The following corrections and changes are made to the DEIR and incorporated as part of the FEIR. Revised or new language is underlined. Deleted language is indicated by ~~strikethrough~~ text. Text revisions are either the result of a staff-initiated change or in response to a comment received.

Based on text changes made to the Draft EIR, either as a result of staff-initiated changes or in response to comments received, Table S-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures has been revised and is included in its entirely beginning on page 5-2.

The remaining text corrections follow revised Table S-1.

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
AESTHETICS			
Impact AES-1: Affects a Scenic Vista. The project site is bounded on two sides by scenic corridors, US 101 and Mark West Springs Road. However, the proposed medical center facilities would not substantially interrupt or block scenic vistas.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact AES-2: Damages Scenic Resources. There are no trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings or other features on the site that are considered scenic resources. Although US 101 is listed as a Sonoma County scenic corridor, it is not a Designated State Scenic Highway.	NI	No mitigation required	-
Impact AES-3: Permanent Change in Project Site's Visual Quality and Character. The visual quality and character of the northern portion of the site where new medical facilities would be built would change, but the proposed new facilities would be consistent with the character of the WFC and compatible with the character of the surrounding area.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact AES-4: Permanent New Source of Light or Glare. The proposed medical center would require night lighting for operational, security, and safety purposes that would represent a new source of substantial light. Also, the new buildings could be a potential source of daytime glare.	PS	**Mitigation AES-4a: Use lights that prevent light trespass.** The following measures are recommended to control and prevent light trespass: • Lighting plans should be submitted for design review and approval. • The plans should require that free-standing light fixtures ~~use low-pressure sodium lamps or other similar lighting fixture and~~ be installed and shielded in such a manner that all lights are shielded from off-site view and no light rays are emitted from the fixture at angles above the horizontal plane. • Building-mounted lights should be shielded and downcast. • ~~Prohibit the use of high intensity discharge lamps.~~ **Mitigation AES-4b: Use building materials and surfaces that minimize reflected glare.** The following measures are recommended to minimize reflected glare: • Exterior building materials should be composed of at least 50 percent low-reflectance non-polished surfaces. • All bare metallic surfaces should be painted with flat finishes to reduce reflected glare.	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact AES-5: Cumulative Impacts of Hospital Operations on Aesthetics. Continued operation of the proposed project could contribute to a significant cumulative impact on aesthetics.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
AGRICULTURE			
Impact AG-2: Cumulative Agricultural Resources Impacts. Implementation of the proposed project could result in a considerable contribution to significant cumulative agricultural resources impacts.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact AGR-1: Conversion of Farmland to Nonagricultural Uses. A 12-acre section of the project site is designated as Farmland of Local importance, which would be converted to nonagricultural use as a result of the project.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
AIR QUALITY			
Impact AIR-1: Temporary Increase of Criteria Pollutants for Which the Project Region Is Non-Attainment. Haul truck trips bringing fill to the proposed project site could potentially result in a net increase of criteria pollutants (ROG, NOx and PM_{10}) 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)	PS	**Mitigation AIR-1: Reduce Length of Haul Truck Trips, Restrict Idling.** The following measures could reduce emissions associated with haul truck trips to the project site. a) Preference for material to be imported to the site should be given to sources closest to the project site; b) Enforce state idling restrictions that apply to large trucks and construction equipment by posting clearly visible signs at the haul truck entrances that clearly stating the restrictions (no idling for greater than 5 minutes at any location); c) If possible, avoid haul truck trips on days when Spare the Air Days are forecasted by the BAAQMD. Because the source of the fill material and schedule for importing fill has not been determined at this time, the exact effectiveness of these measures is unknown. However, it is known that haul truck trips will be within a 15-mile radius of the project and impacts were calculated based on 15-mile distance from fill source. Fugitive dust control measures associated with the haul truck activities are addressed in Mitigation AIR-2a.	SU

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact AIR-2: Temporary Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Construction Dust and Exhaust Emissions. Fugitive dust and exhaust emissions (from construction equipment and pile driving fuel combustion) during demolition, construction, and grading could expose sensitive receptors to substantial criteria pollutant concentrations.	PS	**Mitigation AIR-2a: Include Measures to Control Dust Emissions.** Implementation of the measures recommended by the BAAQMD and listed below would reduce the air quality impacts associated with grading and new construction to a less than significant level: 1. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to residences should be kept damp at all times. 2. Cover trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard. Dust-proof chutes shall be used to load debris onto trucks during demolition. 3. Pave, apply water at least twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas. 4. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas and sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads. 5. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (i.e., within 10 days for previously-graded areas where final grading has occurred and for other construction areas that have been inactive for 30 days or more). 6. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles. 7. Limit traffic speeds on any unpaved roads to 15 mph. 8. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. 9. Suspend construction activities that cause visible dust plumes to extend beyond the construction site. 10. Limit the area subject to excavation, grading and other construction activity at any one time **Mitigation AIR-2b: Include Measures to Reduce Criteria Pollutant Exhaust From Construction Equipment.** 1. The project shall ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel powered equipment used on the project site do not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		any one hour. Any equipment found to exceed 40 percent opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) shall be repaired immediately. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly throughout the duration of the project construction. A record of the inspection shall be maintained on-site. The BAAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. 2. The contractor shall install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors). 3. Signs shall be posted that indicate diesel-powered equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off or operators would be subject to fines. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate, or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks could keep their engines running continuously as long as they were onsite. 4. Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions. 5. The applicant shall designate a Disturbance Coordinator responsible for ensuring that mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts to nearby residences from construction are properly implemented. The Disturbance Coordinator shall be responsible for notifying adjacent land uses of construction activities and schedule and shall provide a written list of the aforementioned dust control measures. The list shall identify a contact person that will respond to any complaints. A log shall be kept of all complaints and the actions taken to remedy any valid complaint as well as the response period.	
Impact AIR-3: Consistency With Applicable Air Quality Plan. Operation of the new Medical Campus would generate air emissions which could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan	LTS	No mitigation required	-

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact AIR-4: Insignificant Long-Term Increases in Carbon Monoxide Emissions. Carbon monoxide emissions from traffic associated with the operation of the proposed Medical Campus could violate carbon monoxide standards.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact AIR-5: Long-Term Increases in Criteria Pollutant Emissions. Criteria pollutant emissions associated with the operation of the proposed Medical Campus could exceed BAAQMD CEQA significance thresholds, potentially resulting in a significant net increase of NO_x, PM_{10}, or ROG.	PS	**Mitigation AIR-5a: Schedule Generator Testing to Avoid Ozone Exceedances.** Testing of the diesel generators for more than one hour per day shall not occur during the months of May through October, to ensure that these emissions would not contribute to exceedances of State ozone standards in the region. **Mitigation AIR-5b: Ensure Compliance With BAAQMD Rules and Regulations.** Some mechanical equipment (e.g., natural gas fired boiler and diesel emergency generators) used at the hospital would require permits from the BAAQMD. The applicant shall consult with the BAAQMD to ensure compliance with appropriate rules and regulations so that emissions are properly controlled and do not exceed levels reported in this analysis. **Mitigation AIR-5c: Reduce Air Pollutant Emissions on Spare the Air Days.** The hospital administrators shall sign up with the BAAQMD to receive Spare the Air notifications and avoid scheduling generator testing on these days. In addition, Hospital and office building staffs should be informed of the Spare the Air Days so that they may voluntarily reduce emissions through carpooling, using transit or other means.	SU
Impact AIR-6: Insignificant Increases in TAC Emissions. Diesel particulate matter from construction and operation of the project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations that would lead to an increased probability of cancer greater than 10 in one million.	LTS	No mitigation required	–

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact AIR-7: Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The proposed project would result in emissions of greenhouse gases, and would thus contribute to the global inventory of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change	PS	**Mitigation AIR-7: Develop project with the project design features and emissions reduction measures.** The project shall be developed with the project design features and emissions reduction measures set forth in Table ~~1~~9 and 10 of Appendix C-5: 1. Incorporate energy conservation measures, including Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) or equivalent standards in the design and construction of the new campus. Such measures to be incorporated to the extent feasible include passive energy conservation designs, green roof designs, low flow and waterless fixtures, and low impact development practices. Participate in PG&E's Energy by Design program or the equivalent to optimize solar to the extent feasible (see **Section 4.4.2** for more details). 2. Include measures to reduce vehicle trips and encourage transit, such as coordinating with Sonoma County Transit, providing bus stops adjacent to the hospital, providing priority parking for vanpools and carpools, and recharge stations or similar facilities for electric vehicles or other alternate fuel vehicles. Where feasible, use low emission of alternate fuel vehicles in the campus service fleet (see **Section 4.4.2** for more details). 3. Provide sidewalks/pedestrian paths to encourage walking; provide bicycle parking, and develop off peak hour work shifts to the maximum extent feasible 4. Reduce water usage and associated energy demands by maximizing use of on-site water (rainwater or grey water) where appropriate, utilizing high performance fixtures and equipment, and drip irrigation and high efficiency irrigation control on any new landscaping. (The project's wastewater offset program will also reduce water usage). 5. Monitor the efforts of CARB and other state agencies charged with reducing the state's contribution to global climate change and implement any applicable strategies adopted through promulgated regulations.	SU
BIOLOGY			
Impact BIO-1: Temporary Construction Impacts on raptors and other	PS	**Mitigation BIO-1: Survey Trees Within 300 Feet of Project**	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
special status birds. The proposed project may affect special status birds, including nesting raptors, if present on-site when construction begins.		**Site and Impose Buffers to Avoid Impacts to Nests.** A nesting survey for raptors and other special-status bird species shall be conducted prior to commencing with tree removal, grading, or other construction work if this work would occur between February 1 and August 31. Nesting surveys shall include examination of all trees within 300 feet of the project site, regardless of whether they are slated for removal. If a nest is discovered, a buffer zone around the nest tree must be staked with bright orange lath or other suitable staking. If the tree is located off the project site, then the buffer shall be demarcated per above where the buffer occurs on the project site. The size of the buffer will be established by a qualified biologist to reflect the identified raptor or special-status bird species. No tree removal, grading, or other construction work~~construction or earth-moving activity~~ shall occur within the established buffer until it is determined by the qualified biologist that the young have fledged (that is, left the nest) and have attained sufficient flight skills to avoid project construction zones. This typically occurs by July 15 for raptors. This date may be earlier or later, and shall~~would~~ be determined by a qualified biologist. ~~If a qualified biologist is not on site to make observations, the buffers shall be maintained in place through the month of August and work within the buffer can commence September 1.~~	

