

Land Use and Circulation Alternatives

Summary of Comments and Feedback

April 29, 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 April 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.

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 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 103 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 and provided an additional opportunity for people to provide feedback on the alternatives and policy choices. A total of 119 people filled out the Online Survey (96 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 = 70% or higher response rate
Respondents generally favored/felt/agreed/disagreed = 50% or higher response rate
There is a desire = there were multiple written comments on the same topic or idea

Economic and Housing Development

- Respondents strongly favored focusing new housing and job growth towards Downtown, along major 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).
- Respondents generally favored locating new housing within walking or wheeling distance to existing and planned shopping and dining areas, 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.

Efficient and Sustainable Development

- Respondents strongly favored re-purposing major streets as multi-modal corridors that include safe and accessible pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
- Respondents generally favored 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 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, and access to bicycle facilities (lanes, pathways).

Resilience and Safety

- Respondents were generally concerned with the ongoing threat of wildfires, earthquakes, and drought in Santa Rosa. There was also a concern about evacuation plans and strategies in the event of another major natural disaster.
- 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.
- 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 thought it would be good to consider 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

- Most 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 availability during normal business hours (8 AM to 6 PM) to participate in meetings or events, limited understanding of how local land use and funding decisions are made, 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 environmental justice, safety, and equity related projects are funded and prioritized for identified Equity Priority Communities.
 - Ensure every neighborhood has access to parks and community spaces.
 - 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.
- Participants strongly 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 and wildfire smoke.

Alternatives Comparison

- The strong majority of respondents favored Alternatives 1 and 2 (with Alternative 2 being slightly more favored).
- 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.

- 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? N:96

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion	No Response
Focus new housing and job growth towards Downtown and along major corridors.	50.0%	30.2%	8.3%	0.0%	11.5%
Focus new housing and commercial growth in neighborhood retail centers and along community corridors.	57.3%	28.1%	2.1%	1.0%	11.5%
Focus new housing and commercial uses across the city proportionally to where they exist today.	19.8%	19.8%	44.8%	3.1%	12.5%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- I prefer alternative #2, but take grave exception to the identification of housing focus areas in the WUI in Fountain grove and the Oakmont related area. We CANNOT put more people in harm's way.
- One of SR's main issues is the city is spread out- a mid-sized city in 7 different neighborhoods.
- Development needs to include library and cultural census enhancements.
- Alt 2 w/o the urban wildland interface areas in N.E.
- Increasing neighborhood density reduces quality of life.

- Downtown should definitely be a focus because there has already been so much investment. However, the new housing will not be inherently affordable because of the cost of construction. Focus on keeping existing housing affordable or build more affordable housing types throughout the city. This means simplifying the zoning code and allowing multifamily projects of up to three stories throughout the city. Zoning should segregate uses that are incompatible based on the health and well-being of people, not different housing types. Housing density should be a function of infrastructure and city services capacity. Also, the city has a growth boundary for a reason. Rural residential should be kept to unincorporated land and possibly wildfire prone areas.
- (1) A good strategy would blend options 1 and 2, with option 1 rephrased to say, "new high-rise apartment housing" and with a height limit of 3 stories outside the downtown area. (2) Mobile home housing should be given special attention because it is a cheap way to house people on limited budgets; right now, there is no explicit policy about mobile homes, and they are scattered randomly without any plan at all. Example: why was Journey's End butted up against a major hospital?
- 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? N:93

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion	No Response
Locate new housing so it is within walking or wheeling distance to existing and planned shopping and dining areas.	77.4%	12.9%	2.2%	0.0%	7.5%
Ensure new shopping and commercial areas have multi-modal access, regardless of where they are located.	52.7%	28.0%	3.2%	4.3%	11.8%
Housing and circulation patterns should allow for more seniors, or "aging in place."	64.5%	16.1%	5.4%	5.4%	8.6%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- We need to encourage more frequent, smaller volume trips for things like grocery shopping. People will do it if it is easy. Right now people are walking home small carts of groceries to save on fuel costs.
- With the temporary state budget surplus, this would be the ideal time to move forward aggressively with the Greenway plan, which could connect east and west sides of the city with off-road bike routes. Also, aging in place would be best facilitated by Alternative 2.
- 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 signaled 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? N:92

