-A-3 and HP-A-5. <u>HP-A-3:</u> If cultural resources are encountered during development, work should be halted to avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified consulting archaeologist and Native |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|---|---|---|--|
| | through HP-A-5 would reduce | proposed project and would | American representative (if appropriate) has |
| | potential cumulative impacts on | reduce potential impacts on | evaluated the situation, recorded the identified |
| | cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric | archaeological resources. | cultural resources, and determined suitable |
| | sites, historic sites, and isolated | Therefore, impacts would be less | mitigation measures. |
| | artifacts and features) and human | than significant. | |
| | remains to less than significant. | | HP-A-5. Ensure that Native American human |
| | Therefore, impacts would be less than | | remains are treated with sensitivity and dignity and |
| | cumulatively considerable. | | assure compliance with the provisions of California |
| | | | Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and |
| | | | California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. |
| | Impact 4.J-4: Implementation of the | Consistent. Construction of the | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan |
| | proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | proposed project has the potential | 2035 policies. |
| | 2035 along with potential | to impact previously undiscovered | |
| | development in the surrounding region | paleontological resources. | |
| | would result in cumulative impacts to | However, implementation of the | |
| | paleontological resources in the | provisions outlined in the General | |
| | region. However, implementation of | Plan 2035 would reduce the | |
| | the provisions outlined in the proposed | contribution to cumulative impacts | |
| | General Plan 2035 would reduce the | to paleontological resources to less | |
| | contribution to cumulative impacts to | than significant. Therefore, impacts | |
| | paleontological resources to less than | would be less than significant. | |
| | significant. Therefore, impacts would | | |
| | be less than cumulatively | | |
| | considerable. | | |
| . Visual Quality | | | |
| ne proposed project would resu eneral Plan 2035 Policies UD-A- | | | of the project site from the surrounding area. apacts associated with visual quality would be less |

UD-F-4: Provide visual interest in building, site, and landscape design that avoids the sense of a monotonous tract development.