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact BIO-2: Permanent Loss of Potentially Jurisdictional Features. Project construction would result in the loss of approximately 0.39 acre of jurisdictional wetlands and other waters.	PS	**Mitigation BIO-2a: Avoidance and Minimization of Impacts to Jurisdictional Features.** Waters of the U.S. and state shall be avoided by the project where possible and impacts shall be minimized to the extent practicable through the use of Best Management Practices during construction. These practices shall include installing orange construction fencing to keep workers and equipment out of the area to be preserved, and using erosion control measures, such as straw wattles, hay bails, and drain inlet controls to keep sediment and debris from entering jurisdictional waters. During project construction, a biological monitor will also be on-site to monitor the integrity of preserved wetlands and other waters while major earth moving activities are underway. **Mitigation BIO-2b: Compensatory Mitigation.** Impacts to wetlands or other waters under the regulatory authority of the Corps and RWQCB shall be compensated for at a 2.5:1 ratio (i.e., impacts to 0.026 acre of wetlands or other waters). This shall be accomplished by construction of a 0.067-acre linear drainage ditch on the project site as part of the first phase of project construction. Impacts to isolated wetlands under regulatory authority of the RWQCB (0.364 acre) shall be compensated for at a 2:1 ratio. This shall be accomplished by purchasing 0.8 acre of creation credits at a RWQCB-approved mitigation bank. Mitigation credits shall be purchased prior to breaking ground on the project site. ~~For those wetland areas that are impacted as part of the proposed project, appropriate permits shall be acquired from the Corps and RWQCB prior to any impacts occurring to regulated waters of the U.S. and/or State. Impacted wetland areas shall be compensated for at a 2:1 ratio (i.e., for each square foot of impact, compensation shall consist of 2 square feet of replacement/preservation compensation) via purchase of mitigation credits from a Corps and RWQCB approved wetland conservation bank. As the project will impact 0.39 acre of seasonal wetland, 0.78 acre of mitigation credits shall be purchased from a qualified wetlands conservation bank. Prior to purchasing mitigation credits from a qualified conservation bank, approval from the Corps and RWQCB shall be required. Mitigation credits shall be purchased prior to breaking ground on the project site. Copies of applicable permits from the Corps and~~	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		~~RWQCB shall be provided to Sonoma County prior to grading, and any conditions in these permits shall become a condition of project approval. Any other conditions that are stipulated for wetland impacts by the Corps and/or RWQCB shall also become conditions of project approval. If mitigation compensation is not required by the Corps and/or RWQCB for the proposed project, then this condition of project approval shall be deemed unnecessary.~~ ~~In the event that mitigation credits cannot be secured from a Corps and RWQCB approved wetland conservation bank, compensation wetlands shall be created/enhanced on-site and will resemble those wetlands affected by the project (known as in-kind replacement). If wetlands cannot be created in-kind and on-site, wetland creation/enhancement shall be implemented offsite. Any wetland creation/enhancement plan shall be approved by the Corps and the RWQCB via permit issuance from these agencies for the appropriate jurisdictional features within the purview of these agencies. Mitigation requirements shall include that all impacted wetlands are replaced at a minimum 2:1 ratio (for each square foot of impact, one square foot of wetland would be enhanced/created) or as otherwise specified in permitting conditions imposed by the Corps and/or RWQCB. Thus, since 0.39 acre of seasonal wetland would be impacted, 0.78 acre of created/enhanced wetland would be required to be constructed. Implementation of this mitigation measure shall require that any site where wetlands are created/enhanced would have to be preserved in perpetuity via recordation of a perpetual restrictive deed recorded on the Title of the property. In addition, a five-year monitoring plan shall be implemented by a qualified biologist. At the end of the five-year monitoring period, the Corps and RWQCB shall render a conclusion that the created/enhanced wetlands are successful.~~	
Impact BIO-3: Permanent Loss of Protected Native Trees. The proposed project would remove native trees that are protected under ordinances in the Sonoma County Zoning Regulations.	PS	**Mitigation BIO-3: Plant Replacement Trees or Pay In-Lieu Fee.** The removal of native, protected oak trees shall be mitigated by planting replacement trees or paying an in-lieu fee, per zoning regulations. If replacement planting is the mitigation option chosen, replacement trees shall be the same species as the trees removed.	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		To determine the mitigation ratio for coast live oaks removed, it shall be necessary for the applicant to implement Sonoma County's "arboreal value" methodology, which is a mathematical evaluation of the arboreal component of a site for the purposes of establishing a plan for tree preservation. Under this methodology one of two available methods can be used for determining arboreal values, based on Chart Nos. 1 or 2 in the Sonoma County Tree Ordinance. Chart No. 1 requires analysis be done only in the development areas and requires 100 percent replacement or in-lieu fees. Chart No. 2 requires analysis of the entire site but allows for removal of up to 50 percent of the arboreal value. Compensation for the loss of greater than 50 percent of arboreal value will require replacement by using the chart. Replacement shall include the replanting of coast live oak and valley oaks on the project site in accordance with the arboreal value and Chart No. 2 or by paying the in-lieu fee.	
Impact BIO-4: Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources. The proposed project could contribute to a significant cumulative impact on biological resources.	PS	**Mitigation BIO-4: Implement Mitigation BIO-2a and BIO-2b.** Implement Mitigation BIO-2a and BIO-2b.	LTS
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Impact CUL-1: Permanent Change to a Potentially Historic Resource. The project would demolish a barn at 100 Mark West Springs Road, a potentially historic resource.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact CUL -2: Potential Construction Impacts to Undiscovered Unique Archaeological Resources. Project construction could adversely affect undiscovered unique archaeological resources, if present.	PS	**Mitigation CUL-2: Work Stoppage and Resource Evaluation in the Event of a Subsurface Prehistoric or Historic Resource Find.** If any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to assess the significance of the find according to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5. If any find is determined to be significant, representatives from the county and the archaeologist will meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be, as necessary and at the discretion of the consulting archaeologist, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and documentation according to current professional standards. In considering any suggested mitigation proposed by the	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		consulting archaeologist to mitigate impacts to historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the county will determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) will be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for historical resources or unique archaeological resources is being carried out.	
Impact CUL-3: Potential Construction Impacts to Undiscovered Unique Paleontological Resources. Although site soils have a very low potential to yield paleontological resources, project construction could adversely affect undiscovered unique paleontological resources, if present.	PS	**Mitigation CUL-3: Work Stoppage and Resource Evaluation in the Event of a Paleontological Resources Find.** In the event that fossils or fossil-bearing deposits are discovered during construction, excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted. The contractor shall notify a qualified paleontologist to examine the discovery. The paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed (in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995), evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the project proponent determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the project on the qualities that make the resource important. The plan shall be submitted to PRMD for review and approval prior to implementation.	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact CUL-4: Potential Construction Impacts to Undiscovered Human Remains. Undiscovered human remains could be affected by excavation activities during project construction.	PS	**Mitigation CUL-4: Work Stoppage and Resource Evaluation in the Event Human Remains Are Encountered.** If human skeletal remains are uncovered during project construction, the contractor (depending on the project component) will immediately halt work, contact the Sonoma County coroner to evaluate the remains, and follow the procedures and protocols set forth in Section 15064.5(e)(1) of the *CEQA Guidelines*. If the county coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the project proponent will contact the NAHC, in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, subdivision (c), and Public Resources Code 5097.98 (as amended by AB 2641). Per Public Resources Code 5097.98, the contractor shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located, is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the contractor has discussed and conferred, as prescribed in this section (California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98), with the most likely descendents regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains.	LTS
Impact CUL-5: Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts. Implementation of the proposed project could result in a considerable contribution to significant cumulative cultural resources impacts	LTS	No mitigation required	-
GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
Impact GEO-1: Exposure of People or Structures to Fault Rupture. Damage to proposed project facilities or injury to persons could potentially occur due to fault rupture.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact GEO-2: Exposure of People or Structures to Seismic Ground Shaking. Strong seismic ground shaking is expected to occur at the project site at some time during the design life of the proposed project. Strong seismic ground shaking has the potential to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact GEO-3: Exposure of People or Structures to Seismic-Related Ground Failure. Some soils at the project site would be susceptible to seismic softening if subject to strong earthquake-generated ground shaking.	LTS	No mitigation required	-

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact GEO-4: Exposure of People or Structures Damage Due to Landslides. Damage due to landslides at the project site is considered to be low.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact GEO-5: Soil Erosion. On-site soils may be susceptible to erosion and loss of topsoil depending on drainage paths and hydrology design.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact GEO-6: Differential Settlement. Differential settlement at the project site could result in damage to project buildings or other improvements.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact GEO-7: Expansive Soils. Expansive soils may be encountered during project grading and construction activities. Development on such soils could result in damage to foundations, slabs, or pavements.	PS	**Mitigation GEO-7a:** The contractor shall keep exposed subgrade moist at all times during construction. **Mitigation GEO-7b:** Slabs shall be underlain with 12 inches of select fill consisting of low to non-expansive material. For slabs constructed on native, undisturbed material, the slab-on-grade subgrade shall be excavated to a minimum 12 inch depth below the subgrade level and replaced with select fill. The overexcavated exposed grades shall be scarified to a depth of 12 inches, moisture conditioned to at least 4 percentage points above optimum moisture, and recompacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction. Restore grades in the slab area using low- to non-expansive select engineered fill compacted to 90 percent relative compaction at least 2 percentage points above optimum moisture. Engineered fill shall consist of low- to non-expansive soil having a Plasticity Index less than 12. For interior floor slabs on grade abutting strip footing stemwalls, the edge of the slabs do not require thickening; for all other cases the edges of the slab on grade should be increased by 2-inches greater than slab section. **Mitigation GEO-7c:** The Structural Engineer shall provide final design thickness and additional reinforcement, if necessary, for the intended structural loads. As a minimum requirement, reinforce slabs-on-grade to control cracking. Provide frequent control joints to reduce the cracking. Provide a thickened edge extending at least 6 inches into compacted soil to minimize water infiltration. Place a 4-inch-thick layer of clean crushed rock or gravel, which conforms to the requirement listed in Section 2.04 of Part I of the Guide Contract Specifications, under all secondary concrete slabs. Slope slabs away from the buildings at a slope of at least 2 percent to prevent water from flowing toward the building.	LTS
Impact GEO-8: Fills. Fill material may be encountered during project	PS	**Mitigation GEO-8:** All undocumented fills within proposed	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
grading and construction activities. Development on such soils could result in damage to foundations, slabs, or pavements.		building footprint shall be removed and replaced with properly compacted engineered fill.	
Impact GEO-9: Cumulative Impacts Related to Geology and Soils. Construction and operation of the proposed project could result in a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to geology and soils.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
Impact HAZ-1: Temporary Risk of Exposure to Hazardous Materials During Construction. Excavation of soils and construction of project features could potentially cause health hazards to construction workers, the public, and the environment should hazardous materials be encountered or released.	PS	**Mitigation HAZ-1a: Dispose Existing On-site Hazardous Materials Before Construction.** Prior to construction, hazardous materials such as paint and solvents no longer in use at the site and empty containers for paint and chlorine shall be properly disposed. Batteries shall be disposed in accordance with regulatory requirements. **Mitigation HAZ-1b: Implement Health and Safety Plan.** A health and safety plan shall be used to protect the general public and all workers in the construction area. The plan shall describe the practices and procedures to protect worker health in the event of an accidental release of hazardous materials (for example, fuels or solvents during construction) or if previously undiscovered hazardous materials are encountered during construction. The plan shall include items such as spill prevention, cleanup and evacuation procedures. The plan will help protect the public and workers by providing procedures and contingencies that will help reduce the exposure to hazardous materials. **Mitigation HAZ-1c: Evaluate Structures for Potential Presence of Asbestos and Lead.** Existing structures shall be evaluated for the presence of ACBM and lead-based paints prior to their renovation or demolition. The evaluation shall be conducted by a Cal-OSHA certified ACBM and lead-based paint contractor. Any ACBM or lead identified as a result of the evaluation shall be removed by a Cal-OSHA certified ACBM and lead-based paint contractor and be transported and disposed off-site in accordance with regulatory requirements. **Mitigation HAZ-1d: Remove and Backfill Septic Systems and Leach Fields.** Septic systems and related leach fields located	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		within the proposed project site shall be removed in accordance with Sonoma County permitting requirements. **Mitigation HAZ-1e: Inspect, Test, and Remove Potentially Contaminated Soil and Groundwater.** During excavation at all construction areas, the contractor shall inspect the exposed soil for visual evidence of contamination, particularly near the areas identified during site reconnaissance. If contamination indicators (e.g., obvious soil staining, odors, etc.) are encountered during excavation or grading activities, all work shall stop and an investigation shall be designed and performed to verify the presence and extent of contamination at the site. Results shall be reviewed and approved by the County's Environmental Health Division or DTSC before construction. The investigation could include collecting samples for laboratory analysis and quantifying contaminant levels within the proposed excavation and surface disturbance areas. Subsurface investigation will determine the appropriate worker protection and the hazardous material handling and disposal procedures. Areas with soil and groundwater determined to be hazardous waste shall be removed by personnel who have been trained through the OSHA-recommended 40-hour safety program (29 CFR 1910.120) with an approved plan for groundwater extraction, soil excavation, control of contaminant releases to the air, and off-site transport or on-site treatment. **Mitigation HAZ-1f: Implement Measures in SWPPP for Accidental Spill Containment and Cleanup.** A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared and implemented as discussed in Section 3.9. This plan will describe practices and procedures for spill containment and cleanup. The practices developed for the SWPPP will help protect water and soils from hazardous materials spills during construction.	

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact HAZ-2: Exposure to Hazardous Materials Through Routine Transport, Use, and Storage. Operation of the Medical Campus would involve the routine transport, use, and storage of small quantities of hazardous materials. Materials classified as hazardous include chemicals that are used routinely at medical facilities as well as building maintenance materials such as paint and solvents. Exposure to these materials could affect safety and health.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact HAZ-3: Potential for Spills of Hazardous Materials During Operations. Medical Campus operations could potentially result in upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Exposure to these materials could affect safety and health.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact HAZ-4: Handling of Hazardous Materials Within 0.25 Mile of a School. Operation of the Sutter Medical Center would involve handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact HAZ-5: Helicopter Operations. The proposed project includes development and operation of a helistop, the operation of which could pose a safety hazard to people living, working and traveling in the area.	~~P~~LTS	No mitigation required ~~**Mitigation HAZ-5: Install lighting on Power Poles Crossing US 101 at the Project Sites.** Lighting shall be placed on the power poles crossing US 101 at the project site in a manner that will make the poles readily visible from the air by helicopter pilots at night and in such a manner as to not distract drivers on US 101.~~	- ~~LTS~~
Impact HAZ-6: Cumulative Impacts from Operational Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The operation of the proposed project in conjunction with past, current, and probable future projects in the area would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to medical helicopter operations or the transport, handling, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials in the area.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
Impact HY-1: Temporary Water Quality Effects. Project construction has the potential to increase the amount of urban pollutants and sediment in storm water runoff and to degrade runoff water quality.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact HY-2: Permanent Water Quality Effects. Project operation has the potential to increase the amount of urban pollutants in storm water runoff and to degrade runoff water quality.	LTS	No mitigation required	-

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact HY-3: Permanent Effects on Groundwater Supplies. The proposed project could deplete groundwater supplies through pumping of groundwater and interfere with groundwater recharge. Operation of the two proposed wells could create a net deficit in aquifer volume or lower the local groundwater table level.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact HY-4: Permanent Alteration of Drainage Patterns and Potential Increase In Siltation or Erosion. Project development would alter drainage patterns in the project area and could increase the rate or amount of surface runoff such that substantial siltation or erosion would occur on- or off-site.	PS	**Mitigation Measure HY-4:** The following measures will ensure that increased runoff associated with increased impervious area will result in a less-than-significant impact with regard to siltation or erosion: • Detention basins shall be used in conjunction with source- and treatment-control BMPs to maximize infiltration to the greatest extent possible and prevent increases in peak runoff from the 2-year storm. • Landscaping shall be designed and maintained to prevent runoff from contacting bare soil~~, and silt fences, berms, or sediment control basins shall be installed~~.	LTS
Impact HY-5: Permanent Alteration of Drainage Patterns and Potential Increase in Flooding. Project development would alter drainage patterns in the project area and increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, which could exceed the capacity of storm water drainage systems and result in significant flooding on- or off-site.	PS	**Mitigation HY-5: Prevent Increase in 10-Year Peak Flows.** The proposed project shall modify drainage patterns or detention of runoff such that post-development peak flows in a 10-year storm will not exceed the pre-development 10-year peak flows at the point where runoff leaves the project site.	LTS
Impact HY-6: Cumulative Impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality. Construction and operation of the proposed project could result in a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to hydrology and water quality.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
Impact LU-1: Conflict with an established land use plan, policy, or regulation. Potential inconsistencies with General Plan adopted land use designations, and the proposed amendment to include the project site within the Larkfield-Wikiup Urban Service Boundary established in the County General Plan. As part of the project, this boundary would be relocated to include the project site and maintain consistency with adopted land use plans and policies.	LTS	No mitigation required	-