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion	No Response
Re-purpose major streets as multi-modal corridors that include safe and accessible pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	85.9%	5.4%	1.1%	2.2%	5.4%
Focus new housing and non-residential uses near SMART rail stations to support Santa Rosa and other Bay Area commuters.	57.6%	27.2%	3.3%	3.2%	8.7%
Focus growth in central areas of the city to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	58.7%	26.1%	6.5%	0.0%	8.7%
Preserve natural ecosystems and resources, such as plants, trees, wildlife, within the city.	83.7%	5.4%	0.0%	4.4%	6.5%
Allocate more resources to communities that are the most vulnerable to climate related hazards.	56.5%	16.3%	12.0%	5.4%	9.8%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- 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.
- Allocate resources according to need in mitigate environmental justice and released hazards.
- Don't assume growth is inevitable. Provide enough water for comfortable living, supporting gardens, taking baths!
- Resources include zoning, land use that allows for childcare, small professional and person service., small profession offices, home business,
- We need to reduce CO2 producing vehicle trips without taking too much time away from residents. The ideal circulation would be majority cycling and transit with single occupant vehicular travel reserved mainly for commercial purposes and less able-bodied people. Also, trees should be used more often as barriers between nuisance land uses, like highways, and housing.
- As a 50-yr climate scientist, I can say for sure that we cannot predict climate at city scales, now or even 10 yr from now. Allocating resources based on climate forecasts at the 1-km scale makes no sense at all. We can't forecast drought, flood, intense rain, or wildfire yet, so there is no way to plan for them other than what we do now: forbid development in "flood plains" (remember people kayaking thru The Barlow?) and other such common-sense rules.

- 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? N:92

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion	No Response
Ensure all neighborhoods have complete and accessible sidewalks.	70.7%	15.2%	1.1%	3.2%	9.8%
Improve bus transit services and amenities to allow convenient access to most neighborhoods.	68.5%	17.4%	3.2%	1.1%	9.8%
Improve multi-modal access to SMART stations.	63.0%	21.7%	1.1%	3.3%	10.9%
Create a complete network of bicycle facilities connecting neighborhoods to shopping centers, office areas, Downtown, and parks and open space areas.	76.1%	12.0%	1.1%	2.2%	8.6%
Build new streets, or add lanes to existing streets, to provide more vehicle capacity.	24.0%	14.1%	49.9%	0.0%	12.0%

Other Comments and Feedback

- 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.
- More active transportation options (bike share, scooters share, protected bike lanes and sidewalks)
- Car culture does no build community
- Sidewalks, bike lanes, curb cuts- ADA accessible.
- Take space away from cars and give it back to the people!
- Use smaller alternate energy buses
- Build intraurban electric trolley infrastructure to connect to all major Santa Rosa neighborhoods and downtown

- Bus ridership here is somewhat sparse, and bus stops in my area are often shelters for the homeless. More and more people are getting around by personal electric transport like E-cars, bikes, and scooter.
- The Santa Rosa climate is ideal for cycling. The general plan needs to focus on encouraging cycling to the maximum extent possible. Provide enough low stress facilities for cycling to get around the city while maintaining creek trails for recreation. Sidewalks are great but having a wide, separated shared use path would be even better. CityBus is great for getting to downtown, but it should also be able to efficiently get people from West Santa Rosa across town, to Howarth Park for example. Bus transit should attract more riders, not just depend on a larger greater population density for riders.
- Only one side of the street needs to have a sidewalk. Even us oldsters can cross a street. (2) We should plan for a more carless city, meaning that we should do everything possible to support, first, train travel, and second, SMALL buses not the behemoths we have now that travel mostly empty. (3) We should actively support and subsidize electric bikes, which make bike travel much more accessible for the less macho (and most numerous) part of our city. I would emphasize off-road bike paths as much as possible, and study how this was done in places like Boulder, CO, Greenbelt MD, Columbia MD, Reston VA, and Bend OR.
- Bus ridership here is somewhat sparse, and bus stops in my area are often shelters for the homeless. More and more people are getting around by personal electric transport like E-cars, bikes, and scooter.
- All of the improvements above will need to be accessible people with Disabilities. Sidewalks will need to 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 are 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? N:92

Policy Choices	Very Concerned	Concerned	Not Concerned	No Opinion	No Response
Wildfire	5.4%	70.1%	18.5%	1.1%	5.4%
Flood	9.8%	35.9%	39.1%	1.1%	14.1%