L. Open Space and Agriculture

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | | mland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide iciated with open space and agriculture, consistent |
| M. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity | | | |
| from an earthquake on the Rodgers addition, the proposed project woul impacts associated with soil erosion and CBC. Therefore, implementation with the General Plan EIR. <u>NS-C-8:</u> Adopt mandatory, minimum | Creek Fault (the nearest active fault), an d not include any new habitable structur and loss of topsoil during construction. T of the proposed project would result in erosion control measures for current pr | area of unstable rock on slopes great es on the project site. General Plan 2 The proposed project would also be r less than significant impacts associat operties and those under construction | an area of violent or very violent ground shaking ter than 15 percent, or a landslide complex. In 035 Policy NS-C-8 would ensure less than significant equired to comply with the Uniform Building Code ted with geology, soils, and seismicity, consistent |
| operations, and storm water runoff. | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | shall reduce soil erosion from primary | y erosional agents, including wind, construction |
| N. Hazards and Hazardous Mater | | | |
| Exposure and Release of Hazardous Materials | Impact 4.N-1: Development anticipated under the proposed Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 on land previously impacted by releases of hazardous materials such as from underground fuel storage tanks would expose residents or workers to hazardous materials or wastes. However, implementation of General Plan 2035 Policies NS-F and NS-F-1 through NS-F-6 would minimize dangers from exposure to hazardous materials. Impacts would be less than significant . | <u>Consistent.</u> The project site is not known to contain any hazardous materials or wastes (such as underground fuel storage tanks) and is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites. Therefore, the risk of exposure or release of hazardous materials would be less than significant and General Plan 2035 Policies NS-F and NS-F-1 through NS-F-6 would not be applicable to the proposed project. | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan 2035 policies. |
| Hazardous Building Materials | Impact 4.N-2: Demolition of any existing structures for the purpose of redevelopment anticipated under the proposed Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 could contain hazardous building materials, such as lead-based paint, | <u>Consistent.</u> The proposed project does not include demolition activities. Therefore, General Plan 2035 Policies NS-F-1, NS-F-2, and NS-F-5 would not be applicable to | No applicable mitigation measures or General Plan 2035 policies. |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | asbestos containing materials (ACMs), | the proposed project and impacts | |
| | and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) | would be less than significant. | |
| | which could expose and adversely | | |
| | affect workers, the public, or the | | |
| | environment if not handled | | |
| | appropriately. However, | | |
| | implementation of General Plan 2035 | | |
| | Policies NS-F-1, NS-F-2, and NS-F-5 | | |
| | would require that remediation and | | |
| | cleanups as well as all other aspects of | | |
| | new businesses adhere to all | | |
| | applicable regulations such as those | | |
| | described above in addition to the | | |
| | Hazardous Materials and Waste | | |
| | Management Plan of Sonoma County. | | |
| | Therefore, proposed redevelopment of | | |
| | older existing facilities would be | | |
| | required to adhere to appropriate | | |
| | identification and abatement | | |
| | procedures by certified contractors | | |
| | who employ practices that limit the | | |
| | exposure of hazardous building | | |
| | materials, where present, and impacts | | |
| | would be less than significant. | | |
| Transportation, Use, and Storage of | Impact 4.N-3: New commercial and | Consistent. Construction of the | None recommended beyond implementation of |
| Hazardous Chemicals | light industrial uses anticipated under | proposed project has the potential | General Plan 2035 policy NS-F-5. |
| | the proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | to create a hazard to the public or | |
| | 2035 would involve the transportation, | environment through the routine | NS-F-5: Require commercial and industrial |
| | use, and storage of hazardous | transportation, use, and disposal of | compliance with the Sonoma County Hazardous |
| | chemicals, which could present public | construction-related hazardous | Materials and Waste Management Plan. |
| | health and/or safety risks to facility | materials such as fuels, soils, | |
| | workers, patients and visitors, and the | solvents, and other materials. | |
| | surrounding area. However, | Operation of the proposed project | |
| | implementation of General Plan 2035 | is not expected to use any | |
| | Policies NS-F-3 through NS-F-6 would | hazardous materials. General Plan | |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | require that hazardous materials are | 2035 Policy NS-F-5 would be | | | |
| | stored, handled, and disposed of | applicable to the proposed project | | | |
| | according to the Hazardous Materials | to ensure compliance with the | | | |
| | and Waste Management Plan of | Hazardous Materials and Waste | | | |
| | Sonoma County and restrictions on | Management Plan of Sonoma | | | |
| | facilities handling large quantities of | County and compliance with all | | | |
| | hazardous materials would be placed. | applicable federal, State, and local | | | |
| | With implementation of General Plan | regulations would ensure the | | | |
| | 2035 policies, impacts would be less | proposed project would have a less | | | |
| | than significant. | than significant impact to the | | | |
| | | public or environment from the | | | |
| | | routine transportation, use, and | | | |
| | | disposal of hazardous materials | | | |
| | | during construction. | | | |
| Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous | Impact 4.N-4: Land use and infill | Consistent. With implementation | None recommended beyond implementation of | | |
| Materials Impact | development envisioned under the | of General Plan 2035 Policy NS-F-5, | General Plan 2035 Policy NS-F-5. | | |
| | proposed Santa Rosa General Plan | implementation of the proposed | | | |
| | 2035 would not result in cumulative | project would not result in a | | | |
| | hazardous materials and human health | significant impact related to | | | |
| | risk impacts with implementation of | hazards or hazardous materials. | | | |
| | the General Plan 2035 policies | Therefore, impacts would be less | | | |
| | discussed above. Impacts would be | than significant. | | | |
| | less than cumulatively considerable. | | | | |
| O. Energy | • | | | | |
| The proposed project is intended to serve the existing use at the project site and would not increase the need for, or cause, inefficient use of, local energy sources. | | | | | |

The proposed project is intended to serve the existing use at the project site and would not increase the need for, or cause, inefficient use of, local energy sources. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in **less than significant** impacts associated with energy, consistent with the General Plan EIR.