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact LU-2: Cumulative land use and planning impacts. In general, development consistent with the County General Plan would result in an increase in developed land uses in the County. As stated in the Sonoma County General Plan 2020 EIR, this development would result in significant cumulative land use impacts due to the intensification of land use conflicts. Although the proposed project is consistent with County land use plans and policies, the proposed project would result in a cumulative considerable impact because it would contribute to the significant cumulative impact of increased developed land uses in the County that, while consistent with the County General Plan, could result in increased land use conflicts.	PS	**Mitigation LU-2:** To mitigate the significant impact of intensified land use conflicts as a result of the proposed project, the mitigation measures described in the following sections would be implemented: • Section 4.2 Aesthetics • Section 4.4 Air Quality • Section 4.5 Biological Resources • Section 4.6 Cultural Resources • Section 4.7 Geology and Soils • Section 4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials • Section 4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality • Section 4.10 Land Use and Planning • Section 4.11 Noise • Section 4.13 Public Services • Section 4.15 Traffic • Section 4.16 Utilities and Service Systems	LTS
NOISE			
Impact NOI-1a: Noise From Construction Activities (No Pile Driving) Would Impact Adjacent Noise Sensitive Land Uses. Construction on the site will temporarily increase noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive receptors.	PS	**Mitigation NOI-1a: Use Temporary Noise Barriers and Limit Hours of Construction.** The following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce noise generated by construction: • Construct temporary noise barriers with a minimum height of 8 feet, such as a solid plywood construction barrier or earthen berm, between the construction activity and residences within 630 feet before site grading and earthwork begins. Openings for site access between the project site and adjacent residential land uses during these phases of construction must be minimized. Noise barriers may be removed once all ground level work is complete and upper floor construction is underway. • Limit significant noise-generating construction activities, including truck traffic coming to and from the site for any purpose, to daytime, Monday through Saturday, non-holiday hours (7:00 AM to 6:00 PM). • Properly muffle and maintain all construction equipment	Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		powered by internal combustion engines. • Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines by limiting idling to 5 minutes, per State idling restrictions. • Locate all stationary noise-generating construction equipment, such as air compressors, as far as practical from existing nearby residences and other noise-sensitive land uses. Acoustically shield such equipment by using piles of aggregate, project trailers, other non-noise generating equipment, or with temporary portable noise barriers. • Select quiet construction equipment, particularly air compressors, whenever possible. Fit motorized equipment with proper mufflers in good working order. Designate a "construction noise disturbance coordinator" to be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and would require that reasonable measures to correct the problem be implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule. (The project sponsor should be responsible for designating a construction noise disturbance coordinator and posting the phone number and providing construction schedule notices).	
Impact NOI-1b: Noise From Construction Activities (With Pile Driving) Would Impact Adjacent Noise Sensitive Land Uses. Construction on the site could involve pile driving and will temporarily increase noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive receptors.	PS	**Mitigation NOI-1b: Use Temporary Noise Barriers and Limit Hours of Construction.** While construction using pile driving is not anticipated, the following mitigation measures are provided should OSHPD disallow the use of surcharge: • Where feasible based on a consideration of geotechnical conditions and structural requirements, implement “quiet” pile driving technology (using the drill and cast-in-place method). • Erect temporary plywood noise barriers or noise control blankets around pile driving rigs to reduce noise emissions from the site and shield adjacent uses.	SU
Impact NOI-2: Exposure of the Hospital to Highway Noise Levels That Exceed County Exterior and Interior Noise Standards. The entire project	PS	**Mitigation NOI-2a: Shield Exterior by Modifying Site Layout or Incorporating Noise Barriers.** Use building massing to	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
site is exposed to highway noise at levels exceeding 60 dBA L_{dn}, the Sonoma County threshold of acceptability for noise-sensitive development. Noise levels at the proposed hospital could exceed the county's exterior and interior noise limits.		shield outdoor activity areas from traffic noise. Outdoor activity areas shall be developed within the acoustically sheltered portions of the site to the extent feasible. If all of the common outdoor areas cannot be shielded with proposed buildings, noise barriers shall be incorporated into the design to ensure the common areas are properly mitigated from existing traffic noise to less than 60 dBA $L_{dn.}$ **Mitigation NOI-2b: Incorporate Sound Insulation Treatments and Building Upgrades to Reduce Interior Noise Levels.** Incorporate sound insulation treatments and building upgrades into the buildings so as to achieve an interior L_{dn} of 45 dBA or less with windows closed. Such treatments may include, but would not be limited to, acoustically rated windows and doors, acoustical caulking at all exterior wall penetrations, and noise control treatments for all air transmission paths associated with mechanical ventilation systems. An acoustical analysis of the project's design and the preparation of a report detailing the necessary noise mitigation features shall be completed during the project design and incorporated into the building plans and submitted to PRMD.	
Impact NOI-3: Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Receptors to Mechanical Noise Levels That Exceed County Standards. Mechanical equipment on the roofs of the proposed structures or in the Central Utility Plant could produce noise levels in excess of Sonoma County's noise standard applicable to on-site mechanical noise.	PS	**Mitigation NOI-3: Perform Acoustical Design Review.** During the design phase of the mechanical equipment for the proposed project, an acoustical consultant shall review the final design of the Central Utility Plant facility as well as the placement of any auxiliary outdoor mechanical equipment, such as roof top ventilation fans. The acoustical consultant shall determine that sufficient noise mitigation, such as noise barriers around the equipment, is incorporated into the project design to ensure that noise from all mechanical equipment is limited to 45 dBA or less at the noise sensitive receptors. The acoustical consultant's evaluation shall be submitted to PRMD.	LTS
Impact NOI-4: Intermittent Increase in Ambient Noise and Exceedance of County Standards From Parking and On-Site Circulation. On-site parking and circulation of motor vehicles could intermittently increase ambient noise levels and could potentially exceed the Sonoma County General Plan **Table NE-2** noise standards at the noise sensitive land uses adjacent to the parking lot.	PS	**Mitigation NOI-4: Provide a Noise Barrier to Shield Residences Adjacent to Parking Area.** Construct a solid 6-foot-high noise barrier on the project side of the eastern property line where parking areas are adjacent to residential properties. The location of the noise barrier is shown in Figure 3.11-5. In order to be effective, the barrier must be constructed airtight over its face and at the base and have a minimum surface weight of 3.5 pounds	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		per square foot. Suitable materials include wood, pre-cast masonry or pre-cast concrete panels. A 6-foot high noise barrier would provide 7-8 dB of reduction from these types of noises.	
Impact NOI-5: Exposure of Sensitive Off-Site Receptors to Intermittent Noise from Helicopter Operations. Some residential areas near the project site would be exposed to an SEL in excess of 90 dBA during helicopter operations, which represents an intermittent but substantial increase over the ambient noise that could disturb a number of occupants.	PS	**Mitigation NOI-5a: Adopt Preferential Approach and Departure Profiles.** Adopt preferential directional approach and departure profiles. According to the analysis, the SEL levels will be greater when the helicopters are approaching from the north and departing to the south. Recommend to helicopter pilots that anytime the conditions are favorable all approaches shall be made from the south with subsequent departures made to the north. This will help reduce the SEL levels and the potential for sleep disturbance to the residences to the north of the project site. **Mitigation NOI-5b: Implement Monitoring and Adaptive Management.** A program of monitoring helicopter operations and designating a community noise disturbance coordinator shall be implemented to address noise annoyance in nearby residential areas. As a part of these measures, helicopter ambulance companies and pilots shall be informed by hospital staff of approved flight paths to and from the hospital helistop to avoid or reduce short-term noise exposures to noise sensitive areas. Sutter shall maintain a helistop log that includes arrival and departure times, the approach route taken, and explanation of any flight path deviation from the designated flight paths. A noise disturbance coordinator shall be identified at Sutter who would record citizen complaints and review the helistop log to determine the source of the noise disturbance. Communicate any helicopter noise complaints to the pilots and request they modify their flight approach whenever possible.	SU

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact NOI-6: Exposure of Sensitive On-Site Receptors to Intermittent Noise from Helicopter Operations. The majority of the project site would be exposed to an SEL in excess of 90 dBA during helicopter operations, an intermittent but substantial increase in ambient noise that could disturb hospital patients and others at the project site.	PS	**Mitigation NOI-6: Conduct Acoustical Analysis and Incorporate Findings into Project Design.** Noise mitigation features such as window sound insulation or upgraded wall assemblies shall be incorporated into the project design. To determine the specific features required to reduce these adverse noise effects, an acoustical analysis of the project design shall be conducted that details the necessary noise mitigation features required for patient rooms and other sensitive hospital use areas to meet an interior SEL of 65 dBA and/or maximum noise level (L_{max}) of 55 dBA during helicopter operations. The findings of this acoustical analysis shall be incorporated into the design of the hospital.	LTS
Impact NOI-7: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Intermittent Noise from Ambulance Operations. Ambulance and emergency vehicle noise will occur in the vicinity of the project site as a result of the project.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact NOI-8: Cumulative Noise Impacts. Project operation noise from traffic, helicopters, and mechanical equipment, when added to other existing noise in the project vicinity may be cumulatively considerable.	PS	**Mitigation NOI-8:** Implement Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-6.	SU
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
Impact PH-1: Indirect Growth Inducement. Implementation of the proposed project could indirectly induce growth in the area.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact PH-2: Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts. Implementation of the proposed project could result in a considerable contribution to significant cumulative population and housing impacts.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
PUBLIC SERVICES			
Impact PS-1: Need for Additional Fire Protection Services. Implementation of the proposed project may result in the need for additional fire protection services.	PS	**Mitigation PS-1: Determine Need for and Provide for Additional Firefighting Services.** The project shall be reviewed and approved by Sonoma County and state firefighting agencies to determine the appropriate equipment, personnel needs, and training required to fight specialized fires. Mitigation shall include but not be limited to[1]: 1. Fitting any new structures with sprinklers;	LTS

[1] Jack Rosevear, Rincon Valley Fire Department 2009

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		2. Training for specialized (helistop) firefighting underwritten by the hospital.	
Impact PS-2: Need for Additional Police Protection Services. Implementation of the proposed project could result in the need for additional police protection services.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact PS-3: Need for Additional Schools. Implementation of the proposed project could result in the need for additional schools.	NI	No mitigation required	-
Impact PS-4: Cumulative Impacts from additional Public Service Demands. The continued operation of the proposed project could result in a significant increase in the demand for public services and the need for new facilities to serve that need.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
RECREATION			
Impact REC-1: Construction of Recreational Facilities That Might Have an Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment. The project would relocate existing athletic fields and a playground at the WFC and construct passive recreation facilities at the Medical Campus. Relocation of the WFC facilities could have temporary minor impacts on recreationists during construction.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact REC-2: Cumulative Recreation Impacts. Implementation of the proposed project could result in a considerable contribution to significant cumulative recreation impacts.	LTS	No mitigation required	-

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC			
Impact TR-1: Year 2014 Intersection Level of Service. Project traffic would adversely affect the level of service at several intersections in 2014.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-1: Intersection Improvements.** Prior to occupancy, the project applicant shall: **A.** Construct/implement the following: • Mark West Springs Road/Lavell Road • Prohibit left turns from Lavell Road to eastbound Mark West Springs Road. (Alternative access is available to the neighborhood served by Lavell Road (i.e. to Old Redwood Highway) in order to allow access to eastbound Mark West Springs Road.) **B.** Enter into an agreement with the County to provide a fair share contribution to the following improvements (see **Figure 3.15-15**), when and if these improvements are programmed and funded for construction: **River Road/Fulton Road** • One additional through lane on the north and southbound Fulton Road intersection approaches. **River Road/Barnes Road** • Signalize the intersection and interconnect with operation of the planned signal at the River Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps intersection. Separate right and left turn lanes on the Barnes Road intersection approach	SU
Impact TR-2: Year 2014 Signalization Needs. The unsignalized River Road/Barnes Road intersection would experience a significant impact in 2014 based upon peak hour signal warrant evaluation.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-2: Intersection Signalization.** Prior to occupancy, the project applicant shall enter into an agreement with the County to provide a fair share contribution to the following improvements when and if they are programmed and funded for construction: • Signalize the **River Road/Barnes Road** intersection and interconnect with operation of the planned signal at the River Road/U.S.101 Southbound Ramps intersection.	SU

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact TR-3: Year 2014 95th Percentile Vehicle Queuing. Numerous intersections would experience significant impacts to 95th percentile queuing due to the addition of project traffic.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-3: Intersection Improvements for 95th Percentile Vehicle Queuing.** Prior to occupancy, the project applicant shall: **A.** Construct/implement the following (see **Figure 3.15-15**): **River Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps** • ~~Change signal timing.~~ Work with Caltrans to achieve optimal signal timing relative to the proposed improvements. **Mark West Springs Road/Old Redwood Highway** • Provide~~Add~~ second left turn lanes on the Old Redwood Highway north~~ and south~~bound approaches. The length of the left turn lanes shall be limited to that distance which can be feasibly constructed within the existing right of way. ~~If it is determined after field investigation that the left turn lanes cannot be feasibly constructed within exiting right of way, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.~~ • Add a second left turn lane on the Mark West Springs Road westbound approach. • Adjust signal timing. • Provide additional length to the following turn lanes: Old Redwood Highway Southbound Right Turn Lane: Lengthen from 100 feet to the maximum length available within the existing right of way (approximately 180 feet)~~at least 250 feet.~~ Mark West Springs Road Westbound Right Turn Lane: Lengthen from 50 feet to at least 175 feet. **Mark West Springs Road/Lavell Road** • Prohibit left turns from the southbound Lavell Road approach (see Mitigation Measure TR-1). **B.** Enter into an agreement with the County to provide a fair share contribution to the following improvements when and if they are programmed and funded for construction: **River Road/Fulton Road** • Provide one additional through lane on the north and southbound Fulton Road intersection approaches (same as Mitigation Measure TR-1). North and southbound right	SU

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		turns will be made from the new through lanes. In conjunction with this measure, provide second departure lanes on the north and southbound intersection legs, which will then merge to single travel lanes north and south of the intersection. • Provide a second left turn lane on the westbound River Road approach. • Provide additional length to the following turn lane: Fulton Road Southbound Left Turn Lane: Lengthen from 75 feet up to at least 175 feet. **Mark West Springs Road/Old Redwood Highway** Old Redwood Highway Northbound Right Turn Lane: Lengthen from 50 feet up to at least 175 feet	
Impact TR-4: Year 2014 Arterial Operation. No arterial segments would experience significant impacts.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact TR-5: Year 2014 Freeway Operation. Two freeway segments would experience significant impacts in 2014 due to project traffic.	PS	There are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce this impact.	SU
Impact TR-6: Year 2035 Intersection Level of Service. Several intersections would experience level of service impacts due to the addition of project traffic.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-6: Various Road and Signalization Improvements.** Prior to occupancy, the project applicant shall: **A.** Construct/implement the following (see **Figure 3.15-16**): **Mark West Springs Road/Lavell Road** • Prohibit left turns from Lavell Road to eastbound Mark West Springs Road. (This measure has been recommended for mitigation of 2014 impacts [see TR-1].) **Mark West Springs Road/Old Redwood Highway** • Provide second left turn lane~~s~~ on the Old Redwood Highway north~~ and south~~bound approach~~es~~ as well as the Mark West Springs Road westbound approach. Extend the length of the left turn lane on the Old Redwood Highway southbound approach to approximately 255 feet, which may (at the discretion of the DTPW) include approximately 210 feet in a dedicated left turn lane, and an additional 45 feet (or more) in the adjoining north two way left turn lane. The length of the left turn lane shall be limited to that distance which can be feasibly constructed within the existing right of way. • Provide overlap right turn phasing on all intersection	SU

