

Land Use and Circulation Alternatives Summary of Comments and Feedback

Updated May 11, 2022

The Santa Rosa Forward Project Team developed three future circulation and land use alternatives offering three different scenarios (“alternatives”) for how Santa Rosa could grow and change in the coming years and decades. The alternatives were developed based on the Existing Conditions Analysis, current equity issues, and Community Vision Statement developed during previous phases of the project. The alternatives each start with the potential for 36,000 new housing units (over the next 20+ years), equal to the number accommodated in the current General Plan, but differ in where new housing and other uses would go.

The three alternatives are described in an **Alternatives Workbook** that illustrates each alternative with a map and development diagram and provides a comparative analysis of how each addresses housing, economic growth, sustainability, safety, resiliency, and equity priorities and needs in Santa Rosa. Each scenario aims to implement the Community Vision while offering a unique approach to distributing future housing and retail growth across the community. In the Fall and Winter of 2021/2022, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Community Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed and provided feedback on the alternatives and a draft Alternatives Workbook prior to its public release.

After the release of the Alternatives Workbook, in March and May 2022, the Project Team facilitated a **Land Use and Circulation Alternatives Event Set**. The event set was organized around the content and ideas presented in the Alternatives Workbook and designed to gather community feedback on the alternatives and major policy choices. The Project Team developed and conducted a range of in-person and virtual engagement events and tools to reach the community through the event set. Among the tools developed was an **Alternatives Worksheet**, adaptable for use as a paper worksheet or web-based survey, designed as a companion to the Alternatives Workbook, with a series of questions to identify community priorities and preferences related to the alternatives and policy choices. This document summarizes the event set and community input, organized into three parts:

- **Part 1: Community Events and Surveys:** A summary of the different community events and surveys conducted during the Land Use and Circulation Alternatives phase of the project.
- **Part 2: Major Themes and Feedback:** A summary of the major reoccurring themes and feedback the Project Team heard from the community.

- **Part 3: Combined Summary of All Responses and Comments:** A comprehensive summary of all responses, comments, and ideas received from the community.

The combined community feedback summarized in this document will be used by the Project Team to develop a draft **Preferred Alternative**, which will be presented to the community during a subsequent round of engagement.

Collage of Community Event Photos



Part 1

Community Events and Surveys

The Land Use and Circulation Alternatives Event Set was the third series of community workshops, surveys, and events for Santa Rosa Forward. The event set included six different options for members of the community to participate and provide feedback: pop-up events, community workshops, CAC member-led meetings, City staff-led meetings, a virtual open house, and an online survey.

Pop-Up Events

The Project Team hosted a pop-up tent during a variety of community events and at key locations in Santa Rosa to help promote the project and solicit feedback on the alternatives and policy choices. The pop-up included a series of display posters and bilingual materials summarizing the alternatives and how they compare to one another. These pop-up events provided an important opportunity to bring awareness and visibility of the Santa Rosa Forward project to the broader community. The discussions that took place during these events were informal and staff directed people to Community Workshops, the Online Survey, and the Virtual Open House to learn more about the alternatives and policy choices and provide additional comments and feedback.

Event	Date and Time	Event, Location
Pop-Up 1	March 12 th , 9:00 am-12:00 pm	Arbor Day Tree Planting, Rincon Valley Community Park
Pop-Up 2	March 13 th , 10:30 am - 1:30 pm	St. Patrick 5K Race, Courthouse Square
Pop-Up 3	March 16 th , 2:00 pm – 4:00 pm	Redwood Empire Food Bank Distribution, Bayer Farm, Roseland
Pop-Up 4	March 21 st , 12:45 pm-2:45 pm	Redwood Empire Food Bank Distribution, Martin Luther King Jr. Park in South Park
Pop-Up 5	March 23 rd , 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm	Oliver's Seniors Shopping Day, Montecito Shopping Center
Pop-Up 6	March 26 th , 4:00 pm - 8:00 pm	The Mary Lou Low Rider Patrol Car Reveal, City Hall Parking Lot
Pop-Up 7	April 3 rd , 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm	Roseland Youth Wellness Fair, Elsie Allen High School
Pop-Up 8	April 23 rd , 11:00 am – 2:00 pm	Earth Day, Courthouse Square
Pop- Up 9	April 28 th , 4:30 pm to 7:30 pm	Celebrating Parents as Heroes, Children's Museum of Sonoma County

Community Workshops

In March 2022, the Project Team hosted five in-person Community Workshops to present the alternatives and gather community comments and feedback on the alternatives and a policy choices. The workshops were held at varying times on different days of the week to be accessible to varying audiences. The workshops had identical agendas and were conducted in the same manner to ensure participants had similar experiences.

Upon arrival, attendees were asked to register, providing their name, email, and their relationship to Santa Rosa (whether they live in, work in, and or visit the city). Each participant was offered dinner, childcare, a day transit pass, a pen, project swag including a bag and or a notepad, and an Alternatives Worksheet. The Alternatives Worksheet is a questionnaire packet that allowed residents to share feedback with 13 questions on policy regarding the future of housing, jobs, economic development, mobility, sustainability, safety, resiliency, and equity and seven demographic questions to track the diversity of the people who responded.

For the first 20-30 minutes of each workshop, there was an open house gallery of poster versions of the Alternatives Workbook in both English and Spanish. Attendees were able to roam around the room and ask questions to the various Project Team members in the room. Depending on the workshop, the Project Team then presented in either or both English and Spanish. The presentation provided an update on the Santa Rosa Forward process, introduced the Alternatives Workbook and Worksheet. Presentations concluded with a question-and-answer period. After, attendees were provided dinner and were able to roam around the gallery to ask more questions as they completed their Worksheets.

Workshop	Date and Time	Location	Language(s)	Participants
Workshop 1	Wed., March 16 4:30 – 6:30 pm	Steele Lane Community Center 415 Steele Lane	English, with Spanish translation	18 Participants
Workshop 2	Fri., March 18 5:30 – 7:30 pm	Roseland University Prep 1931 Biwana Drive, #1	Spanish, with English translation	21 Participants
Workshop 3	Tues., March 22, 5:30 – 7:30 pm	Central Santa Rosa Library 211 E Street	English, with multilingual translation	25 Participants
Workshop 4	Thur., March 24, 5:30 – 7:30 pm	Finley Community Center 2060 W College Ave.	Spanish, with English translation	7 Participants
Workshop 5	Sat., March 26, 11:00 am – 1:00 pm	South Park Lighthouse Church 920 Bennett Valley Rd	English, with Spanish translation	26 Participants
Total				97 Participants

City Staff Meetings and Presentations

City staff held additional meetings and presentations with more than 15 organizations throughout the city. The meetings with organizations were an opportunity to introduce Santa Rosa Forward, present the alternatives, organize other workshops, and encourage people take the online survey or visit our virtual studio.

No.	Meeting or Presentation	Date and Time	Organization/Group
1	Meeting with Vice President of the NAACP Sonoma County Branch	Mon., January 31, 10:00 am – 11 am	NAACP Sonoma County Branch
2	Meeting with Santa Rosa City Schools District	Thur., Feb. 3, 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm	Santa Rosa City Schools District
3	Meeting with Gustavo Sanchez, Latinx Radio	Fri., March 4, 2:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Latinx Radio
4	Phone meeting with Nancy Wong, President of RECA	Mon., March 7, 9:00 am - 10:00 am	Redwood Empire Chinese Association (RECA)
5	Radio Interview with Greta Mart, KRCB	Mon., March 7, 2:30 pm - 3:00 pm	Radio - Northern California Public Media
6	Roseland Charter School Board Meeting Presentation	Wed., March 8 5:30 – 8:30 pm	Roseland School Charter
7	Phone Interview with Iliana Salguero for	Mon., March 14 9:30 – 10:00 pm	La Prensa Sonoma
8	Mujeres Unidas / United Women weekly Meeting	Tues., March 15 5:30 – 7:30 pm	Mujeres Unidas / United Women
9	Roseland School District Board Meeting	Wed., March 16, 5:30 – 7:30 pm	Roseland School District
10	Planning & Development Day Presentation	Thur., March 17, 5:30 – 7:30 pm	Leadership Santa Rosa Program
11	Meeting with Catholic Charities Santa Rosa	Fri., March 25, 11:00 am – 1:00 pm	Catholic Charities of Santa Rosa
12	Live Radio Interview with Maria Mendoza, Voces de Mujeres	Sat., March 26, 11:00 am – 1:00 pm	KBBF 89.1 FM
13	SB 18 Meeting with Federated Indians Graton Rancheria	Wed., March 30, 2:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Federated Indians Graton Rancheria
14	Presentation at Santa Rosa Together Periodical Meeting	Thu., April 7, 4:00-6:00 pm	Santa Rosa Together
15	Presentation to Advocacy Council Meeting	Thu., April 13, 12:00 pm – 1:30pm	Santa Rosa Metro Chamber
16	Presenting at Race and Sexism class, Prof. Manza Atkinson class	Thu., April 14, 11:00 am – 12:00pm	Sonoma State University
17	Environmental Justice Panel	Thu., April 21, 5:30 pm – 7:00pm	Generation Housing and Greenbelt Alliance
18	Meeting with North Bay Organizing Project	Thu., April 28, 11:00 am – 12:00pm	North Bay Organizing Project

Virtual Open House

The Project Team developed an online Virtual Open House that mirrored the content in the Community Workshops. This Virtual Open House, which was digitally located in Old Courthouse Square, provided an opportunity for Santa Rosans to experience the workshop format and discussions without having to attend an in-person event. The virtual space included videos from members of the Project Team that provided an overview of each station

The Virtual Open House was available in both English and Spanish formats and provided an additional opportunity for people to provide feedback on the alternatives and policy choices by responding to the same questions posed in the Alternatives Worksheet. A total of 657 people visited the Virtual Open House.

Online Survey

The Project Team also developed an Online Survey that included the same questions from the Virtual Open House and Alternatives Worksheet, distributed at the Community Workshops, but in a simple questionnaire format. The Online Survey was available in both English and Spanish formats and provided an additional opportunity for people to provide feedback on the alternatives and policy choices. A total of 284 people filled out the Online Survey (261 in English and 23 in Spanish).

