Whitlock & Weinberger
Transportation, Inc.

490 Mendocino Avenue
Suite 201
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

voice 707.542.9500
fax 707.542.9590
web www.w-trans.com

Proposed Initial Study for the Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project

in the

City of Santa Rosa

July 3, 2007

Environmental Checklist

1. Project title

Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project

2. Lead agency name and address

City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department
69 Stony Circle
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

3. Contact person and phone number

Nancy Adams
Transportation Planner
(707) 543-3910

4. Project location

The project extends along Sonoma Avenue from Santa Rosa Avenue to Summerfield Road.

5. Project sponsor's name and address

City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department
69 Stony Circle
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

6. General plan designation

The project is located along a major east-west corridor identified as a Regional Arterial Street on Figure 5-1 of the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan. Sonoma Avenue is also designated as a Bicycle Corridor, specifically as a Class II Bicycle Lane Corridor, on Figure 5-2 of the Santa Rosa 2020 General Plan.

7. Zoning

Land uses along Sonoma Avenue include Public/Institutional, Low and Medium Density Residential, Office, and Community Shopping Center (Retail & Business Services), and Parks & Recreation.

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The project consists of adding bike lanes and related modifications, including re-striping, narrowing of some existing travel lanes, removing existing travel lanes, and possible removal of some on-street parking. Several alternative lane configurations were studied for various roadway segments within the project area to provide bicycle lanes and generally improve bicycle safety and bicycle access to community facilities and activity centers.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings

Land uses surrounding Sonoma Avenue consist of City Hall and other government buildings, a park, and a museum on the west end, offices and schools in the west-central area, a community shopping center in the east-central area, and a large regional park and a public middle school at the eastern end. Interspersed along the entire project segment are low to medium density residential uses, though low density housing is predominant.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Consultations will be conducted with Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition, Santa Rosa Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board, Slater Middle School, Doyle Park Elementary School, and the Santa Rosa Fire Department.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, *involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact"* as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetic	☐ Agriculture Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology /Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	X None

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Prepared By:

MJYung 7-6-07

Mary Jo Yung, P.E. Date
Lead Agency Representative

Reviewed By:

Nancy Adams 07.06.07

Nancy Adams Date
Transportation Planner

I concur with the findings and conclusions above.

Gillian Hayes 7-6-07

Gillian Hayes Date
Environmental Coordinator, City of Santa Rosa

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

    b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

    c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:

    a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

    b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

Issues

In evaluating project impacts, the following abbreviations were used to indicate the level of significance.

- PSI = Potentially Significant Impact
- LTSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- LTS = Less than Significant
- NI = No Impact

I.	AESTHETICS – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on aesthetics. Items a), b), c), and d) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

II.	AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on agricultural resources. Items a), b), and c) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

III.	AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. Though the project would result in a slight decrease in average running speed on some segments and increase in average delay at some intersections, it would also contribute to the increased use of bicycles as a viable mode of travel, thereby reducing the number of vehicles and their associated emissions. Since the reduction in vehicular traffic was not quantified, but can reasonably be assumed, the project is expected to have a less-than-significant impact on air quality. Items a), b), c), d), and e) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on biological resources. Items a), b), c), d), e), and f) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on cultural resources. Items a), b), c) and d) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

VI. VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	☐	**X**
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	**X**
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on geology and soils. Items a), b), c), d), and e) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:		PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on hazards and hazardous materials. Items a), b), c), d), e), f), g), and h) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:		PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on hydrology and water quality. Items a), b), c), d), e), f), g), h), i), and j) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would not divide an established community, nor conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation. It is consistent with and implements policies in the General Plan and the Update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, as summarized in the discussion below. The project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The project would result in a beneficial land use impact by providing additional bicycle linkages between land uses. Items a) and c) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the discussion.

