

RESOLUTION NO. _____

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA
RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT,
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, AND STATEMENT OF
OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE CARITAS VILLAGE PROJECT – FILE
NUMBER PRJ18-052

WHEREAS, on September 10, 2018, Catholic Charities and Burbank Housing (Applicants) submitted an application for a General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Tentative parcel map, Conditional Use Permit for an emergency shelter, Major Landmark Alteration Permit, and Major Design Review for a proposed project to expand homeless services currently operating on the project site, and to construct 126 units of permanent, affordable housing, to be located at 431, 437, 439, 465 A Street and 506, 512, 516, 520, 600, 608, and 612 Morgan Street, more particularly described as Assessor's Parcel Numbers 010-041-001, 004, 005, 008, 009, 010, 011, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020 (Project Site); and

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Rosa determined that an environmental impact report (EIR) should be prepared for the Caritas Village project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code sections 21000 *et seq.*

WHEREAS, on October 30, 2018, the City adopted City Council Resolution No. RES-2018-192, approving a Professional Services Agreement with Stantec Consulting Services (Stantec), to prepare the EIR for the proposed project.

WHEREAS, on January 25, 2019, the City issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR and the NOP was circulated for comment by responsible and trustee agencies and the public for a thirty-day comment period ending on February 24, 2019.

WHEREAS, thirty (30) written comments were received on the NOP, copies of which are set forth in Table 1-1 of the Draft EIR.

WHEREAS, on February 6, 2019, the City conducted a scoping session to elicit additional comments on the scope of the Draft EIR and received several verbal comments.

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR for the Caritas Village project (SCH # 2019012040) was distributed to the public and various public agencies for review and comment beginning on November 15, 2019 and ending on December 30, 2019.

WHEREAS, the City received three comments on the Draft EIR, and responses to those comments have been prepared and included in the Final EIR.

WHEREAS, the Final EIR was made available to the public on February 3, 2020.

WHEREAS, on February 27, 2020 at a public meeting of the Planning Commission, the Commission considered the contents of the Caritas Village Environmental Impact Report, comprised of the Draft EIR, the Final EIR, the comments received and the response to comments (Final EIR).

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a), the City is required to adopt all feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that can substantially lessen or avoid any significant project-related environmental effects. As demonstrated by the Findings of Fact attached as Exhibit A to this Resolution, the EIR identified the following significant environmental impact attributable to the Caritas Village Project that could not be mitigated to a level of less than significant:

1. Impact CUL-1: The proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5.

WHEREAS, the City is required by Public Resources Code section 21081.6, subdivision (a), to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Program to ensure that the mitigation measures adopted for the Project are actually carried out, and the City has prepared such a Mitigation Monitoring Program, attached as Exhibit C to this Resolution.

WHEREAS, for reasons set forth in the Findings of Fact attached hereto, the City has determined that the alternatives as described in the EIR are infeasible.

WHEREAS, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 prohibits a public agency from approving or carrying out a project for which an environmental impact report has been completed which identifies one or more significant effects, unless the public agency determines the impacts are acceptable due to overriding concerns as described in Guidelines Section 15093.

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has considered the City's statement of overriding considerations, attached hereto as Exhibit B, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (b) and CEQA Guidelines section 15093.

WHEREAS, on February 27, 2020, the Planning Commission considered the contents of the Caritas Village EIR, the proposed Findings of Fact, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and all documentation including staff reports, oral and written comments, and testimony and materials presented of all those wishing to be heard on these matters at a public meeting held on this matter.

WHEREAS, none of the comments made during the public review period, none of the oral or written testimony presented during the public hearing on the project, and none of the other information presented to the City on the project and the EIR have included significant new information requiring recirculation of some or all of the EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Rosa makes the recommendation that the City Council adopt the Findings of Fact set forth

in Exhibit A, attached hereto, which findings are incorporated herein by reference, with regard to the potentially significant environmental impact identified in the Caritas Village EIR.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the Caritas Village Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as set forth in Exhibit C, attached hereto and made part of this Resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council make the following findings for a statement of overriding considerations for the significant environmental effects identified by the EIR and adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations, as set forth in Exhibit C, attached hereto and made part of this Resolution:

- A. All potentially feasible mitigation measures have been considered to substantially lessen or avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts. Where feasible, mitigation measures have been adopted as part of the Project. The imposition of these measures will reduce the identified impacts, but not to a level of less than significant, and it is not feasible to fully mitigate these impacts.
- B. All potentially feasible alternatives to the Project have been considered, and there are no feasible alternatives that would reduce the above significant and unavoidable impacts to a less than significant level.
- C. The Project's impacts discussed above therefore remain significant and unavoidable.
- D. The Statement of Overriding Considerations as set forth in Exhibit B, which is attached and made part of this resolution, identify the specific reasons why the benefits of the Project outweigh its significant and unavoidable impacts.

REGULARLY PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Rosa on this 27th day of February, 2020, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

APPROVED: _____
PATTI CISCO, CHAIR

ATTEST: _____
CLARE HARTMAN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

ATTACHMENTS:

Exhibit A – Findings of Fact with Table A – CEQA Findings of Fact

Exhibit B – Statement of Overriding Considerations

Exhibit C – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

DRAFT

EXHIBIT A

TO CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. ____

**FINDINGS OF FACT FOR THE
CARITAS VILLAGE PROJECT**

I.

INTRODUCTION

The City of Santa Rosa (“City”), as lead agency, prepared an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) for the Caritas Village Project (the “Project”). In its entirety, the EIR consists of the November 2019 Draft EIR (“Draft EIR” or “DEIR”), and the February 2020 Final EIR (“Final EIR” or “FEIR”), (SCH # 2019012040).

