



Negative Declaration

Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

(707) 527-1900 FAX (707) 527-1103

Publication Date: October 5, 1998

Adoption Date:

State Clearinghouse:

This statement and attachments constitute the **Negative Declaration** as proposed for or adopted by the Sonoma County decision-making body for the project described below.

File No.: PLP 98-0050 **Planner:** Kenneth Ellison

Project Name: West County Transportation Agency

Project Description: School bus storage, maintenance, and administrative facility for the West County Transportation Agency through a General Plan Amendment from Rural Residential 2.5 acre density to Public/Quasi-Public and a South Santa Rosa Area Plan Amendment from Rural Residential 1-5 acre density to Public/Quasi-Public and a zone change from RR (Rural Residential) B6 2.5 acre density to PF (Public Facilities) on APN 134-074-022, and a Use Permit for the facilities on APN's 134-074-022 & 134-072-025, 048 on a total of 9.14 acres.

Project Location: 3300 Juniper Avenue (aka West Robles Ave), Santa Rosa
See Location Map - Attached

Environmental Finding:

Based upon the information contained in the Initial Study included in the project file, it has been determined that there will be no significant environmental effect resulting from this project, provided that mitigation measures are incorporated into the project. The Negative Declaration has been completed in compliance with CEQA State and County guidelines and the information contained therein has been reviewed and considered.

There will be a potential impact on biotic habitat of concern to Fish & Game.

Initial Study: Attached

Other Attachments: Application and Project Referrals

Decision-making Body: Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

Lead Agency: Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

COUNTY OF SONOMA
PERMIT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
(707) 527-1900 FAX (707) 527-1103

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

FILE #: PLP 98-0050 **PLANNER:** Kenneth Ellison

PROJECT: GPA/SPA/ZCE/UPE for school bus storage/maintenance yard **DATE:** 10/2/98

PROJECT LOCATION: 3300 Juniper Avenue, Santa Rosa

APPLICANT NAME: West County Transportation Agency

APPLICANT ADDRESS: 745 North Main Street, Sebastopol, Ca 95472

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: General Industrial (APN's 134-072-025 & 048)
Rural Residential 2.5 acre density (APN 134-074-022)

AREA PLAN: South Santa Rosa Area Plan - General Industrial (APN's 134-072-025 & 048)
Rural Residential 1-5 acre density (AP 134-074-022)

ZONING: M1 (Limited Industrial), and RR (Rural Residential) - B6 2.5 acre density

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: Request for a school bus storage, maintenance, and administrative facility for the West County Transportation Agency through a General Plan Amendment from Rural Residential 2.5 acre density to Public/Quasi-Public and a South Santa Rosa Area Plan Amendment from Rural Residential 1-5 acre density to Public/Quasi Public and a zone change from RR (Rural Residential) - B6 - 2.5 acre density to PF (Public Facilities) on APN 134-074-022, and a Use Permit for the facilities on APN's 134-074-022 and 134-072-025 & 048, on a total of 9.14 acres located at 3300 Juniper Avenue (A.K.A. 367 West Robles Ave), Santa Rosa, Supervisorial District 5.

SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

East - General Industrial Land currently developed with an industrial park.

North/West - Rural Residential Land developed with a number of scattered residences.

South - General Industrial Land currently vacant.

Other Public Agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement). Army Corps for fill of Wetlands, City of Santa Rosa for Public water hookup on APN's 134-072-025 & 048, Regional Water Quality Control Board storm runoff permits may be required.

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" or "Potentially Significant unless Mitigated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☒ Land Use and Planning	☒ Transportation/Circulation	☒ Public Services
☐ Population and Housing	☒ Biological Resources	☒ Utilities & Service Systems
☒ Geological Problems	☐ Energy & Mineral Resources	☒ Aesthetics
☒ Water	☒ Hazards	☒ Cultural Resources
☒ Air Quality	☒ Noise	☐ Recreation
	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed by 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

The environmental documents which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached or referenced herein, and hereby made a part of this document.

Incorporated Source Documents

In preparation of the Initial Study checklist, the following documents were referenced/developed, and are hereby incorporated as part of the Initial Study. All documents are available in the project file or for reference at the Permit and Resource Management Department.

- ☒ Project Application and Description
☐ Initial Data Sheet
- ☒ County Planning Department's Sources and Criteria Manual
- ☒ Sonoma County General Plan and Associated EIR
- ☒ Specific or Area Plan South Santa Rosa
- ☒ Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance
- ☒ Sonoma County Rare Plant Site Identification Study
- ☒ Project Referrals from Responsible Agencies
- ☒ State and Local Environmental Quality Acts (CEQA)
- ☒ Biological Assessment of site by Golden Bear Biostudies
- ☒ Correspondence received on project.