Drought	75.0%	15.2%	1.1%	0.0%	8.7%
Dam Failure	10.9%	23.9%	44.6%	6.5%	14.1%
Earthquake	42.4%	41.3%	6.5%	0.0%	9.8%
Fire Caused by Earthquake	33.7%	43.5%	8.7%	3.3%	10.8%
Landslide (earthquakes, rainfall, and post-fire)	14.1%	34.8%	32.6%	7.6%	10.9%
Severe Weather such as Extreme Heat	32.6%	34.8%	15.2%	6.5%	10.9%
Evacuation Planning	48.9%	38.0%	3.3%	0.0%	9.8%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- 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.
- Another pandemic? Asteroid? Zombies?
- No development should be allowed in flood plains.
- we need to be proactive and plan for safe "shelter in place"
- Zombie Apocalypse.
- Sheltering in place - residents and the unhoused.
- Evacuation is a common denominator among many hazards, and the city needs to move forward more aggressively to underground power lines. The PD said 6 of the 20 recent fires were caused by trees falling on power lines or electrical substructures, and even if not the cause, such events can completely block an evac route. Just waiting passively for PG&E to do this, is not a plan. And as a resident of Ragle Ranch, with underground power, I can tell you that it is a delight not to have that tangle of wires and power poles uglifying our neighborhood.
- Yikes - Maybe the priority should first be a robust safety plan for the city
- Sheltering in place - residents and the unhoused.
- 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? N:92

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion	No Response
Limit the amount of housing in wildfire prone areas of Santa Rosa.	66.3%	22.8%	1.1%	1.1%	8.7%

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion	No Response
Limit the amount of housing in flood prone areas and near earthquake fault zones.	48.9%	37.0%	6.5%	1.1%	6.5%
Ensure that all neighborhoods have safe and efficient emergency evacuation routes and allow housing everywhere regardless of hazards.	60.9%	6.5%	18.5%	5.4%	8.7%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- The City should support the creation and maintenance of local neighborhood groups...as COPE, Neighborhood watch, etc.
- The last question is difficult to answer, i.e. Yes on safe emergency evacuation routes but NO on allowing housing in hazard areas.
- Evacuation routes should be clear and efficient even in low-risk areas.
- I only agreed with the 3rd option here if you delete "and allow...hazards", which is completely unrelated. As to option 1, I would urge biting the bullet and saying "forbid" not "limit". We are all forced to pay the price for the people who build their mansions, fortresses, communes, etc. up in the rural areas. We pay thru increased insurance premiums (mine have doubled since 2017), city costs for running services and road maintenance to these remote locations, and other things that you are very aware of.
- Evacuation routes should be clear and efficient even in low-risk areas.
- I only agreed with the 3rd option here if you delete "and allow...hazards", which is completely unrelated. As to option 1, I would urge biting the bullet and saying "forbid" not "limit". We are all forced to pay the price for the people who build their mansions, fortresses, communes, etc. up in the rural areas. We pay thru increased insurance premiums (mine have doubled since 2017), city costs for running services and road maintenance to these remote locations, and other things that you are very aware of.
- 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 warning 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 the 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 their 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? N:93

Policy Choices	Major Issue	Mild Issue	Not an Issue	Not Sure	No Response
Opportunities to be involved in community decision making.	25.8%	24.7%	36.6%	3.2%	9.7%
Access to public facilities and services.	26.9%	10.8%	49.5%	3.2%	9.7%
Access to public spaces supporting physical activity.	23.7%	20.4%	43.0%	3.2%	9.7%
Pollution exposure and poor air quality.	30.1%	30.1%	26.9%	3.2%	9.7%
Access to healthy and affordable foods.	28.0%	10.8%	50.5%	1.1%	9.7%
Access to safe and sanitary housing.	30.1%	14.0%	46.2%	1.1%	8.6%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- We're older, white, and very lucky.
- Downtown should add a European style market building that supports small local vendors + allows downtown residents a variety of healthy local products without needing to drive anywhere.
- While the city reaches out for comments, they quickly dismiss our concerns a sustainable source of water to accommodate growth.
- Land use and zoning should encourage community, back yard garden, community food sharing, ns gardens
- As to option 1, the city has done an excellent job in holding events to get community input, but failed to show us where specific comments from the public have altered the course of planning. Nothing would engage us better than hearing that comment X from neighbor Y actually led to a change in thinking about the plan. As to option 5, of course the homeless do not have such access, but that is an issue that the plan needs a whole separate section about, rather than just hoping it will go away.
- As to option 1, the city has done an excellent job in holding events to get community input, but failed to show us where specific comments from the public have altered the course of planning. Nothing would engage us better than hearing that comment X from neighbor Y actually led to a change in thinking about the plan. As to option 5, of course the homeless do not have such access, but that is an issue that the plan needs a whole separate section about, rather than just hoping it will go away.
- Lo mas molo es mas barato xlo saludable mos caro
- Calles sin luz, calles sin acceso a bicicletas opeartones inseguridad al cuminar.
- 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:95

