

## **3 LEAD AGENCY CHANGES**

---

### **3. LEAD AGENCY CHANGES**

---

This chapter consists of changes to the Draft EIR generated by the City of Santa Rosa because of typographical errors, clarification of wording, correction of references, or minor additions to expand or amplify existing text. Minor revisions to environmental analyses are provided. None of these changes constitute new information leading to new significant impacts or substantial increases in the severity of significant impacts.

# LEAD AGENCY CHANGES

## CHAPTER 1, INTRODUCTION CHANGES

Figure 1-5 in Chapter 1 has been changed to show the correct Kelly Farm, Brown Farm and Alpha Farm boundaries.

Page 1-31 changes as follows:

**TABLE 1-5**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations by Alternative**

Impact	KF 1	KF2	BF1	BF 2	AF	No Project	Mitigation Measure
<b>Visual Resources</b>							
14.1 and 14.2. The Pump Station Component may have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, substantially damage scenic resources, or substantially degrade the existing character of the site.	⊙	⊙	⊕	⊙	●		3.3.18. Minimize Temporary and Permanent Visual Impacts 3.4.4. Landscape and Architectural Screening

## CHAPTER 2, PROJECT DESCRIPTION CHANGES

Figure 2-1 in Chapter 2 has been changed to show the correct Kelly Farm, Brown Farm and Alpha Farm boundaries.

Page 2-13, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

### *Site Development*

Proposed development at the KF2 site includes a new 185 MG-capacity storage pond with an emergency spillway and surrounding fence, an inboard pump station, a new on-site gravel access road, a below-ground water reuse pipeline, and a below-ground extension of the overhead distribution circuit. The KF2 site plan is shown in Figure 2-4. The amount of land that would be permanently disturbed by the project is 47 acres. The temporary construction disturbance area (including the permanent footprint) is ~~76~~ 64 acres. Site preparation would include tree removal, removal of a portion of the existing irrigation system and modification to other portions of the irrigation system, and abandoning three groundwater monitoring wells. A series of groundwater monitoring wells would be placed in the vicinity of the storage pond. The number and location of these wells would be determined in consultation with the NCRWCB. The capacity of the

KF 2 pond was determined because it is bounded by the Kelly Farm boundary on the north and east, the Kelly Farm boundary, and the 48-inch SCWA aquaduct on the west, and the 100-year floodplain on the south (see Figure 2-3).

Page 2-17, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

The amount of land that would be permanently disturbed by the project is ~~58~~ 48 acres. The temporary construction disturbance area (including the permanent footprint) is 76 acres. Site preparation would include tree removal, removal of a portion of the existing irrigation system and modification to other portions of the irrigation system as needed, abandoning an existing gate and access road that transects the BF1 site, and abandoning six groundwater monitoring wells.

Page 2-21, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

The amount of land that would be permanently disturbed by the project is ~~54~~ 41 acres. The temporary construction disturbance area (including the permanent footprint) is 67 acres. Site preparation would include tree removal, removal of a portion of the existing irrigation system and modification to other portions of the irrigation system as needed, abandoning an access road that transects the pond site, abandoning one groundwater monitoring well, and removal of the weather station. If needed, the weather station would be relocated outside the pond footprint.

## **SECTION 4.2, AGRICULTURE CHANGES**

Page 4.2-9, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

The City could identify no feasible measures to reduce or avoid the permanent loss of 41 to ~~62.5~~ 62.1 acres of status farmland that would result from construction of Storage component facilities or at-grade pump station facilities due to implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3.18. Among the measures considered was use of the County's Small Farms Initiative on other City-owned properties. The Small Farms Initiative allows farmers access to public lands zoned for agriculture, thereby putting agricultural land into agricultural production and providing land to farmers who otherwise would not have access to farmland. This initiative is effective in increasing the amount of land that is in agricultural production and making status farmland available to farmers who otherwise would not have access to such lands. However, because the initiative does not increase the total amount of status farmland in Sonoma County, use of the Small Farms Initiative would not be effective in mitigating the SSP impact of reducing the total amount of status farmland in Sonoma County.