These findings, as well as the accompanying Statement of Overriding Considerations attached as Exhibit B to City Council Resolution No. _____, have been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 14, § 15000 et seq.).

II.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The term “Project,” as used in this document, means the project description as set forth in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR.

A. Project Location

The Project is located within the City of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, California (See DEIR Figure 2.0-1). Specifically, the project site is located at 431, 437, 439, 465, 501, and 507 A Street and 506, 512, 516 520, 600, 608, and 612 Morgan Street, Santa Rosa (See DEIR Figure 2.0-2). Except for the parcels at 501 and 507 A Street, the project site is bordered by A Street, Morgan Street, 6th Street, and 7th Street. The Project site is approximately 2.78 acres.

B. Overview

Caritas Village includes the construction of a full city block of development that includes a comprehensive family and homeless support services facility (Caritas Center) and an affordable housing development (Caritas Homes).

Caritas Center will consolidate existing on-site family support and homeless service centers into a single building with an emergency shelter-family that includes (i) an expanded shelter for homeless families with children, (ii) a relocated Navigation Center, (iii) coordinated entry program, (iv) offices for the Homeless Outreach Services Team, (v) relocated wrap around services, (vi) Nightingale Shelter, (vii) administrative offices and meeting space for leadership

staff, of on-site programs and administrative staff; (vii) a medical service-doctor's office to provide physical and mental health care to on and off-site patients; and (viii) other uses set forth the project description of the Draft EIR, Chapter 2, including a transitional residency program (TRP).

Caritas Homes will provide up to 126 permanent affordable housing units, plus two units for on-site managers.

C. Project Objectives

The Project's objectives, as set forth in the EIR, are as follows:

1. Orderly and systematic development of an integrated and sustainable residential community that is consistent with the goals and policies of the City of Santa Rosa General Plan and Downtown Station Area Specific Plan for this area.
2. Construct new affordable housing and expanded homeless services predominately on land already owned by Catholic Charities.
3. Continue to provide homeless and family support services at their existing location because the purchase funding for these parcels requires these services to be on-going.
4. Continue to provide homeless and family support services at their existing location because this is a known and familiar location for them. These services have been offered here since 1989, and the public is familiar with and expects these services to be offered at this location. Preserving homeless services at this location is of importance in order to maintain participant enrollment and for continuity of services, and ease of use by Catholic Charities' clients.
5. Since many of the service recipients and potential tenants do not own vehicles, construct the expanded center and housing within walking distance of the SMART Train Station and Transit Mall so clients and tenants have easy access to transportation to public services and jobs.
6. Provide onsite support services for residents of Caritas Homes.
7. Help as many people as practicable by developing the project site to the highest residential density allowed by the City's General Plan.
8. Develop transit and pedestrian-oriented affordable rental housing in downtown Santa Rosa within 0.25 mile of the SMART Train Station in

Railroad Square and within 0.30 mile of Bus Route 1. Bus Route 1 is one of only two city routes that picks up passengers in 15-minute increments.

9. Reduce vehicle miles traveled by siting affordable rental housing at sites that can be developed with high densities near public transportation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Based on its own review of the EIR and other information and testimony received in connection with the Project, the City finds these objectives to be acceptable and persuasive from a public policy standpoint and accords them weight in considering the feasibility of alternatives set forth in the EIR and in invoking overriding considerations in approving the Project. (*See Sierra Club v. County of Napa*, 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1507-1508 (2004); and *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Association v. City of Oakland*, 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 715 (1993) (“*Sequoyah Hills*”).)

D. Discretionary Approvals

Project approval requires the City, as lead agency, as well as certain "responsible agencies," to take discrete planning and regulatory actions to approve the overall Project. Described below are the discretionary actions necessary to fully carry out the Project. In addition to certifying the Final EIR and adopting these Findings and the associated Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (CEQA requirements), the City must take the following actions for project approval:

- General Plan Amendment
- Specific Plan Amendment
- Rezoning
- Tentative Parcel Map
- Minor Use Permit
- Landmark Alteration Permit – Cultural Heritage Board
- Design Review/ Parking Reduction – Design Review Board
- Conveyance of Remnant Parcels – Housing Authority and City Council

Responsible and Permitting Agencies

Responsible and permitting agencies are state and local public agencies, other than the lead agency, that have some authority to carry out or approve a project or that are required to approve a portion of the project for which a lead agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR. A list of responsible and/or permitting agencies is included below. However, this list is not exhaustive and could include other agencies. The DEIR has been designed to provide information to these agencies to assist them in the permitting processes for the proposed project. While CEQA is not binding on federal agencies, and no federal agencies have been identified that would be required to take action on the project, any such agency may use the analysis in this document in order to assist with the preparation of their own analyses required by federal law.

- California Department of Transportation, District 4

- California State Office of Historic Preservation
- State Water Resources Control Board
- Regional Water Quality Control Board #1
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District

III.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City prepared a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") on January 24, 2019. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15023, subdivision (c), and 15087, subdivision (f), the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research was responsible for distributing environmental documents to State agencies, departments, boards, and commissions for review and comment. The City followed required procedures with regard to distribution of the appropriate notices and environmental documents to the State Clearinghouse. The State Clearinghouse was obligated to make, and did make, that information available to interested agencies for review and comment. The NOP was received by the State Clearinghouse (SCH # 2019012040) on January 24, 2019, and a 30-day public review period ended on February 24, 2019. The City also held a scoping Session on February 6, 2019 to receive comments on the NOP. The NOP and all comments received on the NOP are presented in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

The EIR includes an analysis of the following issue areas:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| • Aesthetics | • Noise and Vibration |
| • Air Quality | • Transportation |
| • Biological Resources | • Tribal Cultural Resources |
| • Cultural Resources | • Energy |
| • Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change | • Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| • Land Use and Planning | • Public Services |