Discussion

The City of Santa Rosa encourages projects that add bicycle lanes to arterial roadways, as noted in the following General Plan policies:

"Pursue implementation of walking and bicycling facilities as envisioned in the City's Updated Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan." (GP Policy T-J-1)

"Provide bicycle lanes along all regional/arterial streets and high volume transitional/collector streets." (GP Policy T-L-1)

"Provide bicycle lanes on major access routes to all schools and parks." (GP Policy T-L-2)

"Promote and facilitate the use of bicycles with other transportation modes." (GP Policy T-L-7)

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on *mineral resources*. Items a) and b) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	**X**	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The

proposed project may result in a substantial permanent noise level increase where through-travel lanes would be realigned closer to existing noise-sensitive receivers along the roadway (Item c). The project would not generate noise or ground borne vibration and does not include noise-sensitive uses that would be sensitive to environmental noise. Items a), b), d), e), and f) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

Significance Criteria

The City of Santa Rosa discourages projects that would, "…create ambient noise levels more than 5 dBA DNL above existing background noise levels...". (Policy NS-B-14) This analysis identifies a significant noise impact where the project would increase existing noise levels at sensitive land uses by 5 dBA DNL or greater in noise environments where noise levels would remain less than 60 dBA DNL, or 3 dBA DNL or greater where future noise levels would be 60 dBA DNL or greater. Noise levels at residential receivers along Sonoma Avenue are calculated to be greater than 60 dBA DNL, therefore, a 3 dBA DNL or greater noise increase would be considered significant.

Discussion

Substantial Permanent Increase

The relative changes in traffic noise levels along Sonoma Avenue were calculated for each roadway segment (Segments 1-5) under each project alternative (Alternatives 1-3). The change in noise levels was calculated by comparing the equivalent lane distance under existing and project conditions based on the roadway cross-sections prepared by W-Trans. The addition of bike lanes would generally move the near travel lane away from existing residential receivers resulting in an immeasurable decrease in traffic noise levels (-0.2 to –0.5 dBA). Traffic noise levels are calculated to decrease by less than 1 dBA DNL at residential receivers where the re-striping of the roadway would move the travel lanes further away. Where travel lanes would be re-striped closer to existing residential receivers, traffic noise levels are calculated to increase slightly (+0.1 to +0.3 dBA). The project would not measurably increase existing traffic noise levels (less than 1 dBA DNL) and would result in a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on population and housing. Items a), b), and c) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
ii) Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
iii) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
iv) Parks?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
v) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on Public Services. Item a) would not be applicable to the project and is therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

XIV. RECREATION	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on recreation. Items a) and b) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	**X**	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	**X**	☐
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	**X**	☐
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The proposed project would not cause an increase in traffic. It may result in the level of service standard being exceeded, or an increase in congestion, as longer queues at signalized intersections develop due to far-side intersection lane reductions (Item b). The project would not change air traffic patterns and does not increase hazards due to design features. The project may result in an inadequate emergency access and inadequate parking capacity. It would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, but rather supports such policies. Items a), c), d), and g) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

A project traffic analysis was completed. *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project*, Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc., July 3, 2007, provides the technical details used to complete this section of the impact evaluation, and is referenced here as the Background Report.

Significance Criteria

Item b).The City of Santa Rosa has an adopted Level of Service (LOS) Standard in the General Plan. It allows for a minimum of LOS D operation along major corridors (Segment LOS). While there is no formal policy for intersections, LOS D operation was also used as an operational goal for signalized intersections, though exceeding this goal would not be considered a significant impact.
Though providing no qualitative measure, the City of Santa Rosa General Plan 2020 also notes that the success of achieving LOS standards is increased when alternative modes of transportation are provided to offset the expected vehicular uses…." This General Plan institutes a new classification system for streets and a new way of looking at the City's street system compared with previous versions of the Plan. The new system represents a major departure from the conventional approach to street design,

which is based upon a hierarchal system that focuses on concentrating automobile traffic onto a limited number of major streets. Under the new classification system, the functional emphasis has shifted from concentration to dispersal. A greater concern for providing equality among all modes of transportation – particularly pedestrians and bicyclists – is reflected in the new classifications as well as the importance of the streetscape to the character and quality of the public realm." (GP Section 5-2, Roadway Classification System). This Plan also notes, "Pedestrians and bicyclists must also be welcomed and are in greater need of support, due the higher vehicle speeds and amounts of traffic." (GP Section 5-2).