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		approaches. ~~**East Fulton Road/Old Redwood Highway**~~ • ~~Provide a second lane on the eastbound E. Fulton Road approach.~~ **B.** Enter into an agreement with the County to provide a fair share contribution to the following improvements when and if they are programmed and funded for construction: **River Road/Barnes Road** • Signalize the intersection and interconnect with operation of the planned signal at the River Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps intersection. (This measure has been recommended for 2014 impacts [see TR-2].) • Provide separate right and left turn lanes on the Barnes Road intersection approach.	
Impact TR-7: Year 2035 Signalization Needs. The unsignalized River Road/Barnes Road intersection would experience a significant impact based upon peak hour signal warrant evaluation.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-7: Intersection Improvements at River Road/Barnes Road.** Enter into an agreement with the County to provide a fair share contribution to the following improvement when and if it is programmed and funded for construction: **River Road/Barnes Road** • Signalize the intersection and interconnect with operation of the planned signal at the River Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps intersection.	SU
Impact TR-8: Year 2035 95th Percentile Vehicle Queuing. Numerous intersections would experience significant impacts to 95th percentile queuing due to the addition of project traffic.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-8: Intersection Improvements for 95th Percentile Vehicle Queuing.** Prior to occupancy, the project applicant shall: **A.** Construct/implement the following (see **Figure 3.15-16**): • River Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps • ~~Change signal timing.~~ Work with Caltrans to achieve optimal signal timing relative to the proposed improvements. **Mark West Springs Road/Old Redwood Highway** • Add dual left turn lanes to the north~~, south~~ and westbound intersection approaches. Extend the length of the left turn lane on the Old Redwood Highway southbound approach to	SU

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		approximately 255 feet, which may (at the discretion of the DTPW) include approximately 210 feet in a dedicated left turn lane, and an additional 45 feet (or more) in the adjoining north two wat left turn lane. • Adjust signal timing. • Provide overlap right turn phasing on all intersection approaches. • Provide additional length to the following turn lanes: Old Redwood Highway Northbound Left Turn ~~Lanes~~: ~~Lengthen~~Add second turn lane and lengthen from 200 feet to create a combined storage length of approximately ~~at least~~ 350 feet. Old Redwood Highway Northbound Right Turn ~~Lane~~: Lengthen from 50 feet to approximately 170 feet ~~at least 275 feet~~. Mark West Springs Road Westbound Left Turn ~~Lane~~: ~~Lengthen~~Add second turn lane and lengthen from 225 feet to create a combined storage length of approximately ~~at least~~ 300 feet. Mark West Springs Road Westbound Right Turn ~~Lane~~: Lengthen from 50 feet to approximately 100 ~~at least 250~~ feet. **Mark West Springs Road/Project Main Entry** • Adjust signal timing. • ~~Mark West Springs Road Eastbound Through Movement: 768 feet/lane with 860 feet of storage~~ **Mark West Springs Road/Lavell Road** • Prohibit left turns from the Lavell Road stop sign controlled approach. Alternative access is available to the neighborhood served by Lavell Road (i.e., to Old Redwood Highway) in order to allow access to eastbound Mark West Springs Road. • B. Enter into an agreement with the County to provide a fair share contribution to the following improvements when and if they are programmed and funded for construction:	

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		• River Road/Fulton Road • Provide second left turn lanes on the westbound River Road approach and on the southbound Fulton Road approach. • Adjust signal timing. • Provide additional lengths to the following turn lanes: River Road Westbound Dual Left Turn Lanes: Lengthen from 150 feet up to at least 375 feet. Fulton Road Southbound Dual Left Turn Lanes: Lengthen from 75 feet up to at least 175 feet	
Impact TR-9: Year 2035 Arterial Operation. No arterial segments would experience significant impacts.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact TR-10: Year 2035 Freeway Operation. Two freeway segments would experience significant impacts in 2035 due to project traffic.	PS	There are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce this impact.	SU
Impact TR-11: Parking Impacts. The proposed Sutter project could result in an inadequate supply of parking for the proposed uses. However, the shared use parking plan between Sutter and Wells Fargo Center would provide overflow parking areas immediately adjacent to the project site.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact TR-12: Pedestrian Impacts. Increased pedestrian activity to and from the proposed medical center could present safety concerns for pedestrians.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-12: Traffic Calming Measures and Sidewalk along West Side of Main Entry Drive + Continuous Pathway Along Old Redwood Highway.** Prior to occupancy, the applicant shall provide the following measures: • Provide traffic calming measures, such as speed tables or landscaped chokers within the parking aisles north of the hospital main entry to significantly reduce vehicle speeds at the pedestrian walkway. Highlight the walkway with signing and different pavement surface. • Provide a sidewalk ~~along the entire length of the west side of the project main entry driveway~~ from Mark West Springs Road to all public Sutter Medical Campus building entrances. The exact location shall be as determined by the Design Review Committee. • ~~Prior to occupancy, the applicant shall obtain the necessary right of way and c~~ Construct a 4' wide ~~sidewalk/~~pedestrian pathway on the east side of Old Redwood Highway, north of Mark West Springs Road, on the western edge of Assessors parcels 058-071-015, 016, and 017 within existing right of	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		way. If final engineering demonstrates there is insufficient right of way to construct a 4' wide pathway, then the applicant ~~is unable to~~ shall obtain the necessary right of way~~, then the applicant~~ or provide adequate funding to the County to obtain it.	
Impact TR-13: Bicycle Impacts. The site layout is adequate to accommodate bicycle riders.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact TR-14: Transit Impacts. Potential inadequacy of public transit availability to the project site.	LTS	No mitigation required	-

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact TR-15: Construction Traffic Impacts. Truck traffic associated with project construction could cause significant traffic safety impacts as trucks attempt to turn from the site to Mark West Springs Road. In addition, construction worker traffic could cause significant traffic safety impacts (during peak outbound flow periods) as workers attempt to turn from the site to Mark West Springs Road.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-15: Develop Traffic Management Plan and Provide all Roadway Widening along Mark West Springs Road and a Signalized Mark West Springs Road/WFC Main Entry Intersection Before Occupancy of Phase II.** • Phase I Fill Importation Prior to grading permit issuance, the applicant shall develop and obtain County approval of a construction traffic management plan. Assuming all fill truck access at the project site is to/from the west, flag people shall be employed to control truck access at the Mark West Springs Road/WFC main driveway intersection (for outbound left turns). During peak traffic periods, outbound truck movements shall only be allowed every 8 to 10 minutes so as to minimize disruption to the traffic flow along Mark West Springs Road. Use of the flag people will eliminate the need for outbound trucks to turn right from the site and travel through the community on Old Redwood Highway as well as other roads. • Phase II Prior to occupancy of Phase II, the applicant shall provide all roadway widening along the US 101 northbound off-ramp, Mark West Springs Road and a signalized Mark West Springs Road/WFC main entry intersection. Also, the applicant shall provide a flag person to control egress from the project site at all times during Phase II construction when more than 20 vehicles per hour (non trucks) are expected to be exiting the site or when more than 2 trucks per hour would be expected to be exiting the site.	LTS
Year 2014 Off-Site Impacts with Phase III Development			
Impact TR-16: Year 2014 Intersection Level of Service. Project traffic would adversely affect the level of service at several intersections. These would be the same intersections and for the same movements as with project Phase II traffic.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-16: Intersection Improvements.** Prior to occupancy the project applicant shall: Implement Mitigation Measure TR-1 (i.e., the same measures as with Phase II development).	SU

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact TR-17: Year 2014 Signalization Needs. The unsignalized River Road/Barnes Road intersection would experience a significant impact in 2014 based upon peak hour signal warrant evaluation.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-17: Intersection Signalization.** Prior to occupancy, the project applicant shall enter into an agreement with the County to provide a fair share contribution to the following improvements when and if they are programmed and funded for construction: Implement Mitigation Measure TR-2 for River Road/Barnes Road	SU
Impact TR-18: Year 2014 95th Percentile Vehicle Queuing. Numerous intersections would experience significant impacts to 95th percentile queuing due to the addition of project traffic.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-18: Intersection Improvements for 95th Percentile Vehicle Queuing.** Prior to occupancy, the project applicant shall: Implement Mitigation Measure TR-3 (**see Figure 3.15-20**).	SU
Impact TR-19: Year 2014 Arterial Operation. No arterial segments would experience significant impacts.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact TR-20: Year 2014 Freeway Operation. Two freeway segments would experience significant impacts in 2014 due to project traffic.	PS	There are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce this impact	SU
Impact TR-21: Cumulative Traffic and Transportation Impacts. Implementation of the proposed project could result in a considerable contribution to significant cumulative traffic and transportation impacts.	PS	**Mitigation Measure TR-21: Implement Mitigation Measures TR-6 through TR-8 and TR-16 through TR-18.** Implement Mitigation Measures TR-1 through TR-3, TR-6 through TR-8, and TR-16 through TR-18.	SU
UTILTIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
Impact UT-1: Require New or Expanded Water Supplies. The proposed project could require new or expanded entitlements of water supplies to serve the project.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact UT-2: Require Construction of New Water Treatment Facilities. The proposed project would require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	PS	**Mitigation UT-2: Implement Mitigation HY-4, AIR-1, AIR-2a, and AIR-2b. Mitigation UT-2:** Implement Mitigation HY-4, AIR-1, AIR-2a, and AIR-2b	LTS
Impact UT-3: Require Construction of New Stormwater Drainage Facilities. The proposed project would require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	PS	**Mitigation UT-3: Implement Mitigation HY-4, AIR-2a, and AIR-2b.** Implement Mitigation Measures HY-4, AIR-2a, and AIR-2b to prevent increases in stormwater runoff and minimize air quality impacts during construction.	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Impact UT-4: Result in Inadequate Wastewater Treatment Capacity. Project implementation could result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	PS	**Mitigation UT-4a: Retrofit the WFC with Low Flow Toilets and Other Indoor Water Conserving Devices.** Indoor plumbing fixture retrofit and replacements shall be implemented at the WFC to the maximum extent practicable to reduce its wastewater generation. At a minimum, the following measures will be implemented: 1. Install low flow toilets (1.6 gallons average per flush). 2. Install 1.0 gallons per flush urinals. 3. Retrofit lavatory faucets with 1.5 gpm flow moderators. A report shall be prepared by Sutter Hospital before an occupancy permit is granted that describes the retrofit of the WFC and compares the pre- and post-retrofit water usage to provide an accounting of the reduction in wastewater generation. The report will include the number of participants in the retrofit program that is funded by Sutter up to that point and the number required to offset the waste generation from the WFC. If there are insufficient participants in the program to offset the wastewater generated by the WFC, a program to increase participation shall be proposed by Sutter and implemented immediately upon approval by the County and SCWA. The WFC will not be connected to the Sanitation Zone collection system until there are sufficient participants in the program unless an exception to this requirement is expressly granted by SCWA. **Mitigation UT-4b: Install Ultra Low Flow Toilets and Other Indoor Water Conserving Devices in All of the New Buildings, including the Sutter Medical Center, the Physicians Medical Center, and the Medical Office Building.** Water conservation measures shall be implemented in all of the new buildings, including the Sutter Medical Center, the Physicians Medical Center, and the Medical Office Building, and will include some or all of the following: 1. Install ultra-low flush toilets (1.1 gallons average per flush). 2. Install lavatory faucets with 1.5 gpm flow moderators. 3. Install ultra-low flow (0.5 gpm) lavatory faucets with infrared sensors for on/off control in public restrooms. 4. Install 0.5 gallon per flush urinals in public restrooms.	LTS

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		A report will be prepared by Sutter describing the water conserving measures to be implemented in the new buildings. The report will be submitted to the County and SCWA before issuance of a building permit. The report shall provide an estimate of the waste generation in the new buildings and the number of ESD participants in the retrofit program required to offset the waste generated. **Mitigation UT-4c: Achieve Offset Credits by Funding a Program to Retrofit Residential and Commercial Buildings With Ultra Low Flow Toilets and Other Indoor Water Conserving Devices.** Sutter shall offset the additional wastewater generated by the proposed project by funding the recently approved SCWA direct install program to retrofit residential and commercial buildings with ultra low flow toilets and other indoor water conserving devices. Sutter shall fund the program at a level sufficient to meet the needs of this project per Table 3.16-3. Alternatively, if the report prepared as part of Mitigation UT-4b is approved by SCWA and demonstrates that less wastewater would be generated due to the implementation of additional water conserving devices, the level of funding could be reduced to account for the reduced number of required offsets. The method of funding shall be agreed to between Sutter and the SCWA before issuance of a building permit. Sutter shall submit a report every six months to the SCWA starting just~~in January 2010~~ prior to annexation of the site to the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone and continuing until the retrofit program has reduced the waste generated in the Sanitation Zone sufficiently to offset the waste generated by this project. The report shall state the number of ESDs that have participated in the program and shall also provide an estimate of the date at which the program is expected to meet the needs of the project based on the rate of participation. If the date is later than the expected date of occupancy, a program to increase participation or the amount of savings by participants (e.g., include high efficiency washers in the program) shall be included in the report and subsequently implemented once approved by SCWA. The final report will need to show that the expected wastewater generated by the project has been offset by the retrofit	

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
		program before an occupancy permit is granted. **Mitigation UT-4d: Ensure Hospital Wastewater Discharge Quality.** Kitchen waste collection systems will be installed at all nurses' stations and any food processing locations. These wastes will either be composted on site or will be collected for commercial recycling. **Mitigation UT-4e: Provide Capacity for Increased Wastewater Flows at Proposed Connection Points.** If modeling shows a lack of capacity and Sutter chooses to connect at the Mark West Springs Road trunk line, the portion of the existing 8" sewer between the project connection point in Mark West Springs Road and its terminus at the trunk sewer in Old Redwood Highway at Lark Center Drive will be replaced with a larger diameter sewer prior to hospital occupancy.	
Impact UT-5: Require Construction of New Wastewater Treatment Facilities. The proposed project would require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	PS	**Mitigation UT-5: Implement Mitigation UT-4a through UT-4c.** Implement Mitigation Measures UT-4a through UT-4c to offset project wastewater flows and implement Mitigation Measures AIR-2a, and AIR-2b to minimize air quality impacts during construction of the replacement sewer line, if required.	LTS
Impact UT-6: Result in Insufficient Landfill Capacity. The proposed project could be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.	LTS	No mitigation required	-
Impact UT-7: Cumulative Impacts to Utilities and Service Systems. Construction and operation of the proposed project could result in a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to utilities and service systems.	LTS	No mitigation required	-