The EIR also identified topical areas that were determined not to be significant, as well as specific issues within some of the above topical areas that were determined not to be significant. An explanation of why each is determined not to be significant is provided in Section 7 of the DEIR. These topical areas and issues are as follows:

- Aesthetics (scenic vistas, scenic resources, light and glare)
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality (odors)
- Biological Resources (riparian habitat, wetlands, resident or migratory fish or wildlife, habitat conservation plan)
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning (physically divide community, conflict with plans and policies)
- Mineral Resources
- Noise (projects located near airstrips or airports)
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Traffic and Transportation (air traffic patterns, hazards to design features)
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfires

The City published the Draft EIR (SCH # 2019012040) for public and agency review on November 15, 2019. A public review period of 45 days was provided on the DEIR, which ended on December 30, 2019. This period satisfied the requirement for a 45-day public review period as set forth in Section 15105 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The Final EIR was issued on February 3, 2020. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, the Final EIR provided responses to all comments received by the City of Santa Rosa on the Draft EIR.

On February 27, 2020, the Planning Commission held a public meeting to consider the proposed Project and Final EIR and recommended that the City Council certify the EIR and adopt the Project, findings of fact, statement of overriding considerations and mitigation and monitoring program.

On March 3, 2020, the City Council held a public meeting to consider the proposed Project and Final EIR, findings of fact, statement of overriding considerations and Mitigation and monitoring program.

IV.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e), the record of proceedings for the City's decision on the Project includes the following documents:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the Project;

- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP;
- The Draft EIR for the Project and all appendices;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR;
- The Final EIR for the Project, including comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, and appendices;
- Documents cited or referenced in the Draft, and Final EIRs;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the City Council in connection with the Project and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the City, consultants to the City, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the City's action on the Project;
- All documents submitted to the City by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project, up through the close of the City Council public hearing on March 3, 2020;
- Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the City in connection with the Project;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the City at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings;
- The City of Santa Rosa General Plan and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the General Plan;
- The City of Santa Rosa Zoning Ordinance and all other City Code provisions cited in materials prepared by or submitted to the City;
- Any and all resolutions adopted by the City regarding the Project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;
- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and

- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The official custodian of the record is Amy Nicholson, Environmental Coordinator, City of Santa Rosa, Planning and Economic Development, Room 3, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95404.

The City Council has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decisions on the proposed project even if not every document was formally presented to the City Council or City Staff as part of the City files generated in connection with the Project. Without exception, any documents set forth above not found in the Project files fall into one of two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions of which the City Council was aware in approving the Project. (See *City of Santa Cruz v. Local Agency Formation Commission* (1978) 76 Cal.App.3d 381, 391-391; *Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 729, 738, fn. 6.) Other documents influenced the expert advice provided to City Staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the City Council as final decision makers. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the City Council's decisions relating to approval of the Project. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21167.6, subd. (e)(10); *Browning-Ferris Industries v. City Council of City of San Jose* (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 852, 866; *Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 153, 155.)

V.

FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The same statute provides that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of Projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." Section 21002 goes on to provide that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a Project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The first such finding is that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. The second permissible finding is that such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. The third potential conclusion is that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of

employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.)

As explained elsewhere in these findings, "feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors. The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 (*City of Del Mar*); *Sierra Club v. County of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1509 [court upholds CEQA findings rejecting alternatives in reliance on applicant's project objectives]; see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 (*CNPS*) ["an alternative 'may be found infeasible on the ground it is inconsistent with the project objectives as long as the finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record'"] (quoting *Kostka & Zischke, Practice Under the Cal. Environmental Quality Act* [Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed. 2009] (*Kostka*), § 17.39, p. 825); *In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165, 1166 (*Bay-Delta*) ["[i]n the CALFED program, feasibility is strongly linked to achievement of each of the primary project objectives"; "a lead agency may structure its EIR alternative analysis around a reasonable definition of underlying purpose and need not study alternatives that cannot achieve that basic goal".] Moreover, "'feasibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417 (*City of Del Mar*); see also *CNPS, supra*, 177 Cal.App.4th at p. 1001 ["an alternative that 'is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint' may be rejected as infeasible"] [quoting *Kostka, supra*, § 17.29, p. 824]; *San Diego Citizenry Group v. County of San Diego* (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 1, 17.)

For purposes of these findings (including the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and the attached Table A to these findings), the term "avoid" refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level. In contrast, the term "substantially lessen" refers to the effectiveness of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce that effect to a less than significant level.

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt feasible mitigation measures or, in some instances, feasible alternatives to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a), (b).)

With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons that the agency found the project's benefits outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects. (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).) The California Supreme Court has stated, "[t]he wisdom of approving . . . any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to

the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced.” (*Goleta II, supra*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 576.)

The City of Santa Rosa's Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project is included in Exhibit B to City Council Resolution No. _____.

VI.
LEGAL EFFECT OF FINDINGS

These findings constitute the City’s best efforts to set forth the evidentiary and policy bases for its decision to approve the Project in a manner consistent with the requirements of CEQA. To the extent that these findings conclude that various mitigation measures outlined in the FEIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded or withdrawn, the City hereby binds itself to implement these measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational, but rather constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when the City adopts a resolution approving the Project.

VII.
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared for the Project and is being approved by the same Resolution that has adopted these findings. The City will use the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is attached as Exhibit C to and incorporated into the environmental document approval resolution and is approved in conjunction with certification of the EIR and adoption of these Findings of Fact.

VIII.
SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The Draft EIR identified a number of significant and potentially significant environmental effects (or impacts) that the Project will cause or to which it will contribute. Most of these significant effects can be fully avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. Other effects, however, cannot be avoided by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or alternatives, and thus will be significant and unavoidable. For reasons set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations attached as Exhibit B to the same Resolution adopting this Findings of Facts adopted concurrently herewith, the City Council has determined that overriding economic, social, and other considerations outweigh the significant, unavoidable effects of the Project.