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 cited in the comments 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).

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed by 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

The environmental documents which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached or referenced herein, and hereby made a part of this document.

Incorporated Source Documents

In preparation of the Initial Study checklist, the following documents were referenced/developed, and are hereby incorporated as part of the Initial Study. All documents are available in the project file or for reference at the Permit and Resource Management Department.

- ☒ Project Application and Description
☐ Initial Data Sheet
- ☒ County Planning Department's Sources and Criteria Manual
- ☒ Sonoma County General Plan and Associated EIR
- ☒ Specific or Area Plan South Santa Rosa
- ☒ Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance
- ☒ Sonoma County Rare Plant Site Identification Study
- ☒ Project Referrals from Responsible Agencies
- ☒ State and Local Environmental Quality Acts (CEQA)
- ☒ Biological Assessment of site by Golden Bear Biostudies
- ☒ Correspondence received on project.

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 cited in the comments 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) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Potentially Significant Unless 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 17 at the end of the checklist, "Earlier Analysis" 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). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 17 at the end of the checklist.
- 6) Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. Other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1. **LAND USE AND PLANNING** Would the proposal:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?	_____	__X__	_____	_____
b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	_____	__X__	_____	_____
c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	_____	__X__	_____	_____
d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	_____	_____	_____	__X__
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	_____	_____	__X__	_____
f) Require land acquisition or easements?	_____	_____	_____	__X__

Comment/Mitigation:

The proposed project includes a request for a General Plan Amendment, Area Plan Amendment, and Zone Change, so is by definition inconsistent with those documents. See attached General Plan Consistency Determination dated August 11, 1998 for a complete analysis of the issues regarding the proposed amendments. If the proposed amendments are approved, the project would then be consistent with the revised General Plan, Area Plan, and Zoning. The project could also be incompatible with existing rural residential land uses in the area to the north and west due to traffic, noise, visual, and drainage issues. As discussed in more detail through the individual sections of this initial study, all of these impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level with the appropriate mitigations. See the individual sections of this initial study for further detail on the potential impacts and their mitigation. No impacts or incompatibilities are expected to agricultural operations from the project.

If approved, the project will result in an extension of a limited industrial type use into an area which has adjacent residences developed in a rural residential neighborhood. This could result in some disruption to the rural residential neighborhood. However, given the site is already surrounded on two sides by industrial designations, and is presently vacant, and the project would install some physical roadway and drainage improvements to the area that are needed, the overall disruption to the neighborhood is expected to be less than significant as long as the project specific environmental impacts can be adequately mitigated as discussed in this initial study. No off site easements are required by the project.

2. **POPULATION AND HOUSING** Would the proposal:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

Comment/Mitigation: The project would involve industrial uses only, and would have no impact on County wide housing projections, growth, or affordable housing. The loss of one potential house site on APN 134-074-022 is not considered significant.

3. **GEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS** Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Fault rupture?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
b) Seismic ground shaking?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
c) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
d) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
e) Landslides or mudflows?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
g) Subsidence of the land?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
h) Expansive soils?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
i) Unique geologic or physical features?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

Comments/Mitigation: The project area is subject to seismic ground shaking through numerous faults and the potential for expansive soils. Expansive soils could also be present on the site, and erosion could take place if fill is improperly placed on site during construction activities. Mitigation requires obtaining proper building permits and meeting all County standard seismic safety, soil test/compaction, erosion control and drainage review requirements. There are no known potential impacts on site from seiche, tsunami, volcanic hazards, landslides, mudflows, subsidence, or unique geologic features.

4. **WATER** Would the proposal result in:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate amount of surface runoff?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____

c) Alteration of surface water quality through discharges or temperature, dissolved oxygen and/or turbidity?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
e) Changes in currents, course or direction of water movements?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
f) Change in quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
h) Impacts to groundwater quality?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____

Comment/Mitigation: The project would require compaction of the soil and construction of new building(s) and other hard surface areas. This would increase rain runoff from the property and potentially change drainage patterns, increasing runoff and erosion, and exposing people to minor flood/drainage problems in the surrounding area. Mitigation requires the project have engineered grading and drainage plans reviewed and approved by the Permit and Resource Management Department drainage specialist for conformance with all County standards to insure no significant off-site impacts will occur. This review will also insure no ponding or minor flooding occurs on or off site from the project due to the flat terrain. Given the scale of the project compared to the total land area available for groundwater recharge, a less than significant effect is expected on groundwater recharge. No potential impacts to groundwater flow or direction have been identified.