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance With Mitigation Incorporated
Energy			
Construction Energy Use. Construction of the proposed project would use electricity and gas as a short-term consequence (up to 48 months) of construction of the project.	LTS	The following mitigation measures have already been discussed in the air quality Section 4.4. While these mitigation measures shall be implemented in order to minimize air quality impacts they also will assist in preventing inefficient energy usage and promote conservation of energy resources. **Mitigation AIR-1: Reduce Length of Haul Truck Trips, Restrict Idling** **Mitigation AIR-2b: Include Measures to Reduce Criteria Pollutant Exhaust From Construction Equipment** **Mitigation AIR-7: Develop project with the project design features and emissions reduction measures** Energy Reduction Methods are also described in Section 4.4.2	LTS
Operational Energy Use. Based on worst case estimates from the applicant's mechanical engineers (Sutter Energy Conservation Report, March 2009), the three facilities that will be power consumers will use a combined 6,520,577 kilowatt hours per year (kWh/yr) at full buildout. The project would not require the construction of additional electrical generation capacity. The proposed project's natural gas usage is estimated to be approximately 109,337 therms per year. The natural gas use by the proposed project will not represent a significant increase in the natural gas usage within the County. Project operation would not result in a wasteful or inefficient use of transportation energy.	LTS		LTS

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

SU = Significant and unavoidable

Based on internal review, the text on page 1-4 within Section 1.3 has been revised to add the following:

> The project would be completed in phases beginning with amendment of the sphere of influence of the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone and the annexation of the site into the SCWA's Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone, connection to the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone's wastewater treatment system, and decommissioning of the existing on-site LBMF sewage treatment facility.

Based on internal review, the Assessor's Parcel No. for Lot E in Table 2-1 on page 2-4 has been revised as follows:

058-040-0~~6~~36

Based on internal review, the text on page 2-4 within Section 2.2.1 has been revised to add the following:

> In addition to the development site, the project includes placing one additional adjacent 1.41 acre parcel (APN 058-040-036) inside the Larkfield-Wikiup Urban Service Boundary. This parcel is designated Rural Residential 1 acre density in the General Plan, is zoned RR (Rural Residential) – B6 – 1 acre density – VOH (Valley Oak Habitat), and is currently developed with one single family dwelling served by a well and septic system. The purpose of including this parcel within the Urban Service Boundary is to prevent the formation of 'island' parcels which do not have sewer service available inside the Urban Service Boundary (if the overall development project is approved); island parcels are also contrary to LAFCO policy. Including the subject residential parcel inside the Urban Service Boundary would not change the land use designation or the allowed uses on that property.

Per Comment O.14.1, the text on page 2-9 of Section 2.0 of the EIR has been revised as follows:

> WFC buildings and facilities occupy most of the LBMF's 28+- acres with the primary entrance off Mark West Springs Road over Parcels A and B, and with secondary access from East Fulton Road easterly of Parcel B over Parcel C~~on the eastern side of Parcel B~~; the rest of the LBMF property is vacant. An existing barn in the northern end of the property on Parcel A is currently being used as the LBMF maintenance facility.

Per Comment O.14.2, the text in Section 2.3.2 on the bottom of page 2-10 and the top of page 2-11 has been revised as follows:

> Subsequent to the 2008 Initial Study, Sutter and LBMF reached an agreement to downsize the joint Master Plan for the project site. As currently proposed, the joint Master Plan would accommodate the existing LBMF facilities and the proposed Medical Campus facilities on the 53-acre site via an integrated land use and circulation plan, which would include a primary~~single major~~ signalized site entry road from Mark West Springs Road, a secondary site entry road from East Fulton Road, and a separate dedicated emergency vehicle access.

Based on internal review, the text on page 2-11 has been revised to add the following:

> The project would be completed in phases, beginning with amendment of the sphere of influence of the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone and the annexation of the site into the SCWA's Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone, decommissioning of the existing on-site LBMF sewage treatment facility, and connection to the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone's wastewater treatment system.

Based on internal review, the text on page 2-15 within Section 2.3.2 has been revised to add the following:

> In addition to the development site, the project includes placing one additional adjacent 1.41 acre parcel (APN 058-040-036) inside the Larkfield-Wikiup Urban Service Boundary. This parcel is designated Rural Residential 1 acre density in the General Plan, is zoned RR (Rural Residential) – B6 – 1 acre density –

VOH (Valley Oak Habitat), and is currently developed with one single family dwelling served by a well and septic system. The purpose of including this parcel within the Urban Service Boundary is to prevent the formation of 'island' parcels which do not have sewer service available inside the Urban Service Boundary (if the overall development project is approved); island parcels are also contrary to LAFCO policy. Including the subject residential parcel inside the Urban Service Boundary would not change the land use designation or the allowed uses on that property. Amendment of the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone's sphere of influence and annexation of the project site and the adjacent 1.41-acre parcel into the Sanitation Zone will require approval of LAFCO.

Based on internal review, the text in Section 2.3.2.1 on page 2-15 has been revised to add the following:

Phase I (2010-2012): Entitlement, Relocation, Replacement of Utilities and Existing Facilities

1. Phase I(a)

   A. Amendment of the sphere of influence of the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone and ~~A~~annexation of the entire 53-acre site and the additional adjacent 1.41 acre parcel (APN 058-040-036) to the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone; and,

Based on internal review, Figure 2-4 referenced in Section 2.3.2.1 has been revised to more clearly illustrate potential future hospital expansion areas and depict updated landscaping and minor changes to the Central Utility Plant. These minor alterations to the figure better reflect the project as proposed and as analyzed in the EIR.


MARK WEST SPRINGS ROAD
US HIGHWAY 101 OFFRAMP
POTENTIAL FUTURE EXPANSION
MAIN ENTRY
MOB ENTRY
NEW SUTTER MEDICAL CENTER OF SANTA ROSA
PHYSICIANS MEDICAL CENTER
MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING
RELOCATED MAINTENANCE FACILITY
PROPOSED HELISTOP
AMBULANCE ENTRY
AMBULANCE ENTRY
CENTRAL UTILITY PLANT
RELOCATED PLAYGROUND
POTENTIAL FUTURE EXPANSION
NEW WELL SITE
US HIGHWAY 101
NORTH DETENTION BASIN
WELLS FARGO CENTER FOR THE ARTS
SOUTH DETENTION BASIN
RELOCATED PLAYFIELD
N
0
200
400
FEET
URS
Sutter/LBMF Joint Master Plan
Figure 2-4
Master Plan

Based on internal review, the text on the bottom of page 2-23 within Section 2.4 Required Permits and Approvals has been revised to add the following:

In addition to the above, a general plan text amendment may be implemented to restrict uses consistent with those of the master plan.

Other major permits or approvals that will likely be required for the proposed project include:

- Approval by Sonoma County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of amendment of sphere of influence of Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone and annexation of project site and the adjacent 1.41-acre parcel into the Sanitation Zone
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- Approved Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan Requirements and Stormwater Mitigation Plan from North Coast RWQCB
- Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the North Coast RWQCB
- Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- Permit to Operate from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)
- Approval from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Caltrans Division of Aeronautics and FAA permits for helicopter operations

Based on internal review the exterior lighting mitigation has been modified slightly to allow a wider variety of energy efficient lighting types, while maintaining all requirements for fully shielded and downcast fixtures to avoid offsite glare and excessive skyglow. Mitigation Measure AES-4a on page 3.2-23 is modified as follows:

The following measures shall be implemented to control and prevent light trespass:

- Lighting plans shall be submitted for design review and approval.
- The plans shall require that free-standing light fixtures ~~use low-pressure sodium lamps or other similar lighting fixture and~~ be installed and shielded in such a manner that all lights are shielded from off-site view and no light rays are emitted from the fixture at angles above the horizontal plane.
- Building-mounted lights should be shielded and downcast.
- ~~Prohibit the use of high intensity discharge lamps.~~

Based on internal review Mitigation Measure AIR-7 was revised to refer to the correct tables in Appendix C-5. Mitigation Measure AIR-7 on page 3.4-51 has been revised as follows:

The project shall be developed with the project design features and emissions reduction measures set forth in Table~~s~~ ~~1~~9 and 10 of Appendix C-5:

Per Comment O.14.3, the text in Section 3.5.1.3 of the EIR on page 3.5-3, second paragraph, has been revised as follows:

The WFC and the grounds surrounding the barn have been planted with ornamental trees and shrubs, including redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), deodar cedar (*Cedrus deodara*), Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*), liquidambar (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), camphor (*Cinnamomum camphora*), olive (*Olea europaea*), persimmon (*Diospyros kaki*), strawberry tree (Arbutus unedo), rose (*Rosa* sp.) and juniper (*Juniperus* sp.). Large lawns are located north and southwest of the WFC. A few mature valley oaks~~, including a 48-inch diameter oak,~~ stand within the parcel that contains the barn.

Per Comments A.1.4-A.1.5, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 on page 3.5-13 has been revised to include DFG's recommendation as follows:

> A nesting survey for raptors and other special-status bird species shall be conducted prior to commencing with tree removal, grading, or other construction work if this work would occur between February 1 and August 31. Nesting surveys shall include examination of all trees within 300 feet of the project site, regardless of whether they are slated for removal. If a nest is discovered, a buffer zone around the nest tree must be staked with bright orange lath or other suitable staking. If the tree is located off the project site, then the buffer shall be demarcated per above where the buffer occurs on the project site. The size of the buffer will be established by a qualified biologist to reflect the identified raptor or special-status bird species. No tree removal, grading, or other construction work~~construction or earth-moving activity~~ shall occur within the established buffer until it is determined by the qualified biologist that the young have fledged (that is, left the nest) and have attained sufficient flight skills to avoid project construction zones. This typically occurs by July 15 for raptors. This date may be earlier or later, and shall~~would~~ be determined by a qualified biologist. ~~If a qualified biologist is not on site to make observations, the buffers shall be maintained in place through the month of August and work within the buffer can commence September 1.~~

Per Comment A.3.4, Mitigation Measure BIO-2b: Compensatory Mitigation, on pages 3.5-14 and 3.5-15 of the DEIR has been revised as follows:

> Impacts to wetlands or other waters under the regulatory authority of the Corps and RWQCB shall be compensated for at a 2.5:1 ratio (i.e., impacts to 0.026 acre of wetlands or other waters). This shall be accomplished by construction of a 0.067-acre linear drainage ditch on the project site as part of the first phase of project construction. Impacts to isolated wetlands under regulatory authority of the RWQCB (0.364 acre) shall be compensated for at a 2:1 ratio. This shall be accomplished by purchasing 0.8 acre of creation credits at a RWQCB-approved mitigation bank. Mitigation credits shall be purchased prior to breaking ground on the project site.
>
> ~~For those wetland areas that are impacted as part of the proposed project, appropriate permits shall be acquired from the Corps and RWQCB prior to any impacts occurring to regulated waters of the U.S. and/or State. Impacted wetland areas shall be compensated for at a 2:1 ratio (i.e., for each square foot of impact, compensation shall consist of 2 square feet of replacement/preservation compensation) via purchase of mitigation credits from a Corps and RWQCB approved wetland conservation bank. As the project will impact 0.39 acre of seasonal wetland, 0.78 acre of mitigation credits shall be purchased from a qualified wetlands conservation bank. Prior to purchasing mitigation credits from a qualified conservation bank, approval from the Corps and RWQCB shall be required. Mitigation credits shall be purchased prior to breaking ground on the project site. Copies of applicable permits from the Corps and RWQCB shall be provided to Sonoma County prior to grading, and any conditions in these permits shall become a condition of project approval. Any other conditions that are stipulated for wetland impacts by the Corps and/or RWQCB shall also become conditions of project approval. If mitigation compensation is not required by the Corps and/or RWQCB for the proposed project, then this condition of project approval shall be deemed unnecessary. In the event that mitigation credits cannot be secured from a Corps and RWQCB approved wetland conservation bank, compensation wetlands shall be created/enhanced on-site and will resemble those wetlands affected by the project (known as in-kind replacement). If wetlands cannot be created in-kind and on-site, wetland creation/enhancement shall be implemented offsite. Any wetland creation/enhancement plan shall be approved by the Corps and the RWQCB via permit issuance from these agencies for the appropriate jurisdictional features within the purview of these agencies. Mitigation requirements shall include that all impacted wetlands are replaced at a minimum 2:1 ratio (for each square foot of impact, one square foot of wetland would be enhanced/created) or as otherwise specified in permitting conditions imposed by the Corps and/or RWQCB. Thus, since 0.39 acre of seasonal wetland would be impacted, 0.78 acre of created/enhanced wetland would be required to be constructed. Implementation of this mitigation measure shall require that any site where wetlands are created/enhanced would have to be preserved in perpetuity via recordation of a perpetual restrictive deed recorded on the Title of the property. In addition, a five-year monitoring plan shall be implemented by a qualified biologist.~~

~~At the end of the five-year monitoring period, the Corps and RWQCB shall render a conclusion that the created/enhanced wetlands are successful.~~

Per Comment A.2.1, the Regulatory Setting section under Section 3.8.2.2 State on page 3.8-4 of the DEIR has been revised to add the following:

Helicopter Operations. Within California, operation of a heliport other than one strictly for personal use requires that a Heliport Permit be obtained from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Division of Aeronautics. This requirement is spelled out in Public Utilities Code Section 21661.5. Prior to applying for this permit, the project applicant must first submit information on the proposal to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) so that the agency can conduct an aeronautical study of the proposal in accordance with FAA Regulations Part 77. This aeronautical study will examine whether the airspace required for the heliport is free of obstructions that could be hazards and does not interfere with the airspace of nearby airports. Aeronautical studies do not examine other types of compatibility factors such as noise.

Per Comment A.2.1, the Regulatory Setting section under Section 3.8.2.3 Local on page 3.8-6 of the DEIR has been revised to add the following:

Helicopter Operations

Before an application is submitted for a Heliport Permit from the California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics, the proposed heliport plan must be submitted to and acted upon by the Sonoma County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for evaluation against land use compatibility criteria adopted by that agency.

Per Comment A.8.1, the text for Impact HAZ-5 in Section 3.8.3.4 of the EIR has been revised as follows:

Impact HAZ-5: Helicopter Operations

The proposed project includes development and operation of a helistop, the operation of which could pose a safety hazard to people living, working, and traveling in the area.

Significance: Less than~~Potentially~~ significant

Discussion: The proposed project would include a helistop for helicopter ambulances to be able to pick up and drop off patients. The helistop would be located on the west side of the project site close to US 101. An average of 17 helicopter flights per month (or approximately 200 flights per year) have occurred at Sutter's Chanate Road campus during the past 4 years. It is assumed that up to 20 flights per month (or 240 flights per year) may occur with full buildout of the proposed project due to growth in the future.

For the proposed project, the optimum alignment for the approach/departure paths for the helistop are from the south-southeast and north-northwest. This alignment coincides not only with the prevailing winds at the site, but also provides the opportunity for helicopters to approach and depart the helistop by flying over US 101. As such, the paths are aligned so as to ensure that helicopters do not fly directly over Wells Fargo Center buildings or the residential area north of Mark West Springs Road. This path also helps ensure that redwood trees near the site will not be obstructions, although the height and proximity of light poles and redwood trees near the site do limit other options for approach/departure path alignments.

The accident rate of helicopter emergency medical services (HEMS) operations has been steadily decreasing, but experienced a marked increase in 2008. From 1998 through 2007, an average of 10.8 HEM accidents occurred annually in the U.S (HAI 2008). Whether the 2008 increase is an anomaly is uncertain, but the National Transportation Safety Bureau has investigated and offered recommendations pertaining to flight procedures (Appendix G). The rate of accidents for all types of helicopter operations has trended downward over the last decade. The increased numbers of twin-engine turbined-powered helicopters in the helicopter fleet (the type that will be used by REACH, the operator for the project) has been an apparent

contributing factor in this positive trend, due to greater engine reliability and the multiple engines (NTSB 2009) (Appendix G).

The vast majority of helicopter accidents, particularly HEMS accidents, take place either en route or at a remote landing site, rather than at an established heliport/helistop or airport. Weather was a significant factor in 19% of all HEMS accidents. The tendency of HEMS pilots to attempt to accomplish their life-saving missions despite adverse weather conditions is considered a factor in this regard. With a majority of the accidents occurring at a remote landing site or en route decreases the chances of impacts to third party individuals in the nearby vicinity.

In conversations with the Sonoma County Sheriff Helicopter Unit, the Sheriff identified the power lines that cross US 101 at the project site represented a potential hazard to helicopter operations and recommended that lighting be placed on the power poles (Appendix G-5). Subsequent to these conversations, the California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics in a letter dated January 28, 2010, indicated that upon further review they believe that lighting the power poles crossing US 101 approximately 1,500 feet northwest of the heliport site will not be necessary or required. Further, they state that the power poles will not interfere with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Heliport Design or penetrate Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77 imaginary surfaces. The Sonoma County Sheriff has indicated the Sheriff's Department will abide by the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics decision regarding the lack of a need to light the utility poles near the proposed Sutter helistop (Personal Communication with Sheriff Bill Cogbill, April 21, 2010).

~~Further p~~Pursuant to Federal Aviation Administration Advisory Circular No. 150/5390-2B, *Heliport Design*, the helistop will have lights that will help safely guide a pilot in and out of the site.

Given the low number of helicopter flights ~~,~~and the low accident rate at established helistops, appropriate lighting to safely guide in pilots, ~~as well as lights being placed on nearby power poles,~~ risks to third parties from helicopter operations can be considered less than significant.

Helicopters could have a potentially disruptive effect on highway traffic, but the time required for a helicopter to pass by and land would be brief. At the project site, the proposed approach and departure routes would put the helicopter in view of motorists along US 101 for less than a minute, with only approximately 5 flights a week occurring at full buildout. The pad's visibility from the highway could also be a factor. Lights associated with the helistop would be mostly blocked from view of the motorists by vegetation that would be planted between the helipad and US 101. In both cases the effects are likely to diminish over time as helicopter activity becomes more familiar to motorists who regularly use the route. Also, planned landscaping will largely shield the view of the pad from the highway.

Elsewhere in California, there are several existing helicopter facilities situated close to (within approximately 500 feet) a freeway. These include: Calstar (Auburn), Children's Hospital (Oakland), Good Samaritan Hospital (San Jose), Maguire Heliport (Los Angeles). San Joaquin General Hospital (Stockton), and St. Elizabeth Community Hospital (Red Bluff).

Based on the County's review of information provided by Sutter, there is no data available on the topic of traffic accidents related to helicopter overflights (see Appendix G). The Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) stated that there are no records available that would determine if automobile accidents were caused by nearby aircraft activity. (One reason is the fault is placed on the driver of automobile(s), not outside influences such as aircraft activity.) Research was also conducted in the National Highway Safety Administration's online database, but no records of accidents involving aircraft or helicopters were found. Staff at the California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics and Helicopter Operations indicated that they are not aware of any general conditions or specific incidents in which helicopter operations have been cited as a vehicle traffic hazard. A similar response was received from the Air Operations Commander of the California Highway Patrol Team, Keith Dittimus.

Lights associated with the helistop are also likely to be unobtrusive as seen from the highway. The perimeter lights will be green and lead-in lights yellow; both are intended to be seen from the air and will be largely unnoticeable from the highway among parking lot and other lights on the property. The flood light or lights required to allow helicopter and ground crews to work around the helistop at night would

normally be on only when a helicopter is present and will be off during helicopter takeoffs and landings so as not to interfere with the vision of pilots.

Therefore, the risk of traffic accidents on US 101 caused by proposed helicopter operations are also considered less than significant.

Mitigation ~~HAZ-5:Install lighting on Power Poles Crossing US 101 at the Project Sites~~

~~Lighting shall be placed on the power poles crossing US 101 at the project site in a manner that will make the poles readily visible from the air by helicopter pilots at night and in such a manner as to not distract drivers on US 101~~No mitigation required.

Per Comment A.5.14, the first paragraph of Section 3.9.1 on page 3.9-1 of the DEIR has been revised to read:

The project site is located in the Santa Rosa Valley, which is bounded by the Mendocino Range to the west and the Mayacmas and Sonoma mountains to the east. The site is part of the larger Russian River watershed. Water supply in the region is provided by a combination of groundwater and surface water primarily from the Russian River and Dry Creek (a tributary of the Russian River). The region has a Mediterranean climate, with cool, wet winters and hot, dry summers. Annual precipitation is about 35 inches at the site and ranges from approximately 30 inches to ~~in~~ the south in Santa Rosa to about 55~~40~~ inches in the mountains to the east~~north~~, with the majority of the rain occurring from October through April.

Per Comment A.5.16, Sections 3.9.2.2 and 3.9.2.3 on pages 3.9-7 and 3.9-8 of the DEIR have been revised as follows:

3.9.2.2 State

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne Act) of 1969, which became Division 7 of the California Water Code, authorized the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to provide comprehensive protection for California's waters through water allocation and water quality protection. The SWRCB implements the requirements of CWA Section 303 that water quality standards be set for certain waters by adopting water quality control plans through the Porter-Cologne Act. The Porter-Cologne Act also established the responsibilities and authorities of the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs). These responsibilities and authorities include preparing water quality plans for areas within the region (Basin Plans), identifying water quality objectives (WQOs), and issuing NPDES permits pursuant to the Clean Water Act. WQOs are defined as limits or levels of water quality constituents and characteristics established for reasonable protection of beneficial uses or prevention of nuisance. Under the Porter-Cologne Act, discharges of storm water from the project area would require NPDES permits due to the size of the project.

In addition to implementing the NPDES permitting program, the Porter-Cologne Act authorizes the RWQCBs to issue Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs). Generally, WDRs are issued for discharges that are exempt from the CWA NPDES permitting program, discharges that may affect groundwater quality, and/or wastes that may be discharged in a diffused manner. WDRs are established and implemented to achieve the WQOs for receiving waters as established in the Basin Plans.

Under the NPDES program, the North Coast RWQCB has established permit requirements for storm water runoff for the project area. Project applicants with construction activities on 1 acre or more are subject to the permitting requirements of the NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Runoff Associated with Construction Activity (General Construction Permit). The General Construction Permit requires the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for construction activities. The SWPPP must include specifications for Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be implemented during site preparation (including demolition) and construction. BMPs are measures taken to control degradation of surface water by preventing soil erosion or the discharge of pollutants from the construction area. The SWPPP must describe measures to prevent or control runoff after construction is complete and identify procedures for inspecting and maintaining facilities. Examples

of typical construction BMPs include scheduling or limiting activities to certain times of year, installing sediment barriers such as silt fence and fiber rolls, maintaining equipment and vehicles used for construction, stabilizing entrances to the construction site, and developing and implementing a spill prevention and cleanup plan. The SWRCB has identified BMPs to effectively reduce degradation of surface waters to an acceptable level.

Beneficial uses, WQOs, and the implementation program for achieving the WQOs for the water bodies in the project area are stipulated in the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region (2007 Basin Plan) (North Coast RWQCB 2007). The Russian River watershed has been listed under Section 303(d) of the CWA as an impaired water body for sediment and temperature. The Santa Rosa Creek watershed and segments of the Russian River have also been listed as impaired for pathogens. Work has begun on the development of a TMDL for pathogens, and the development of sediment and temperature TMDLs for the Russian River watershed is set to begin in 2010 (SWRCB 2009).

In October 2009 the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region issued Waste Discharge Requirements for the City of Santa Rosa, the County of Sonoma, and the Sonoma County Water Agency for Storm Water and Non-Storm Water Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (Order No. R1-2009-0050). The Order requires that the permitted agencies prepare a new development integrated water quality and water resource plan which includes a Low Impact Development (LID) manual, post-construction treatment BMP choice criteria, and a hydromodification control and mitigation plan. The integrated water quality/resource plan shall be included in an updated Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) manual. Until a hydromodification control plan is prepared for new development, interim controls shall apply. These interim controls include a requirement that BMPs be sized for the 2-year 24-hour rain event that keeps post-construction peak discharge, peak velocity, and peak duration at or below those respective pre-construction levels. The permitted agencies shall also ensure that pre-construction storm water runoff volume is the same as the post-construction storm water runoff volume for flows up to the 85th percentile 24-hour storm and larger storms where adverse impacts to receiving waters are possible.

3.9.2.3 Local

~~Under the NPDES program, the North Coast RWQCB has established permit requirements for storm water runoff for the project area. Project applicants with construction activities on 1 acre or more are subject to the permitting requirements of the NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Runoff Associated with Construction Activity (General Construction Permit). The General Construction Permit requires the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for construction activities. The SWPPP must include specifications for Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be implemented during site preparation (including demolition) and construction. BMPs are measures taken to control degradation of surface water by preventing soil erosion or the discharge of pollutants from the construction area. The SWPPP must describe measures to prevent or control runoff after construction is complete and identify procedures for inspecting and maintaining facilities. Examples of typical construction BMPs include scheduling or limiting activities to certain times of year, installing sediment barriers such as silt fence and fiber rolls, maintaining equipment and vehicles used for construction, stabilizing entrances to the construction site, and developing and implementing a spill prevention and cleanup plan. The SWRCB has identified BMPs to effectively reduce degradation of surface waters to an acceptable level.~~

~~Beneficial uses, WQOs, and the implementation program for achieving the WQOs for the water bodies in the project area are stipulated in the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region (2007 Basin Plan) (North Coast RWQCB 2007). The Russian River watershed has been listed under Section 303(d) of the CWA as an impaired water body for sediment and temperature. The Santa Rosa Creek watershed and segments of the Russian River have also been listed as impaired for pathogens. Work has begun on the development of a TMDL for pathogens, and the development of sediment and temperature TMDLs for the Russian River watershed is set to begin in 2010 (SWRCB 2009).~~

Discharges to the storm sewer system in the Santa Rosa area are regulated by the Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) for the City of Santa Rosa, the County of Sonoma, and the Sonoma County

Water Agency (SCWA). The SWMP is required as part of the NPDES permit for the Santa Rosa area. The main purpose of the SWMP is to identify pollutant sources potentially affecting the quality and quantity of storm water discharges and to implement measures to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, as defined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The SWMP also provides guidelines for the implementation of the post-construction/development Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SUSMP applies to projects that would add over 1 acre of impervious surface. Implementation of the SUSMP involves source control and treatment control BMPs and promotes the use of low-impact development in the project design process.

PRMD reviews projects for drainage design consistent with SCWA flood control requirements. The SCWA guidelines specify different criteria for hydrologic design depending on the size of the watershed draining to the area of interest. For major waterways with a drainage area of at least 4 square miles, constructed drainage systems must be designed for the 100-year event. For secondary waterways with drainage areas of between 1 and 4 square miles, drainage systems must be designed for at least the 25-year event. For minor waterways with drainage areas of less than 1 square mile, the 10-year event is used for the minimum design event. The tributary area draining to the project site is much less than 1 square mile, which indicates that designing for the 10-year storm event would be consistent with the SCWA design criteria for flood control.

The Sonoma County Grading, Drainage, and Vineyard and Orchard Site Development Ordinance (County Grading Ordinance) was adopted on December 9, 2008. The provisions for regulating stormwater quality are consistent with the NPDES program and the CWA. The provisions for regulating grading, drainage, and site development are designed to prevent soil loss and erosion, protect water quality, protect watercourses from obstruction, and prevent flooding. The County Grading Ordinance relies on BMPs as well as specific criteria relating to grading and drainage to meet the provisions.

Per Comment A.5, a new paragraph has been added to Section 3.9.2.2 of the DEIR on page 3.9-7 as follows:

In October 2009 the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region issued Waste Discharge Requirements for the City of Santa Rosa, the County of Sonoma, and the Sonoma County Water Agency for Storm Water and Non-Storm Water Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (Order No. R1-2009-0050). The Order requires that the permitted agencies prepare a new development integrated water quality and water resource plan which includes a Low Impact Development (LID) manual, post-construction treatment BMP choice criteria, and a hydromodification control and mitigation plan. The integrated water quality/resource plan shall be included in an updated Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) manual. Until a hydromodification control plan is prepared for new development, interim controls shall apply. These interim controls include a requirement that BMPs be sized for the 2-year 24-hour storm event that keeps post-construction peak discharge, peak velocity, and peak duration at or below those respective pre-construction levels. The permitted agencies shall also ensure that pre-construction storm water runoff volume is the same as the post-construction storm water runoff volume for flows up to the 85th percentile 24-hour storm and larger storms where adverse impacts to receiving waters are possible.

Per Comment O.14.7, the text in the third paragraph under discussion of Impact HY-2 on page 3.9-11 of the EIR has been revised as follows:

To the maximum extent possible, post-construction runoff from impervious surfaces shall be directed into vegetated swales and detention basins that will function as bioretention facilities and allow for treatment during smaller storms. Roof drain downspouts shall be connected to bioretention cells or other low impact development facilities which will slowly infiltrate water into the ground up to the first flush (85th percentile) storm event.~~media filters or other structural storm water treatment devices (such as proprietary subsurface systems available from commercial vendors) before discharging into the storm drain system and eventually off-site.~~

Per Comment A.5.3, the last sentence on the bottom of DEIR page 3.9-11 and the bulleted text at the top of DEIR page 3.9-12 are hereby modified as follows:

Pollution prevention measures will include, but not be limited to:

- Vegetated swales;
- Bioretention facilities;
- Roof drain downspout filters;
- Subsurface treatment structures;
- Storm drain stenciling;
- Irrigation systems designed to minimize overspray;
- Landscaping using plants with minimal water requirements;
- Designing and maintaining landscaping to prevent runoff from contacting bare earth;
- Covered trash areas; and
- Connecting drains in trash areas to the sanitary sewers, and in the case where food waste is present, having regularly maintained grease interceptors. Approval shall be received from SCWA's Airport/Larkfield/Wikiup Sanitation Zone before any connection is made from dumpster and food waste areas to the sanitary system.

Per Comment A.5.5, the second paragraph on page 3.9-15 of the DEIR has been revised to read:

The proposed project will be required under the new ~~Santa Rosa Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan (SUSMP)~~Regional Water Quality Control Board Waste Discharge Requirements (Order No. R1-2009-0050) to capture the difference in runoff between the runoff volume generated by the post-construction 85th percentile rainfall event and the pre-project condition, to the maximum extent practicable. The 85th percentile storm event for the Santa Rosa area is a rainfall event with a depth of approximately 1 inch. Best Management Practices (BMPs), which may include cisterns, landscape soil amendments, and vegetated infiltration swales, will be used to achieve this goal. In addition, the project includes detention basins (see **Figure 3.9-3**) that would help infiltrate storm water.

Per Comment O.14.8, the first bullet of Mitigation Measure HY-4 on page 3.9-43 of the DEIR has been revised as follows:

- Detention basins shall be used in conjunction with source- and treatment-control BMPs to maximize infiltration to the greatest extent possible and prevent increases in peak runoff from the 2-year storm.

Per Comment A.5.7, the second bullet of Mitigation Measure HY-4 on page 3.9-43 has been revised to read:

- Landscaping shall be designed and maintained to prevent runoff from contacting bare soil~~, and silt fences, berms, or sediment control basins shall be installed~~.

Per Comment A.5.10, the first paragraph under the Tributary D discussion on page 3.9-45 of the DEIR has been revised to read:

The post-construction tributary drainage area to the existing culverts located along the freeway off-ramp shall be reduced in size such that the peak 10-year storm water runoff will approximate existing pre-construction conditions. The potential minor increases in runoff due to the small addition of impervious surface in Tributary Area D will be offset by directing some of the pre-construction tributary area to drain into adjacent tributary areas (compare Figures 3.9-2 and 3.9-3).

Based on internal review, the text on page 3.10-1 within Section 3.10.1 has been revised to add the following regarding LAFCO approval:

> In addition to the development site, the project includes placing one additional adjacent 1.41-acre parcel (APN 058-040-036) inside the Larkfield-Wikiup Urban Service Boundary. This parcel is designated Rural Residential 1 acre density in the General Plan, is zoned RR (Rural Residential) – B6 – 1 acre density – VOH (Valley Oak Habitat), and is currently developed with one single family dwelling served by a well and septic system. The purpose of including this parcel within the Urban Service Boundary is to prevent the formation of 'island' parcels which do not have sewer service available inside the Urban Service Boundary (if the overall development project is approved); island parcels are also contrary to LAFCO policy. Including the subject residential parcel inside the Urban Service Boundary would not change the land use designation or the allowed uses on that property. Amendment of the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone's sphere of influence and annexation of the project site and the adjacent 1.41-acre parcel into the Sanitation Zone will require approval of LAFCO.

Based on internal review, the text on page 3.10-9 in Section 3.10.3.4 has been revised to add the following regarding LAFCO approval:

> The project also includes a General Plan amendment to place the 53 acre development area of the property inside the Larkfield-Wikiup Urban Service Boundary (in addition to the Rural Residential parcel noted above), to ultimately allow annexation of the site to the local sewer district. Amendment of the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone's sphere of influence and annexation of the project site and the adjacent 1.41-acre parcel into the Sanitation Zone will require approval of LAFCO. Those~~That~~ amendments and other aspects of the project are analyzed for potential inconsistencies with the General Plan policies below.

Based on internal review, the project consistency analysis text for General Plan Policy PF-1f in Table 3.10-1 of the EIR on page 3.10-11 has been revised to add the following regarding LAFCO approval:

> The Larkfield-Wikiup Urban Service Boundary would be relocated to include the proposed project site. Ultimately, the site would be included in the sewer district sphere of influence and the sewer district boundary, subject to LAFCO approval.

Per Comment O.14.9, the project consistency analysis text for General Plan Policy CT-3b in Table 3.10-1 of the EIR on page 3.10-14 has been revised as follows:

> As described in Section 3.15, traffic analyses demonstrate that project traffic itself would not exceed the LOS standards in the General Plan. On a cumulative basis, however, project traffic when combined with anticipated future traffic in the cumulative condition would adversely affect the LOS at certain intersections. To mitigate the project's contribution to these adverse cumulative effects, the project would provide a fair share contribution to traffic system improvements at certain intersections, as detailed in Section 3.15. There would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact at certain intersections where mitigation is~~presently~~ infeasible, as detailed in Section 3.15. Project approval would require a Statement of Overriding Considerations with respect to the project's contribution to these cumulative impacts.

Per Comment O.14.14, the text on page 3.11-13 in Section 3.11.3.1 of the EIR has been revised as follows:

> To determine the expected noise levels produced by helicopter operations on the site and in its vicinity, the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) Integrated Noise Model (INM) version 7.0a was used to establish ground level noise contours for the projected operations. The noise model uses flight parameters, such as helicopter type, number of operations, and arrival and departure profiles to calculate both noise exposure levels in L_{dn}, or sound exposure~~single-event noise~~ level~~s~~ in SEL.

Based on internal review, the text starting on the bottom of page 3.11-13 in Section 3.11.3.1 has been revised as follows to correct the definition of SEL:

> Given the aforementioned parameters, the existing and potential future noise levels produced by helicopter operations on the site and the surrounding vicinity were modeled using the INM 7.0a. The future noise

exposure contours are presented in **Figure 3.11-3**, and the 90 dBA sound exposure~~single event~~ level (SEL) contours are presented in **Figure 3.11-4**.

Based on internal review, the text on page 3.11-34 in Section 3.11.3.4 has been revised as follows to correct terminology (sound exposure levels rather than single event noise levels):

The operation of the proposed helistop would result in the majority of the site being exposed to an SEL of 90 dBA or more under future conditions. Depending on the construction of the exterior walls and windows of patient rooms and other hospital areas requiring relative quiet, the exterior facades of the hospital may be exposed to sound exposure~~single event noise~~ levels high enough to result in significant disturbances inside the hospital.

Per Comment A.6.2, Section 3.13.1 on page 3.13-1 of the DEIR has been revised as follows:

3.13.1 Environmental Setting

Fire and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Responders

The project site is in unincorporated Sonoma County to the north of the City of Santa Rosa. This area is under the jurisdiction of the Sonoma County Department of Emergency Services, Fire Services Division, County Service Area #40. The Sonoma County Department of Emergency Services would have jurisdiction over fire code enforcement for new development in the project area. Fifteen volunteer fire companies comprise CSA #40 and are funded primarily through donations, with equipment and administrative support provided by the county. In addition, 17 Fire Protection Districts are funded through county taxes and operated by the Fire Division of the Department of Emergency Services. Additional fire protection in the unincorporated areas of the county is provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

Fire protection service for the project site would be provided by the Rincon Valley Fire Protection District. The Rincon Valley Fire Protection District would have jurisdiction for maintenance of fire code regulations after the project receives a final certificate of occupancy. The nearest station is located 0.5 mile away in Larkfield. The station is manned by a captain, two firefighting engineers, and approximately 50 volunteers. Equipment includes a Type 1 Engine, a Type 3 Engine, a water tender/engine combination, and a SQUAD (support unit). Response time to the project site varies but is approximately 4 minutes.

Per Comment A.6.5, **t**he text in Section 3.13.3.3 at the bottom of page 3.13-5 of the DEIR has been revised as follows:

For the SMCSR, PMC, and MOB (with a total floor area of approximately 306,000 square feet) with Type 1 construction, the Uniform Fire Code requires 3,750 gallons per minute (gpm) of fire flow capacity with a 20 pounds per square inch (psi) residual pressure in the water main. ~~With an automatic sprinkler system, the fire marshal may reduce the fire flow requirement by up to 75 percent. Typically, a 50 percent reduction is assumed, which would mean that a fire flow capacity of approximately 1,875 gpm would need to be available **(see Appendix J)**.~~Sonoma County Amendment #38 amends the California Fire Code Appendix B Section B105.2 with an Exception that states "A reduction in required fire-flow of up to 50%, as approved, is allowed when the building is provided with an approved automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2." If this exception were approved for the proposed project a fire flow capacity of approximately 1.875 gpm would need to be available.

Per Comment A.6.4, the first paragraph at the top of page 3.15-2 in Section 3.15.1.1 of the DEIR has been revised as follows:

Access to the proposed Sutter project would be primarily via the existing main WFC driveway, which connects to Mark West Springs Road about 800 feet east of the Mark West Springs-River Road interchange with the US 101 freeway. Secondary Sutter access would also be possible via the existing WFC driveway connection to East Fulton Road, near the East Fulton Road connection to Old Redwood Highway. A new emergency vehicle (ambulance) access would connect to Mark West Springs Road about 250 feet east of the Mark West Springs Road-River Road interchange with the US 101 freeway. The emergency access, fire

lanes, street naming and building addressing shall be consistent with Sonoma County Fire Safe Standards and the 2007 California Fire Code, as adopted by Sonoma County Code.

Per Comment O.14.17, the text starting at the bottom of page 3.15-20 of the EIR has been revised to reflect the most recent Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices as follows:

There are 8 possible tests for determining whether a traffic signal should be considered for installation. These tests, called "warrants", consider criteria such as actual traffic volume, pedestrian volume, presence of school children, and accident history. The intersection volume data together with the available collision histories were compared to warrants contained in the Federal Highway Administration *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD), ~~Federal Highway Administration,~~ 2003. Revision 1 as Amended for use in California (California MUTCB) adopted September 2006~~, California Supplement, which has been adopted by the State of California as a replacement for *Caltrans Traffic Manual*~~. Section 4C of the California MUTCD provides guidelines, or warrants, which may indicate need for a traffic signal at an unsignalized intersection. As indicated in the MUTCD, satisfaction of one or more warrants does not necessarily require immediate installation of a traffic signal. It is merely an indication that the local jurisdiction should begin monitoring conditions at that location and that a signal may ultimately be required.

Based on internal review, the text in Section 3.15 at the bottom of page 3.15-47 has been revised as follows to clarify project access:

Proposed Project Circulation System Improvements

The project would use but modify the ~~two~~ existing entrance~~s~~ to the WFC~~,~~ off Mark West Springs Road. It would also use, but not modify, the existing access from ~~and~~ East Fulton Road. In addition, several road improvements would be completed prior to the opening of the facility (i.e., Phase II). These include the following transportation improvements (see **Figure 3.15-15~~14~~**).

Per Comment O.14.25, Mitigation Measure TR-3 for River Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps on page 3.15-66 of the EIR has been revised as follows:

River Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps

- ~~Change signal timing.~~Work with Caltrans to achieve optimal signal timing relative to the proposed improvements.

Per Comment O.14.27, Mitigation Measures TR-3, TR-6, and TR-8 have been revised as follows with respect to turn lanes at the Mark West Springs Road/Old Redwood Highway and East Fulton Road/Old Redwood Highway intersections:

Mitigation Measure TR-3A, pages 3.15-66 - 67:

Mark West Springs Road/Old Redwood Highway

- Provide~~Add~~ second left turn lane~~s~~ on the Old Redwood Highway north ~~and south~~bound approach~~es~~, and extend the length of the left turn lane on the Old Redwood Highway southbound approach to approximately 255 feet, which may (at the discretion of the DTPW) include approximately 210 feet in a dedicated left turn lane, and an additional 45 feet (or more) in the adjoining north two way left turn lane. The length of the left turn lanes shall be limited to that distance which can be feasibly constructed within the existing right of way. ~~If it is determined after field investigation that the left turn lanes cannot be feasibly constructed within exiting right of way, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.~~
- Add a second left turn lane on the Mark West Springs Road westbound approach.
- Adjust signal timing.
- Provide additional length to the following turn lanes:

Old Redwood Highway Southbound Right Turn Lane:

Lengthen from 100 feet to the maximum length available within the existing right of way (approximately 180 feet)~~at least 250 feet~~.

Mark West Springs Road Westbound Right Turn Lane:

Lengthen from 50 feet to approximately 100~~at least 175~~ feet.

Mark West Springs Road/Lavell Road

- Prohibit left turns from the southbound Lavell Road approach (see Mitigation Measure TR-1).

Mitigation Measure TR-6A, page 3.15-72:

Mark West Springs Road/Lavell Road

- Prohibit left turns from Lavell Road to eastbound Mark West Springs Road. (This measure has been recommended for mitigation of 2014 impacts [see TR-1].)