The City Council’s recommendations with respect to the Project's significant effects and mitigation measures are set forth in "Table A" attached to these findings. The findings set forth in Table A are hereby incorporated by reference.

Table A does not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the EIR. Instead, the Table provides a summary description of each impact, describes the applicable mitigation measures identified in the EIR and adopted by the City Council, and states the City's findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the EIR, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in those documents supporting the EIR's determinations regarding the Project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In addition, the Planning Commission and City Council Staff Reports for certification or recommendation on certification of the EIR and approval or recommendation on approval of the Project's entitlements include discussions supporting the EIR's determinations; therefore, those documents are hereby incorporated by reference into these findings. In making these findings, the City Council ratifies, adopts, and incorporates into these findings the analysis and explanation in the EIR, all staff reports and resolutions recommending certification of the EIR and approval of the Project's entitlements, and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the EIR, all staff reports and resolutions for certification of the Project EIR and recommendation of approval of the Project entitlements, and City Council Resolution No. _____, relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

In considering specific recommendations from commenters, the City has been cognizant of its legal obligation under CEQA to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental effects to the extent feasible. The City recognizes, moreover, that comments frequently offer thoughtful suggestions regarding how a commenter believes that a particular mitigation measure can be modified, or perhaps changed significantly, in order to more effectively, in the commenter's eyes, reduce the severity of environmental effects. The City is also cognizant, however, that the mitigation measures recommended in the EIR represent the professional judgment and experience of the City's expert staff and environmental consultants. The City therefore believes that these recommendations should not be lightly altered. Thus, in considering commenters' suggested changes or additions to the mitigation measures as set forth in the EIR, the City, in determining whether to accept such suggestions, either in whole or in part, has considered the following factors, among others: (i) whether the suggestion relates to a significant and unavoidable environmental effect of the Project, or instead relates to an effect that can already be mitigated to less than significant levels by proposed mitigation measures in the Draft EIR; (ii) whether the proposed language represents a clear improvement, from an environmental standpoint, over the draft language that a commenter seeks to replace; (iii) whether the proposed language is sufficiently clear as to be easily understood by those who will implement the mitigation as finally adopted; (iv) whether the language might be too inflexible to allow for pragmatic implementation; (v) whether the suggestions are feasible from an economic, technical, legal, or other standpoint; and (vi) whether the proposed language is consistent with the Project's objectives.

As is often evident from the specific responses given to specific suggestions, City staff and consultants carefully considered and weighed the comments submitted to the City. In some instances, the City developed alternative language addressing the same issue that was of concern

to a commenter. In no instance, however, did the City fail to take seriously a suggestion made by a commenter or fail to appreciate the sincere effort that went into the formulation of suggestions.

IX. **GROWTH INDUCEMENT**

As required by section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must discuss ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Also, the EIR must discuss the characteristics of the project that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. Growth can be induced in a number of ways, such as through the elimination of obstacles to growth, the stimulation of economic activity within the region, or the establishment of policies or other precedents that directly or indirectly encourage additional growth. Under CEQA, this growth is not to be considered necessarily detrimental, beneficial, or of significant consequence. Induced growth would be considered a significant impact if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth, directly or indirectly, significantly affects the environment.

In general, a project could foster spatial, economic, or population growth in a geographic area if the project removes an impediment to growth (e.g., the establishment of an essential public service, the provision of new access to an area, or a change in zoning or General Plan amendment approval), or economic expansion or growth occurs in an area in response to the project (e.g., changes in revenue base, employment expansion).

The Project will cause direct population growth by constructing up to 128 dwelling units. These units will add up to 472 new residents to the City's population, on an infill, but underutilized, site in a Priority Development Area. Because the Project is in the downtown area, on an underutilized site, it will not increase population growth beyond what was projected in the City's General Plan and the Downtown Station Area Plan. The Project will also increase on-site employees by 65, but local employees are expected to fill these positions. Thus, the Project will not substantially induce population growth by providing 128 new dwelling units and 65 jobs.

The Project would be served by existing utilities in the project area and would not result in the extension of urban infrastructure to an area that is currently not serviced. The additional demand for utilities and public services generated by operation of the proposed project would be met with existing facilities, as described in the NOP. The project would be constructed within the City's Urban Growth Boundary. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

X. **SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

CEQA Guideline section 1526(c) requires an EIR to discuss significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved if the proposed Project is implemented. The Project will result in an irretrievable commitment of nonrenewable natural and energy resources because it requires water, electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels. Because the Project is an in-fill

project on an underutilized site; is close to bus and rail facilities; exceeds city and state minimum green building requirements; will comply with the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance; natural resources will be conserved to the maximum extent possible. Thus, the resource requirements are not inefficient, unnecessary or wasteful. The Project does not include large quantities of hazardous materials, therefore, does not have the potential to cause serious environmental accidents.

XI. **PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

A. Basis for Alternatives-Feasibility Analysis

1. Significant, Unavoidable Impacts of the Project

Under CEQA, where a significant impact can be substantially lessened (i.e., mitigated to an "acceptable level") solely by the adoption of mitigation measures, the agency, in drafting its findings, has no obligation to consider the feasibility of alternatives with respect to that impact, even if an alternative would mitigate the impact to a greater degree than the proposed project. (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; *Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council*, 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521 (1978) ("*Laurel Hills*"); *see also Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford*, 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 730-731 (1990); *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California*, 47 Cal.3d 376, 400-403 (1988).)

All of the potential environmental impacts associated with adoption and implementation of the proposed Project were found to be either *less than significant* without mitigation or *less than significant with mitigation*, with the exception of one impact associated with cultural and historic resources, which was found to be *significant and unavoidable with mitigation measures*.