5. AIR QUALITY Would the proposal:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
d) Create objectionable odors?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

Comment/Mitigation: The project does not involve any significant identified air quality impacts, other than dust potentially blowing off of graveled areas. Mitigation requires dust and debris be controlled on site through cleanup or watering at all times. If future use of the building(s) creates any air pollution, a permit from the Regional Air Pollution Control Board would be required at that time.

6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Would the proposal cause:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
b) Safety hazards from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____

- | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------|-------|--------------|
| d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site, or change parking conditions? | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ | _____ |
| e) Hazards or barriers for vehicles, pedestrians or bicyclists? | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ | _____ |
| f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| h) Change in traffic circulation patterns? | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ | _____ |

Comment/Mitigation: The proposed project would create new public roadway segments as required by the South Santa Rosa Area Plan, and new private driveway intersections with the County roadway. Heavy employee traffic and bus traffic can be expected to use the surrounding roads during certain peak periods to access and leave the site. Many of the roads in the area, including the north end of Juniper (presently approximately 12' wide), are not designed to handle a significant amount of additional traffic. The combination of these factors could result in local traffic and pedestrian safety problems. There will also be a minor cumulative impact on overall County traffic. Mitigation of these potential impacts requires that the new public roadway segments be designed and constructed to meet all County standards (through review and bonding of required improvement plans), and that private driveway intersections also meet all County traffic safety standards through the Encroachment Permit process, and a traffic impact fee be paid for cumulative impacts on the County roadway system. In addition, to prevent excessive traffic on the north end of Juniper Avenue prior to its eventual widening, the project must block Juniper Avenue at the end of the new on site improvements with an emergency vehicle access only crossing, until such time as the north end of Juniper is improved to meet County Traffic Safety standards. In addition, all busses accessing or leaving the site shall be routed along the major roads in the area - West Robles/Dutton/Todd Avenue, except for buses doing local drop-off and pickup.

7. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the proposal result in impacts to:

- | | <i>Potentially
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>Potentially
Significant
unless
Mitigated</i> | <i>Less than
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>No
Impact</i> |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|
| a) Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including plants, fish, insects, animals and birds)? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, serpentine, coastal habitat, etc.)? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
| d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)? | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ | _____ |
| e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |

Comments/Mitigation: The property contains a number of small wetland areas. A biological assessment of the property was completed. No endangered, threatened, or rare species were identified on site. No locally designated species or natural communities were identified on site. No wildlife dispersal or migration corridors were identified on site. The applicant has proposed setting aside the western most one acre of APN 134-074-022 for the preservation and creation of new wetlands to mitigate the fill of other wetland areas on site. All required Army Corps permits are proposed to be obtained to do this work. To mitigate the wetlands impact for CEQA purposes, the project must be conditioned to set aside the one acre area with a permanent open space easement, and mitigate any wetlands filled by the creation of an equal or greater amount of new wetland area, in addition to obtaining all required federal permits.

8. **ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES** Would the proposal:

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	---	---	----------------------

- | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------------|
| a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____X_____ |
| b) Use non-renewable resources in an inefficient manner? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____X_____ |
| c) Cause a known mineral resource to become unavailable for future use? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____X_____ |
| d) Increase the demand for energy? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____X_____ |

Comment/Mitigation: The project does not involve any significant use of energy resources. Standard permits will be obtained for PG&E hookup.

9. **HAZARDS** Would the proposal involve:

- | | <i>Potentially
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>Potentially
Significant
unless
Mitigated</i> | <i>Less than
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>No
Impact</i> |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|
| a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil pesticides, chemicals or radiation? | _____ | _____X_____ | _____ | _____ |
| b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evaluation plan? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____X_____ |
| c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? | _____ | _____X_____ | _____ | _____ |
| d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____X_____ |
| e) Increased fire hazard in areas with brush, grass, or trees? | _____ | _____ | _____X_____ | _____ |

Comment/Mitigation: While construction of the buildings does not represent a significant hazard, some hazardous materials (fuel, oil, solvents, etc.) will be stored on site for use in repairing and maintaining the buses. It is possible that spills or exposure of employees to these substances could occur. Regulation of these uses is through the County hazardous materials and fire ordinances, and State and Federal laws. A hazardous materials plan meeting all County, State, and Federal requirements must be submitted to the County for its review and approval prior to startup of the use. All requirements of the County, State and Federal Government for hazardous materials handling and storage must continue to be met during the lifetime of the permit. The proposed project is not expected to impact any emergency response plans or expose people to existing health hazards. The risk of increased fire danger to the neighborhood is considered insignificant given the large setback and hard surfaced areas being created which contain no flammable materials.