Policy Choices	Percentage Responding Yes
Limited access to reliable internet.	14.7%
Limited availability during normal business hours (8 AM to 6 PM) to participate in meetings or events.	40.0%
Limited availability during evenings to participate in meetings or events.	26.3%
Limited understanding of how local land use and funding decisions are made.	42.1%
Limited understanding of my Council District or connections to my Council member.	22.1%
I don't know what Santa Rosa Forward is or how the process works.	10.5%
Lack of language translation.	14.7%
Lack of time.	17.9%
Use of jargon or government acronyms.	12.6%
I'm concerned whether what I say will be included.	27.4%
No response	16.8%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- I still am not wild about only physical meetings, and would like a digital option also whenever possible.
- You're doing great with access!
- How are non-Spanish non-English speakers involved?
- Concerns about water + quality of life and dismissed.
- The planning process is so ridiculously drawn out that I doubt any of this will happen in my lifetime.
- I feel major policy decisions only play superficial attention to public input. Plans are developed first as "drafts" then public input sought. I'd like to see planning to be "bottom up". Start with community visioning, then develop drafts for further refinement.
- I live in Central West Santa Rosa which typically gets less representation than East of the Freeway does
- Land use decisions in the city are arcane and sometimes so unreasonable that we suspect corruption or collusion or maybe just not caring enough. Examples abound: the Chanate property; the empty land next to the downtown SMART station; the "renovated" town square; the grossly underutilized Fairgrounds; the siting of mobile home parks; the refusal to set up parking lots for homeless RVs, so that they move randomly around the city; the refusal to permit more dwellings in the WUI; the refusal to deal with derelict houses and barns, many of which are firetraps threatening their neighbors. As to Council members, have they considered coming out to our neighborhoods and meeting with us? We never see them!

Q9: How should City of Santa Rosa funding be prioritized to ensure each neighborhood receives equitable public investments in the coming years? N:93

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion	No Response
Develop a prioritized list of improvements or services for each neighborhood.	72.0%	16.1%	1.1%	0.0%	10.8%
Ensure environmental justice, safety, and equity related projects are funded and prioritized for identified Equity Priority Communities.	58.1%	24.7%	3.2%	2.2%	11.8%
Ensure every neighborhood has access to parks and community spaces.	72.0%	10.8%	1.1%	5.4%	10.8%
Prioritize development that addresses social and economic needs of the economically vulnerable populations.	60.2%	22.6%	2.2%	3.2%	11.8%
Address and reverse the underlying socioeconomic factors and residential social segregation in the community that contributes to crime and violence in the city.	64.5%	17.2%	3.2%	3.2%	11.8%

Other Comments and Feedback

- Robust and enforceable polices in the Ej element. Remove single family and exclusionary zoning.
- Reparations are needed to reverse centuries of structure and create home ownership.
- I'm fortunate enough to live near parks and with sidewalks + bike lanes.
- None of the above! The most dense neighborhoods should receive the bulk of funds since they generate the most jobs, housing, and tax revenue.
- Give neighborhood access to school grounds for recreation and community activities.
- prioritized list through bottom up planning
- I think all neighborhoods should be treated more or less the same. Everyone should see improvements in the neighborhood. People in neighborhoods like MacDonaldd will understand that they already have a great environment and don't need to be emphasized, but they should see something for their tax dollars. Deciding at the Council level which neighborhoods should receive more and which less, is the kind of "social engineering" that hasn't worked well. I lived in NYC for a while, and saw how the vast social engineering projects like Coop City and rent control utterly failed. The one kind of social engineering that can work is "affordable housing", and I think the plan needs a whole section on it, including a plan to deal with those who game the system (I know one).
- 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)? N:93