## SECTION 4.4, SURFACE WATER QUALITY CHANGES

Page 4.4-15, Table 4.4.5

**TABLE 4.4-5**  
**Pond and Pump Station Characteristics Relative to Erosion and Flooding Potential**

Site	Temporary Construction Zone (acres)	Permanent Disturbance (acres)	Impervious Area (acres)	Encroachment into 100-year Floodplain <sup>(a)</sup>
KF1	<del>92</del> <u>90</u>	62.1	1.6 for access road + <del>0.2</del> <u>1.1</u> for at-grade pump station	Minor per FIRM; none per 75-foot BFE
KF2	<del>75</del> <u>64</u>	48.1	2.5 for access road + <del>0.2</del> <u>1.1</u> for at-grade pump station	None per FIRM; none per 75-foot BFE
BF1	<del>75</del> <u>76</u>	<del>58.1</del> <u>49.1</u>	1.1 for access road + <del>0.2</del> <u>1.1</u> for at-grade pump station	None per FIRM; none per 75-foot BFE
BF2	<del>66</del> <u>67</u>	<del>50.5</del> <u>41</u>	1.9 for access road	None per FIRM; none per 75-foot BFE
AF	<del>76</del> <u>77</u>	<del>4.1</del> <u>50</u>	2.8 for access road	Minor per FIRM; none per 75-foot BFE

## SECTION 4.8, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES CHANGES

Page 4.8-30, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph:

California tiger salamanders occur on the Kelly Farm having been trapped on the site during 2003-2004 (LSA 2004). During the 2003-2004 survey, an adult California tiger salamander was captured on the farm site approximately 200 feet east of KF1. An additional ~~72~~ 72 tiger salamander captures were made in the northeastern portion of Kelly Farm, north of Duer Road, and 86 California tiger salamanders were captured on an undeveloped parcel adjacent to the northeastern portion of Kelly Farm. The entire 61-acre permanent impact area for the SSP at the KF1 site is located within 1.3 miles of known breeding sites for California tiger salamanders and therefore is considered terrestrial habitat for this species (CNDDDB 2007). The additional ~~32~~ 29 acres of land that would be temporarily disturbed during SSP facilities construction are largely located within Kelly Conservation Area (USFWS 2005), a 662-acre area of which a minimum of 350 contiguous acres are to be set aside for the conservation of California tiger salamanders per the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy.

Page 4.8-31, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

....Loss of individuals may reduce the California tiger salamander population in this area to unsustainable levels and make recovery of the population on the Santa Rosa Plain questionable. A take permit would also be required. KF2 storage pond construction activities would temporarily impact an additional ~~29~~ 17 acres of the Kelly Conservation Area. Temporary impacts to this habitat may result in mortality to California tiger salamanders by crushing and compaction of the soil. Temporary impact areas would be restored as described in the Project description, and would provide terrestrial habitat for this species following completion of the Project.

Page 4.8-32, last paragraph:

California tiger salamanders may occur on Brown Farm although none were trapped at this site during the 2003-2004 survey (LSA 2004). The proposed BF2 storage pond would be located within 1.3 miles of an existing California tiger salamander breeding pond (USFWS 2005) and would result in a temporary impact to approximately 67 acres of potential tiger salamander terrestrial habitat and a permanent impact to approximately ~~54~~ 41 acres of potential tiger salamander terrestrial habitat. The Llano Conservation area lies directly east of the BF2 site, but does not extend to the west side of Llano Road (USFWS 2005).

Page 4.8-37, last paragraph:

**KF1.** The KF1 Storage component may impact 15 special-status animal species. The CNDDDB does not contain records of any of these species occurring on the site (CDFG 2007), but suitable habitat for these species is present on the site. Of these 15 species, western pond turtle, golden eagle, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, loggerhead shrike, and American badger are most likely to occur on the site. These species are relatively common in Sonoma County and may occur in annual grassland, oak woodland, and riparian habitats such as those that occur on the site. Construction-related impacts include potential mortality to individual animals during construction, and permanent loss of nest sites, burrows, and foraging areas following construction of the facilities. The SSP may also result in on-going impacts to special-status species during embankment maintenance operations such as mowing. Construction of Storage component facilities at this site would result in a permanent impact area of 61 acres and a temporary impact area of approximately ~~92~~ 90 acres. Most of the impact area is currently irrigated hayfields.