2. Scope of Necessary Findings and Considerations for Project Alternatives

These findings address whether the various alternatives substantially lessen or avoid any of the significant unavoidable impacts associated with the Project and also consider the feasibility of each alternative. Under CEQA, "feasible means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15364.) As explained earlier, the concept of feasibility permits agency decision makers to consider the extent to which an alternative is able to meet some or all of a project's objectives. In addition, the definition of feasibility encompasses "desirability" to the extent that an agency's determination of infeasibility represents a reasonable balancing of competing economic, environmental, social, and technological factors supported by substantial evidence.

In identifying potentially feasible alternatives to the Project, the following Project objectives were considered:

1. Orderly and systematic development of an integrated and sustainable residential community that is consistent with the goals and policies of the City of Santa Rosa General Plan and Downtown Station Area Specific Plan for this area.
2. Construct new affordable housing and expanded homeless services predominately on land already owned by Catholic Charities.
3. Continue to provide homeless and family support services at their existing location because the purchase funding for these parcels requires these services to be on-going.
4. Construct new affordable housing and expanded homeless services predominately on land already owned by Catholic Charities.
5. Continue to provide homeless and family support services at their existing location because the purchase funding for these parcels requires these services to be on-going.
6. Continue to provide homeless and family support services at their existing location because this is a known and familiar location for them.
7. Construct the expanded Center and housing within walking distance of the SMART Train Station and Transit Mall so the clients and tenants have easy access to transportation to public services and jobs.
8. Provide on-site support services for residents of Caritas Homes.
9. Help as many people as practicable by developing the project site to the highest residential density allowed by the City's General Plan.
10. Develop transit and pedestrian-oriented affordable rental housing in downtown Santa Rosa within 0.25 miles of the SMART Train Station in Railroad Square and within 0.30 miles of Bus Route 1.
11. Reduce vehicle miles travelled by siting affordable rental housing at sites that can be developed with high densities near public transportation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Under CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6, as noted earlier, the alternatives to be discussed in detail in an EIR should be able to "feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project[.]" For this reason, the objectives described above provided the framework for evaluating possible alternatives.

The Draft EIR Alternatives to the Proposed Project evaluated three Project alternatives in accordance with the parameters set forth by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6: “No Project,” “Site Redesign – Two Buildings/Reduced Footprint/Higher Density,” and “Partial Preservation.” In addition, three other alternatives were initially considered but ultimately rejected from further consideration: “Site Redesign – One building along 6th Street or One Building along A Street,” “Increased Density,” and “Alternative Location.” All alternatives were initially evaluated on their ability to meet Project objectives, feasibility, and whether they would avoid or substantially reduce the proposed Project's significant environmental impacts. Based on this initial evaluation, the “No Project,” the “Site Redesign – Two Buildings/Reduced Footprint/Higher Density,” and the “Partial Preservation” alternatives were identified as warranting detailed analysis, while the “Site Redesign – One building along 6th Street or One Building along A Street,” the “Increased Density,” and the “Alternative Location” alternatives were rejected because they did not meet the most basic Project objectives.

Based on the requirements of CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6, the Project objectives, and the rejection initially considered alternatives for the above reasons, the following alternatives to the Project were set forth in the EIR:

1. No Project Alternative
2. Site Redesign – Two Buildings/Reduced Footprint/Higher Density Alternative
3. Partial Preservation Alternative

The City Council finds that the range of alternatives studied in the EIR reflects a reasonable attempt to identify and evaluate various types of alternatives that potentially would reduce the Project's environmental effects, while accomplishing most but not all of the Project's objectives. The City Council finds that the alternatives analysis is sufficient to inform the City Council and the public regarding the tradeoffs between the degree to which alternatives to the Project could reduce environmental impacts and the corresponding degree to which the alternatives would hinder the Applicants' ability to achieve their Project objectives.

B. Analysis of Project Alternatives

The purpose of a discussion of alternatives to a project in an EIR is to provide a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant environmental effect of a project, even if the alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be costlier. The range of alternatives describes those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the Project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects.

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6 provides that an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. “The discussion of alternatives is subject to a construction of reasonableness.” (*Residents Ad Hoc Stadium Committee v. Board of Trustees* (1979) 89 Cal.App.3d 274.) A feasible alternative is an

alternative capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors. A feasible alternative is also one that accomplishes the Project's "underlying fundamental purpose."

The EIR satisfies the requirements of CEQA by providing a reasonable range of alternatives, each of which is intended to address the means by which the unavoidable adverse impacts of the Project can be lessened.

Determining the feasibility of Project Alternatives involves a reasonable balancing of various economic, environmental, social, and technological factors. (*California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001; *City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417.) The City Council has carefully conducted a reasonable balancing of those factors in determining the feasibility of alternatives to the proposed Project. After conducting a thorough and careful determination, the City Council finds that Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 are not feasible for the reasons stated herein, and each of them independently of the others.

1. No Project Alternative

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1), the No Project Alternative is required as part of the "reasonable range of alternatives" to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of taking no action or not approving the proposed project. Under this alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed, and the project site would remain in its current condition.

a. Description

This alternative assumes that no additional development would occur on the project site. Catholic Charities would continue to use existing structures on the project site to provide family and homeless supportive services.

b. Analysis of the No Project Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

While the No Project Alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable impact to a historical resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, it would have greater impacts to greenhouse gases, land use and planning, noise, transportation, energy, and hazards and hazardous materials.

c. Analysis of the No Project Alternative's Ability to Meet the Project Objectives

The No Project alternative would only meet two of the Project objectives: continuing to provide homeless and family support services at the Project site. The alternative would not meet two critical Project objectives: increasing services to homeless individuals and providing permanent housing to people who have been or are at risk of homelessness.

d. Feasibility of the No Project Alternative

Because the No Project alternative would not meet the Project objectives, and because the No Project alternative would not provide the same benefits as the proposed Project, it is not a feasible alternative.

2. Site Redesign – Two Buildings/Reduced Footprint/Higher Density Alternative

a. Description

This alternative would redesign the Project so that the parcels along Morgan Street are not included in the Project site, and redesign the Project as two buildings with a reduced footprint and higher density. The Caritas Center and Caritas Homes portions of the Project would be redesigned to each sit on a 0.75-acre parcel. Caritas Center would be four stories in height and Caritas Homes would be a minimum four stories above the ground level podium style parking. Caritas Homes would provide approximately 75% of the housing units as compared to the proposed Project. This alternative would eliminate the demolition of structures adjacent to Morgan Street including the historic four-plex at 608 Morgan and the historic single-family home at 520 Morgan. The structures at 516 and 520 Morgan may continue to be used for transitional housing for short-term occupancies. Other structures on Morgan may also be used as site facilities such as offices or meeting space, but potential long-term occupancy would not be permitted due to cancer risk from air pollutants unless the HVAC system is upgraded to incorporate high filtration systems. The site redesign alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources.

b. Analysis of the Site Redesign – Two Buildings/Reduced Footprint/Higher Density Alternative’s Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

This Alternative would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources by preserving the historic four-plex at 608 Morgan and the historic single-family home at 520 Morgan. This alternative would have equivalent impacts compared to the proposed project on air quality, land use and planning, and transportation. The site redesign alternative would have less impacts compared to the proposed project on biological resources, cultural resources and tribal cultural resources. This alternative would result in greater impacts to aesthetics, noise, energy, hazards and hazardous materials and public services.

c. Analysis of the Site Redesign – Two Buildings/Reduced Footprint/Higher Density Alternative’s Ability to Meet the Project Objectives

While this Alternative would meet most Project objectives, it would not meet the Project objective to “help as many people as practicable by developing the project site to the highest residential density allowed by the City’s General Plan.”

The site redesign would require modification of the site layout and a reduction in building size and the number of housing units that can be built. As such, the project site would not be built to as high a density as possible, and fewer affordable housing units would be available.

Additionally, the alternative is potentially inconsistent with several General Plan Policies. For example, Policy LUL-F-1 prohibits density at less than the minimum density allowed in each residential density classification. Alternative 2 states that “there may be a reduction in housing units as a result of the site redesign” (DEIR p. 5-12.). Reducing the unit count is not consistent with Policy LUL-F-1 because the redesign would likely not meet the minimum density requirements. The alternative is also not consistent with LUL-L-3, which requires “pedestrian friendly environments and [] convenient connections to the transit facility for all modes of transportation.” This alternative would result in the elimination of the plaza or mews, thus eliminating a key pedestrian friendly feature from the Project. The alternative would conflict with General Plan Policy LUL-P, which requires enhancement of the Sixth/Seventh Street corridors because eliminating the plaza or mews would result in less-pedestrian friendly frontages along this corridor. If the alternative included the same number of residential units, it would also conflict with General Plan Policy UD-B-4, which states “respect and relate the scale and character of development at the edges of the downtown to the surrounding preservation districts. In order to retain the same number of residential units under the Site Redesign Alternative scenario, Caritas Housing would have to be at least 5 stories high, which does not respect the one and two-story houses on the block north of Seventh Street.

d. Feasibility of the Site Redesign – Two Buildings/Reduced Footprint/Higher Density Alternative

As is stated earlier, CEQA defines feasible as “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors. (14 Cal. Code Regs., § 15364.)

The Site Redesign Alternative combines both phases of Caritas Homes into one building. This would delay construction of Caritas Homes because funds used to purchase the Project site require that Catholic Charities operate an emergency shelter at all times. In order to comply with the grant requirements under this Alternative scenario, the applicants must first construct Caritas Center, then demolish the existing hospital building, which houses the emergency shelter, then construct Caritas Homes. This would result in at least a two-year delay for construction of Caritas Homes. This delay jeopardizes the ability to secure funding for Caritas Homes and delays the provision of affordable housing during a housing crisis, rendering this Site Redesign alternative infeasible because Caritas Housing could not be constructed in a reasonable period of time.

The Site Redesign Alternative also presents practical issues through construction staging. If the Project site has a reduced footprint, there won't be adequate space on the Project site to stage construction equipment and trailers. This problem would be further exacerbated by taller buildings with more floors needing to stage construction equipment such as cranes. The need for

space for construction staging makes this Alternative infeasible because there are practical barriers to it being constructed within a reasonable period of time.

Alternative 2 is also infeasible because it would delay the construction of Caritas Homes, which jeopardizes funding for this and other projects. The grant money that Catholic Charities, an applicant, used to purchase much of the Project Site requires an emergency shelter to be operated on the site for 55 years. (see Letter from Mark Krug, dated February 13, 2020, p. 1.) The proposed Project was deliberately designed so that Caritas Center and Caritas Homes Phase 1, could be constructed while the existing emergency shelter in the General Hospital Building continued to operate in order to satisfy the property purchase restrictions. The Project's design allows Caritas Center to be constructed and operating, then the existing emergency shelter would be demolished, followed by construction of Caritas Homes Phase 2. Alternative 2 would not allow this sequencing to occur, thus delaying all of Caritas Housing until Caritas Center is completed. (see Letter from Mark Krug, dated February 13, 2020, pp.1-2.)

The inability to sequence construction and operations in this manner would cause at least a 16-month delay before construction of Caritas Homes. This delay jeopardizes Burbank Housing's, a co-applicant, ability to maintain existing Project funding awards. Thus far, Burbank Housing has commitments for \$13 million to fund Caritas Homes, but these funds would be put at risk of rescission for lack of timely performance if Alternative 2 were adopted and there was a 16-month delay for Caritas Homes. The flat façade along Seventh Street is not compatible with the single-level, single-family home along Seventh Street. Finally, the taller building required by Alternative 2 requires different construction equipment, such as cranes, relative to the proposed Project. (see Letter from Mark Krug, dated February 13, 2020, p. 2.) Since Alternative 2 reduces the Project Site by eliminating the parcels along Morgan Street, the site would be too small to stage the construction equipment needed for the taller building required for Alternative 2. Alternative 2 with reduced housing is not feasible because it would cause delays that jeopardize funding; the increased height, even with a reducing in the housing units, is incompatible with the historic neighborhood; and the Project Site would not be adequate to stage construction equipment.

The City also considered that Alternative 2 said that Caritas Housing *may* be reduced to 75% of its proposed size. Thus, and in an abundance of caution, the City considered what would happen if the size was not reduced and Caritas Housing still included 128 units. The concept drawings for this scenario show that Caritas Homes would be 70 feet and six stories high and would require the use of mechanical stackers to have the same number of parking spaces as the proposed Project. (see Letter from Mark Krug, dated February 13, 2020, p. 2 and Attachment 1.) This scenario would be 28 feet higher than the proposed Project and would tower over the neighborhood, rendering it incompatible with the two-story residences in the block north of the Project Site and the general character of this historic district. The mechanical parking stackers are also prohibitively expensive. In addition, the Project architect, Pyatok Architects, prepared a shadow study for this scenario. This shadow study shows that this scenario would produce more shadows on the adjacent block during certain times of the year. (see Letter from Mark Krug, dated February 13, 2020, p. 2, Attachment 2.) Thus, this scenario is not feasible because it could

cause delays that jeopardize funding; a lack of neighborhood compatibility; and the need for and inability to stage construction equipment necessitated by the taller building on a smaller Project Site.

Because the Site Redesign Alternative would not meet the important Project objective of developing the site at the highest residential density allowed; the Alternative is not consistent with several General Plan Policies; the height of a taller Caritas Homes building would not be compatible with the homes along Seventh Street; the Alternative would cause the Caritas Homes portion of the Project to not be completed within a reasonable amount of time, which will result in lost funding; and because there would be practical barriers to staging the construction equipment needed for the Alternative, and for each of these reasons independent of the others, the City Council finds that Alternative 2 – Site Redesign, is not feasible.

3. Partial Preservation Alternative

a. Description

In this Project Alternative most buildings on the project site would be demolished, however, the historic single-family home at 520 Morgan Street and single-family home at 512 Morgan Street would be relocated to 501 A Street and 507 A Street, respectively. 507 A Street would be used as a residence and 501 A Street would be used as administrative offices for Catholic Charities.

b. Analysis of the Partial Preservation Alternative’s Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

This Alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources by eliminating the demolition of the historic single-family home at 520 Morgan Street, however the historic four-plex at 608 Morgan would still be demolished and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A structural review of 608 Morgan Street found that the fourplex is too deteriorated to survive relocation. (See letter from John Merle Cook, S.E., MKM & Associates, p. 2-4, dated May 13, 2019.) The loss of historic cultural resources would not be mitigated to less-than significant levels with this Alternative. Relocating the fourplex is not an option because it is not in a suitable condition to move to another location.

This alternative would have equivalent impacts compared to the proposed project on air quality, biological resources, GHG emissions, land use and planning, noise, hazards and hazardous materials and public services. The partial preservation alternative would have less impacts compared to the proposed project on cultural resources, and historical resources. This alternative would result in greater impacts tribal cultural resources, and energy.

c. Analysis of the Partial Preservation Alternative’s Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The Partial Preservation Alternative would achieve all Project objectives. 501 A Street is currently zoned Commercial Neighborhood (“CN”), which does not allow detached single-

family homes. 507 A Street is currently zoned Residential – High Density (“R-3”), which also does not allow detached single-family homes. However, the Medium Density General Plan designation allows new single family detached housing in historic preservation districts. Per the government code language, implementing AB 3194, a proposed housing development project is not inconsistent with the applicable zoning standards and criteria, and shall not require a rezoning, if the housing development project is consistent with the objective general plan standards and criteria but the zoning for the project site is inconsistent with the general plan. Relocating the single-family detached structures on lots zoned CN and R-3 can be found consistent with the Zoning Code, as long as single-family detached structures are consistent with the objective standards of the General Plan.

d. Feasibility of the Partial Preservation Alternative

From a practical perspective, Alternative 3 would delay Project construction by an estimated 15 months. (Letter from Bert Bangsberg, dated February 13, 2020, Attachment 1.) According to the Project applicants, this delay would: (1) jeopardize an extraordinary funding opportunity for Caritas Homes; (2) increase Project costs because construction costs are increasing at a rate of 4% per year; and (3) reduce the amount of New Market Tax Credits available to one of the applicants, Catholic Charities. (see Letter from Bert Bangsberg, dated February 13, 2020, p. 1.) It would also delay construction because the applicants must replace the money spent on additional soft costs, find additional revenue to pay for the increased construction costs, and find other ways to replace expenditures that will be excluded from the New Market Tax credits because of the primary delays. Even more importantly, delayed construction will delay providing essential services to people experiencing homelessness and delay the ability to provide 64 permanently affordable housing units, while the City is experiencing a housing crisis and a homeless emergency crisis. Finally, it is estimated that moving the two houses would cost about \$750,000. (see Letter from Bert Bangsberg, dated February 13, 2020, p. 3.) The Caritas Village Project Manager estimated that the financial impact of the delay caused by Alternative 3 is \$2,250,000. (see Letter from Bert Bangsberg, dated February 13, 2020, p. 3.) In addition to the delay increasing Project costs, the delay that Alternative 3 would cause jeopardizes Burbank Housing’s funding for this *and other projects* because existing tax credit rules would subject Burbank Housing to “negative points” for future applications and Burbank Housing would suffer damage from the negative points in future years and for this and other projects. (see Letter from Bert Bangsberg, dated February 13, 2020, p. 2.)