Policy Choices	Agree	Worth Considering	Disagree	No Opinion	No Response
Build or improve sidewalks in my community.	53.8%	19.4%	3.2%	7.5%	16.1%
Build or improve bike lanes in my community.	66.7%	14.0%	2.2%	4.3%	12.9%
Build or improve parks in my community.	62.4%	17.2%	1.1%	6.5%	12.9%
Reduce air pollution in my community.	51.6%	19.4%	5.4%	9.7%	14.0%
Reduce water pollution in my community.	48.4%	16.1%	5.4%	12.9%	17.2%
Access to affordable housing.	61.3%	11.8%	4.3%	7.5%	15.1%
Access to healthy and affordable food.	55.9%	18.3%	4.3%	6.5%	15.1%
Access to jobs.	50.5%	21.5%	0.0%	12.9%	15.1%

Additional Comments and Feedback

- Need rent control polices and zoning regs to provide separations of industrial harmful land uses + residential/ sensitive/
- Clean Creeks, Clean Street
- 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.
- Note: Bike lanes are useless unless they are PROTECTED Bike Lanes. No painted stripe ever stopped a 3000-pound car!
- answered based on City...not sure what "community" refers to
- Please recognize explicitly which of these items belong in a city plan. Many items belong in a county plan, or even a state plan. Have the wisdom to know what you can affect, and what you can't.
- Please recognize explicitly which of these items belong in a city plan. Many items belong in a county plan, or even a state plan. Have the wisdom to know what you can affect, and what you can't.
- 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: 95

Policy Choices	Percentage Responding Yes
Gas cooking appliances or heaters in the home.	29.5%
Secondhand smoke from neighbors in or around the home.	24.2%
Secondhand smoke outside of the home.	16.9%
Vehicle emissions.	54.7%
Emissions from industrial facilities.	16.8%
No response	25.3%

Other Comments and Feedback

- Wildfire.
- Wildfire smoke.
- Wildfire smoke.
- Road Noise, Road Noise
- We have no barriers. But it seems all new housing should be ADA accessible to accommodate elderly, disabled, and even families with small children.
- Wildfire smoke.
- Wildfire smoke. Smoke from neighbor's woodstoves.
- Would love to see more electric vehicles.
- Emissions from the asphalt plant.
- Air quality is a county not a city issue. And in our county, it is entirely a car thing. You can see that on Sat and Sun, when the air is much clearer.
- Would love to see more electric vehicles.
- Emissions from the asphalt plant.
- Air quality is a county not a city issue. And in our county, it is entirely a car thing. You can see that on Sat and Sun, when the air is much clearer.

Q12: What barriers do you face to access safe and sanitary housing? N:96

Policy Choices	Major Issue	Mild Issue	Not an Issue	Not Sure	Blank
Financial barriers to pay security deposit and move-in expenses.	22.3%	9.6%	43.6%	2.1%	22.3%
Inability to meet minimum credit score requirements.	21.9%	3.1%	53.1%	1.0%	20.8%
Lack of affordable homes suitable for family size.	29.2%	5.2%	41.7%	1.0%	22.9%
Housing not adequately maintained by landlord.	26.0%	3.1%	46.9%	3.1%	20.8%
Inability to afford needed repairs on home I own	22.9%	11.5%	39.6%	3.1%	22.9%
Not able to request needed repairs from landlord out of fear of eviction.	25.0%	5.2%	42.7%	6.3%	20.8%

Other Comments and Feedback

- Again, we're lucky. I believe all of the issues are faced by people needing legally affordable housing.
- Needing 20% down to avoid mortgage insurance. Lower down payments.
- I am not a renter; I own a home that is mortgage-free. But I feel all the above are issues for new renters and low-income folks.
- Home Construction/Repair costs too high.
- Not that these are not issues—but they are not our family's issues. We have a single-family home and enough money to pay its expenses.
- No puedo decirle a mi arrendador que cambiando por miedo a que me corra y no encuentre 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.

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:87

Alternative 1 Central Corridors	Alternative 2 Neighborhood Main Streets	Alternative 3 Distributed Housing	No Response
33.3%	44.8%	5.8%	27.6%

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?