Part 2

Summary of Major Themes and Feedback

The following is a summary of the major themes and feedback provided by the community during all the engagement events. This includes comments made during the in-person workshops and pop-up events, as responses submitted in completed Alternatives Worksheets (e.g., physical comment cards), the Virtual Open House, and online surveys. The summary narrative is written based on the following approach:

- *Respondents strongly favored/felt/agreed/disagreed/were concerned* = 70% or higher response rate.
- *Respondents generally favored/felt/agreed/disagreed/were concerned* = 50% or higher response rate.
- *There is a desire/preference/concern* = there were multiple written comments on the same topic or idea.

Economic and Housing Development

- Respondents generally favored focusing new housing and job growth towards Downtown, along major corridors and community corridors, and in neighborhood retail centers.
- Respondents generally disagreed with focusing new housing and commercial uses across the city proportionally to where they exist today.
- There is a desire to not locate new housing/population growth within the wildland urban interface (WUI).
- While there was a preference to focus new housing in Downtown, there were also comments to ensure there is a mix of housing at a range of affordability levels located throughout the city (not just high-end or expensive housing formats).
- There is a concern regarding the increased infrastructure pressures new housing would put on city assets and resources (roads, sidewalks, water, etc.).
- Respondents strongly favored locating new housing within walking or wheeling distance to existing and planned shopping and dining areas.
- Respondents generally favored ensuring new shopping and commercial areas have multi-modal access.
- Respondents generally favored creating housing and circulation patterns that are more conducive to seniors and the ability to “age in place.”

- There is a desire to increase walkability and transit services/amenities throughout Santa Rosa for all residents, especially seniors.
- There is a concern about the location of Elnoka Senior Community as it impacts to traffic and access to commercial spaces.

Efficient and Sustainable Development

- Respondents generally favored re-purposing major streets as multi-modal corridors that include safe and accessible pedestrian and bicycle facilities, focusing new housing and non-residential uses near SMART rail stations to support Santa Rosa and other Bay Area commuters, and focusing growth in central areas of the city to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- Respondents strongly favored preserving natural ecosystems and resources, such as plants, trees, and wildlife within the city.
- Respondents generally favored allocating more resources to communities that are the most vulnerable to climate-related hazards.
- There is a desire to ensure that new growth is planned and managed to ensure there is adequate water supply and availability.
- There is a desire to help insulate low-income households and vulnerable communities from the effects of climate change.
- Respondents generally favored Improving bus transit services and amenities to allow convenient access to most neighborhoods, including improving multi-modal access to SMART stations and creating a complete network of bicycle facilities connecting neighborhoods to major destinations.
- Respondents generally disagreed with building new streets or adding lanes to existing streets, to provide more vehicle capacity.
- There is a strong desire to ensure all neighborhoods have complete and accessible sidewalks, access to bicycle facilities (lanes, pathways), and reliable public transportation.
- There is a desire to modify Highway 12 for the safety of all pedestrians, cyclist, and vehicles for regular operations and states of emergency.

Resilience and Safety

- Respondents were strongly concerned with the ongoing threat of drought, evacuation planning, and wildfires in Santa Rosa. There was a general concern for earthquakes and fires caused by earthquakes. There was also some concern about landslides and severe weather.
- Respondents were less concerned about the ongoing threat of floods or dam failures.
- There is a desire to address the effects of the current pandemic or the potential effects of future pandemics in the General Plan.
- Some specific concern regarding evacuation planning reference the constraints and traffic on highway 12 in the Oakmont area.
- Respondents strongly agreed with limiting the amount of housing in wildfire prone areas of Santa Rosa and ensuring that all neighborhoods have safe and efficient emergency evacuation routes.
- Respondents generally agreed with limiting the amount of housing in flood prone areas and near earthquake fault zones.
- There was a desire to balance the need for more housing (and denser housing) with safety considerations.
- There is a desire to consider the needs of people with disabilities in the safety and evacuation approaches.

Equity in Santa Rosa

- Some respondents felt that pollution exposure and poor air quality are issues in Santa Rosa.
- Many respondents felt that opportunities to be involved in community decision making, access to public facilities and services, access to public spaces supporting physical activity, access to healthy and affordable foods, and access to safe and sanitary housing are not major issues in Santa Rosa (note: respondents who felt these were major issues identified their concerns to specific neighborhoods).
- Respondents felt that limited understanding of how local land use and funding decisions are made, limited understanding of my Council District or connections to my Council member and concerned about whether they would be heard are all barriers for them being actively involved in City decision-making processes.

- Participants strongly felt the following activities should be funded and prioritized to ensure each neighborhood receives equitable public investments in the coming years:
 - Develop a prioritized list of improvements or services for each neighborhood.
 - Ensure every neighborhood has access to parks and community spaces.
- Participants generally felt the following activities should be funded and prioritized to ensure each neighborhood receives equitable public investments in the coming years:
 - Ensure environmental justice, safety, and equity related projects are funded and prioritized for identified Equity Priority Communities.
 - Prioritize development that addresses social and economic needs of the economically vulnerable populations.
 - Address and reverse the underlying socioeconomic factors and residential social segregation in the community that contribute to crime and violence in the city.
- There is a desire to streamline City review and approval processes for new projects to reduce cost and expedite good projects.
- There is a desire to continue to incorporate opportunities for virtual meetings and language interpretation access.
- Participants generally felt the following actions and activities will help improve community health:
 - Build or improve sidewalks in my community.
 - Build or improve bike lanes in my community.
 - Build or improve parks in my community.
 - Reduce air pollution in my community.
 - Reduce water pollution in my community.
 - Access to affordable housing.
 - Access to healthy and affordable food.
 - Access to jobs.
- Participants felt that the largest sources of air quality issues for them and their families include vehicle emissions, Gas cooking appliances or heaters in the home, and wildfire smoke.
- Participants generally felt the following actions and activities are barriers they face to access safe and sanitary housing:
 - Financial barriers to pay security deposit and move-in expenses.
 - Inability to meet minimum credit score requirements.
 - Lack of affordable homes suitable for family size.

- Housing not adequately maintained by landlord.
- Inability to afford needed repairs on home I own
- Not able to request needed repairs from landlord out of fear of eviction.

Alternatives Comparison

- The strong majority of respondents favored Alternative 2 (53%) and Alternative 1 (49%), or a combination of the two.
- Major reoccurring refinements to the alternatives included:
 - Focusing new housing growth near transit (current and planned) and near Downtown.
 - Reducing the amount of new growth within the wildland urban interface (WUI) area to improve community safety and reduce the threat of future wildfire hazards.
 - Ensuring that all neighborhoods have adequate evacuation routes in the event of a wildfire or other natural disaster.
 - Ensuring future growth and change limits direct impacts to the natural environment and open space areas.
 - Creating more mixed-use neighborhoods along major corridors and within Downtown.
 - Ensuring new growth areas can have adequate access to multi-modal transportation and future mobility options (e.g., drones, autonomous vehicles, electric vehicles, etc.).
 - Ensuring there is a range of housing types and affordability levels throughout the city to improve equity, while also keeping the growth areas within the confines of Alternatives 1 and 2.

Part 3

Combined Summary of All Responses and Comments

Each of the engagement methods described in Part 1 included information from the Alternatives Workbook and the same questions for community members to respond to. The following is a combined summary of all community comments and feedback received during the Land Use and Circulation Alternatives Event Set. While the results should not be considered statistically valid for the entire Santa Rosa population, the findings are from a broad enough sample that they can help identify common themes and concerns when combined with the various community input activities conducted for the Santa Rosa Forward project.

For each question, a letter “n” is provided to identify the number of respondents to that individual question (note, participants were not required to answer every question). This number is the basis of the percentages shown. The value for n varies for each question since respondents could skip questions when taking the survey. Also, some questions allowed participants to select two or more answer choices, resulting in total counts greater than the number of respondents and total percentages greater than 100%, in some instances.

Station #1: Economic and Housing Development

Q1: Where should we encourage most new jobs, commercial, single-family housing, and multi-family housing?

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion
Focus new housing and job growth towards Downtown and along major corridors. N:228	52%	36%	11%	1%
Focus new housing and commercial growth in neighborhood retail centers and along community corridors. N:223	49%	34%	16%	1%
Focus new housing and commercial uses across the city proportionally to where they exist today. N:221	21%	26%	48%	5%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- Increasing neighborhood density reduces quality of life.
- Alt 2 w/o the urban wildland interface areas in N.E.
- Development needs to include library and cultural census enhancements.
- One of SR's main issuer is the city is spread out- a mid-sized city in 7 different neighborhoods.

- I prefer alternative #2, but take grave exception to the identification of housing focus areas in the WUI in Fountaingrove and the Oakmont related area. We CANNOT put more people in harm's way.
- Focus away from those areas subject to firestorms
- I believe that neighborhood retail centers would decrease driving and free up clogged roads. However, new housing should not be in eastern Santa Rosa unless significant infrastructure, especially roads (including Hwy 12) are widened or added, because these roads are already too crowded other alternatives. However, new housing should not be in the east.
- Downtown needs to get rid of the big bank buildings and allow for shops, maybe apartments on 2nd floor. Use Sonoma, Napa, and Healdsburg as examples. Add neighborhood grocery & retail centers. Build single story houses.
- No new housing, as we have a water shortage!
- Important not to allow development along Hwy 12 east of Los Alamos because of wildfire evacuation considerations.
- Do not build Elnoka.
- Keep new development away from wildfire-prone areas.
- California is experiencing a mass exodus. We do not need to build more. The city can incentivize homeowners to add ADU's to their property.
- Above all, fire evacuation plans must be already planned for existing areas prior to even considering building homes i.e., only one way of evacuating Oakmont Village, no Elnoka plan should even be considered prior to new escape routes out of Oakmont Village.
- I support option #1.
- Keep highway 12 corridor from Rincon Valley to Glen Ellen low traffic volume, maintain rural atmosphere. Expansion of the highway will be very disruptive to the environment and the communities in the area.
- Create housing where it has the least environmental impact but increases density where commercial enterprises can thrive.
- A combination of Alternative 1 and 2 would be best.
- How can we grow when we don't have water to support the existing population?
- I tend to prefer alternate 2.
- Focus on Alternative one with one or two neighborhood center.
- Please do not build out on Hwy 12 near Oakmont. There are not enough viable ways to get out in case of fire or other emergencies.