Since there is no current standard for measuring achievement of alternative transportation mode policies, this analysis was performed by using the automobile standard of Level of Service. Segment Levels of service were evaluated under existing and future traffic volumes during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods.

Item e). The General Plan notes "… [the community should] provide for citizen safety through expedient response to emergency calls. The fire response goal is 4 minutes to 80 percent of emergency calls, 5 minutes to 90 percent of emergency calls, and 6 minutes or less to all emergency calls." (GP Policy PSF-E-1)

Item f). There is no Significance Criteria established in Santa Rosa to measure the impact of a project on street parking. In lieu of such criteria, this analysis measured Actual parking supply and demand in the project areas where parking would need to be removed in order to implement an Alternative. The study was performed in accordance with the Study Methodology described in the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Manual of Transportation Engineering Studies*.

Discussion

Item b). Under Existing volumes, operation of all five study segments would remain at LOS D or better during both peaks evaluated except for one segment (Farmers Lane to Hahman Drive) which is already operating at LOS E. While LOS E operation would be retained with no change in average speed under Alternative 1, operation would drop to LOS F with either of the other two alternatives. This would be a *significant* impact associated with Alternatives 2 or 3, while Alternative 1 has a *less-than-significant* impact.

Under Future volumes three of the study segments are projected to operate at LOS E or F under the current configuration, and would continue to do so with any of the three Alternative configurations evaluated; this would result in a *less-than-significant* impact.

See Table 13 in the Background Report for a comparison of operational results.

Item e). Discussion and correspondence with City of Santa Rosa Fire Department personnel yielded feedback on the various designs, but focused on the drivers' ability to clear a path for emergency vehicles on streets where there is a two-lane layout. Alternative 1 offers a two-lane layout, with the added features of bike lanes and a two-way left-turn lane. In the case of Alternative 1, such added lanes work to provide refuge for the vehicles attempting to get out of the way of an emergency response

vehicle, rendering the two lanes unobstructed. In other words, this type of design is acceptable to fire response staff and represents a *less-than-significant* impact.

Concrete medians, if incorporated into the design, would require a new assessment given that such medians decrease the flexibility of a street network to accommodate emergency response situations. None of the alternatives include adding a median, so this is a non-issue for this project.

Item f). To install two bike lanes in Study Segment 3 (Hahman Drive to Yulupa Avenue), which is 42 feet wide, parking would need to be removed from one side of the street. A peak parking demand study was performed on two evenings, including counting the number of parked vehicles on both sides of the street within the study segment. The study concluded that there was a maximum 25 percent occupancy of the available parking between Hahman Drive and Franquette Avenue, a maximum of 17 percent occupancy of the parking spaces between Franquette Avenue and Edgemont Way, and a maximum 18 percent occupancy of parking spaces on the block between Edgemont Way and Yulupa Avenue. Since Alternative 1 proposes to remove 50 percent of the parking on these blocks, or one side of the street, the study demonstrates that sufficient parking supply would be retained for peak parking demands.

It is not specified which side of the street have the parking removed, as the occupancy was found to be equal for both sides of the street. Those residents whose parking was eliminated along their property frontage would need to cross two travel lanes to/from their parked cars, which is less than 40 feet. This is a *less-than-significant* impact.

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

XVI.UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider=s existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

XVI.UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project=s solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on utilities and service systems. Items a), b), c), d), e), f), and g) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	PSI	LTSM	LTS	NI
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	**X**

The Sonoma Avenue Bike Lanes project would result in the re-striping of Sonoma Avenue between Santa Rosa Avenue and Summerfield Road to provide continuous bike lanes along the roadway. The project would have no impact on mandatory findings of significance. Items a), b), and c) would not be applicable to the project and are therefore not carried forward in the analysis.