Page 4.8-38, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:

**KF2.** The KF2 Storage component may impact 21 special-status animal species. The CNDDDB does not contain records of any of these species occurring on the site (CDFG 2007), but suitable habitat for these species is present. Of these 21 species, species such as western pond turtle, golden eagle, Cooper's hawk, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, loggerhead shrike, tricolored blackbird, yellow

warbler, and American badger are most likely to occur on the site. These species are relatively common in Sonoma County and may occur in annual grassland, oak woodland, and riparian habitats such as those that occur on the site. Construction-related impacts include potential mortality to individual animals during construction, and permanent loss of nest sites, burrows, and foraging areas following construction of the facilities. The storage pond component may also result in on-going impacts to special-status species during embankment maintenance operations such as mowing. Construction at this site would result in a permanent impact area of 47 acres and a temporary impact area of approximately ~~76~~ 64 acres. Most of the impacted area is currently irrigated hayfields with valley oaks scattered throughout the fields.

Page 4.8-38, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

**BF2.** Construction of the BF2 storage pond may impact 17 special-status animal species. The impact is similar to that described for the BF1 Storage component. Construction at this site would result in a permanent impact area of ~~51~~ 41 acres and a temporary impact area of approximately 67 acres. Most of the impacted area is currently irrigated hayfields and oak woodland.

Page 4.8-38, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph:

**BF1.** The BF1 Storage component may impact 21 special-status animal species. The CNDDDB does not contain records of any of these species occurring on the site (CDFG 2007), but suitable habitat for these species is present. Of these 21 species, species such as western pond turtle, golden eagle, Cooper's hawk, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, loggerhead shrike, tricolored blackbird, yellow warbler, and American badger are most likely to occur on the site. These species are relatively common in Sonoma County and may occur in annual grassland, oak woodland, and riparian habitats such as those that occur on the BF1 site. Construction-related impacts include potential mortality to individual animals during construction, and permanent loss of nest sites, burrows, and foraging areas following construction of the facilities. The Storage component may also result in on-going impacts to special-status species during embankment maintenance operations such as mowing. Construction at this site would result in a permanent impact area of ~~58~~ 49 acres and a temporary impact area of approximately 76 acres. Most of the impacted area is currently irrigated hayfields and oak woodland.

## SECTION 4.11, AIR QUALITY CHANGES

Page 4.11-20, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence:

from ~~47~~ 41 to 74 acres, and temporary construction activities would cover from ~~67~~ 64 to ~~77~~ 90 acres. . .

**SECTION 4.14, VISUAL RESOURCES CHANGES**

Page 4.14-11, Table 4.13-3

**TABLE 4.14-3**  
**Visual Resources Impacts**

Evaluation Criteria	Significance Threshold	Impact	Type of Impact <sup>1</sup>	Level of Significance <sup>2</sup>
BF1 <i>Pump Station component</i>	Strong visual contrast	Moderate	C, P	⊖○
	Permanent view obstruction	Slight	C, P	○
	Loss or alteration of a specific scenic resource	Removal of no additional trees	C, P	==

Page 4.14-22, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph

*Pump Station component - Significant: KF1, KF2, ~~BF1~~, BF2, and AF*

The pump station at the KF1 site would be situated on the embankment near the northeast corner of the pond.....

Page 4.14-22, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph

The pump station would be situated at the closest point to a nearby proposed County Open Space District trail. The trail parallels the pond embankment (and pump station) at this point. The pump station would also be visible from a proposed Class I bike route that would generally follow the route of the Open Space District trail. This is considered a significant impact. Electrical lines serving the pump station would be underground and not introduce a visual contrast. No trees, beyond those removed for the storage pond, would be removed for the pump station.

Page 4.14-24, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph (deleted, but moved to page 4.14-25):

~~The pump station at the BF1 site would be situated on the embankment at the southwest corner of the pond (see Figure 4.14-5b). The BF1 site is situated within a County designated Scenic Landscape Unit and the Santa Rosa-Sebastopol Community Separator. Given its location and the bulk of the pond embankment upon which it is located, this pump station would not be visible from Llano Road and only slightly visible from the proposed County Open Space District trails in the foreground. Given its placement on the embankment, it would create a strong visual contrast in foreground views. It would be unlikely to be viewed from Highway 12 and Joe Rodota Trail due to the amount of intervening vegetation and distance. Being 15 feet in height, and situated on the embankment, the pump station would add to the view created by the embankment. However, given the~~

~~size and bulk of the storage pond and the placement of the pump station, the pump station would not add appreciably to view obstruction. Electrical lines serving the pump station would be underground and not introduce a visual contrast. No trees, beyond those removed for the storage pond, would be removed for the pump station. As its construction would occur simultaneously with that of the storage pond, pump station activities, equipment, and vehicles would be visible from these viewpoints, creating a temporary significant impact for visual contrast.~~