- Santa Rosa is turning into San Jose. Too many ugly, cheap looking apartments with no true style. Put a stop to developers erecting housing that detracts from our ability to live in the Santa Rosa we moved here for.
- Makes sense to focus low income and senior multifamily housing in areas where there is easy access to retail services. Santa Rosa needs more economically available housing units to meet current needs.
- Walking and biking to work is preferable to driving.
- Alternative 2 allows small business to flourish and provide good walk-able neighborhoods throughout the city. It is more realistic to implement, and its dispersal will allow smaller scale missing middle housing rather than larger apartment and condo developments. It will offer opportunities for individual owners and small developers to develop denser housing rather than cater to larger developers that need a minimum number of units to pencil out development.
- Big housing needs is affordable housing to support those who are in the very to extremely low-income category. Another is having housing that is accessible to those with Disabilities, an accessible home will have a zero-step entrance at least 32-inch width doorways and pathways, a bathroom with grab bars, and lowered climate controls light switches, doorbells.
- One of my concerns with the downtown focus (Alt 1) is that new development is so concentrated downtown that it appears to leave some of Santa Rosa's wealthier neighborhoods (Bennet Valley, Rincon Valley, Montgomery Village) untouched by increased density. I think all of Santa Rosa would benefit from increased density, excluding wildfire and flood prone areas. There is existing commercial sprinkled throughout our city that would benefit from increased residential density within walking/biking distance. I like the vision of a Santa Rosa that is a series of denser neighborhoods connected by biking and walking paths, vs. only a single core of downtown density. I worry focusing all development on downtown means city residents that don't live along the proposed transit corridors would need to drive downtown, but with such concentrated, high density right there, it will become trafficky and end up discouraging residents who live outside the core from coming downtown. I don't think we need 20 story buildings all over downtown, I think we need more 3-story buildings all over the city near existing hubs of commerce and parks.
- We should help neighborhoods thrive, not just downtown merchants.
- We need to take into account the fact that many people will continue to work, at least part-time, remotely. Also, many neighborhoods do not currently have easy/walkable access to services and stores. I would like to see more grocery stores and services within walking distance of my neighborhood. For example, I can easily walk to a marijuana dispensary but must use my vehicle to shop for groceries.

Q2: Is nearby access, including walking and wheeling, to shopping important, or is it ok for housing to be more separated from these commercial uses?

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion
Locate new housing so it is within walking or wheeling distance to existing and planned shopping and dining areas. N:222	71%	15%	14%	0%
Ensure new shopping and commercial areas have multi-modal access, regardless of where they are located. N:216	61%	26%	8%	5%
Housing and circulation patterns should allow for more seniors, or “aging in place.” N:218	60%	26%	8%	7%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- More office type services concentrated near downtown but retail and restaurants in neighborhood centers. Either way focus on investing in reliable frequent public transit lines in the major circulation corridors and focus development along those corridors.
- Keep commercial and more hosting away from Sonoma valley as it's already overloaded for traffic during wildfire exits.
- I could not choose an option because it's impossible to consider housing without considering roads. Please see my response to Q2 (the first question in my survey (for some reason no Q1 appears in the survey I'm using)).
- More smaller HOA senior communities mixed in neighborhoods.
- Housing for all age should provide private patios to grow food, enjoy pets, and enjoy nature. High rise housing should be limited.
- Do not build Elnoka.
- This city needs a senior and disabled bus system. Many cities have implemented this method with great success. I encourage Santa Rosa to work smarter.
- I support option #1.
- Commercial viability will come mostly from younger generations but some allowance might be considered for a modest number of senior living arrangements (in place or otherwise).
- How can we grow when we don't have water to support the existing population?
- Santa Rosa needs affordable housing for seniors but not concentrated next a WUI. I would also be interested in knowing how much of our current senior housing is populated retirees from other cities, counties and states rather than local retirees.
- Aging in place is a myth only truly available for rich people.

- Housing like Elnoka should not happen because of the location. Hwy 12 is a scenic byway, Elnoka would impose on Annabel State Park, it would keep local residents of Oakmont and area from being able to evacuate in emergencies because of the increase in residents, and for many more reasons. Design of Santa Rosa must take neighborhood residents into prime consideration.
- One of the best parts of living in an urban area is walk & bike friendly neighborhoods. I'd prefer not to need to drive to destinations.
- It is not OK to continue the current pattern of segregating housing from other uses. We need to integrate commercial and housing to allow for a greater diversity of housing types and to encourage more sustainable future.
- To make walking and wheeling safe sidewalks will need to be well maintained as cracks and bumps can pose a safety issue for those with mobility and or vision disabilities. There should also be plastic bumps to indicate the end of the sidewalk and/or beginning of the cross walk. Cross walks will also need to be highly visible and signalized and time especially for those on busy/main streets. The time allowed to cross will need to be long enough for those with mobility disabilities to cross, for example they may need 15 seconds instead of 10 seconds to safely cross. If the time cannot be extended then curb extensions or refugee islands will need to be created to allow for safe crossing. It would also be good to have class IV separated bikeways or bike lanes with a vertical/physically buffer to make it safe to wheel in bike lanes as they may be lower to the ground and harder to see. Finally public transit both fixed routes and paratransit will still need good in these areas to help get people to and from their destination even if it is a couple blocks.
- I would like housing to be integrated with commercial uses. I love walking to the grocery store, coffee shop, bike shop. I wish I could meet more of my needs by walking or a short bike trip.
- What exactly do you mean by "multi-modal access," and what does choosing that option actually mean?

Station #2: Efficient and Sustainable Development

Q3: What actions should we take to best support a sustainable future for Santa Rosa?

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion
Re-purpose major streets as multi-modal corridors that include safe and accessible pedestrian and bicycle facilities. N:224	67%	23%	7%	3%
Focus new housing and non-residential uses near SMART rail stations to support Santa Rosa and other Bay Area commuters. N:225	63%	30%	4%	3%
Focus growth in central areas of the city to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. N: 222	59%	32%	7%	2%
Preserve natural ecosystems and resources, such as plants, trees, wildlife, within the city. N:229	90%	9%	0%	1%
Allocate more resources to communities that are the most vulnerable to climate related hazards. N:226	66%	15%	15%	4%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- Don't assume growth is inevitable. Provide enough water for comfortable living, supporting gardens, taking baths!
- Allocate resources according to need in mitigate environmental justice and released hazards.
- Only about 12% of Sonoma County residents commute out of the County, so until all the SMART stations are open, and the last mile is dealt with, development around SMART isn't all that exciting to me.
- The neighborhood hubs are good for leisure activities. I like walking to a coffee shop, retail, a restaurant, some groceries, a park. I don't need to walk to my insurance office - focus that stuff downtown near mass transit.
- Make Hwy 12 near Oakmont 4 lanes.
- East end needs another fire station, no more housing. Too many already and a busy corridor to Sonoma town
- I chose the last alternative. Plenty of resources are already located to central Santa Rosa, but there are insufficient (police, fire, retail, medical) in Oakmont.
- Wildfire evacuation corridors especially.

- More resources should be applied to protecting the woodland fire interface as that helps all residents of Santa Rosa. We should learn from recent fires and the impact they had in entire city.
- Fire mitigation is critical to the wellbeing of Santa Rosa residents.
- Do not build Elnoka.
- Elnoka is in a WUI area, so it should not be allowed to be built.
- Many of our “major streets” are not walkable. Areas of Santa Rosa are not receiving the same resources, such as sidewalks and storm drains. We all pay the same property taxes and the lack of attention to these areas is completely unacceptable.
- Santa Rosa has an enormous problem with fires and lack of evacuation roads. One road "out" of a community not only doesn't work, but it will cause death. This must be a priority.
- I support option #1.
- Fire safety vegetation mgmt., home hardening requirements for safe properties by added building code desirable.
- How can we grow when we don't have water to support the existing population?
- Allocating more resources to vulnerable communities to aid in wildfire evacuation; not to build more of anything in WUI or near WUI areas.
- First, make all neighborhoods walk and bike friendly. Second, improve public transit to get between regional cities or to desirable shopping centers. Third, improve electric vehicle charging infrastructure.
- We need to make all streets safe for cyclists and pedestrians, and allow stores within walking distance of most homes. Redesign roads that are proving dangerous, provide more safe crosswalks and bike-paths, and reduce speed limits to avoid any serious injuries if there is a crash.
- The Disability community is a community group that would greatly benefit from getting more resources to deal with climate change and the hazards that come with it. For the re purpose of main streets they will need to be accessible to all mobility levels for both pedestrians and bicyclists.
- The City should help insulate low-income households from the effects of climate change, but should not be shoring up wealthy neighborhoods that have encroached on wild spaces and are now subject to increased fire/flood risk.

Q4: What transportation investments would you like to make it easy and enjoyable to get around?

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion
Ensure all neighborhoods have complete and accessible sidewalks. N:222	69%	23%	5%	3%
Improve bus transit services and amenities to allow convenient access to most neighborhoods. N:225	67%	28%	4%	1%
Improve multi-modal access to SMART stations. N:219	63%	30%	4%	3%
Create a complete network of bicycle facilities connecting neighborhoods to shopping centers, office areas, Downtown, and parks and open space areas. N:225	60%	26%	11%	3%
Build new streets, or add lanes to existing streets, to provide more vehicle capacity. N:221	29%	25%	44%	2%

Other Comments and Feedback

- Take space away from cars and give it back to the people!
- Sidewalks, bike lanes, curb cuts- ADA accessible.
- Car culture does no build community.
- More active transportation options (bike share, scooters share, protected bike lanes and sidewalks).
- We need to have a public transportation system that works for the people. 6 miles is the average trip in Sonoma County. More people would take public transportation if it was more flexible and convenient -- large (mostly empty) buses on fixed routes that take a long time to get from A to B do NOT work.
- Bikes are not practical for families at all. Stop focusing on bikes and focus on reliable frequent public transportation. I can't bike my kids to get groceries. Also, not all neighborhoods need equal bus service. Focus that on transportation corridors connecting a dense downtown and neighborhood hubs.
- Improve access to Oakmont for emergencies.
- Add lanes eastward to Oakmont only.
- Widen Highway 12 to Kenwood.