P. Parks and Recreation

The proposed project is intended to serve the existing use at the project site and would not increase demand on parks and recreation facilities. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in **less than significant** impacts associated with parks and recreation, consistent with the General Plan EIR.

¹ Department of the Army, San Francisco District, United States Army Corps of Engineers. 2024. File No. SPN-2023-00355. February 15.

| AB = Assembly Bill | LOS = level of service |
|--|---|
| ABAG = Association of Bay Area Governments | SR-12 = State Route 12 |
| BAAQMD = Bay Area Air Quality Management District | TCM = Transportation Control Measure |
| CO ₂ = carbon dioxide | US-101 = United States Highway 101 |
| CO ₂ e/yr = carbon dioxide equivalents per year | USACE = United States Army Corps of Engineers |
| CTS = California tiger salamander | USFWS = United States Fish and Wildlife Service |

| Resource Topic | Summary of General Plan EIR Impacts | Applicable Potential Project Impacts | Applicable General Plan EIR Mitigation Measures and General Plan Policies |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| DPM = diesel particulate matter | | VMT = vehicle miles traveled | |
| EIR = Environmental Impact Report | | | |

CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS PURSUENT TO CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15183 (PROJECTS CONSISTENT WITH A COMMUNITY PLAN, GENERAL PLAN, OR ZONING)

As demonstrated in the EIR Impact Analysis Summary provided above, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with the findings of the certified General Plan EIR. The proposed project is therefore exempt from further environmental review on the basis that all proposed project elements are consistent with the environmental impacts, environmental effects, and zoning requirements outlined in the General Plan EIR. Further analysis is included below.

A. The project entitlements would be consistent with the land uses, densities, and other zoning and development standards set forth in the General Plan 2035, and which were analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

The proposed project would be located at 1455 Corporate Center Parkway in the City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County. The project site is designed as General Industry in the City's General Plan 2035 and is within the IG zoning district. The proposed project would expand the parking facilities on the project site by adding 60 new parking spaces on 20,470 square feet (0.47 acre) of the project site in order to serve the existing commercial uses at the project site. As such, the proposed project would be consistent with the land uses densities, and other zoning and development standards set forth in the General Plan 2035.

B. "Environmental effects that are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located" Standard.

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15183(b)(1), this section presents an examination and discussion of whether the proposed project could result in environmental effects that are peculiar to the project or the project site. If no additional mitigation measures are required to reduce project-specific impacts to a less than significant level, other than those required in the prior EIR, then *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15183 exemption applies.

The proposed project would not result in any environmental effects that would be peculiar to the project or the project site. Based on the EIR Impact Analysis Summary (see Table A above), the proposed project would not result in any new impacts that would require additional mitigation measures, beyond those required under the General Plan EIR. Accordingly, no impacts peculiar to the proposed project or project site would occur.

C. "Environmental effects that were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent" Standard.

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15183(b)(2), this section presents an examination and discussion of whether there are any environmental effects that were not analyzed as significant effects in the General Plan EIR (e.g., General Plan amendments, zoning actions, etc.) with which the proposed project would be consistent.

The EIR Impact Analysis Summary includes a summary of the impact conclusions of the General Plan EIR compared to the potential impacts associated with the proposed project. As discussed

in the EIR Impact Analysis Summary (see Table A above), no significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the General Plan EIR, and no new significant impacts would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

D. "Environmental effects that are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action" Standard

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15183(b)(3), this section presents a discussion of and analyzes whether there are any environmental effects that are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the General Plan EIR.