Page 4.14-25, add paragraph after 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:

*Pump Station Component – Less than Significant: BF1*

The pump station at the BF1 site would be situated on the embankment at the southwest corner of the pond (see Figure 4.14-5b). The BF1 site is situated within a County-designated Scenic Landscape Unit and the Santa Rosa-Sebastopol Community Separator. Given the pump station’s location on the south corner of the pond embankment and the bulk of the pond embankment itself, this pump station would not be visible from Llano Road and only slightly visible from the proposed County Open Space District trails in the foreground. It would not be visible from the bikeway paralleling the Laguna de Santa Rosa shown in the Draft Sonoma County Outdoor Recreation Plan and would be unlikely to be viewed from Highway 12 and Joe Rodota Trail due to the amount of intervening vegetation and distance. Being 15 feet in height, and situated on the embankment, the pump station would add to the view created by the embankment. However, given the size and bulk of the storage pond and the placement of the pump station, the pump station would not add appreciably to view obstruction. Electrical lines serving the pump station would be underground and not introduce a visual contrast. No trees, beyond those removed for the storage pond, would be removed for the pump station. As its construction would occur simultaneously with that of the storage pond, pump station activities, equipment, and vehicles would be visible from these viewpoints, creating a temporary significant impact for visual contrast.

Mitigation: **Storage component: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF**

**Pump Station component: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF**

Page 4.14-26

*Pump Station Component - Less than Significant: KF1, KF2, ~~BF1~~ and BF2*

Page 4.14-30, 2<sup>nd</sup> through 4<sup>th</sup> paragraphs:

The KF2 pump station could be situated near its current position inboard on the embankment, but outboard at-grade and surrounded with vegetative screening. It would be less visible to residences and users of the proposed trail and bike route. Impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

~~As part of Mitigation Measure 3.3.18, the BF1 pump station is proposed to be constructed outboard at grade (instead of inboard on the pond embankment),~~

~~shielding it from view of the proposed trails. This would make this potential visual impact less than significant.~~

As shown in Figure 4.14-5c, the BF2 pump station would be sufficiently screened and less visible to the users of the proposed trails and bike routes. Impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Page 4.14-36 changes as follows:

**TABLE 4.14-4**  
**Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures – Visual Resources**

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure
<b>BF1</b>		
14.1 and 14.2 The Storage component may have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, substantially damage scenic resources, or substantially degrade the existing character of the site.	⊙	3.3.18. Minimize Temporary and Permanent Visual Impacts 3.4.4. Landscape and Architectural Screening
<del>14.1 and 14.2 The Pump Station component may have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, substantially damage scenic resources, or substantially degrade the existing character of the site.</del>	<del>⊙</del>	<del>3.3.18. Minimize Temporary and Permanent Visual Impacts 3.4.4. Landscape and Architectural Screening</del>

### CHAPTER 3, MITIGATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM CHANGES

Page 3-55, 4<sup>th</sup> row in table:

14.1 & 14.2. The Pump Station Component may have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, substantially damage scenic resources, or substantially degrade the existing character of the Site.	Significant – AF Less than Significant – KF1, KF2, <del>BF1</del> , BF2
---	--

### CHAPTER 6, CEQA-REQUIRED SECTIONS CHANGES

Page 6-12, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph:

The environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives is the BF2 Alternative. This alternative is identified as environmentally superior, because it would have fewer significant and unavoidable impacts than identified for the KF1, KF2 and AF alternatives, and although it would have the same number of significant and avoidable impacts identified for the BF1 alternative (specifically loss of status farmland, energy use and greenhouse gas emissions, construction traffic congestion and noise, and potential for impacts to cultural resources), in most cases the impacts would be less severe. This

decreased severity is due in large part to the pond's size: it is the smallest of the five alternatives with a storage capacity of 105 MG, its facilities would cover ~~54~~ 41 acres of land, and its embankments would rise only 13 to 26 feet above the surrounding grade. Less land disturbance causes less impact on status farmland and potentially less impact to cultural resources. The BF2 pond's smaller size and its location in relation to Pump Station E cause less energy use and greenhouse gas emissions. The BF2 alternative also would be the least visually intrusive of the ponds and.....

## **TM-4 CHANGES**

Figure 2-11 and Figures 21 through 26 in *TM-4* have been changed to eliminate the domestic well from the BF1 pond site.