- I am not in favor of new streets, but I am in favor of adding lanes to accommodate existing traffic and allow emergency egress.
- Envision access to neighborhood shopping centers via walking, biking. Or even, for seniors or disabled, low emission golf cart access.
- I live in Oakmont and would love to take a shuttle or to the Smart train with few intervening stops. Until that happen, we need to widen roads because the only viable option for Oakmont residents is a car.
- Pedestrians need maximum protection. With Specialized Bicycles now in town, consult with them regarding how other communities make bicycling safer. City bus and Sonoma Transit need to carry more than 3 bikes, especially during commute hours.
- Maintain all streets more effectively (example-well used Calistoga Road)
- Property at Melita and Hwy 12 should be small retail, grocery, and a park. Parking hub for public transportation to downtown & employment areas. No apartments or housing at Melita & Hwy 12. It's too dangerous for fire evacuations.
- Wildfire evacuation corridors especially.
- Only as needed for evacuation corridors.
- Widen Hwy 12 each of Melita Road to improve fire evacuation.
- Widen Hwy 12 for use in evacuations only (e.g., center lane designed to easily alternate direction of traffic).
- Do not build Elnoka.
- Highway 12 between Calistoga and Oakmont Drive needs to be more accessible, either with extra bike lanes, to be used to multi lanes in emergencies.
- Build another exit street from Oakmont in case of fire.
- First fix our streets and roads starting to resemble 3rd world conditions.
- With all the consideration for alternate transport methods, adding more lanes might not be necessary. We don't need 30,000+ new homes. We definitely don't need so many new offices since people are working remotely.
- Once more, fire evacuation.
- I support option #1 and widen Hwy 12 near Oakmont.
- These items add significant cost with little or no economic benefit to the city. The only become a source of future expense for repairs and thus, should be minimized or mostly eliminated as a bad investment.
- The scenic corridor of highway 12 cannot be expanded for quicker evacuation, but Highway 12 shoulders could be expanded for bicycles and emergency vehicles and evacuation.

- How can we grow when we don't have water to support the existing population?
- We need to focus on access options that decrease the use of motor vehicles and make it easier for people access food, shopping, schools and restaurants by walking.
- Put major focus on using the shoulders of Highway 12 for emergency egress due to fires, or other natural disasters.
- Large bike lane near Oakmont that can be used to evacuate people during emergencies.
- Add a large bike lane on highway 12 near Oakmont to be used as an escape route during evacuations.
- Improving the quality of our road surfaces, but not build new streets or lanes as that will add to more development, crowding and car traffic and pollution.
- There are some roads that should have additional lanes built to handle safe evacuations. For example, Highway 12 near Oakmont.
- Make it easy as possible to use a combination of walking, biking, and public transport.
- The climate crisis will require us to reduce driving and shift to light-weight (small) electric vehicles. We should begin to redesign streets and neighborhoods to accommodate them. The average adult should be expected to drive less than 50 thousand miles each year; roads should be modified accordingly.
- All of the improvements above will need to be accessible people with Disabilities. Sidewalks will need to be well maintained and there should be no gaps or missing sections. The bus system for both fixed route and paratransit will need to be robust and reliable, with more frequent bus times as many people with Disabilities don't drive and rely on public transit to get around. It would be good to see bike lanes that have some sort of physical buffer to help create separation between the lane and cars. This will help create a better sense of safety especially if the lane is by some in a wheelchair, another mobility device or a specialized bike which may be lower to the ground and harder to see by motorists.
- Santa Rosa is almost entirely flat, making it ideal for biking. A key hurdle to safe biking at major intersections, which are spread all throughout Santa Rosa. I'd like to see a subset of roads that bisect Santa Rosa be converted to bike- and pedestrian-forward roads. They can still allow cars but use design to force slow driving; have intersections where all 4 crossings are open for pedestrians at once; eliminate parking along the road and convert to a walk/bike path. We have enough roads to support really focusing on pedestrians and bikers on a few. People might lose their mind over this, but Sonoma Ave would be a perfect example since there are alternatives paralleling Sonoma that are great for cars. I hope the Southeast Greenway comes to fruition as that would also be ideal - especially if new housing can be integrated in that plan.

Station #3: Resilience and Safety

Q5: Which natural hazards or safety issues are you most concerned about?

Policy Choices	Very Concerned	Concerned	Not Concerned	No Opinion
Wildfire N:233	87%	12%	0%	1%
Flood N:219	9%	29%	60%	2%
Drought N:228	76%	22%	0%	2%
Dam Failure N:215	9%	23%	62%	6%
Earthquake N:224	43%	49%	8%	0%
Fire Caused by Earthquake N:223	36%	50%	2%	12%
Landslide (earthquakes, rainfall, and post-fire) N:221	18%	43%	36%	3%
Severe Weather such as Extreme Heat N:221	39%	43%	4%	14%
Evacuation Planning N:228	73%	23%	1%	3%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- No development should be allowed in flood plains.
- Another pandemic? Asteroid? zombies?
- SR's GP EIR had better adequately evaluate evacuation routes, particularly with regard to wildfire dangers, since at least 5 development related EIRs have been kicked out by courts for lack of adequate evacuation planning. This is why I oppose Alternative 2's proposed housing opportunity sites in SR's WUI areas.
- We need to focus on living roofs and other cooling measures and ways to recharge the water tables too.
- Concentrate evacuation planning on the Oakmont community.
- Access to Oakmont and that area is lacking.
- Have PGE put power lines underground on east end thru Valley of the Moon.
- Oakmont Village needs additional exit routes.
- Air quality associated with fire. Not that city planning can address that.
- The Oakmont evacuation in 2020 was not successful for most Oakmont residents. We need an additional exit road: to Lawndale from the east side of Oakmont Drive, or via Annadel to Bennett Valley Road. Also widen Channel drive and run it to west Oakmont. Keeping a to-go bag is not the simple matter the first department proposes. The things I need to take are the

things I use every day--medications, electronics, paperwork, the clothes I wear. When we leave, we don't know if we will ever see our house and car again. Many of us are not affluent.

- Immobile residents, including seniors needing transportation must be evacuated much sooner than in the past.
- Beaver Creek crossing Hwy 12 at Oakmont can flood and cause erosion.
- Hwy 12 too burdened for efficient evacuation. All new developments need to address impacts to evacuation and also to impact on water resources. Existing residential should not have to bear the burden.
- Underground gas utilities and impacts to evacuation routes during earthquake.
- Crowded escape routes.
- Oakmont evac access needs to be more efficient.
- Do not build Elnoka; will add to evacuation issues, water issues, emergency issues, traffic issues and would bring a huge liability to life and property.
- Oakmont needs another egress street besides hwy 12.
- Evacuation on Highway 12 is woefully inadequate and before the city considers anything else, that needs to be fixed.
- EVACUATION PLANNING - SANTA ROSA NEEDS TO STEP UP TO THIS PROBLEM NOW.
- Need better egress from Oakmont in evacuations.
- Santa Rosa is a hodgepodge of urban and rural roads that are inadequate to handle smooth egress in the event of an emergency. This is particularly true on the east side where Hwy. 12. So, development should be directed into areas closer to the center of Santa Rosa nearer to Hwy 101.
- Shorter time to evacuate Oakmonters.
- Evacuation times are already too long for those living on 2-lane highway 12; need moratorium on further housing in this area until evacuation and water issues are addressed.
- Highway 12 between Santa Rosa and Sonoma is a major concern.
- Oakmont was allowed to get too big for possible evacuation. Serious concern!
- In Oakmont very concerned about wildfire & evacuation plan.
- As an Oakmont resident these issues are always on my mind.
- Better evacuation route(s) from Oakmont.
- Improve wildfire evacuation routes and procedures.

- Water availability as we move into the future.
- Water availability.
- Need additional evacuation route south from Oakmont thru Lawndale.
- Improve ability for Oakmont to evacuate in case of fire.
- We must address Oakmont's ability to evacuate safely from fire.
- Other impacts from Climate Change.
- Yes, pandemics also need to be taken into account.

Q6: What actions should the City prioritize when planning for community safety and resilience related to natural hazards?

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion
Limit the amount of housing in wildfire prone areas of Santa Rosa. N:230	82%	16%	1%	1%
Limit the amount of housing in flood prone areas and near earthquake fault zones. N:227	56%	39%	4%	1%
Ensure that all neighborhoods have safe and efficient emergency evacuation routes and allow housing everywhere regardless of hazards. N:224	70%	7%	21%	2%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- Hell will freeze before Santa Rosa has a serious flood. Did you not notice the perpetual drought?!
- See above. Also, "shelter-in-place" is NOT an option. Please do not consider that a mitigation in the EIR, or....well, just don't do it.
- Third option is confusing. Agree that we need safe emergency evacuation routes, but not that we should allow housing everywhere regardless of hazards.
- Safe and efficient emergency evacuation routes are needed wherever there is housing. In the Sonoma Valley, consider creating additional exit routes from Oakmont both to the east and to the west. To the east a connection from Oakmont Drive to Frey Road through to Lawndale Road could create an emergency route to Warm Springs Road and either Bennett Valley Rd or Arnold Drive without needing to get on Hwy 12. I own property on Lawndale Rd that backs up to Frey Rd property close to where Frey Rd turns west toward Oakmont and I would be willing to grant an easement for an emergency evacuation route. Can't speak for

the neighbors. To the west, link in to Channel Drive and Montgomery. But don't put more housing in the Sonoma Valley.

- Oakmont does not now have safe and efficient emergency evac routes.
- Impossible to get out of Oakmont in time during fire.
- No more housing on east end toward Oakmont.
- Expand Rt12 by Oakmont community.
- If not already being done, a masterplan should be developed with policies enacted in WUI areas. Fire breaks are critical and they need continual maintenance.
- We need to focus on efficiently evacuating the rural part of Calistoga Road and all of Oakmont. Once we've accomplished that, we could think about more housing in these areas/residents in those areas,
- We live in Oakmont ~ The last two evacuations were a mess. We should limit development along Hwy 12 west of Los Alamos until Hwy12 is widened to Kenwood and the smaller roads going south.
- To allow housing to return to Fountaingrove is ludicrous and criminally negligent.
- Ensure safe and efficient evacuation routes but control new housing in hazard zones.
- Do not allow housing/apartments at Melita and Hwy 12. Very dangerous for evacuation.
- Existing housing needs better emergency evacuation routes.
- The more dense the housing the harder it is to evacuate.
- See prior comments.
- Last 3 extremely important .
- Highway 12 between Melita and Pythian should have 1 additional evacuation lane.
- We need to ensure that all neighborhoods have safe and efficient emergency evacuation routes.
- Emphasis on “safe and efficient” emergency evacuation routes.
- Do not build Elnoka; especially in regard to the above.
- See earlier comments.
- Limit the amount of housing, period, until fire safety and water shortages (not to mention road conditions) are adequately dealt with.
- Agree with 1st part, but not second part.

- it is critical that neighborhoods have safe, accessible evacuation when communities are planned and developed.
- The Oakmont Village is the prime example of very poor evacuation planning. Nothing should be even considered being built near this area until a plan is in place for 3 ways of evacuating this area, and it is fully publicized.
- New housing must consider fire protection, drought, evacuation, and impact on surrounding neighborhoods.
- New techniques to mitigate earthquake effects are available, so new construction could be built with the highest standards of safety for earthquake. I hardly think that there are many areas prone to flooding. If so, build structures higher with that in mind.
- Quicker evacuations for senior communities like Oakmont and earlier notice to leave
- Enlarge hwy 12 to four lanes from farmers lane to Kenwood.
- These should be the top planning priority -- growth at best should be downtown.
- “Regardless of hazards” is ridiculous and would lead to impossible execution of evacuations and provision of routine fire and safety services.
- Already allowing too much development in Fountain Grove. No safe evacuation for senior developments from Spring Lake to Oakmont.
- Look at history and our changing climate. I know you want to increase the tax base but allowing dense housing to be built (or rebuilt) in areas prone to wildfires is irresponsible.
- I have a doctorate in Policy, and the way this question combines these two elements makes this question invalid. Whoever included this in the survey wasn’t trained properly in survey questions. Responses to this should be tossed out.
- Living in Oakmont I am always concerned.
- Keep further development out of wildfire areas.
- A coordinated plan is key. The last question is BAD. Second part of it is a “silent slider” for those who only read the first part and miss the whopper of a problem with the second part.
- This is a trick question - poorly written.
- Very concerned as I live in Oakmont!
- Plan evacuation routes for the future ENTIRE SR area w/+36k people.
- Hwy 12 East of Santa Rosa is a death trap in a wildfire. Need more evacuation routes!
- Oakmont and Highway 12 should be address.
- Separate the 3rd option above into: agree that all neighbors have safe & efficient evac routes; disagree to allow housing everywhere regardless of hazards

- Provide funding for existing residents to implement emergency preparedness, e.g., foundation strengthening, brush clearing.
- When developing safety plans the needs and issues of people with Disabilities will need to be strongly considered. They may need extra warning to evacuate as they may take longer to get ready. They may need help making sure they pack the right things, getting out of their home and they may need a ride that will need to be big enough to support any medical equipment and/or mobility devices. For evacuation warnings some people with Disabilities may not be able to receive or understand warnings sent via text, so these warnings should also be sent by to cell and landline phones, and via email. When police and/or fire are doing drive warnings using their sirens they may need to go physically to the house as someone with a hearing disability may not hear the sirens. To make it a quicker process they city should consider providing residents a way to indicate that someone with a Disability is living at the house, so officers or members of the public know which houses that may need extra help. Another benefit of having an indication that some is living a home with a Disability will also help with search and rescue operations. This will be important because some with a Disability may not be able to wait as long for rescue as there may health condition may deteriorate more quickly due to their disability.
- Evacuation planning is important, but I worry it can be a red herring for anti-density proponents. I'm not in favor of more building in the far eastern reaches of Santa Rosa, but a lot of other neighborhoods can be denser even though there is some risk of fire and needing to evacuate (e.g., Coffey Park, neighborhoods near Howarth Park). The City should also be complementing denser development with more robust wildfire prevention - which denser development can actually help with in the form of increased property taxes (new construction = more people = more people paying property taxes to the city which can be used for vegetation management etc.). New construction can also be designed with fire resistance in mind.

Station #4: Equity in Santa Rosa

Q7: Which of the following issues are challenges you or your family members face in Santa Rosa?

Policy Choices	Major Issue	Mild Issue	Not an Issue	Not Sure
Opportunities to be involved in community decision making. N:219	27%	29%	42%	2%
Access to public facilities and services. N:217	21%	28%	49%	2%
Access to public spaces supporting physical activity. N:217	22%	24%	52%	2%
Pollution exposure and poor air quality. N:217	31%	36%	29%	4%
Access to healthy and affordable foods. N:218	26%	19%	54%	1%
Access to safe and sanitary housing. N:217	27%	15%	57%	1%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- While the city reaches out for comments, they quickly dismiss our concerns a sustainable source of water to accommodate growth.
- Downtown should add a European style market building that supports small local vendors + allows downtowns residents a variety of healthy local products without needing to drive anywhere.
- We're older, white, and very lucky.
- Safety is a major issue but sanitary isn't.
- We're lucky to live in the Cherry Street Historic District which we consider to be the safest in the City relative to climate extremes
- When the air quality is bad due to wildfires, etc., it's a serious issue for everyone. My spouse has COPD and is especially vulnerable.
- Move the homeless out!!! City has totally ignored and stood back long enough. Move them all out and on.
- Pollution includes light pollution and traffic noise.
- Property at Melita & Hwy 12 can be a big recreation area. Playing fields for soccer & baseball.
- Pollution during wildfires has been daunting.
- We recognize that we are among the fortunate in these regards.

- Do not build Elnoka.
- our elected leaders never listen to us, their constituents.
- Fire Evacuation Safety!
- These questions are not a problem for me because I am white, wealthy and healthy. The air pollution issue is mostly when wildfires near and far erupt.
- Need to quit building low income and get the all-around cost of housing to come down.
- Air quality along major highways including 12 is a major concern.
- While my family is not food or housing challenged, it is a concern for a large part of our population and needs to be addressed.
- Based on water.
- Because of the lack of water.
- Wildfire pollution and affordable foods are challenging.
- We are fortunate that these are not challenges we face; however, we very much appreciate that this question is asked as we are aware that there are those who do face these challenges. Thank you for asking.
- Lo mas molo es mas barato xlo saludable mos caro // The models are cheaper and healthier are expensive.
- Calles sin luz, calles sin acceso a bicicletas opeartones inseguridad al cuminar.// Streets without light, streets without access to bicycles, operations, feel insecure when walking.
- High-speed traffic through residential areas (e.g., Hoen Ave) makes my home more dangerous (e.g., crossing the street, children playing, outdoor pets).

Q8: What barriers are making it difficult for you or your fellow community members to be involved in Santa Rosa Forward or other City decision-making? N:192

Policy Choices	Percentage Responding Yes
Limited access to reliable internet.	11%
Limited availability during normal business hours (8 AM to 6 PM) to participate in meetings or events.	28%
Limited availability during evenings to participate in meetings or events.	24%
Limited understanding of how local land use and funding decisions are made.	49%
Limited understanding of my Council District or connections to my Council member.	34%
I don't know what Santa Rosa Forward is or how the process works.	22%
Lack of language translation.	12%
Lack of time.	25%
Use of jargon or government acronyms.	22%
I'm concerned whether what I say will be included.	30%
Additional comments	14%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- The planning process is so ridiculously drawn out that I doubt any of this will happen in my lifetime.
- Concerns about water + quality of life and dismissed.
- How are non-Spanish non-English speakers involved?
- You are doing great with access!
- I still am not wild about only physical meetings, and would like a digital option also whenever possible.
- The amount of time spent during meetings that feels wasted.
- I am not.
- Families are busier than retired people and the opinions of young people and families should be solicited especially bc they aren't going to participate as much as older wealthier people. And our city needs to attract more young people and families.
- I don't know about others but time and information are likely obstacles. I would urge communicating w/ students
- Local Politicians, city council need to get to work! Future here getting worse. Too long homeless allowed and now more unsightly unhealthy environments exist. Talk talk but little gets accomplished.

- I'm a senior. I can't drive at night because of vision problems. I like to participate via Videos or zoom.
- PD and FD that are not responsive to community concerns.
- Elected and appointed decision-makers seem to have their own agendas and are not responsive to constituents!
- I think the City is doing a good job to include people in decision making
- Belief that what is received is actually heard.
- Poor broadband.
- Housing improvements permits need to be less expensive.
- Do not build Elnoka.
- Explain how you can consider building when there is not adequate fire evacuation for those neighborhoods already present.
- Corrupt politicians.
- Good availability for Oakmont.
- I believe that opportunity exists to participate for me overall. A time restraint is
- I wish I had heard about this project earlier.
- I am concerned that money and business interests are driving the processes and that Oakmont residents' concerns are not being adequately considered.
- Needs of the Elders of Oakmont are missing from the new general plan alternatives
- I just (end of April 2022) learned about what Santa Rosa Forward is and how the process works; more media coverage and more education on how local government works and how to be effective and engaged participants in the process would be very helpful.

Q9: How should City of Santa Rosa funding be prioritized to ensure each neighborhood receives equitable public investments in the coming years?

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion
Develop a prioritized list of improvements or services for each neighborhood. N:218	74%	23%	2%	1%
Ensure environmental justice, safety, and equity related projects are funded and prioritized for identified Equity Priority Communities. N:215	62%	25%	8%	5%
Ensure every neighborhood has access to parks and community spaces. N:216	74%	19%	3%	4%
Prioritize development that addresses social and economic needs of the economically vulnerable populations. N:216	59%	28%	9%	4%
Address and reverse the underlying socioeconomic factors and residential social segregation in the community that contributes to crime and violence in the city. N:210	65%	19%	9%	7%

Other Comments and Feedback

- None of the above! The most dense neighborhoods should receive the bulk of funds since they generate the most jobs, housing, and tax revenue.
- I'm fortunate enough to live near parks and with sidewalks + bike lanes.
- Reparations are needed to reverse centuries of structure and create home ownership.
- Robust and enforceable policies in the EJ element. Remove single family and exclusionary zoning.
- Socioeconomic and social segregation are not the issue behind the advanced crime. Drugs and unchecked mental illnesses effect all economic backgrounds and that is the major player in our crime issue. Not to mention the laws that support the lack of law regarding drugs and allowing people with mental illnesses to live on the streets.
- Oakmont is different because of its location in the Sonoma Valley and needs individual objectives.
- The politics around this are difficult. If all neighborhoods don't feel they are being tended too then it will be harder to put resources into marginalized neighborhoods. I don't know the best way to handle this tension.
- Stop immigrants coming in with no skills. Many gang related and drug cartel related. Crime is up, arrest and release revolving door policy.

- Not sure how that can be achieved but sounds like a good idea.
- Many of these items seem like an impossible dream, considering the cost of housing, the fact that downtown Santa Rosa is clogged with homeless people, and the mall has only Macy's and the Apple Store are likely to attract a lot of customers as far as I can tell.
- Remove homeless and their junk from city spaces.
- Park space is unfairly centered east of 101. Southwest Santa Rosa needs park space sufficient enough to accommodate its population.
- The city and local government are creating discrimination and political conflict with questionable legal decisions and actions.
- Reverse socioeconomic factors - how???
- Real consequences for crime. Not jail and release only to repeat
- Do not build Elnoka.
- This is a socio-political agenda, not city planning.
- Huh?????? Gibberish!
- We should not focus on any one community, everyone is supposed to be equal.
- Do not allow Elkno to be built....too much density along highway 12. Evacuation during emergencies/ fire already too congested.
- These issues are expensive and intractable. Stick to basics: water; fire; evacuation; air quality.
- Without the socio-economic/pop culture babel, provide maintenance and safety services to those communities which lack the political muscle to demand what they are entitled to.
- Communicate priorities.
- Ensure that funding is proportionate to the need.
- Funding that helps people with Disabilities, get access to housing and to fully engage in the community will need to a priority when deeming funding.
- The City can't fix all our problems. But what the City CAN do is take a look at all of the requirements Santa Rosa puts on new construction and start scaling back. City needs to issue more building permits each year, full stop. That is one of, if not the greatest way the City can address big socioeconomic problems like poverty. Housing is expensive here because there's not enough to go around. When people are spending a huge amount of their income on rent, are forced to relocate every few years because of rent increases, it has massive impacts on that family and our community. That money going to rent isn't going to restaurants, services, healthcare. Moving is stressful and disrupts the lives of kids in school. Needing to commute to work from an affordable area to an expensive one burns more fossil fuels and creates air quality problems. So City of Santa Rosa, I beg you to sharpen your focus to reducing City-imposed barriers to new housing production, and change the things that

are clearly in your control - permitting, zoning, impact fees. I don't care if my neighbor's house is set back 4 feet from my property line or if their front yard has a fence or not. Take a scalpel to your zoning code, your plan check process, cut out all the tumors to save the heart!

Q10: Which of the following actions could help to improve or keep your health (physical, mental, and social)?

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion
Build or improve sidewalks in my community. N:197	44%	28%	14%	14%
Build or improve bike lanes in my community. N:203	50%	24%	17%	9%
Build or improve parks in my community. N:204	54%	25%	12%	9%
Reduce air pollution in my community. N:199	54%	25%	11%	10%
Reduce water pollution in my community. N:196	53%	22%	11%	14%
Access to affordable housing. N:198	53%	22%	13%	12%
Access to healthy and affordable food. N:199	52%	23%	14%	11%
Access to jobs. N:194	49%	24%	12%	16%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- Note: Bike lanes are useless unless they are PROTECTED Bike Lanes. No painted stripe ever stopped a 3000 pound car!
- The A.Q in Santa Rosa is good. No need to spend resources on A.Q when there are many more significant issues. A friend visiting from Chongla China commented on how wonderful our A.Q is.
- Clean Creeks, Clean Street
- Need rent control polices and zoning regs to provide separations of industrial harmful land uses + residential/ sensitive/
- None
- We pay so much for healthcare and daycare we're drowning. We work so much we're exhausted
- Plenty of job opportunities exist, it's those not willing to work. Looking for govt handouts .

- I know of no park in Oakmont where people of all ages and physical abilities might get together on a summer evening or any other time.
- Build a parking hub at Hwy 12 and Melita and provide public transportation to downtown & employment areas. This would help commuters from Sonoma.
- Air quality suffers during fire season
- Most of these issues do not apply to Oakmont
- My community is fortunate to have above amenities. They need to be maintained
- Do not build Elnoka
- This questionnaire does not understand the difference between a socio-political agenda and city planning
- Safety begins with fire evacuation routes.
- I have access, sidewalks, and parks and am retired. However, many lower income residents of color do not.
- we are retirees at Oakmont with many advantages
- Santa Rosa should focus its resources on the communities that need them the most.
- I answered this question as I agree that all of these actions would improve health of our larger Sonoma County community (not my specific smaller neighborhood)
- Frequent public transportation to food, health and community centers
- Sidewalks are often covered by neighborhood landscaping, low-hanging trees, and vehicles parked in driveways blocking sidewalks. Education or enforcement of keeping sidewalks clear would help my neighborhood be more walkable and safe.
- In addition to better access to affordable housing there will also need to better access to ADA complaint housing.

Q11: What sources of air quality issues do you or your family members experience?

N:184

Policy Choices	Percentage Responding Yes
Gas cooking appliances or heaters in the home.	32%
Secondhand smoke from neighbors in or around the home.	22%
Secondhand smoke outside of the home.	26%
Vehicle emissions.	68%
Emissions from industrial facilities.	19%
Other	22%

Other Comments and Feedback

- We have no barriers. But it seems all new housing should be ADA accessible to accommodate elderly, disabled, and even families with small children.
- Road Noise, Road Noise
- Wildfire smoke.
- Wildfire smoke.
- Wildfire.
- Wildfire toxins
- Smoke from wildfires
- Wildfires. The increasingly common practice of neighbors remotely turning on their cars to warm or cool them, resulting in them idling for 5-10 minutes...
- Fires
- None. We like prefer gas ranges.
- Smoke from fires
- Air pollution from wildfires.
- Wildfire smoke
- Fire
- smoke from fires
- noise and air polluting landscape machines.
- wildfires
- wildfire smoke during fire season
- fire smoke and airborne debris
- Wildfires
- Vineyard spraying chemicals
- Wildfire smoke
- I don't have any strong opinions
- Do not build Elnoka; would only add to the above issues.
- smoke from area wildfires
- use of chemicals/pesticides/herbicides by wineries
- wildfire smoke
- Active wildfires in the vicinity
- Air quality isn't a huge issue here. Plant more tree's and be done with it.

- Highway 12 is like a freeway in producing air and noise pollution
- Gas Blowers (Noise & Fumes). Support Charging Station for apartments, schools, libraries and parking garages.
- None
- Air quality issues related to wild fires.
- Wildfires
- Smoke from wildfires
- During wildfires
- Wildfires
- wildfire smoke
- Smoke from wildfires
- Otro, describa a continuación.
- Other, please describe below.

Q12: What barriers do you face to access safe and sanitary housing?

Policy Choices	Major Issue	Mild Issue	Not an Issue	Not Sure
Financial barriers to pay security deposit and move-in expenses. N:205	20%	10%	67%	3%
Inability to meet minimum credit score requirements. N:203	15%	8%	73%	4%
Lack of affordable homes suitable for family size. N:204	28%	9%	59%	4%
Housing not adequately maintained by landlord. N:202	17%	8%	69%	6%
Inability to afford needed repairs on home I own. N:205	21%	18%	58%	3%
Not able to request needed repairs from landlord out of fear of eviction. N:203	14%	8%	71%	7%

Other Comments and Feedback

- Again, we're lucky. I believe all of the issues are faced by people needing legally affordable housing.
- Housing around here is so expensive. You need to tax second homes and investment rental properties. Need more affordable homes to purchase.
- We're privileged and lucky not to have any of these problems; we own our home in downtown
- Fortunate to be affluent enough that it's not an issue for us.
- No more handouts.

- All impossible to do realistically ~
- I own my own home.
- Property taxes, especially for newer owners, add significantly to housing costs and are inequitable within communities. Insurance costs rising rapidly.
- Do not build Elnoka.
- You are trying to save the world and cannot give us streets and roads without life threatening potholes - please grow up.
- Safe housing = safe and multiple fire evacuation routes from your neighborhood.
- I am fortunate not to be impacted. Many others are not.
- I am fortunate enough to not face these barriers, but my adult children and many of their friends do.
- We are not renters.
- Wildfire upgrades to home and landscaping are expensive.
- No puedo decirle a mi arrentador que cambiando por miedo a que me corra y no encuente un lugar adonde vivir con my familia.// I can't tell my Landlord about any changes out of fear that he'll evict me and not find a place to live with my family.
- Older homes need to be retrofitted for earthquake preparedness, e.g., reinforced foundations, wall straps, foundation anchors.
- There needs to be transitional housing for those coming out homelessness, jails, hospitals, care homes/hospice and mental health services.

Station #5: Alternatives Comparison

Q13: Based on your responses to the policy questions above, which alternative, or alternatives, come closest to meeting your vision for the future of Santa Rosa? N:194

Alternative 1 Central Corridors	Alternative 2 Neighborhood Main Streets	Alternative 3 Distributed Housing
49%	53%	14%

Q14: Is there anything you would **change** or **adjust** in that alternative to make it better meet your vision? Or is there a combination of alternatives that you would like to see?

- Even more emphasis on adding housing to downtown Santa Rosa. This is the only area where one could comfortably live without a car. Also, it's on the cusp of becoming a genuine cultural center if people could live there. People = life & culture.
- I would like to see mixed use neighborhood main streets alongside central corridors and increased density downtown. This would make neighborhoods walkable and moving between neighborhoods and points of interest bike able.
- Rather than grow the city can be reorganized to mimicable 2. Don't be called into a growth plan that takes the city from livable to unlivable and undesirable.
- Alternative 2 remaining the five/flood. Risk areas and moving housing. Allocative around the two smart stations. See adjustment above.
- combining aspects of 1 + 2 seem most practical.
- increase transit options to the outlying areas that want experience majority of growth (Bennet valley)
- Prioritize downtown revitalization and urbanization of #1.
- Again, REMOVE all housing opportunity sites in the WUI from Alternative 2. Alternative 1 is also OK. Alternative 3 is not. Also, planning development along, for instance Mendocino Avenue, needs to have public SPECIFIC PLANS for each area, since there is existing housing within a block of the corridor that increased density will impact, likely negatively.
- I like that people would be able to live throughout the city and not have the congestion in the center of Santa Rosa. Not everyone would like to live near downtown. If we have hubs throughout the town, people can enjoy the country life and city life if they choose
- All three need to be utilized with emphasis on being in close proximity to services.
- More housing opportunities for low income. More housing opportunities/ shelters for homeless folks. Rent control!!
- In the Distributing Housing model for the Rural Residential it would be great to have retail available for folks who may be elderly and need access to foods/water/ and easy access to clothing. Or places where they can also mingle and not be isolated.

- I would like to see a combination in all three alternatives. I think that the more adequate and better we can make the community for everyone the better progress we are going to see and the better outcome as well.
- A hybrid between 1 and 2 is the best. I think major growth needs to happen downtown but also neighborhoods need little retail hubs. Housing should be focused downtown and around the neighborhood hubs. Sidewalks and crosswalks should be installed around neighborhood destinations and they should be connected by public transit to downtown and other hubs. All major transportation corridors should have frequent public transportation, not just a few.
- Minimize new housing in firestorm areas and those that need evacuations during firestorms (Oakmont, Skyhawk, Calistoga, Fountaingrove).
- Combination of 1 and 2. Disagree that 3 is viable. My inclination is to go w/ #1 but existing neighborhoods would benefit from increased housing and commercial. All development should take climate and drought into consideration.
- I want a vibrant downtown. But enhancing some of the existing neighborhood hubs to make them more walkable and self-sufficient also makes sense for Santa Rosa. I would not put any more housing east of Skyhawk.
- Central corridors are good in that they encourage alternatives to single cars but could also become underdeveloped and encourage stroads to develop if too many lanes are added as time and demand continue.
- Affordable healthy grocery stores located near underprivileged neighborhoods.
- I would take under consideration how these housing plans would affect long term layouts for Santa Rosa.
- I wouldn't change anything.
- Improve Hwy 12 from Melita to Sonoma.
- Expand RT 12 from Melita Rd to Pythian Rd.
- No further development along highway 12. There is already too much congestion. An exception might be for Elnoka provided there is a connecting road to Oakmont. A Connecting Road from Oakmont to Melita. It would provide Oakmont an additional evacuation route. It would allow residents of Elnoka to shop and go to the banks and medical offices in Oakmont Village without using Highway 12. It would reduce traffic on Highway 12 and at the always crowded intersection of Highway 12 and Oakmont Drive.
- Neighborhood concept engenders neighborliness. This has many advantages...small biz support, walkability, crime reduction, less commute times means more family time, better school support
- No additional housing should be considered in eastern Santa Rosa until there is sufficient infrastructure (roads, fire stations, police stations to accommodate it.
- DO NOT CONTINUE BUILDING ON HWY 12 UNTIL IT IS WIDENED TO 4 LANES EAST TO KENWOOD AND THE STREETS HEADING SOUTH. WE HAD FRIGHTENING EXPERIENCES WITH THE EVACUATIONS IN 2017 AND 2020. MORE HOUSING WITHOUT THE WIDENING WILL PROVE DEADLY...
- Prioritize non-carbon energy facilities, distributed vehicular charging centers and downtown traffic-calming investments.

- East and West approaches to the city center are primarily narrow, winding streets. Workforce single occupant vehicles during rush hours must be reduced by developing public transit for the 21st century. Limited stop east/west bus routes using electric buses and enhanced capacity for bicycles a must! Ask Specialized Bicycles what other communities do.
- Include a focus on enhancing evacuation routes for all portions of the city.
- Central corridors & neighborhoods should be well paved. Improved bus services for neighborhoods to employment areas.
- Widen main thoroughfares such as Highway 12.
- High rises in downtown Santa Rosa are a visual blight: look at San Francisco. These are alienating to those that live in them. Usually, little inviting greenscapes are included, again alienating those that live in these due to lack of community connectedness manifested in poor landscapes. Three story limits with plenty of trees, sidewalks, bike lanes and a park. Not a concrete slab like the Santa Rosa plaza.
- I would like to see a combination of Alternatives 1 and 2
- Regardless of priorities for new housing development, all existing housing/neighborhoods should have adequate evacuation alternatives for major disasters (primarily wildfires). Evacuation bottlenecks should be identified and eliminated!
- Prioritize emergency egress that is now restricted by (1) minimal access to Highway 12 from Oakmont and all residential areas off Highway 12 and (2) the single-lane nature of Highway 12.
- I wish I would have understood (with the graphs) these 3 alternatives at the beginning of the questionnaire. I think we have to go more Central to lessen auto use and make public transit or walking more available to shopping and services.
- No more developments in wildfire zones that have been designated as well as others that need to be designated as high fire zones from past history.
- Consider additional housing near employment centers, e.g., medical service and education centers.
- Consider transportation alternatives for seniors. Plan private green spaces (small garden for growing veggies, pets, nature) for all new housing and more green and recreation space
- do the necessary to spread lower income households throughout city.
- keep the rural areas rural.
- Encourage a vibrant "downtown" with housing, commercial and walkable streets.
- Increased access to healthy food. Ability for individuals and communities to grow their own food (land, education).
- We have north-south rapid transit but no east- west rapid transit which leads to problems from Sonoma Valley and Sebastopol to central Santa Rosa.
- Allow a mix of rural and low density and some restricted neighborhood commercial and office.
- Strongly incorporate evacuation planning, especially for parts of SR near Highway 12. Also, any plan must realistically deal with increasingly severe drought and decreasing water availability.

- Mix commercial with housing as in Europe, Windsor even. Stop separating people from where they shop and gather.
- We better evacuation access to roads especially given Hwy. 12 is only two lane. With drought we must be careful to stop adding population we can't sustain.
- My priority would be to ensure that future development provides equitable access to goods and services, and safety, for all Santa Rosans. Climate change, drought, wildfires and earthquakes do not discriminate.
- Combination of one and two. And please do not build Elnoka; it will cause harm to people, property and liability to same.
- 2 and 3
- I would like a combination of alternatives 1 and 2. Somewhere in between the two alternatives.
- In Alt 2, increase evacuation routes out of Oakmont (not only onto Hwy. 12) and adjacent areas on and around Hwy12; require Elnoka to update their EIR to reduce houses and increase evacuation routes (or negate the building permit); do not allow increased residences and retail between Melita and Pythian Road. Make an amendment to the current General Plan to increase requirement to establish additional wildfire evacuation routes and fire stations for the Oakmont area.
- Combination of 1&2. #1 too congested and does not encourage a combination of ethnicities and income ranges.
- Fix the already existing problems, such as roads and water shortage before entertaining pie-in-the-sky schemes that will not happen unless you tax us, the current and shrinking population to oblivion population, oblivion
- Santa Rosa is unique for many reasons. Don't over build and let this great city turn into another gentrified she'll that runs out the family's who wanted to be here from the start. So many people are choosing g to leave California. All of this new developments and infrastructures might be completely unnecessary. If this proposal is to determine a budget and raise taxes, more research should be done. We have been through a lot in the last few years. Relentless fires and Covid have changed the platform that we thought we knew. Times are changing.
- I would like to see the City of Santa Rosa begin opening up evacuation routes for existing neighborhoods that are in harms way based on previous fires. This must be done before any new neighbors or homes are even considered for planning.
- Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinions on the City Master Plan. I support Alternative #1. It is efficient to be near public transportation. Oakmont has been lucky enough to have a Kaiser office, dentist office, blood drawing office, several different restaurants and they all left for various reasons. The City of Santa Rosa supports bus transportation in Oakmont. The #30 bus takes us to/from the transportation hub in downtown Santa Rosa and the #16 bus takes all around Oakmont and to/from various shopping centers certain days and times during the day which is sufficient for our needs. We are blessed with fire station #7 in Oakmont and they have full time paramedics available to us. Please provide us with additional fire stations in the wild land fire area along Hwy 12 towards Oakmont. As we have seen with the 2017 fire when we lost 2 homes and the 2020 fires when we lost 3 homes and a triplex. The fire station needs additional local help. Traffic is terrible during AM and PM commute times and during fire evacuations, please include a

solution to the traffic and evacuation problems. I am in favor of widening HWY 12, since I live facing HWY 12, and hear the traffic and accidents and worry that I will burn up in my car like the town of Paradise when they tried to evacuate. Please find a solution to this problem. Please limit housing in our wildfire corridor which will limit traffic which will also help with the severe drought that we have suffered with for over 8 years. Please amend the current City Master Plan and include solutions in the new Master Plan to address these items. Thank you

- Given our exposure to wildfire/earthquake evacuation, ongoing drought, and the limited egress from Highway 12, I do not think El Noka should be approved.
- Increase resources to improve safety in the city proper, fix the homeless issue.
- Certainly, you could mix in some neighborhood Main Streets with a Central Corridors scheme.
- Combination of alternative 1 and 2, with alternative one being more heavily weighted
- concentrate on wildfire danger and flooding
- Evacuation times are already too long for those living along the 2-lane part of highway 12; we need a moratorium on further housing in this area until evacuation, water, and air pollution issues are addressed.
- High density housing should be privately developed. City owned/operated housing has been a failure in Eastern cities. Under no circumstances should we consider or model our plans on those facilities. No more "bait and switch" as was done with Los Guillos it destroys community trust in the planning process.
- I'd like to see better/improved "remote" shopping from Calistoga to Oakmont.
- The flaw with Alternative 1 is development along the fault line. I like the neighborhood concept of Alternative 2 but am deeply concerned with anymore development along the WUI (i.e., along route 12 and Montgomery Dr. or the south side of Annadel)
- I would like to see a combination of Alternatives 1 and 2, with the emphasis on Alternative 2. Central Santa Rosa should become much denser, but not at the expense of the neighborhoods.
- A combination of Alts 2 & 3 seem best to me.
- No, I don't want to see a combination of alternatives. A more vibrant, and beautiful downtown would bring in more tourists and locals could enjoy enhanced amenities. No more building if development in the Oakmont, or, Annandale area as the wildfire risk is very high, and, more people and vehicles would only negatively impact our communities in eastern Santa Rosa.
- More carbon free mass transit.
- Combination of 1 and 2
- I believe that a combination of #1 would work best for Santa Rosas' future. I am very concerned about #3 as it will heighten issues extremely important to my community. I feel it is totally irresponsible to build Elnoka. Too much development. Let's not even consider widening scenic Hwy 12 to accommodate this proposed development. How do you evacuate all those folks? Where is the water coming from? I had one questions for the Gallagher guys when they spoke in Oakmont 2 or so years ago.... Do you live out here? No!!!! was the answer.... that closed the case for me. They have not done one thing to mitigate the fire

danger on the Elnoka property since their property damn near burned down several homes along Stone Bridge Dr. I suggest is sold and used as park land with egress available to Oakmont.

- The focus should be on Central Corridors but some communities in Santa Rosa would benefit from the neighborhood Main Street alternative. Limit suburban sprawl where possible. Prohibit further development in wildfire areas.
- Please do not add housing to hwy 12. We need more evacuation routes, wider roads, etc. as it currently stands
- Oakmont MUST be considered separately in the Plan, primarily because of evacuation concerns but also because many in our “active” community are in reality in vulnerable groups. There MUST be control of housing development along Rt 12 for water concerns and quality of life issues as well as evacuation concerns.
- Oakmont needs to be considered separately because of the vulnerable folks here. Water, wildfires, and evacuation routes are different for us. There should be no further housing development near Oakmont!
- I like some aspects of Alternative #2. Maybe a combination of #1 and #2.
- Alternatives 1 & 2
- I think that alternative 1 and 2 could be combined in a way that emphasizes development close to transit while also supporting neighborhood shopping and services so that we don't all need to come downtown for all services. Making sure that the chosen alternative addresses fire safety, evacuation, and drought issues is vital as well.
- Combos of Alternative 1 and 2--More in-fill housing and commercial centers near transportation, but I very much like the neighborhood main street idea like neighborhood hubs.
- Que haya un terreno que construya case móviles para que no tengan tanta demanda con la falta de casas de renta.// That there is land that builds mobile home so that they do not have so much demand with the lack of rental houses
- Overall all 3 are good I picked Alts 2 and 1 because it seems like it will be easier to build accessible housing while providing easy access to shops, restraints and services at the same time. Alt 3 is still good but multiplexes can be harder to build to be ADA accessible. With the more spread out design in this alterative it wont be as easy to get around for people with Disabilities. So if this alterative is adopted public transit will need to be very robust and reliable to make it easy to get around. Finally for all 3 alternatives should also prioritizing building community services such as mental health, child/elder services, health clinics and homeless services and others.
- I would like to see a combination of 1 & 2. Increased downtown development, but I want to see increased density all over Santa Rosa near existing commercial hubs. I want to see more 3-story apartment buildings near the small shopping centers sprinkled all over the city.
- focus on main corridors, better hub and spoke transportation system to make it feasible
- Alternative 1 is best, as it focuses development in the downtown, which will make Santa Rosa more walkable
- I like both Alternatives #1 and #2 because they accomplish higher density near services and transit. However, I would like to see higher number of units both in the Central Corridor and the Neighborhood Main Streets scenarios, and less units in the "Outside" focus areas. This

would hopefully increase the percentage of residents who walk, bike and take transit - and help achieve the city's health, equity and climate goals.

- Reducing the number of vehicle miles traveled should be a primary goal plus adding affordable housing.
- I would like to see a combination of Alternatives 1 and 2. Alternative 3 is not at all appealing to me.

Station #6: Demographics

Q14: Which of the following best describes you? N:222

	Percentage
I live in Santa Rosa	89%
I work in Santa Rosa	24%
I own a business in Santa Rosa	48%
I go to school in Santa Rosa	8%
Other (please specify)	10%

Other Descriptions

- I live near Santa Rosa
- retired
- light house attendee in based in Sonoma
- Own my two-family home which we share w/ our child and her family.
- I'm a retiree and volunteer in Santa Rosa
- Trying to move to Santa Rosa
- Rohnert Park
- Sacramento
- Live and own home in east end of SR
- retired
- retired
- retired single family homeowner
- retired
- Active in volunteer services
- I live in a retirement community
- I live in the Santa Rosa incorporated area but not in the City proper.
- I live in Oakmont
- Oakmont resident
- Retired in Santa Rosa
- retired, in Oakmont
- I spend much of my time volunteering in Santa Rosa and SoCo.
- Retired, Reside in Oakmont in a house by the forest and a creek, I do not drive, take public transportation, am a very active senior adult

Q15: What is your gender? N:222

	Percentage
Female	61%
Male	35%
Non-binary	0%
I prefer not to say	4%
I prefer to self-identify	0%

Q16: What is your age? N:87

	Percentage
17 or younger	0%
18 to 24	9%
25 to 34	8%
35 to 49	14%
50 to 64	12%
65 and Over	58%

Q17: What is your Zip Code? N: 193

Zip Code	Percentage
94558	1%
94928	3%
94931	1%
94954	1%
95401	5%
95403	2%
95404	12%
95405	4%
95407	9%
95409	56%
95472	1%
95476	1%
95482	1%
95678	1%
95747	1%
95905	1%
95401	1%
95403	1%
95404	1%
95405	1%
95409	1%
95409-5879	1%
95409-6321	1%

Q18: What is your race and/or ethnicity? N:219

	Percentage
Asian	2%
Black/African American	1%
Hispanic/Latinx	21%
Native American	1%
Pacific Islander	0%
White/Caucasian	69%
I prefer not to say	10%
I prefer to self-identify. If you prefer to "self-identify", please describe yourself	3%

Other Identifications

- European American
- Romany Gypsy
- Belizean
- A human being longing for a less politically correct environment
- Non racial. Let's stop identifying people based on skin color or ethnic
- Quit focusing on race.
- Swedish, Polish, and German

Q19: What languages do you speak at home? N:87

	Percentage
English	94%
Spanish	20%
Cantonese	0%
Vietnamese	0%
Tagalog	0%
Mandarin	0%
Korean	0%
Asian Indian languages	0%
Russian	0%
Sign Language	0%
Other (please specify)	3%

Other Languages

- German
- French
- Romani Gypsy
- French
- Should not matter, English is our primary language in the US
- Farsi
- Mixteco

Additional Comments and Feedback

The following are additional comments that were made either through the general comments form in the Virtual Open House or the comment form on the project website.

Website Comment, April 11, 2022

I've already attended one of the informational meetings and I've filled out the Alternatives Survey. I would like to recommend Santa Rosa Forward have a look at this organization, Strong Towns, as a worthy addition to your toolbox: Strong Towns <https://www.strongtowns.org>

Website Comment, April 11, 2022

Hi there, My name is Katie, I'm a resident of SR and someone who would love to be involved in the general plan update. I have a few comments: 1) Ease of communication: It is SO hard to find a way to participate and give feedback if you can't go to any of the meetings! This site is hard to find and as a user, you're not even sure that it's getting to the right people. 2) Public awareness: A lot of people don't even know that this is happening, the only way that I knew is because I'm subscribed to City emails! 3) PLEASE consider both what the people want AND what the current academic and social literature says on best practices for planning in the context of climate change and equity. I urge you to do this not only because there is an amazing wealth of information (I'm more than happy to share sources) but also because the younger generation (myself included) is going to be the group that really feels the impacts and implications of these updates more than any other group, but we're the most left out voice (see comments 1 and 2). Therefore, if public will is not balanced with known and current best practices, it will be far too likely that we fall into the cycle of perpetuating old ideas that benefit a minority of vocal but unrepresentative citizens. TL;DR: keep us Gen Zers in mind! 4) My feedback on the alternatives currently presented: Option 1 (and some aspects of 2) are BY FAR the best ideas available. Option 3 is essentially doing what we have been doing for 50 years, and is the known source of inequity, sprawl, and environmental damage! Here are my thoughts in detail: - Yes, we should absolutely focus on preventing sprawl and #1 does that, but it can't be at the expense of downtown's character. If residents wanted high-rises, we'd have moved to Oakland a long time ago.

- The VMT calculation results for all three plans are terrible! Please consider the conditions of existing ped/bike infrastructure (eg: Santa Rosa Ave., Mendocino Ave.) and how that increases VMT, scheduling, safety, and interconnectivity with public transit, zoning changes to encourage mixed use (and maybe put useful things like pharmacies and a grocery downtown instead of tons of empty banks?), encouraging "middle housing", focusing on the integration of greenways into bike/ped infrastructure, etc. There's no way we, as a city, can be sustainable if we keep VMTs almost the same. It's time for Santa Rosa to rethink the way we use our streets. - Please dedicate someone to looking into compiling best practices literature on these issues! Again, I'd love to be involved in this process, but I just don't know how. Who can I talk to at city hall? From an environmental policy graduate student, concerned citizen, and proud resident, Katie

Website Comment, April 21, 2022

I am an affordable housing consultant based in Petaluma having just retired out of active design building remodeling of in-law units and other small space projects. I am a passionate advocate for affordable housing and ADU development. There are planning and political issues at play beyond the matters of regulations, code compliance, and permitting in approving ADU's and small house - cottage cluster projects and I would like to talk with planners about planning issues and plans for easing the permitting approval and cost impacts to build these units. Preapproved plans is one pathway that other cities have done so far like Chico and LA. I do represent several modular and

paneled builders as well as doing site and build for clients who may build such units. I welcome any discussion and further education on the city regulations and planning and promotions and initiatives and protocols for permitting and approvals of ADU's. Thank you for your efforts and getting back to me with a planner who is focused on ADU development.

Website Comment – April 28, 2022

I think that any modern renovation to our downtown should definitely include a European-style market building near it's heart. We have visited them in all large European cities and east coast cities in the US. Philadelphia has two downtown and one can barley get into them at lunchtime. This would draw visitors to Santa Rosa's downtown and encourage people to want to live there. It is intended to give all county growers, vintners, restaurants, and vendors access to buyers all day, everyday of the week. If you want people to live downtown, and visitors to choose Santa Rosa as their destination, something like this would be an additional draw. Better than a simple grocery store, it can have coffee houses, wine-tasting bars, fresh vegetables and ready-made meals. Any empty, multi-story building, close to easy parking could be converted into a major draw for our downtown.

Website Comment – April 30, 2022

Seniors in Oakmont have already had two terrifying evacuation experiences. I'm surprised that there were no hospitalizations or deaths from the horrifying traffics jams trying to exit via Highway 12 in recent wildfires. Some residents were stuck for hours with flames burning and embers flying. In the Glass Fire Highway 12 was closed in the direction of Santa Rosa. In the Tubbs fire it was closed in the direction of Sonoma leaving only one way for 4,000 people to evacuate Oakmont. Oakmont needs exits other than those that feed into highway 12. Even if highway 12 is widened, all lanes could be closed by a fire sweeping down from the Mayacamas. I think additional exit roads for the residents of Oakmont should be included in the General Plan. An additional exit road could be built through Elnoka to Melita. Because there is already a road planned by the developer, Santa Rosa would only have to build a short extension of Stonebridge Road to connect the two communities. Such a road would be useful all the time, not just in evacuations. It would remove a lot of traffic from Oakmont drive and Highway 12. As it is now, when residents of West Oakmont want to go to Spring Lake or Montgomery Village, they must drive along Stonebridge Road to Oakmont Drive, make a left on Oakmont Drive adding to congestion at the intersection, make a left onto Highway 12 and then make a left into Melita. Residents of the new Elnoka Community will have to do the same in reverse if they want to go to the Golf Club or shops and banks in Oakmont Village. Another possibility is a road connecting East Oakmont to Lawnsdale. Perhaps Santa Rosa could work with the State of California and County to find a route for such a road. I hope Santa Rosa takes some action to improve the evacuation plans for Oakmont before there is a disaster. We never know when the winds could blow a raging wildfire through Oakmont.

Virtual Open House Comment – April 15, 2022

Let's build high rise living and business centers!!

Virtual Open House Comment – April 22, 2022

What plans do you have for Santa rosa ave by costco?

Virtual Open House Comment – May 5,2022

Route 12 widening