- 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.
- Prioritize downtown revitalization and urbanization of #1.
- Increase transit options to the outlying areas that want experience majority of growth (Bennet valley)
- Combining aspects of 1 + 2 seem most practical.
- Alternative 2 remaining the five/flood. Risk areas and moving housing. Allocative around the two smart stations. See adjustment above.
- Rather than grow the city can be reorganized to minimal 2. Don't be called into a growth plan that takes the city from livable to unlivable and undesirable.
- 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 bikeable.
- Even more emphasis on adding housing to downtown Santa Rosa. This is the only area where one could comfortably live without a car. Also, its on the cusp of becoming a genuine cultural center if people could live there. People = life & culture
- A combination of Alternatives 1 & 2 best represents what I envision as best for Santa Rosa.
- #2, but could include some focus on increased density in downtown.
- Combination of Alternatives 1 and 2. Adjustments: Robust investment in intraurban (electric transportation between neighborhoods and to/from downtown) vital. I mean: smaller, more frequent electric buses, Pedi-cabs to/from parking garages downtown, electric trolley system on main streets i.e. West College/College, Guerneville Road, Mendocino, Marlow to downtown and SMART stations.
- I'm in favor of centralizing, but not too centralized. I don't like congestion. So my vision is a mixture of both Alt 1 and 2.

- The city should continue its downtown focus, but should focus more on the neighborhood level. However the transect for Alternative 3 most closely matched my vision for the city.
- I would specify that high-rise apartments/condos (over 3 stories, needing an elevator) be confined to the downtown while a height limit of 3 stories be applied outside downtown. Now, the downtown area is what I call a "one-story city", the few high-rises notwithstanding. 90% of the housing stock is one-story, perhaps a relic of the 1906 earthquake. Much of the housing stock is antique, from the 1920s and 30s -- so much so that Montgomery Village, from the 1950s, is viewed as "new housing". What other city has such antique housing stock, that has never been renewed and modernized (esp. for energy efficiency and earthquake resistance) and forces such a low population density in its core? Going with any part of Alternative 1 would be stymied by keeping the one-story city intact -- as stymied as trying to play a game of chess with 90% of the pieces not allowed to be moved. MY FINAL COMMENT: please don't plan a 1950s city for 2050, by which I mean don't plan a fossil-fuel and car-based city. Think bigger. Stop worrying about core parking and start worrying about how to get cars out of the core entirely. And take a look at nearby cities like Napa, Petaluma, Sonoma, Healdsburg, and see what they did right that makes their cores so much more friendly than Santa Rosa.
- Que haya un terreno que construya case mobiles 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 alternative, it won't be as easy to get around for people with Disabilities. So if this alternative 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 prioritize 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 on 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:87

	Percentage
I live in Santa Rosa	95.4%
I work in Santa Rosa	43.7%
I own a business in Santa Rosa	40.2%
I go to school in Santa Rosa	3.5%
Other (please specify)	8.1%

Other Descriptions

- Attendee based in Sonoma
- retired
- I live near Santa Rosa
- I've lived here of 35 years, my 2 children graduated from SR volunteered for many community events
- homeowner
- Love Santa Rosa!
- Love Santa Rosa!

Q15: What is your gender? N:87

	Percentage
Female	51.7%
Male	43.7%
Non-binary	0.0%
I prefer not to say	2.3%
I prefer to self-identify	0.0%
Blank	2.3%

Q16: What is your age? N:87

	Percentage
17 or younger	0.0%
18 to 24	2.3%
25 to 34	10.3%
35 to 49	27.6%
50 to 64	25.3%
65 and Over	34.5%

Q17: What is your Zip Code? N: 87

	Percentage
94928	2.3%
95401	11.5%
95403	3.5%
95404	29.8%
95405	9.2%
95407	11.5%
95409	4.5%
95472	1.2%
95476	1.2%
95905	1.2%
95404/95403	2.3%
No Response	21.8%

Q18: What is your race and/or ethnicity? N:87

	Percentage
Asian	0.00%
Black/African American	1.15%
Hispanic/Latinx	22.99%
Native American	1.15%
Pacific Islander	0.00%
White/Caucasian	70.11%
I prefer not to say	4.60%
I prefer to self-identify. If you prefer to "self-identify", please describe yourself	2.30%
Blank	1.15%

Other Identifications

- European American
- mostly European ancestry

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

	Percentage
English	83.9%
Spanish	25.3%
Cantonese	0.0%
Vietnamese	0.0%
Tagalog	0.0%
Mandarin	0.0%
Korean	0.0%
Asian Indian languages	0.0%
Russian	0.0%
Sign Language	0.0%
Other (please specify)	3.5%
No Response	3.5%

Other Languages

- French
- German
- Mixteco