

**Appendix A:
Initial City Email Responses to Comments on DEIR**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

From: Linda Ruffing
Sent: Monday, December 24, 2018 2:06 PM
To: isabella.Roman@dtsc.ca.gov
Cc: Kartiganer, Deborah L.; Maya DeRosa; Jason Boaz; Linda Collister; Jason Brandman; Kelsey Bennett; Ian Peterson; Debra Geiler
Subject: Re: North Entry Area Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Attachments: Comstock Quaker Hills ESA 9-1-16 - Text, Figures Photos.pdf; Untitled attachment 00367.htm

Hello Ms. Roman:

I am a consultant working for the City of Healdsburg on the North Entry Area Plan project. The environmental remediation of the former RJW Lumber Company property was performed under the oversight of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) in the early- to mid-1990's with a Closure Letter issued on April 8, 1996. I have attached a Phase 1 Environmental Assessment report that was prepared for the current property owner in 2016. It provides a lengthy summary of reports and remediation activities that have occurred on the site including the following:

- Phase I Environmental Assessment (Hallenbeck & Associates, March 1990)
- Phase II Environmental Assessment (Hallenbeck & Associates, June 1990)
- Hydrologic Investigation (Hallenbeck & Associates, February 1991)
- Soil Remediation and Groundwater Assessment (LOK Environmental, February 1993)
- Disposal of Stockpiled Soils (AIG Consultants, September 1994)

Additional clean-up activities were performed from April through August 2004 under Work Plans submitted to the NCRWQCB prior to the demolition/removal of structures and regrading of the former lumber mill property. These reports were prepared by George Goobanoff Associates (GGA) and include the following:

- Work Plan for Oil separator Removal (GGA, April 2004)
- Work Plan for Structural Demolition and Site Cleanup (GGA, April 2004)
- Work Plan for Removal of Scale and Scale Shack Foundation (GGA, April 2004)
- Work Plan for Former Log Pond Excavation (GGA, April 2004)
- Quaker Hill Site Remediation Report (GGA, December 2004)

Please let me know if you need additional information or I can be of further assistance.

Linda Ruffing
North Coast Community Planning
707.272.2343
linda@nccplanning.com

From: Linda Ruffing
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 12:49 PM
To: Eric.Gage@sonoma-county.org
Cc: Curt Bates; Maya DeRosa; Dalene Whitlock; Cameron Nye; Kelsey Bennett; Ian Peterson; Jason Brandman; Shawn Sumpter
Subject: Re: Healdsburg North Entry Area Plan

Hi Eric- I am a consultant to the City of Healdsburg and help coordinate processing of the North Entry Area Plan and its EIR. I forwarded your question to WTrans (they prepared the traffic model for the DEIR). Here is their response:

It is atypical for folks to go north to go south, and it's actually further than it might seem looking at a map. I can't imagine anyone going to Lytton Springs to go to Santa Rosa; it would be faster and shorter to go south, especially outbound where the trip would include a right turn to Grove and a right turn to Dry Creek Road. Further, the Lytton Springs interchange wasn't included in our study area, so it's more conservative to send trips through the Dry Creek Interchange.

As an aside, and in response to one of the comments from the public, we've evaluated the Lytton Springs interchange before, and it's operating at LOS A/B, so has more than adequate capacity to accommodate trips we did assign there as well as many more, if drivers did decide to use Lytton Springs instead of Dry Creek. We'll address that issue when we respond to comments.

Please let me know if you have additional questions or concerns. Thanks!

Linda Ruffing
North Coast Community Planning
707.272.2343
linda@nccplanning.com

From: Eric Gage <Eric.Gage@sonoma-county.org>
Sent: Monday, December 24, 2018 3:41 PM
To: Maya DeRosa <mderosa@ci.healdsburg.ca.us>
Subject: Healdsburg North Entry Area Plan

Good Afternoon Maya,

I'm in the process of reviewing the draft EIR for the North Entry Area Plan and had a question on the traffic study. It appears that the vast majority of trips to the 101 from the site are directed through the city to the Dry Creek Road onramp, and very few to the Lytton Springs Drive onramp, which is closer and a faster approach. Can Healdsburg staff elaborate on the reasoning for this trip distribution?

Thanks,

Eric Gage

Planner III

Comprehensive Planning

www.PermitSonoma.org

County of Sonoma

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Direct: 707-565-1391 | Office: 707-565-1900

<image001.png><image002.png><image003.png><image008.png>

<image009.jpg>

OFFICE HOURS: Permit Sonoma's public lobby is open Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM, except Wednesdays, open from 10:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

On Dec 11, 2018, at 4:54 PM, Linda Ruffing <linda@nccplanning.com> wrote:

Hi Ron- Maya DeRosa and I have compiled a response to your questions as shown in red type below. I hope you find this to be responsive. I apologize for not getting it to you earlier today as was intended. If you have further questions, please don't hesitate to ask.