10. **NOISE** Would the proposal result in:

- | | <i>Potentially
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>Potentially
Significant
unless
Mitigated</i> | <i>Less than
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>No
Impact</i> |
|---|---|---|---|----------------------|
| a) Increases in existing noise levels? | _____ | _____X_____ | _____ | _____ |
| b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____X_____ |
| c) Violate or be inconsistent with Federal, State or local noise standards? | _____ | _____X_____ | _____ | _____ |

Comment/Mitigation: Operation of buses (creating engine, backup beeper and horn noise), and power equipment/tools on the site could generate a significant amount of noise. The adjacent area to the north and west contain a number of residences that could be effected by this noise. Mitigation requires compliance with the General Plan Noise Element standards. In addition, bus operations on APN 134-074-022 which is closest to the residences must be restricted in both hours of operation (6:30am to 6pm Monday through Friday only to prevent nighttime

disturbances of the residences), and in activities allowed. Specific activities which might produce unnecessary noise (such as repair work, refueling, operation of power tools/equipment, and operations requiring regular use of backup beepers or horns) must be prohibited on this parcel. The prevention of through traffic on Juniper Avenue, and routing of buses only on major roads, as discussed in the traffic section of this initial study will also help reduce noise impacts to residences. Exterior noise impacting the site includes potential heavy commercial/light industrial noise from the industrial land to the north/east/south. Since all new commercial/industrial uses are regulated by the General Plan Noise Element, these should not create a significant impact onto the site.

11. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Fire protection?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
b) Police protection?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
c) Schools?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
e) Other government services?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____

Comment/Mitigation: Minor cumulative impact on most government services will occur, including police, fire, and roads to insure the proper function and protection of the facility. Impact fees will be collected to mitigate the overall traffic impacts of the project. Other police, fire, and road access issues will be mitigated through design and construction of the buildings, roads, and security lighting, to meet County safety standards. Conditions of approval must specify obtaining the necessary encroachment permits, building permits, and Design Review of the building layout be obtained/completed. Since the project will be providing a benefit to the public school system, no significant adverse impacts will occur to schools.

12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the proposal cause a need for new or altered utility systems or supplies?

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Power or natural gas?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
b) Communications systems?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
d) Sewer or septic tanks?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
e) Storm water drainage?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
f) Solid waste disposal?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
g) Local or regional water supplies?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____

Comment/Mitigation: The project will require connection to public sewer and water, telephone, and electrical power on APN's 134-072-025 & 048. These parcels are within the South Santa Rosa Urban Boundary area, and provision of service to them is consistent with all adopted County and City of Santa Rosa Plans. Mitigation of potential hookup impacts to the systems requires payment of all standard connection fees, insuring proper installation of all utilities, and obtaining all necessary building, plumbing, sewer, water, mechanical, and electrical permits pursuant to adopted County and City standards. NO public services will be extended to APN 134-074-022, and no uses which require

public services will be allowed on that lot, as it is outside of the South Santa Rosa Urban Boundary designation, and outside of the sewer and water districts.

13. **AESTHETICS** Would the proposal:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	_____	_____	_____	___X___
b) Have a demonstratable negative aesthetic effect?	_____	___X___	_____	_____
c) Create light or glare?	_____	___X___	_____	_____

Comment/Mitigation: The project would be visible from both public roads and the nearby residences to the north and west. The parking of a large number of school buses, and night security lighting for them, could create a potentially adverse visual impact both by day and night. Mitigation of these impacts requires adequate view blocking fencing, perimeter and frontage landscaping, adequate building design, and properly screened night lighting. In addition to requiring these features directly as project conditions, they must also be subject to County Design Review Approval to insure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood and consistency with County standards.

14. **CULTURAL RESOURCES** Would the proposal:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Disturb paleontological resources?	_____	___X___	_____	_____
b) Disturb archaeological resources?	_____	___X___	_____	_____
c) Affect historical resources?	_____	_____	_____	___X___
d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural resources?	_____	_____	_____	___X___
e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	_____	_____	_____	___X___

Comment/Mitigation: Review of the project has found no historic or archaeological sites on the property. However, it is possible buried remains are present. Mitigation requires that if buried remains are found, work be halted and a qualified archaeologist and the Permit and Resource Management Department be consulted.

15. **RECREATION** Would the proposal:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	_____	_____	_____	___X___
b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?	_____	_____	_____	___X___

Comment/Mitigation: The proposed project does not impact existing recreational facilities or the demand for them in any way.

16. **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 pre-history?

_____ _____ X _____

- b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

_____ _____ X _____

- c) 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, other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).

_____ _____ X _____

- d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

_____ _____ X _____

Comment/Mitigation: As identified through this initial study, all of the potential impacts of this project can be mitigated to a less than significant level. No cumulative or long-term impacts have been identified that were not fully mitigated.

17. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

a) Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses 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 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.

Discussion: