NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Date: January 24, 2019
To: State Agencies
From: City of Santa Rosa Planning & Economic Development

Responsible Agencies
Local and Public Agencies
Trustee Agencies
Organizations
Interested Parties

Agencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association of Bay Area Governments</th>
<th>Golden Gate Transit</th>
<th>Sonoma County Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>Lytton Rancheria of California</td>
<td>Sonoma County Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Union School District</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</td>
<td>Sonoma County Water Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Transportation, District 4, Planning Division</td>
<td>North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>Stewarts Point Rancheria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rohnert Park</td>
<td>Roseland Unified School District</td>
<td>The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sebastopol</td>
<td>Santa Rosa City Schools</td>
<td>Tomaras &amp; Ogas, LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale Rancheria of Pomo Indians</td>
<td>SMART District Office</td>
<td>Town of Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Protection and Safety Division Rail Crossings Engineering Section</td>
<td>So.Co. Waste Management Agency</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma</td>
<td>Sonoma County Housing Advocacy Group</td>
<td>US Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Creek Rancheria of Pomo Indians</td>
<td>Sonoma County LAFCO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Caritas Village Project

The City of Santa Rosa will be the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project identified below. The Lead Agency has prepared this Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR in order to provide the widest exposure and opportunity for input from public agencies, stakeholders, organizations, and individuals on the scope of the environmental analysis addressing the potential effects of the proposed project.
Project Title: Caritas Village Project

Project Applicant: Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Santa Rosa, a 501(c)(3) corporation and Burbank Housing Development Corporation, 501(c)(3), a nonprofit housing corporation

Comment Period: Comments may be sent anytime during the 30-day NOP comment period. The NOP review and comment period begins on January 24, 2019 and ends on February 22, 2019. All comments must be received during the comment period and no later than 5:00 PM on February 22, 2019.

The City of Santa Rosa encourages the electronic submission of comments. Please indicate a contact person for your agency or organization and send your comments to: KToomians@srcity.org and include Caritas Village in the subject line.

Your comments may also be sent by FAX to (707) 543-3269 or by mail to:
City of Santa Rosa
Attention: Kristinae Toomians, Senior Planner
100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Scoping Meeting: Oral comments may be provided at the Public Scoping Meeting to be held on February 6, 2019 from 6:00 PM to 7:30 PM at the DeTurk Round Barn, located at 819 Donahue Street, Santa Rosa.

Project Location: The project site is located in the City of Santa Rosa in Sonoma County (See Figure 1). The 2.78-acre site consists of the city block bordered by A Street, Morgan Street, 6th Street, and 7th Street, plus the two lots at 501 and 507 A Street. Specifically, the project is located at 431, 437, 439, 465, 501, and 507 A Street and 506, 512, 516, 520, 600, 608, and 612 Morgan Street in the City of Santa Rosa. (see Figure 2).

The project site is comprised of the following 17 Assessor Parcel Numbers:

010-031-003 010-141-009 (City owned) 010-041-016
010-031-002 010-041-010 (City owned) 010-041-017
010-041-001 010-041-011 010-041-018
010-041-004 010-041-013 010-041-019 (City owned)
010-041-005 010-041-014 010-041-020
010-041-008 (City owned) 010-041-015

Project Description: The Project involves the construction of just over a full city-block of development that combines a comprehensive family and homeless support services facility (Caritas Center) to be operated by Catholic Charities and an affordable housing development (Caritas Homes) to be operated by Burbank Housing. The Caritas Center would consolidate the existing on-site Family Support Center and Homeless Services Center into a single building that would provide an emergency shelter, day center, transitional housing, wrap-around services, health services, and administrative offices. Caritas Homes would provide two permanent housing developments for 126 permanent affordable housing units, plus two units for on-site managers.
The project site is in a highly developed area and currently has structures on most of the Morgan Street parcels. Most of these structures used to be dwelling units, but one was converted to the Homeless Services, or Day or Drop In, Center approximately 28 years ago; two are vacant (one is not habitable), two are used as transitional housing, and one is still used as a private residence.

The project will require the demolition of all structures in a phased sequence of development, except for 512 and 600 Morgan Street, which may be relocated to 501 A Street and 507 A Street, if it is legally and practically possible to move the structures. For purposes of the analysis, it is assumed that all structures would require demolition. The proposed project would be built in three phases: Caritas Center, Caritas Homes Phase 1 (on Morgan Street), and Caritas Homes Phase 2 (on A Street).

The project requires the following approvals from the City listed below:

- General Plan Amendment
- Specific Plan Amendment
- Rezoning of all parcels to TV-M zoning district, except for 501 and 507 A Street
- Parcel Map creating three parcels
- Conditional Use Permit to authorize emergency shelter and transitional housing
- Building height concession
- Design Review
- Parking space reduction
- Sign Permit
- Right of Way Abandonment
- Tree Removal Permit
- Landmark Alteration Permit(s)
- Reserve A Allotments

**Aear of Potential Impact:** The City has determined that an EIR is required for this project. Therefore, as allowed under Section 15063(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City has not prepared an Initial Study and will instead begin work directly on the EIR, as allowed under CEQA Guidelines Section 15081. The EIR will focus on the potentially significant and significant effects of the project and will document the reasons for concluding that other effects will be less than significant. The topics listed below will be further analyzed in the EIR. However, certain criteria within the topics listed below have been scoped out of further analysis, as detailed in the next section.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Wildfire

Based on the site or project characteristics, it is not anticipated that significant impacts will occur within the following environmental topic areas and therefore, these specific environmental impact criteria will be scoped out and included in the Effects Found Not To Be Significant section of the EIR. A brief description of why each topic or impact area was found not to be less than significant, and therefore scoped out, is provided below. The following resource checklist questions are from the Updated CEQA Guidelines Appendix G.
AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

There are no designated scenic vistas in the project vicinity. Views from the project site are largely obstructed by the Santa Rosa Plaza parking garages to the south and east and Highway 101 to the west. To the north are views of an existing residential neighborhood. The 2035 General Plan identifies Highway 101 as a scenic road from the northern to southern City limits with a policy (UD-C-1) in place to require special design criteria at major entries to the City. Given that the proposed project is not located near the entries of the City, the project would appear to viewers on northbound Highway 101 as part of the existing urban setting that is currently visible, as the St. Rose Professional Offices (47 feet in height), the Sonoma County Museum (41 feet in height), the parking garage at 521 7th Street (44 feet in height), and the parking garage at Santa Rosa Plaza (28 feet) in height. Caritas Homes would be the tallest structure on the site with a height of 53 feet 4 inches to the highest architectural element, the structure itself would be 42 feet in height. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and impacts would be less than significant.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?

According to the California Department of Transportation (California Department of Transportation, 2017), there are no officially designated or eligible State scenic highways adjacent to the project site. As such, no impact to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway would occur.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The project site is currently developed and currently produces light and glare from existing lighting, windows, and vehicle travel. Areas adjacent to the project site contain multiple sources of lighting that are typical of developed areas including exterior lighting on residential and commercial buildings, parking lot lighting, street lighting, and vehicle headlights. Glare from adjacent land uses emanates from parked cars, passing cars, and windows on nearby buildings.

No construction work would be conducted at night, so no impacts associated with light and glare would result from construction. However, operation of the proposed project would introduce different light and glare sources from the existing sources. The proposed project would incorporate City standard freestanding street lighting along roadways, walkways, and parking areas. The proposed project would also incorporate lighting on the exterior of the buildings. Glass windows would create new sources of daytime glare and nighttime glow. Introduction of these sources may potentially degrade daytime and nighttime views.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the City’s Zoning Code which regulates outdoor lighting, specifically by minimizing the potential impact from new development or redevelopment. The City’s Zoning Code specifies that no permanently installed lighting shall blink, flash, or be of unusual high intensity or brightness as determined by the City. The City’s Zoning Code also regulates the height and shielding of lighting fixtures. The City’s Zoning Code specifies that an outdoor lighting fixture shall be limited to a maximum height of 14 feet or the height of the nearest building, whichever is less. Light fixtures are also required to be shielded so as to confine glare and
reflections within the boundaries of the site to the maximum extent feasible. Further, all proposed lighting would be subject to the City’s Design Review process to ensure light and glare would not affect day or nighttime views in the area. The applicant is currently evaluating the use of solar panels on Caritas Center, however, typical solar panels are designed to be absorptive rather than reflective. As such, impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant.

**AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES**

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

The project site is currently occupied by existing urban uses and is classified by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) as “Urban, Built-up Land” by the DOC Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (DOC 2016). As such, the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use and no impact would occur.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

The project site is not enrolled in a Williamson Act contract and not zoned or designated by the General Plan for agricultural uses. The DOC classifies the project site as “Non-Williamson Act, Urban Built-up Land” (DOC 2013)

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

The project site is currently occupied by existing urban uses and does not contain forestland (as defined in PRC Section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by PRC Section 4526). Furthermore, the project is not zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104[g]). The City of Santa Rosa City Code categorizes the parcels along Morgan Street as a zoning designation of Multi-Family Residential (R-3) and the parcels along A Street as Neighborhood Commercial (CN) (City of Santa Rosa 2018). As such, the proposed project would not convert forestland or timberland to a non-agricultural use and no impact would occur.

d) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?

There are no forestlands on or adjoining the project site, or within the general vicinity of the project site. As such, the proposed project would not result in the loss of forestland or the conversion of forestland to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?

The project site does not contain lands with Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of State Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance, and is not enrolled in a Williamson Act contract. The project site is not zoned for forestland or timberland production and would not be rezoned from agricultural use. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland or forestland to a non-agricultural use. No impact would occur.
AIR QUALITY

e) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Project Construction

Diesel exhaust and reactive organic gases/volatile organic compounds would be emitted during construction of the project from equipment exhaust, painting, and paving activities, which are objectionable to some; however, emissions would disperse rapidly from the project site and therefore not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. As such, construction odor impacts would be less than significant.

Project Operation

Land uses typically considered associated with odors include wastewater treatment facilities, waste-disposal facilities, or agricultural operations. The project does not contain land uses typically associated with emitting objectionable odors.

The BAAQMD’s 2017 Air Quality Guidelines Table 3-3 provides recommended odor screening distances for a variety of land uses. Projects that would site an odor source or a receptor farther than the applicable screening distance, would not likely result in a significant odor impact. The project site is not located within the screening distances recommended by BAAQMD to any potential odor sources. The impact is less than significant.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

The project site does not contain riparian habitat, or any other sensitive natural communities identified within a local or regional plan, policy, and regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Therefore, the project would have no impact to sensitive habitats.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

The project site is developed and according to the National Wetland Inventory does not contain any water features including any that could be considered jurisdictional. Therefore, no impact to water features would occur.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Existing development, Highway 101, and adjacent roadways essentially surround the project site, which minimizes the opportunity for wildlife to move freely across the property. In addition, the property does not represent a corridor linking areas of open space lands. As such, the site is not considered to support wildlife movement, either regionally or locally. Impacts to wildlife movement corridors are less than significant.
e) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?

The project site is not covered by, nor is it located within, an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state HCP. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impact related to conflicts with an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state HCP.

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

The closest active faults are the Rodgers Creek Fault, located approximately 1.1 mile northeast of the project site; the Bennet Valley Fault located approximately 3.49 miles east of the project site, the Maacama Fault, located approximately 5.1 miles northeast of the project site; and the Healdsburg Fault located approximately 11.3 miles north of the project site. The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo fault zone for any of the nearby faults, including the Rodgers Creek Fault. In a seismically active region such as Northern California, there is always the possibility for future faulting at any site. Historical occurrences of surface faulting have generally closely followed the trace of the more recently active faults. Although fault rupture can possibly occur in previously unfaulted areas, the occurrence is rare. Because the project is not within an Alquist-Priolo fault zone and no substantial evidence indicates that a known fault would traverse the site, the project would result in a less than significant impact associated with this issue.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

According to the City of Santa Rosa General Plan Figure 12-3 Geologic and Seismic Hazards, the project site is in an area classified as the approximate limits of violent groundshaking during an earthquake on Rodgers Creek Fault.

The proposed project would be constructed in conformance with the latest edition of the California Building Code, which includes engineering standards appropriate to withstand anticipated ground accelerations at the project site. Conformance with the earthquake design parameters of the California Building Code would be subject to City review as part of the building site plan review and building permit review process. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with the City’s Municipal Code and General Plan Policy NS-C-2 which require new development to prepare site-specific geotechnical investigations prior to development approval, where applicable (City of Santa Rosa, 2009). Compliance with existing standards and City zoning and policy requirements would result in a less than significant impact.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

According to the Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Public Safety Element, the project site is in an area of low potential for liquefaction (Sonoma County 2014). Soils at the project site consist of Yolo silt loam, characterized as a well-drained soil. The project design would be required to conform to the latest edition of the California Building Code,
City Zoning Code and General Plan Policy Measure NS-C-2, which requires an investigation for all development for the potential of soil liquefaction during seismic ground shaking to result in damage to structures, pavements and utilities. Compliance with existing standards and City zoning and policy requirements would result in a less than significant impact.

iv) Landslides?

The topography of the project site and the surrounding area are flat, and in an area where slopes are considered to be stable (City of Santa Rosa, 2009). Therefore, the potential for a landslide to occur is low. No impact would occur.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would involve demolition, vegetation removal, grading, and excavation activities that could expose barren soils to sources of wind or water, resulting in the potential for erosion and sedimentation on and off the project site. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permitting programs regulate stormwater quality from construction sites, which includes erosion and sedimentation. Under the NPDES permitting program, the preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) are required for construction activities that would disturb an area of 1 acre or more or whose projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres. The SWPPP must identify potential sources of erosion or sedimentation that may be reasonably expected to affect the quality of stormwater discharges as well as identify and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that ensure the reduction of these pollutants during stormwater discharges. Typical BMPs intended to control erosion include sand bags, detention basins, silt fencing, storm drain inlet protection, street sweeping, and monitoring of water bodies. Because the proposed project would increase impervious surfaces by more than one acre, it would be required to follow the requirements outlined in the Guidelines for the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan Storm Water Best Management Practices for New Development and Redevelopment For the Santa Rosa Area and Unincorporated Areas around Petaluma and Sonoma (SUSMP). As required by the Santa Rosa Area SUSMP, the proposed project would include preparation of a Storm Water Mitigation Plan to mitigate post-construction water quality impacts. Therefore, with compliance to applicable regulations, soil erosion impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

c) Be located on strata or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

As previously indicated, there is a very low risk for potential liquefaction on the project site, and no risks of landslides. The soils on the project site, as well as the geologic conditions on- and off-site, would not result in the potential for landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Therefore, impacts associated with this issue would be less than significant.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18 1 B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?

The soils at the project site are comprised of Yolo silt loam and are characterized as well drained soils with low shrink swell potential. The project design would be required to conform to the latest edition of the California Building Code, City Zoning Code and General Plan Policy Measure NS-C-2, which requires an investigation for all development for the potential of soil liquefaction during seismic ground shaking to result in damage to structures, pavements and
utilities. Compliance with existing standards and City zoning and policy requirements would result in a less than significant impact.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

The project would be served by City of Santa Rosa sanitary sewers and would not require the installation of septic or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impacts would occur.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

As with any project that involves earth moving, there is potential for the discovery of paleontological resources during project grading and excavation activities. However, the Santa Rosa General Plan 2035 EIR does not identify paleontological resources in the city. As such, it is not anticipated that there would be significant risk of discovery of or damage to paleontological resources from implementation of the proposed project. Although the potential exists for ground-disturbing activities to inadvertently impact an unknown resource, the likelihood of direct or indirect impacts is low due to the highly developed condition of the area. However, if these resources are inadvertently discovered, General Plan Policies HP-A-2 and HP-A-3 (with assistance from a paleontologist) will be implemented along with federal and state statutes protecting these resources from disturbance and destruction.

Potential destruction of unique paleontological resources, sites, or unique geologic features resulting from the proposed project would be a less than significant impact with compliance to existing goals, policies, and guidelines.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

The proposed project would involve the development of the Caritas Center, which would include mixed use service and emergency shelter facility and transitional housing uses, and the Caritas Homes, which would include 126 affordable housing units, plus two manager’s units. During the construction phase, limited amounts of hazardous materials would be used, including standard construction materials such as concrete, paints, solvents, and heavy construction equipment which would contain diesel fuels and oils. The project contractor would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, as overseen by the California Environmental Protection Agency and California Department of Toxic Substances Control. During operation of the proposed project, the use of hazardous materials would be limited to those commonly found at hotel, commercial/retail, office, and self-storage facilities such as, solvents, cleaners, paints, and pesticides for landscape maintenance activities. These common household hazardous materials would be used in limited quantities and would not create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during project construction and operation would be less than significant.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

The proposed project would the demolition of structures built prior to the 1980s and may pose a hazard regarding asbestos containing materials, lead-based paints, and other hazardous waste containing building materials. As
discussed in impact a) above, project construction and operation activities would involve limited use of hazardous materials, including paints, solvents, fuels, oils, cleaners, and pesticides. The use of these substances is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws pertaining to the safe handle, storage, and transport of hazardous materials. In addition, during construction activities the applicant would be required to implement a SWPPP to prevent contaminated runoff from leaving the project site. Regarding the potential for exposure to hazardous building materials during demolition, the project applicant would retain a certified hazardous waste contractor to determine the presence or absence of building materials or equipment that contains hazardous waste, including asbestos, lead-based paint, mercury, and Polychlorinated Biphenyls. If such substances are found to be present, the contractor would properly remove and dispose of those hazardous materials in accordance with federal and state law. In addition, the contractor would be required to comply with the BAAQMD’s Regulation 11, Hazardous Air Pollutants, Rule 2, Asbestos Demolition, Renovation, and Manufacturing. Compliance with existing regulations, and City zoning and policy requirements would result in a less than significant impact.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely-hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

There are no schools within 0.25 mile of the project site. The nearest school to the project site is Santa Rosa Junior High School located 0.50 mile east of the project site. This condition precludes the possibility of the proposed project exposing schools located within 0.25 mile of the project site to hazardous materials. No impacts would occur.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (DTSC 2018). The project includes one portion of the property (437 A Street) that was associated with the former Memorial Hospital and was the subject of a Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) cleanup site (SWRCB 2018). The potential contaminant of concern was diesel. The case was first opened on December 19, 1991. Site assessment occurred on December 27, 1991 and again on September 22, 1994 and January 19, 1995. Remediation occurred on August 10, 1998 and additional site assessment took place the same day. Monitoring began on August 10, 1998 and the case was completed and closed on August 11, 1998.

The Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan policy NS-F-1 requires remediation, cleanup, and evaluation of risk prior to reuse, in identified areas where hazardous materials and petroleum products may have impacted soil or groundwater. Compliance with existing policy requirements would result in a less than significant impact.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

The nearest public airport to the project site is the Charles B. Schulz-Sonoma County airport located at 2200 Airport Boulevard, approximately 6.25 miles northwest of the project site. The Sonoma County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) adopted the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan Update for Sonoma County in 2001. This plan includes safety zones around the airport that are designed to reduce potential hazards regarding land use compatibility in the
vicinity of the airport due to aircraft operations. The outer boundary of the Outer Safety Zone for Runway 32 extends 15,800 feet southeast of the airport but does not reach the Urban Growth Boundary of Santa Rosa.

The Airport’s “area of influence” extends many miles from the airport property. The ALUC has determined that the “airport influence area” also includes all surrounding areas where the airport’s height limits are in effect and where airplanes using the instrument approach pattern would be expected to be lower than 1,000 feet above ground level, which is the minimum flight elevation permitted above a populated area. The “Airspace Obstruction Height Limits” for the airport extend approximately ten miles southeast of Runway 32 and includes part of the City of Santa Rosa. Any proposed general plan or specific plan amendment zoning code change which would increase structural heights within this area and penetrate the Federal Aviation Regulation’s Part 77 surface elevations, shall be referred to the ALUC for consistency determination. An object constitutes an obstruction to navigation if it extends 200 feet above ground level or 200 feet above the airport elevation, whichever is greater up to three miles (for runway lengths greater than 3,200 feet) from the airport. Runway 32 is approximately 6,000 feet in length. The Caritas Homes component would be the tallest structure on the project site at 42 feet, but it would not constitute an obstruction.

Given the distance from the airport, the proposed project would not expose people working or residing in the area to safety hazards or excessive noise. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

f) Impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The proposed project would not modify any existing roadways in such a way that would impede emergency access or evacuation. Emergency vehicular access would be provided by driveways on A Street and Morgan Street. During the construction phase, temporary and/or partial street closures may be needed. However, access to the project site and the surrounding area would be maintained in accordance with a Traffic Control Plan. The Traffic Control Plan would identify all detours, appropriate traffic controls, and ensure adequate circulation and emergency access are provided during the construction phase. Therefore, project construction and operation activities would not interfere with an emergency evacuation or response plan, and a less than significant impact would occur.

h) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

The project site is completely surrounded by urban development. The project site is designated as an Unzoned Local Responsibility Area on CAL FIRE fire hazard severity mapping, and the adjacent properties are also designated as Unzoned Local Responsibility Area. As the project site and the adjacent areas are not designated as having a high potential for a fire hazard, the project site would not be susceptible to a significant risk of wildland fires, and associated impacts would be less than significant.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would involve demolition, vegetation removal, grading, and excavation activities that could expose barren soils to sources of wind or water, resulting in the potential for erosion and sedimentation on and off the project site resulting in degradation of water quality. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permitting programs regulate stormwater quality from
construction sites, which includes erosion and sedimentation. Under the NPDES permitting program, the preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) are required for construction activities that would disturb an area of 1 acre or more or whose projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres. The SWPPP must identify potential sources of erosion or sedimentation that may be reasonably expected to affect the quality of stormwater discharges as well as identify and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that ensure the reduction of these pollutants during stormwater discharges. Typical BMPs intended to control erosion include sand bags, detention basins, silt fencing, storm drain inlet protection, street sweeping, and monitoring of water bodies. Because the proposed project would increase impervious surfaces by more than one acre, it would be required to follow the requirements outlined in the Guidelines for the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan Storm Water Best Management Practices for New Development and Redevelopment For the Santa Rosa Area and Unincorporated Areas around Petaluma and Sonoma (SUSMP). Under the SUSMP, applicable projects are required to design and implement post-development measures for the management of stormwater quality and stormwater quantity and for the conservation of natural areas of the development site. As required by the Santa Rosa Area SUSMP, the proposed project would include preparation of a Storm Water Mitigation Plan to mitigate post-construction water quality impacts. Therefore, with compliance to applicable regulations, soil erosion impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Demolition and reconstruction could result in impacts related to groundwater if areas currently available for the infiltration of rainfall runoff are reduced and permeable areas are replaced by impermeable surfaces. The Preliminary Low Impact Development (LID) Stormwater Report prepared by BKF Engineering noted that approximately two acres of new impervious surface would be created or reconstructed. The project would provide permeable landscaped areas and open land for some groundwater recharge to continue and would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. In addition, the project is located on an existing developed in-fill site surrounded by development and is not a designated groundwater recharge area.

Since the early 1960s, the City has received most of its potable water supply from the Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA). The SCWA provides water primarily from the Russian River to most of the retail water providers in Sonoma County, and to a lesser degree in Marin County. The City also has received water supply from its own groundwater wells and provided recycled water from its own Subregional Water Reuse System (Subregional System) to some Santa Rosa irrigators.

As discussed in the City of Santa Rosa 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (City of Santa Rosa, 2016), the City receives SCWA water through a series of turnouts, check valves, and direct connections serving City pump stations along the SCWA’s Santa Rosa and Sonoma Aqueducts. There are 59 physical connections between the City’s distribution system and the SCWA’s system, including 39 pressure reducing valves, 16 check valves, and 4 pumping stations. The City’s major water distribution facilities consist of 25 treated water reservoirs, 20 water pump stations, and one well treatment facility.

The City prepared its 2015 Urban Water Management Plan to determine if it had adequate supplies to meet its total demand projection from 2020 to 2040. The City currently has three sources of water supply: (1) an agreement with SCWA, (2) groundwater, and (3) recycled water. Most of the potable water the City receives is from SCWA through the provisions of the Restructured Agreement for Water Supply and provides for the delivery of up to 56.6 million
gallons of water per day (mgd) on average, up to 29,100 acre-feet per year (AFY). The City also produces water from its two groundwater production wells. This supply source is permitted for regular production and can provide up to 2,300 AFY to the City. The City can also access approximately 410 AFY of recycled water from its Regional Water Reuse System for approved uses within the Santa Rosa Urban Growth Boundary. In addition to these water supply sources, the City implements an aggressive water conservation program, saving over 4,500 AFY of water. In a normal water year, the total existing water supply available to the City is approximately 31,810 AFY (not including conservation). Santa Rosa’s highest water use to date was in 2004 when approximately 24,000 acre-feet was used. In 2017, Santa Rosa’s water usage was approximately 17,853 acre-feet.

The City also has a system of emergency groundwater wells which have been used historically to supplement the water supply during emergencies. The City Council’s adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes projects to provide additional water supply during emergencies and peak demand periods. Additional projects are planned to replace old or deteriorated water system pipelines, increase fire protection and storage, improve operational efficiencies of water pump stations, provide emergency power generation at critical project locations, and to maintain and repair the water system throughout the City. These and other ongoing CIP projects are designed to maintain enough water supply system to match General Plan growth projections.

The 2015 Urban Water Management Plan projected total water demand for the years 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, 2035, and 2040 based on the population and employment projections in the 2035 General Plan and determined that there would be adequate supplies to meet future water demands during normal, single-dry, and multi-dry years (City of Santa Rosa 2016).

The project would increase on-site residents by 274 for a total of 394 residents (see population calculations under Population and Housing). The City of Santa Rosa’s current population is estimated at 178,488 (California Department of Finance, 2018). The projected population at General Plan Buildout is 232,360. Additionally, the City lost 3,081 housing units as a result of the wildfires in 2017. However, overall change in Santa Rosa population is positive (0.2 percent) due to a large annexation of almost 2,000 housing units. The increased population of approximately 274 new residents associated with the project is not anticipated to be a substantial additional source that would substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. The impacts would be less than significant.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site:

The proposed project would not result in the alteration of a stream or river, but would add impervious surfaces. The proposed project would be required to implement a SWPPP during construction. Implementation of the SWPPP would control the amount of surface runoff from the site and minimize the amount of pollutants entering the stormwater system. In addition, operation of the proposed project would be subject to the SUSMP. As required by the Santa Rosa Area SUSMP, the proposed project would include preparation of a Storm Water Mitigation Plan to mitigate post-construction water quality impacts. Therefore, with compliance to applicable regulations, soil erosion impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site:
The proposed project would not result in the alteration of a stream or river. The proposed project would be required to implement a SWPPP during construction. Implementation of the SWPPP would control the amount of surface runoff from the site and minimize potential flooding on- or off-site. In addition, operation of the proposed project would be subject to the SUSMP. As required by the Santa Rosa Area SUSMP, the proposed project would include preparation of a Storm Water Mitigation Plan to mitigate post-construction water runoff by incorporating BMPs to limit post-development runoff to pre-development conditions to the maximum extent practicable. Therefore, with compliance to applicable regulations, surface runoff from construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

iii. **Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or**

The project site is currently served by 15-inch storm drains located at A Street and 15-inch, 18-inch, and 21-inch storm drains on 6th Street. The project would create two (2) acres of new impervious surface. The project includes a new 18-inch public storm drain on Morgan Street.

The 2035 General Plan identified policies to ensure that new development and redevelopment, such as the proposed project incorporated improved stormwater flow through maintenance and upgrades of facilities as conditions of approval. Other policies required the incorporation of design features consistent with the SUSMP to limit post-development runoff to pre-development conditions to the maximum extent practicable. The Preliminary Low Impact Development (LID) Stormwater Report prepared by BKF Engineering noted that approximately two acres of new impervious surface would be created or reconstructed. The project would provide permeable landscaped areas and open land for some groundwater recharge and pollution prevention. The proposed project would not result in substantial additional sources of polluted runoff through compliance with existing City standards and policies and the SUSMP.

iv. **Impede or redirect flood flows?**

The project site is split on two Flood Insurance Rate Maps 06097C0728E and 06097C0729E. The maps show that the project site is located in Zone X (FEMA 2008). Zone X is defined as areas not within either a 100-year or 500-year flood hazard zone. As such, the proposed project would not place housing or structures, which could impede or redirect flood flows. No impact would occur.

d) **In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?**

The project site is not located in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone. As such, the proposed project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation. No impacts would occur.

e) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?**

The proposed project would implement a SWPPP during construction and a Storm Water Mitigation Plan to mitigate post-construction water quality impacts consistent with the SUSMP. Compliance with existing standards would reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), effective January 1, 2015, established a framework of priorities and requirements to facilitate sustainable groundwater management throughout the State. The intent of SGMA is for groundwater to be managed by local public agencies and newly-formed Groundwater Sustainability
Agencies (GSAs) to ensure a groundwater basin is operated within its sustainable yield through the development and implementation of a Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSP). The City of Santa Rosa is part of the Santa Rosa Plain GSA. The GSP for the Santa Rosa Plain basin is due January 31, 2022. The GSP will define the sustainability goals for each basin and include projects and actions needed to achieve and/or maintain sustainable groundwater use.

As discussed above, the City of Santa Rosa identified sufficient water supplies for General Plan Buildout and the proposed project’s growth would be consistent with the General Plan. Furthermore, new construction is required to comply with the California Green Building Code water efficiency and conservation measures, which are increasingly more stringent. Landscaping for the proposed project would also be subject to the City’s Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

The above characteristics would indicate that the proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The impact would be less than significant.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

a) Physically divide an established community?

The project consists of the development of Caritas Center and Caritas Homes on a previously developed site. The project site is bordered by Morgan Street and Highway 101 to the west, A Street to the east, 6th Street to the south, and 7th Street to the west. The proposed project would not introduce an incompatible use in the area and would not include any physical features that would physically divide the community (e.g. blocking of roadways or sidewalks). No impact would occur.

c) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The project site is not covered by, nor is it located within, an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state HCP. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impact related to conflicts with an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state HCP.

MINERAL RESOURCES

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource classified MRZ-2 by the State Geologist that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?

Various minerals have been mined in Sonoma County. Aggregate products are the most dominate commercial mineral mined. According to County mapping, the project site is not located within a state-designated Mineral Resource Zone. In addition, the project site contains existing urban uses and does not support mineral extraction operations. No impact would occur.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?
No mineral extraction activities exist on the project site and mineral extraction is not included within the project’s
design. Additionally, the project site is not designated a locally important mineral resource recovery site. As such, no
impact would occur.

NOISE

a) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan
has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose
people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The project site is within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan. The nearest private airport is the
Graywood Ranch Airport, located at 7935 Sonoma Highway, approximately 8.4 miles east of the project site The
nearest public airport is the Charles B. Shulz-Sonoma County Airport, located at 2200 Airport Boulevard,
approximately 6.25 miles northwest of the project site. Therefore, no potential impacts associated with aviation noise
at the project site would occur.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new
homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Construction

Construction of the proposed project would be over multiple years, with a peak employment of 40 to 50 temporary
construction workers. Construction of the project would not affect the population of Santa Rosa or Sonoma County
because of the construction workforce currently available in nearby areas. Since the project is also within commuting
distance of the greater San Francisco Bay area, no construction workers are expected to relocate as a result of
project construction. Construction of the project is not expected to increase the demand for housing. Therefore, the
project would not cause a significant increase in population in the City of Santa Rosa or other communities near the
project.

Operations

The Caritas Homes component of the project would develop 126 affordable housing units with two additional units
reserved for on-site managers. The Caritas Center would develop 50 private family residence rooms as part of the
emergency shelter component and a transitional housing unit for 20 participants. Based on actual data for similar
Burbank Housing developments, Caritas Homes will result in 222 new residents, an average of 1.7 persons per
housing unit. Burbank Housing studied actual occupancy levels for one and two-bedroom units in its recently opened
Crossroads property, which has a high percentage of homeless-dedicated units to develop the estimated number of
new residents. Because the Crossroads development does not have studio housing, the occupancy was assumed to
be one person per studio. Table 1 provides the Caritas Homes occupancy calculations.
Table 1: Caritas Homes – Maximum Number of Occupants Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Minimum Number of Occupants per unit</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Occupants per unit</th>
<th>Mid-point Number</th>
<th>Crossroads Actual Number of Occupants per unit</th>
<th>Number to be used for Caritas</th>
<th>Total Occupants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studios</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-bedroom</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>104.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bedroom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>221.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average occupancy per unit = 1.7

Source: Catholic Charities and Burbank Housing, personal communication, December 2018.

Catholic Charities would provide housing on the project site as part of the Caritas Center and would include 40 transitional housing units, intended for one person per unit and 50 family units. Based on a per-person household rate of 2.64 for the City of Santa Rosa (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017) the 50 family units would add an estimated 132 family residents. There are 120 residents currently on the project.

The proposed project would add 394 total residents (40 transitional residents + 132 family residents + 222 Caritas Homes residents), however, the net increase would be 274 people; this is an increase of approximately 0.15 percent of the total existing City of Santa Rosa population and 0.5 percent of the projected population growth through 2035. Based on the estimated increase in residents, the population growth is not substantial.

Table 2 below shows the expansion in employees and clients as a result of the proposed project. As shown in Table 2, the increase would be minimal.

Table 2: Caritas Center – Service Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Currently On-Site</th>
<th>Proposed with Project</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-site Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale Clinic + Caritas Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clients</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Center</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Entry Program</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support Center</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Homeless Survey</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Volunteers (Day Center and Family Support Center) per year | 178 | 205 | 27
---|---|---|---
Service Groups (12 groups with up to 100 people each per year) | 1,200 | 1,400 | 200
Tours (4 tours/month of up to 15 people each) | 540 | 540 | 0
Thank you events (2 per year with up to 50 participants each) | 100 | 100 | 0
Total | 2,168 | 2,395 | 227

Source: Catholic Charities, personal communication, December 2018.

The expanded Caritas Center would require 155 additional employees to provide the comprehensive services envisioned by the project. The increase in employment would be minimal. Therefore, impacts from population growth would be less than significant.

The proposed project does not include roads or infrastructure, therefore, no growth in population would result from the extension of roads or infrastructure. Therefore, impacts from population growth would be less than significant.

c) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed project would require the demolition of existing homes. Caritas Homes Phase 1 will be located on the site of the currently vacant property at 612 Morgan Street, the vacant four-plex building at 608 Morgan Street, and the buildings currently housing the Homeless Services Center at 600 and 520 Morgan Street. The applicant proposes to demolish the structures on 512 and 506 Morgan Street. 512 Morgan is currently used as a private residence. 506 Morgan is not currently utilized for traditional housing usage. Given that only one traditional residential home will be displaced, the proposed project would not displace a substantial number of existing people or housing. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact concerning displacement of existing housing.
PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

Fire protection services would be provided by the City of Santa Rosa. The nearest fire station is Fire Station 1 located at 955 Sonoma, approximately 0.77 miles east of the project site. Another fire station, Fire Station 2 is located at 65 Stony Point Road, approximately 1.47 miles west of the project site. The General Plan’s fire emergency response time goal is that the Fire Department shall achieve 90 percent performance of arrival of the first fire company at an emergency within five minutes of notification by the dispatch center. The time goal does not include the additional 70 second standard for the dispatch center call taking and emergency medical dispatching. The Department’s emergency resources arrived on scene within 5 minutes of dispatch 73 percent of the time. The Fire Department was not able to meet the General Plan’s response time goal in 2017 (City of Santa Rosa, 2017). The project would create 126 new affordable housing residential units, two on-site manager units, 50 private family residence rooms as part of the emergency shelter, and a transitional housing unit for 20 participants, which would result in a potential population increase of approximately 274 new residents. Demand for fire protection services would be incrementally increased due to the corresponding increase in population at the site. However, project implementation is not anticipated to substantially increase Santa Rosa Fire Department response times to the project site or to the surrounding vicinity or require construction of new or physically altered fire protection facilities.

In accordance with California Government Code Section 53090, the project would be required to pay a fee to offset the increase demand and pay for the additional services. The proposed buildings would be constructed in compliance with local and state fire codes, which would ensure that the buildings would not result in a new fire hazard at the site. Standard conditions of approval would require the provision of a fire flow analysis to ensure that adequate water pressure and flow rates are available on-site for firefighting purposes. No additional fire personnel or equipment would be necessary to serve the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Police protection?

Police protection services would be provided by the Santa Rosa Police Department. The Police Department is headquartered at 965 Sonoma Avenue, approximately 0.84 mile east of the project site. The Santa Rosa Police Department has 264.5 employees serving a community that spans 40 square miles and is home to more than 178,000 people. The proposed facility does not propose new or physically altered police protection facilities, nor does it specifically create an environment generally associated with unlawful activities requiring increased law enforcement services. The project would create 126 new apartments, with two additional apartments that will be reserved for on-site managers, which would result in a potential population increase of approximately 274 new residents. In accordance with California Development Code Section 53090, the project would be required to pay a fee to offset the increased demand and pay for any additional services. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant.

Schools?

The project site would be served by the Santa Rosa City School District (District). The District consists of 9 elementary schools, five middle schools, six high schools, and four charter schools.
Santa Rosa City Schools has 24 schools, 16,000 students, and 1,600 teachers and staff members. The project’s housing would result in an increased demand for school services within the District’s service area. Notably, the children in the Family Support Center would attend the same school they attend prior to staying at the Center or the children would attend the Kid Street Learning Center, thus not impacting the enrollment for Santa Rosa City Schools.

Based on a District’s student generation rates of 0.208 student per multifamily residence for grades K-5, 0.110 student per multi-family residence for grades 6-8, and 0.128 student per multi-family residence for grades 9-12, the Caritas Homes portion of the project (1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units) could generate as many as 14 new students. The addition of 14 students would generate a nominal increase (less than 0.1 percent) in the student population; however, currently many schools are at or near capacity. California Government Section 65996 provides for the collection of school impact fees to ensure that adequate school and related facilities will be available. As the project would be required to pay school impact fees as a condition of project approval, the proposed project would not result in adverse physical impacts to schools. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The children at the Caritas Center attend the same school they attended prior to staying at the center or the children attend the Kidd Street Learning Center, as such the children from the Caritas Center would not increase student enrollment. The impact would be less than significant.

Parks?

The addition of 126 affordable residential units, 2 on-site manager units, 50 private family residence rooms as part of the emergency shelter, and a transitional housing unit, with up to 20 occupants, which would increase the demand for park facilities in the area. The City of Santa Rosa General Plan sets a minimum overall citywide ratio of 6.0 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents for planning purposes. Park acreage can be further divided into 3.5 acres of city parks per 1,000 residents plus 1.4 acres of publicly accessible school recreational land per 1,000 residents, and 1.1 acres of public-serving open space per 1,000 residents. Project implementation would result in a net increase of up to 274 new residents within the City. Based on parkland demand factor of 6.0 acres per 1,000 residents, project implementation would generate a demand for approximately 1.64 acres of parkland. The nearest park to the project site is Depot park, located 0.18 mile west of the project site. In accordance with City of Santa Rosa City Code Section 19-70.060, the project applicant would be required to dedicate land or pay a fee in-lieu thereof, or both, for park or recreational purposes. The project does not include the development of recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities. With the mandatory requirement that the applicant pay in-lieu park fees, the proposed project would not generate the need for new parks and impacts would be less than significant.

Other public facilities?

The addition of up to 274 new residents would create an incremental increase in the demand for library facilities and community centers. In accordance with California Development Code Section 53090, development impact fees would be required to offset any additional service needs. With payment of legislated development fees, impacts would be less than significant.

**RECREATION**

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
As discussed previously, the proposed project would add up to 274 new residents to the City of Santa Rosa which may increase demand for parks or other recreational facilities. However, the proposed project would include private recreational facilities to serve the future residents such as covered gathering area, communal lawn area, pet relief area, tenant vegetable garden planter, day use courtyard, family courtyard, play structure, chapel courtyard, and office patio. These facilities would alleviate the demand on existing and proposed recreational facilities generated by the project residents. In accordance with City of Santa Rosa City Code Section 19-70.060, the project applicant would be required to dedicate land or pay a fee in-lieu thereof, or both, for park or recreational purposes. With the mandatory compliance with the City’s in-lieu fee requirements, the project’s impacts to recreational facilities would be less than significant.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The project would include private recreational facilities that would serve its residents, such as covered gathering area, communal lawn area, pet relief area, tenant vegetable garden planter, day use courtyard, family courtyard, play structure, chapel courtyard, and office patio. However, the proposed project does not include new or expanded off-site recreational facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

a) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?

The nearest public airport to the project site is the Charles B. Shulz-Sonoma County airport located at 2200 Airport Boulevard, approximately 6.25 miles northwest of the project site. The proposed project would not involve use of air transit, nor is it expected to cause any change in air traffic patterns. As such, the proposed project would not result in any changes to air traffic patterns nor would it result in any associated safety risks. Therefore, there would be no impact.

b) Substantially increase hazards to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

During construction of the proposed project, heavy construction equipment may travel on Highway 101, local roadways, and major arterials. The use of Highway 101 and roadways by heavy construction equipment can increase the risk to drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians in the project area. The proposed project would prepare a Traffic Control Plan that would include detours, emergency access, and appropriate traffic controls during construction. An encroachment permit would be obtained from the City for any staging/construction-vehicle parking on adjacent streets, if necessary. Notices regarding closure to the public of street parking would be posted in compliance with City regulations in advance of use. The proposed surface parking lots shown on the site plan would be used as the staging areas and would become the surface parking lots at project completion. Therefore, project construction would not create a transportation hazard, and the impact would be less than significant.

The proposed project would be compatible with the kind of traffic generated by the surrounding commercial developments in the project vicinity. The proposed project does not propose to make changes to a roadway that would create road hazards or alter design features developed to mitigate such hazards. Vehicular access to the project site would be from A Street and Morgan Street. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.
c) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not affect streets or otherwise affect emergency access routes. The proposed project would be designed to incorporate all required Santa Rosa Fire Department standards to ensure the project would not result in hazardous design features or inadequate emergency access to the project site or areas surrounding the project site. Construction of the project would include preparation of a Traffic Control Plan that would ensure that emergency access is provided at all times. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

d) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

The project site would be served by City Bus Routes 1, 2B, and 10, with bus stops within 0.25 miles of the project site. The project site is also located within one-quarter mile of the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) Train Station in Railroad Square and one-third of a mile from Second Street Transit Mall. The Caritas Center would provide up to 32 bicycle parking spaces, while the Caritas Homes would provide a 64 long term bicycle parking spaces for Phase 1 and Phase 2 (e.g. 128 total long-term bike parking spaces), and 4 outdoor, short term bicycle parking spaces. In addition, there are Class II bicycle lanes on 6th Street, Morgan Street, and 7th Street east of the project site. There is also a signed bicycle route on A Street north of 7th Street. The proposed project would not eliminate the bicycle lanes or introduce a barrier to alternative transportation; therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Wastewater Treatment

The City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department, Sewer Division oversees wastewater collection and treatment within the City and would provide such services to the proposed project. Wastewater generated within the City is transported to Laguna Wastewater Treatment Plant for treatment and disposal. The treatment plant is required to abide by all applicable regulations regarding wastewater treatment including those of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The treatment plant has an average daily dry weather flow of 16.9 million gallons per day (mgd) and is permitted for 21.34 mgd. Based on the waste generation rate identified in the City’s Sewer Master Plan of 50 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) per resident and 30 gpcd for employees, the proposed project would be expected to produce approximately 18,350 gpd of wastewater (based on an assumed population of 274 new residents and 155 new employees). As such, there is substantial capacity at the Treatment Plant to serve the proposed project and implementation of the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements or require the expansion of existing facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

Water Treatment

The City of Santa Rosa Water Department oversees potable water distribution within the city limits. The Water Division obtains water on a contractual basis from the SCWA. The project would be expected to require approximately 61,740 gallons of potable water per day based on the Department's domestic water demand generation rate of 126 gpd. Adequate supplies are available to serve the proposed project. Indoor water conservation
fixtures would include low water use plumbing fixtures, with high performance low-flow toilets, faucets, and showerheads using less water than standard facilities. Additionally, the City would require the project to comply with the City’s Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, which would require the project applicant to implement outdoor irrigation water conservation measures and practices. These measures would reduce the proposed project’s demand for potable water and ensure that the project would not require new or expanded water facilities and that related impacts would be less than significant.

**Stormwater Drainage**

The proposed project would include a system of vegetated storm water planting areas that will collect, treat, and convey stormwater runoff from the project site to the existing stormwater system. Stormwater runoff from roofs, pavement surface, and landscaping will flow into storm water planting areas to be treated. The storm water planting areas would be sized to function as stormwater treatment and flow control. Because the proposed project would increase impervious surfaces by more than one acre, it would be required to follow the requirements outlined in the Guidelines for the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan Storm Water Best Management Practices for New Development and Redevelopment For the Santa Rosa Area and Unincorporated Areas around Petaluma and Sonoma (SUSMP). Under the SUSMP, applicable projects are required to design and implement post-development measures for the management of stormwater quality and stormwater quantity and for the conservation of natural areas of the development site. Therefore, the impacts associated with stormwater drainage facilities would be less than significant.

**Electric Power and Natural Gas**

PG&E is the electric and natural gas provider in the City of Santa Rosa. Although the proposed project will demand additional electricity and natural gas, the Santa Rosa 2035 General Plan found that buildout of the General Plan would not exceed the demand for electricity and natural gas estimated in its 2035 General Plan. Furthermore, the proposed project and future development would be subject to more stringent energy efficiency standards through updates of the California Green Building Code and Title 24. The proposed project would also be targeting a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) gold certification, requiring increased energy efficiency above Title 24 standards. No new expanded facilities would be required for electric and natural gas facilities that could potentially cause a significant environmental impact.

The proposed project would require the relocation of existing overhead PG&E electrical distribution lines and the removal of underground gas service facilities that run to each of the structures proposed for demolition. Relocation of the overhead PG&E electrical distribution lines and removal of the underground gas lines would be performed in accordance with PG&E standards. The relocation of the electric and natural gas lines would not cause any significant environmental effects as they would occur on the existing developed land. Compliance with PG&E standards would ensure that the relocation of facilities is conducted in a safe and environmentally sound manner.

**Telecommunication Facilities**

Telecommunications in the City of Santa Rosa are provided by a number of providers. The project site currently has telecommunication services provided to the various structures that would require removal and installation of telecommunication lines to new buildings. Any additional connections that are deemed necessary during final site design would be placed within utility easements. No expanded capacity would be required for telecommunication facilities that could potentially cause a significant environmental impact.
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

The 2015 Urban Water Management Plan projected total water demand for the years 2015, 2020, 2025, 2030, 2035, and 2040 based on the population and employment projections in the 2035 General Plan and determined that there would be adequate supplies to meet future water demands during normal, single-dry, and multi-dry years (City of Santa Rosa 2016).

The project would increase on-site residents by 274 for a total of 394 residents (see population calculations under Population and Housing). The City of Santa Rosa’s current population is estimated at 178,488 (California Department of Finance, 2018). The projected population at General Plan Buildout is 232,360. Additionally, the City lost 3,081 housing units as a result of the wildfires in 2017. However, overall change in Santa Rosa population is positive (0.2 percent) due to a large annexation of almost 2,000 housing units. The increased population of approximately 274 new residents associated with the project is not anticipated to be a substantial additional source that would substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. The impacts would be less than significant.

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

The WWTP has a permitted treatment capacity of 21.34 mgd. The average volume of wastewater treated at the WWTP was 16.9 mgd in 2015 and is expected to stay similar considering the limited growth within the WWTP service area since 2015. The proposed project would generate 0.026 mgd of wastewater that would be a fraction of the available capacity of 4.44 mgd. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

The City of Santa Rosa currently contracts with the Recology Sonoma Marin to handle recycling, organics, and solid waste service. Recology collects and transports commercial and solid waste to the Central Disposal Site Transfer Station at 500 Meacham Road north of Petaluma. Once at the transfer station, the solid waste is sorted and hauled to the following landfills: the Potrero Hills Landfill in Solano County (anticipated to be in operation until approximately 2030), the Redwood Sanitary Landfill in Marin County (anticipated to be in operation until approximately 2039), the Keller Canyon Landfill in Contra Costa County (anticipated to be in operation until approximately 2030) (City of Santa Rosa, 2009).

During construction, there would be a temporary increase in solid waste disposal needs associated with construction wastes. Construction wastes for the project would include small amounts of solid waste from building construction, as well as excess pavement, concrete, and soil associated with excavation and site grading. Both construction waste and operational solid waste could be accommodated by landfills located in the region. The impact from construction waste would be less than significant.

CalRecycle calculates California’s statewide per capita disposal rate. California had a per resident disposal rate of 4.9 pounds/resident/day and a “diversion rate equivalent” of 61 percent. The 2016 per employee disposal rate was 11.4 pounds/employee/day, and the per employee “diversion rate equivalent” was at 63 percent. With an estimated 274 new residents and 155 new employees the proposed project would generate 3,109 pounds of solid waste per day or
1.55 tons per year. It is not anticipated that the proposed project would generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards. The landfills located in the region would have adequate capacity to serve the project.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Solid waste disposal services must follow federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to the collection of solid waste. The project proposes development of residential uses, which would not involve the production and/or disposal of any acutely toxic or otherwise hazardous materials. The proposed project would comply with all state and local waste diversion requirements, including the City of Santa Rosa Municipal Code 9-12, regarding waste collection. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

**WILDFIRE**

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Response to a) through d):

The project site is designated as an Unzoned Local Responsibility Area on CAL FIRE fire hazard severity mapping, and the adjacent properties are also designated as Unzoned Local Responsibility Area. As such the proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan, nor would it exacerbate wildfire risks and expose project occupants to pollutant concentration from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of wildfire. The proposed project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts. Lastly, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as as result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes. No impacts from wildfire would occur.
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