Linda Ruffing
North Coast Community Planning
707.272.2343
linda@nccplanning.com

From: Ron Grassi <ronsallygrassi@mac.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 2, 2018 10:05 AM
To: Maya DeRosa <mderosa@ci.healdsburg.ca.us>
Cc: Dan Petrik (forwarding) <dan.petrik@gmail.com>
Subject: North Entry Area Plan

Hello Maya: I had a few preliminary comments about the North Entry Area Plan. The Draft EIR is very general and attractive in nature so it's hard for me to be specific at this point. However, could you address the following:

1. **Population:** What is the added maximum population for this Area legally permissible under the current zoning? I note in one part of the Plan a projection of 290 units is depicted. Is that the max. number of units. And in any case what increase in resident population is possible?

The General Plan sets maximum allowances for development density in the City. On this site the land use designation of MU (Mixed Use) allows for up to 16 units/acre. In our discussions with the Planning Commission about the future development of the site, the recommendation was to allow more residential than what the General Plan alternative analyzed (150 units). Using a generation factor of 2.54 persons per household (American Community Survey 2008-1012 assumption), 290 units could potentially result in up to accommodate approximately 736 residents. If the Plan is adopted with 290 units in the project description, that would become the maximum.

2. **Traffic:** what is the specific projected increase in traffic count? What formula/assumption are you using, like 3 people to each car?

The Table 3.2-4 on page 3.2-19 of the Draft EIR presents the development assumptions, trip generation rates, and traffic counts for future development in the planning area. The total weekday trip generation is estimated at 4,930 trips. Trip generation rates are based on vehicle trips associated with different land uses (as opposed to population). For example, a multi-family residence is assumed to generate 7.32 trips per day.

3. **Evacuation:** in the event of an emergency, what is the plan for this development? and then specifically what is the plan if a fire breaks out at the north end of the North Entry Area? Are we left with say 1,000 people in cars trying to head south on Healdsburg Ave. and competing with the Saggio people, and yes the Parkland Farms people?

Can you please tell me the projected #s for the North Area (600?) and Saggio (500?) and Parkland Farms (800?)? This would be important to all of us in evaluating the current Area Plan. Thank you.

Emergency response plans are as variable as the types of events and disasters requiring emergency response. At present, the City does not have projections of potential congestion related to emergency evacuations in any given area. I am forwarding your question to Healdsburg Fire Chief Jason Boaz and will let you know if he has any additional information to provide.

4. **Carrying capacity:** I realize this partly goes to the Healdsburg general plan, but, that said, has the planning department sat down and looked at all the projects underway both in construction or planning? What I'm getting at: let's say the current population of Healdsburg is 12,000. So, to exaggerate, I assume you and I would agree that if we increased the housing in the future to allow the City to reach a population of 40,000 that you and I would clearly agree that would tax the City's capacity to provide the quality life we currently enjoy in Healdsburg as we know it. So, then we ratchet the 40,000 example down, and say we admit to 25,000 in this exercise. Is that our limit? or is there some other analysis you could share with me? Maya: what is our City's resident limit and how was it determined? (Note: this letter does not attempt to factor in the added tourist population at this time)

The City does not have a resident limit. As you note, the City's General Plan is the policy document that guides and constrains new development in Healdsburg. The General Plan EIR evaluated the potential impacts associated with future development on various facilities and services with finite capacity (i.e., streets, sewer, water, schools, fire, police, etc.). While these metrics don't address "quality of life" they can serve as a proxy. The General Plan EIR is available online at <https://www.ci.healdsburg.ca.us/355/General-Plan-Environmental-Impact-Report>. The "Population and Housing" section provides information that may be helpful to you, though it based on information/projections from 2009 and thus is somewhat outdated.

2010 Census population for Healdsburg was 11,254. Please refer to the City's Housing Element, Table 31, Population Projections (available online at <https://www.ci.healdsburg.ca.us/357/Housing-Element>). Population projections through 2030 were provided by Association of Bay Area Governments. These projections show a 2030 population for Healdsburg of 12,000. The U.S. Census Bureau's "Quick Facts" tool estimates the July 1, 2017 population for Healdsburg at 11,840.

The City will be updating its General Plan in the near future.

5. **A reminder:** I suggested to you in an earlier email, that your department add the # of units to your project Healdsburg map re presently proposed or under construction projects. I can think of several, apart from those in #4 above, that would collectively add several hundred and maybe a 1000 more people using Healdsburg Ave. at the same time in an evacuation. We, the public, need that input (and CEQA expressly requires developers and planning departments to divulge nearby projects because they're quite relevant.).

Thank you for the reminder!

Sincerely

Ron Grassi
Parkland Farms resident.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK