

California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 4
OFFICE OF REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY PLANNING
P.O. BOX 23660, MS-10D | OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
www.dot.ca.gov



September 4, 2026

SCH #: 2024121124
GTS #: 04-SON-2025-010199
GTS ID: 35216
Co/Rt/Pm: SON/101/22.09

Robert Aguero, Department Program Manager
Sonoma County
2550 Ventura Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Re: County Administration Center Redevelopment Project — Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Dear Robert Aguero:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the County Administration Center Redevelopment Project. The Local Development Review (LDR) Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities. The following comments are based on our review of the June 2026 DEIR.

Please note this correspondence does not indicate an official position or approval by Caltrans on this project and is for informational purposes only.

Project Understanding

The proposed project would involve the construction of a 250,000-square-foot office building and an additional single-story 7,000 to 13,000 gross-square-foot Emergency Coordination Center (ECC). The project would include up to 1,500 residential units within multiple buildings with a maximum height of seven stories, and approximately 20,000 square feet of retail/commercial uses. The project would also include approximately 1,050 surface parking spaces beneath a one-megawatt solar microgrid with battery storage capability. Additional features include pedestrian connections, common open space, stormwater treatment facilities, utility infrastructure improvements, and stormwater design features. The project is directly adjacent to US 101 in Santa Rosa.

Highway Operations

Section	Page and Comment
DEIR 2.5 & Appendix B	Page 2-6 & Appendix B Page 1: The DEIR identifies impacts from the proposed retail component and proposed residential component as less than significant for the Project. We understand that they are currently analyzed on a programmatic level through the DEIR, hence further analysis may be required when the retail or the residential components reach the project level. If this is not the case, please elaborate further.
DEIR 4.13	Page 4.13-19: The DEIR mentions that the Projects' retail and office components would be screened (exempted) from further vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis as they are presumed to have less-than-significant impacts. Please provide an explanation for why the cumulative impact of these above mentioned components would be screened (exempted) from further VMT analysis and are not included in the current analysis. At what phase or date will further VMT analysis for these project components occur?
Appendix B	Page 14: Please verify the latest available Sonoma County Transit (SCT) routes around the project site including 20X, 48X, 60X, and 62X.
Appendix B	Page 19: It is possible that reducing office parking spaces will not sufficiently deter the expanded workforce from generating additional vehicle trips. Consequently, a conservative analysis is requested to evaluate the potential increase in total trip generation. Please reconsider the assumption of a net-zero change compared to existing conditions.
Appendix B	Pages 19-20: Please explain why the source of Table 1 is written ITE Trip Generation Manual 12th Edition, while the first paragraph below Trip Generation says ITE 11th Edition. And please clarify if the ITE 12th Edition already include the mixed-use development logic Provide supporting documents and calculations.
Appendix B	Page 20-22: 1. Please explain the basis behind the assumption for Figure 5. 2. Please specify how and when the data used to form the trip assignment for Figure 6 was collected. Please submit raw data and calculation for verification. Please confirm if this evaluation only includes employee commute to the office in the AM and from the Office in the PM. a. For example, Figure 6, intersection #1: If AM peak volumes are not in parentheses, and PM peak volumes

	are in parentheses, then why assign 2 trips in the AM and 1 trip in the PM for Northbound Left-Turn (NBLt). Why would there be trips to Westbound Through (WBT) and Westbound Right-Turn (WBRt) in the AM. In other words, please explain why there would be more trips in the afternoon/evening than in the morning period coming from the North. b. Additionally, for Figure 6, intersection 2, please explain why there are more trips heading north in the morning (AM) than in the afternoon/evening (PM). Where does the NBT go in the morning (AM) and why are there more NB trips than SB trips? c. Lastly, for Figure 6, intersections 12 & 13, please explain why there are more trips heading west and away from the project site.
Appendix B	Page 24-25: Please confirm if the latest Sonoma County Travel Model (SCTM 2023) with the four-step modelling processes should be used instead of the old Sonoma County Travel Model (SCTCA) model with a base year of 2019? Lastly, please show the VMT calculations and assumptions.
Appendix B	Page 26: Please draw the additional new curb cut on Mendocino Avenue. Please provide a drawing or map displaying this proposed modification.
Appendix B	Page 29: The DEIR states that the Project's residential and employment population would generate additional revenue to support local funding of these transit programs, and the expected increase in passenger demand is not projected to exceed available transit capacity. Please provide additional data that supports this statement suggesting that the increased demand from the project's residential population would be accommodated through available capacity of existing transit facility. Please specify the project's anticipated residential population.
Appendix B	Page 29-33: Under CEQA, a cumulative impact analysis must look at the impacts of a proposed project in combination with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. Please identify direct and indirect impacts of the proposed project that might contribute to a cumulative impact appropriately. Also, please show VMT calculations and assumptions.
Appendix B	Page 30: Please clarify if the assessment of cumulative residential VMT also consider the future residential 1,500 dwelling units within the project area.

Appendix A of Appendix B	Page 6: Please explain why you did not use the current edition of Highway Capacity Manual (HCM).
Appendix A of Appendix B	Page 8-9: Please confirm the accuracy of the source for Table 3, ITE Trip Generation Manual 12th Edition, given the previous comment regarding Table 1 in Appendix B (pages 19-20).
Appendix A of Appendix B	Page 9-11: Please see previous comment regarding figure 5 in Appendix B (pages 20-22)
Appendix A of Appendix B	Page 12: Please provide the Level of Service (LOS) calculation sheets mentioned in the last paragraph of this page.
Appendix A of Appendix B	Page 13: Please describe when and how the existing data for Figure 5 was collected. Please provide supporting documents.
Appendix A of Appendix B	Page 19: Please provide supporting documents to see the details of deficiencies described in Table 5.
Appendix A of Appendix B	Page 20: We observe that in addition to intersections 1, 9, and 13, the following intersections: 3, 7, 8, and 15 would also result in operating conditions below LOS D per Table 5. Please verify and edit content accordingly.
Appendix A of Appendix B	Page 20: Please provide information about who is responsible for the implementation of potential improvements to mitigate the future impacts of the Project. Please provide supporting documents for these improvements.

Traffic Safety

The increased traffic volume at the intersections may have an impact on traffic volumes, and therefore collision rates.

The intersection of the US 101 NB ramps and Guerneville Rd is highlighted as an intersection that will have a reduced LOS post-project without improvements. The proposed improvement to mitigate the LOS reduction by converting the middle left-through-right lane of the off ramp into a through-right lane would result in all left-turn traffic queueing in one lane instead of the existing two. To assess the potential safety concerns, an analysis should be performed on this condition to evaluate whether this will have a significant impact on queueing which may result in stopped cars close to or on the mainline highway, since it could increase the likelihood of vehicles on US 101 NB stopping suddenly, potentially resulting in more frequent rear-end collisions. Also, it is necessary to study how the increased volume on US 101, via the on ramps from Guerneville Rd will affect congestion-related collisions.

Lastly, when configurations are made to the NB off ramp, the crosswalk should be upgraded to ladder type to increase its visibility. Traffic Safety recommends monitoring of this location and how the proposed project impacts collision rates.

Construction-Related Impacts

Project work that requires movement of oversized or excessive load vehicles on State roadways requires a transportation permit that is issued by Caltrans. To apply, please visit Caltrans Transportation Permits ([link](#)).

Prior to construction, coordination may be required with Caltrans to develop a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to reduce construction traffic impacts to the STN.

Thank you again for including Caltrans in the environmental review process. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Edith Gonzales, acting Associate Transportation Planner, via LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov. For future early coordination opportunities or project referrals, please visit Caltrans LDR website ([link](#)) or contact LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Luo Yunsheng'.

YUNSHENG LUO
Branch Chief, Local Development Review
Office of Regional and Community Planning

c: State Clearinghouse