The proposed project would not increase significant off-site or cumulative impacts and would not contribute significantly to public utility demand, traffic, and air quality given that there are no long-term or operational services required. In addition, the appropriate General Plan 2035 policies and mitigation measures discussed in the EIR Impact Analysis Summary would be implemented during construction of the proposed project, and the proposed project would not result in more severe impacts for any environmental resource category than those analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

E. "Environmental effects that are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR." Standard

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15183(b)(4), this section presents a discussion of and analyzes whether there are any environmental effects that are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR.

The General Plan EIR was certified in November 2009. No other updated planning documents, including ordinances, provided substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified. Since no substantial new information not known at the time of the General Plan EIR is available, no updated analyses or other studies are required for the project site.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (Subsequent or Supplemental EIR)

Alternatively, and as also demonstrated in the EIR Impact Analysis Summary, no new information of substantial importance meeting the criteria listed in *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162 has been identified.

The discussion in this section confirms that the proposed project has been evaluated for significant impacts pursuant to CEQA, and no new information of substantial importance meeting the criteria listed in *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162 has been identified. Under *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162 has been identified, under *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162, the determination is that the project's impacts have been considered in the General

Plan EIR that was reviewed and certified by the City Council, and that the EIR provides a sufficient and adequate analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed project.

A. "Substantial Changes in the Project" Standard

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162(a)(1), this section presents a discussion of whether the proposed project constitutes a substantial change in the project analyzed in the General Plan EIR that would require major revisions to the General Plan EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

The proposed project would be consistent with the existing zoning and planning in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed project would not require major revisions to the General Plan EIR.

B. "Substantial Changes in the Circumstances" Standard

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162(a)(2), this section presents a discussion of whether changes to the project site or the vicinity (environmental setting) have occurred after certification of the General Plan EIR that would result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact that were not evaluated and mitigated by the General Plan EIR.

The project site occupies lands historically graded for runways and drainage on the former Naval Auxiliary Landing Field Santa Rosa. The project site comprises open ruderal grassland, small seasonal wetlands, and several storm water drainage structures (drain inlets) and is currently developed with a commercial building that houses the nonprofit organization Becoming Independent, associated surface parking, and a landscaped garden area.

The project site is in similar condition as originally analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Thus, the proposed project would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact from what was included in the General Plan EIR that would affect any issue of environmental significance.

One of the requirements of CEQA is the examination of whether a proposed project would conflict with existing plans and regulations, including the General Plan, zoning regulations, and other planning documents. Inconsistencies may suggest that a project would have environmental effects that were not identified in advance, and for which planning or analysis has not occurred. As discussed above, the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan 2035 land use and zoning designations for the project site.

Based on the above, the proposed project would not result in any new circumstances that would result in new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts from what has been anticipated for the site in the General Plan EIR.

C. "New Information of Substantial Importance" Standard

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162(a)(3), this section includes a discussion of whether the proposed project would result in 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. New information of substantial importance includes: (1) one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR; (2) significant effects previously examined that are substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR; (3) 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 (4) mitigation measures or alternatives that 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.

The proposed project would not result in significant effects not discussed in the General Plan EIR or increase the severity of impacts identified in the General Plan EIR. In addition, no other mitigation measures or alternatives would be applicable or feasible for the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in 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.

Attachments: A: References B: Figure 1



ATTACHMENT A

REFERENCES

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2022. California Natural Diversity Database, commercial version dated April 30, 2022. Biogeographic Data Branch, Sacramento.

City of Santa Rosa. 2009. Draft Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 Environmental Impact Report. March.

City of Santa Rosa. 2009. Santa Rosa General Plan 2035. November 3.

City of Santa Rosa. 2005. Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy. December 1.

Department of the Army, San Francisco District, United States Army Corps of Engineers. 2024. File No. SPN-2023-00355. February 15.

LSA. 2024. 2081 Incidental Take Permit Application, Becoming Independent Parking Lot Project, City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California. July.



ATTACHMENT B

FIGURE 1



SOURCE: Nearmap (05/2022).

I:\2023\20230971\GIS\MXD\ITP\Figure 3_Proposed Project.mxd (7/17/2024)