Mark West Springs Road/Old Redwood Highway

- Provide second left turn lane~~s~~ on the Old Redwood Highway north~~ and south~~bound approach~~es~~ as well as the Mark West Springs Road westbound approach. Extend the length of the left turn lane on the Old Redwood Highway southbound approach to approximately 255 feet, which may (at the discretion of the DTPW) include approximately 210 feet in a dedicated left turn lane, and an additional 45 feet (or more) in the adjoining north two way left turn lane. The length of the left turn lane shall be limited to that distance which can be feasibly constructed within the existing right of way.
- Provide overlap right turn phasing on all intersection approaches.

~~**East Fulton Road/Old Redwood Highway**~~

- ~~Provide a second lane on the eastbound E. Fulton Road approach.~~

Mitigation Measure TR-8A, page 3.15-80:

River Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps

- ~~Change signal timing.~~Work with Caltrans to achieve optimal signal timing relative to proposed improvements.

Mark West Springs Road/Old Redwood Highway

- Add dual left turn lanes to the north~~, south~~ and westbound intersection approaches. Extend the length of the left turn lane on the Old Redwood Highway southbound approach to approximately 255 feet, which may (at the discretion of the DTPW) include approximately 210 feet in a dedicated left turn lane, and an additional 45 feet (or more) in the adjoining north two way left turn lane.
- Adjust signal timing.
- Provide overlap right turn phasing on all intersection approaches.
- Provide additional length to the following turn lanes:

  Old Redwood Highway Northbound Left Turn~~ Lanes~~: ~~Lengthen~~ Add second turn lane and lengthen from 200 feet to create a combined storage length of approximately ~~at least~~ 350 feet.

  Old Redwood Highway Northbound Right Turn~~ Lane~~: Lengthen from 50 feet to approximately 170 feet~~ at least 275 feet~~.

  Mark West Springs Road Westbound Left Turn~~ Lane~~: ~~Lengthen~~ Add second turn lane and lengthen from 225 feet to create a combined storage length of approximately ~~at least~~ 300 feet.

Mark West Springs Road Westbound Right Turn ~~Lane~~: Lengthen from 50 feet to approximately 100~~at least 250~~ feet.

Mark West Springs Road/Project Main Entry

- Adjust signal timing.
- ~~Mark West Springs Road Eastbound Through Movement: 768 feet/lane with 860 feet of storage~~

Mark West Springs Road/Lavell Road

- Prohibit left turns from the Lavell Road stop sign controlled approach. Alternative access is available to the neighborhood served by Lavell Road (i.e. to Old Redwood Highway) in order to allow access to eastbound Mark West Springs Road.

Per Comment O.14.29, Mitigation Measure TR-7 on page 3.15-75 is modified as follows:

Enter into an agreement with the County to provide a fair share contribution to the following improvement when and if it is programmed and funded for construction:

River Road/Barnes Road

- Signalize the intersection and interconnect with operation of the planned signal at the River Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps intersection.

Per Comment O.14.27, the text in the DEIR on page 3.15-81 regarding the significance after mitigation for Impact TR-8 has been revised as follows:

Significance After Mitigation: All impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at River Road/Fulton Road, while some impacts would remain significant and unavoidable at Mark West Springs Road/Old Redwood Highway.

Implementation of the improvements identified in TR-8A would result in acceptable levels of service and queuing at the following intersections, reducing impacts to less than significant:

River Road/US 101 Southbound Ramps

Resultant Base Case + Project Level of Service:

AM Peak Hour LOS B-12.6 seconds control delay
PM Peak Hour LOS A-9.6 seconds control delay

Resultant Base Case + Project 95th Percentile Queues:

PM Peak Hour
US Southbound Off-Ramp Right Turn Lane: 146 feet with 150 feet of storage

Mark West Springs Road/Old Redwood Highway

Resultant Base Case + Project 95th Percentile Queues:

PM Peak Hour
Old Redwood Highway Northbound Through Movement: 761 feet with at least 1,000 feet of storage
Old Redwood Highway Southbound Left Turn: ~~477~~919 feet ~~per lane~~ with at least 975 feet of storage
Mark West Springs Road Eastbound Through Movement: 768 feet with 860 feet of storage

Per Comments O.14.20, O.14.35, and O.14.36, Mitigation Measure TR-12 on page 3.15-93 is revised as follows:

Prior to occupancy, the applicant shall provide the following measures:

- Provide traffic calming measures, such as speed tables or landscaped chokers within the parking aisles north of the hospital main entry to significantly reduce vehicle speeds at the pedestrian walkway. Highlight the walkway with signing and different pavement surface.

- Provide a sidewalk ~~along the entire length of the west side of the project main entry driveway~~ from Mark West Springs Road to all public Sutter Medical Campus building entrances. The exact location shall be as determined by the Design Review Committee.
- ~~Prior to occupancy, the applicant shall obtain the necessary right of way and c~~ Construct a 4' wide ~~sidewalk/~~pedestrian pathway on the east side of Old Redwood Highway, north of Mark West Springs Road, on the western edge of Assessors parcels 058-071-015, 016, and 017 within existing right of way. If final engineering demonstrates there is insufficient right of way to construct a 4' wide pathway, then the applicant ~~is unable to~~ shall obtain the necessary right of way~~, then the applicant shall~~ or provide adequate funding to the County to obtain it.

Based on internal review, the text in Section 3.16.1.1 of the DEIR has been revised to correct baseline water supply data for the project area. This revision does not affect the project impact analysis regarding water supply since the project will provide its own water through two new wells. The text in Section 3.16.1.1 starting on page 3.16-1 of the DEIR has been revised as follows:

3.16.1.1 Water Supply

California American Water (CalAm), a private company, currently provides water to the Larkfield-Wikiup area, including the WFC. CalAm has provided water to the Larkfield service area since purchasing Citizens Utility Company in 2002. The Larkfield service area is in the unincorporated area of Sonoma County approximately 4 miles north of downtown Santa Rosa. Water service is provided to approximately 2,373 customers. About 80 percent of the customers are residential (EPS and Coastland Civil Engineering 2007).

CalAm obtains water from four wells with a total capacity of approximately 1.43 mgd (equal to 990 gallons per minute [gpm]), and from a connection to the nearby SCWA aqueduct, which provides a maximum capacity of 0.8 mgd (556 gpm) by written agreement, subject to an annual limit of 700 acre-feet.

The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) regulates water systems and requires them to provide adequate supply to meet the maximum day demand. CDPH defines the maximum day demand to be equal to the highest annual peak day of the past 10 years. The 10-year historic maximum day usage for the Larkfield service area (2.19 mgd) occurred in 2003, which is just below the estimated system capacity of ~~2.28~~2.23 mgd (~~1,585~~1,546 gpm) (EPS and Coastland Civil Engineering 2007). **Table 3.16-1** summarizes the future well production requirements based on projected number of service connections and corresponding maximum daily water demand in Larkfield (based upon the Sonoma County General Plan land use designations) in ~~5~~10-year increments through 2030 and for ultimate service area build-out.

~~Table 3.16-1. Summary of Projected Population and Customer and Demand in the CalAm Larkfield Service Area that Includes the Proposed Sutter Hospital~~[1]

~~Project Year~~	~~Population Estimate~~	~~Projected Number of Connections~~	~~Required Firm Capacity~~		~~Required Additional Capacity~~
			~~(mgd)~~	~~(gpm)~~	~~(gpm)~~
~~2010~~	~~8,562~~	~~2,508~~	~~2.37~~	~~1,646~~	~~61~~
~~2015~~	~~8,830~~	~~2,584~~	~~2.44~~	~~1,696~~	~~111~~
~~2020~~	~~9,096~~	~~2,659~~	~~2.51~~	~~1,745~~	~~160~~
~~2030~~	~~9,370~~	~~2,733~~	~~2.58~~	~~1,794~~	~~209~~
~~Ultimate at build-out~~	~~10,063~~	~~2,936~~	~~2.77~~	~~1,926~~	~~341~~

[1] ~~Projections from the *Preliminary Feasibility Study for the Formation of a Community Services District to Provide Water Services to the Mark West Area* (EPS and Coastland Engineering 2007).~~

Table 3.16-1. Projected Additional Well Pumping Capacities Based on Population and Maximum Daily Demand in the CalAm Larkfield Service Area Through Buildout [1,2]

Project Year	Population Estimate	Projected Number of Connections	Required Firm Capacity		Existing Firm Capacity		Required Additional Well Production Capacity[3]	
			(mgd)	(gpm)	(mgd)	(gpm)	(mgd)	(gpm)
2010	8,562	2,508	2.37	1,646	2.226	1546	0.14	100
2020	9,096	2,659	2.51	1,745	2.226	1546	0.28	199
2030	9,370	2,733	2.58	1,794	2.226	1546	0.35	248
Ultimate at build-out	10,063	2,936	2.77	1,926	2.226	1546	0.54	380

[1] Projections from the *Preliminary Feasibility Study for the Formation of a Community Services District to Provide Water Services to the Mark West Area* (EPS and Coastland Engineering 2007).

[2] Projections for future Sutter medical facilities are not included in the projects for the Larkfield system.

[3] Figures corrected from 2007 Coastland report.

The projected increase in maximum daily demand between the current CalAm system capacity~~2010~~ and 2030~~2020~~ shown in **Table 3.16-1** is 0.35 mgd, which equates to 248~~148~~ gpm of new well production capacity~~, or 239 acre-feet. Based on the estimated increase in the number of households (286 households), this corresponds to an average demand per household of approximately 0.8 acre-feet per year.~~

The current level of well production capacity compared with the future projections of **Table 3.16-1** suggest the need for new water supply capacity in the CalAm system now, and considerable additional capacity at buildout. The addition of the Sutter project would add to the supply requirements of the CalAm system. Should CalAm need to supply the Sutter project, well production capacity in addition to that indicted in **Table 3.16-1** would need to be realized.

~~Future water demand was also estimated within a portion of the area overlying the aquifer that could be used to supply groundwater for the project. This is the study area used in the groundwater study included in Appendix H-2 (ENGEO, 2009c) and shown along with the Larkfield service area in **Figure 3.9-5**. The increase in annual demand by 2030 was estimated to be 239 acre-feet, based on an increase of 467 households within the ENGEO study area, including the demand for the proposed project, and only including the conservation required to offset the wastewater that would be produced by the project. When additional conservation was included, the increase in annual demand by 2030 was determined to be 168 acre-feet (ENGEO, 2009c). This corresponds to an average demand per household of approximately 0.5 acre-feet per year at existing consumption rates, or approximately 0.4 acre-feet per year when demand is decreased by 20% due to conservation.~~

~~The 2007 and 2008 annual water quality reports for the CalAm Larkfield service area did not report any exceedances of primary or secondary MCLs. However, the average level of arsenic in the treated water was 5 parts per billion (ppb) in 2007 and 4 ppb in 2008, which exceeds the public health goal of 0.004 ppb (CalAm 2009) but not the MCL for arsenic of 10 ppb.~~

Per Comment O.14.40, the text under the column headed "Program" in Table 3.16-3 starting on page 3.16-18 has been revised as follows:

PROGRAM

~~*To be verified by a feasibility study*~~

To be verified by the Offset Monitoring and Reporting Program

Per Comment O.14.41, the second paragraph of Mitigation Measure UT-4c on page 3.16-23 of the DEIR has been revised to read as follows:

> Sutter shall submit a report every six months to the SCWA starting just ~~in January 2010~~ prior to annexation of the site to the Airport-Larkfield-Wikiup Sanitation Zone and continuing until the retrofit program has reduced the waste generated in the Sanitation Zone sufficiently to offset the waste generated by this project. The report shall state the number of ESDs that have participated in the program and shall also provide an estimate of the date at which the program is expected to meet the needs of the project based on the rate of participation. If the date is later than the expected date of occupancy, a program to increase participation or the amount of savings by participants (e.g., include high efficiency washers in the program) shall be included in the report and subsequently implemented once approved by SCWA. The final report will need to show that the expected wastewater generated by the project has been offset by the retrofit program before an occupancy permit is granted.

Based on internal review, text on page 4-9 in Section 4.4.1 has been revised as follows:

- **Mitigation AIR-7: Develop project with the project design features and emissions reduction measures**

  The project shall be developed with the project design features and emissions reduction measures set forth in Appendix C-~~6~~5:

Per Comment O.14.43, corrections have been made to the last two references on page 9-1 of the EIR as follows:

> Brelje and Race Consulting Engineers. 2009a. Preliminary Stormwater Mitigation Plan and Preliminary Hydrology and Storm Water Detention Plan, New Replacement Hospital Project, Sutter Medical Center of Santa Rosa, October 22~~January 29~~.
>
> Brelje and Race Consulting Engineers. 2009b. Water and Wastewater Services Report, New Replacement Hospital Project, Sutter Medical Center of Santa Rosa, November 16~~January 29~~.

Per Comment PH.2.13, Section 9.0 of the DEIR on page 9-4 has been revised to add the following reference:

> Helicopter Association International. 1993. Fly Neighborly Guide. Produced by the Fly Neighborly Committee of HAI, Alexandria, VA.

Based on internal review, the following personal communications have been added to Section 9.0 of the EIR:

> Brody, K. 2010. Senior Project Manager. Mead & Hunt, Inc. Personal communication with Michael Zischke. March 9.
>
> Brody, K. 2010. Senior Project Manager, Mead & Hunt, Inc. Personal communication with Nadin Sponamore. April 15.
>
> Clark, T. 2010. Sutter Health Facilities Coordinator. Personal communication with Tom Minard. April 28.
>
> Cogbill, B. 2010. Sonoma County Sheriff. Personal communication with David Hurst. April 21.
>
> Hagenlocher, M. 2010. Wells Fargo Center Director of Operations. Personal communication with Michael Zischke. March 25.
>
> Kranz, L. 2010. Santa Rosa City Planner. Personal communication with Nadin Sponamore. January.
>
> Maddux-Gonzalez, M. 2010. Sonoma County Public Health Officer. Personal communication with Linda Schiltgen. April 20.

Minard, T. 2009-2010. Senior Project Manager, Sutter Health Planning and Development. Personal communications in meetings with Sonoma County Public Works, Sonoma County Transit, and City of Santa Rosa representatives, including Steve Schmitz, Sonoma County Transit, February through May 2009, and Steve Roraus, Santa Rosa City Bus Operations Superintendent, 2010.

Sponamore, N. 2010. Sponamore Associates. Personal communication with Scott Briggs. May 5.