In addition, while this Alternative would significantly reduce the impact the Project would have on historic resources by preserving the historic building at 520 Morgan Street, there would still be a significant unmitigated impact from the destruction of the historic fourplex at 608 Morgan Street. A structural review of 608 Morgan Street found that the fourplex is too deteriorated to survive any sort of relocation. (see Letter from Tina Wallis Responding to RFI #3, dated May 17, 2019, attachment # 4, p. 2-4, dated May 13, 2019.) The loss of historic cultural resources would not be mitigated to less-than significant levels with this Alternative. Relocating the fourplex is not an option because it is not in a suitable condition to move to another location.

Because this alternative would not be consistent with the Downtown Station Area Plan policies encouraging multi-family housing the downtown area; and because the alternative would not be able to mitigate the impacts on cultural resources to a less-than-significant level, the City Council finds that Alternative 3 – Partial Preservation, is not feasible.

4. The Environmentally Superior Alternative

The qualitative environmental effects of each alternative in relation to the proposed Project are summarized in the table below.

Environmental Resource Area	Proposed Project	No Project (Alternative 1)	Site Redesign (Alternative 2)	Partial Preservation (Alternative 3)
Aesthetics	LTS	L	E	E
Air Quality	LTS/M	L	L	E
Biological Resources	LTS/M	L	L	E
Cultural Resources	SU	L	L	L – Historic Structures E – Archaeological Resources
Greenhouse Gases	LTS/M	G	G	E
Land Use and Planning	LTS	G	E	L
Noise	LTS/M	G	G	E
Transportation and Traffic	LTS/M	G	E	E
Tribal Cultural Resources	LTS/M	L	L	G
Energy	LTS	G	G	G
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LTS/M	G	G	E

Public Services	LTS/M	G	G	E
-----------------	-------	---	---	---

Notes: LTS = Less Than Significant
LTS/M = Less Than Significant with Mitigation
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
L = Less Impact than the Proposed Project
E = Equal Impact to the Proposed Project
G = Greater Impact than the Proposed Project

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of the proposed Project and the alternatives, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an "environmentally superior" alternative be selected and the reasons for such a selection be disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative, is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least environmental impact. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative is an informational procedure and the alternative selected may not be the alternative that best meets Project objectives.

The EIR designated Alternative 3 – Partial Preservation as the environmentally superior alternative in compliance with CEQA Guideline 15126.6(e).

5. Alternatives Rejected from Further Consideration

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) requires EIRs to identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Section 15126.6(c) provides that among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in and EIR are (i) failure to meet most of the basic Project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

The first alternative, the **Site Redesign – One building Along 6th Street or One Building Along A Street Alternative**, would have located both Caritas Homes and Caritas Center within a single building along 6th Street or A Street, which would preserve the historic structures along Morgan Street. This design had multiple prohibitive practical implications including, but not limited to prohibitively high building costs, both the emergency shelter and housing needing to place certain facilities on the ground level which a combined building could not feasibly allow, and the combined building would reduce the parking available to the Project even further than is already requested. Additionally, combining Caritas Homes and Caritas Center into one building presents prohibitive funding and legal implications for the two Applicants who run their respective emergency shelter and housing programs independent of one another and would need to set up a complex financing and ownership system for the two separate entities to run their programs out of the same building. This arrangement is also likely to deter investors who would have otherwise financed the Project, causing Applicants to either lose out on financing options or financing options being offered at less favorable financial terms.

The second alternative, the **Increased Density Alternative**, would have developed the Project at a higher density with additional affordable housing units. The Applicants revised their

Project during the scoping stage to reduce the number of housing units from 137 units to 126 maximum to address community concerns over the Project having inadequate parking. This alternative does not reduce the impact on historic cultural resources, and is not responsive to community concerns.

The third alternative, **Alternative Location**, would require Applicants to locate the Project in another location that would avoid or eliminate the Project's significant impacts. The Applicants do not currently own property that would fulfill most Project objectives, and as nonprofit organizations the Applicants would be poorly situated to acquire funding to purchase a different property should a more suitable location come on the market. Any alternative locations would either also be in the downtown Santa Rosa area and have similar impacts on historic resources, or be located outside of downtown Santa Rosa, but not close to existing transit, thus failing to meet Project objectives. Catholic Charities is also required to continue their family and support services on site, so an alternative location would not reduce the current impacts from existing operations on the site, and any alternative location would fail to meet the Project objective of consolidating existing services on land already owned by Applicants.

DRAFT

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT, TABLE "A"

CARITAS VILLAGE PROJECT

CITY OF SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Section 3.1 - Aesthetics			
<p>Impact AES-1: The proposed Project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.</p>	<p>No mitigation necessary</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)</p> <p>Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR found that the proposed Project would be consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan Urban Design Element. Specifically, the proposed Project would be consistent with Goal UD-B of the Urban Design Element and its applicable policies that pertain to preserving and strengthening the downtown area as a vital and attractive place. In addition, the proposed Project would comply with Policy UD-B-5 and redevelop the existing streetscape and the underutilized parcels with construction of a high-density development with residential and support service uses that contain active uses at the ground floor and shared plazas or mews. The overall Project design would be consistent with the visual character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, architectural style, and use, as defined by the City's</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			Core Area Design Guidelines. In addition, the Project is subject to the City's design review process.
Section 3.2 – Air Quality			
<p>Impact AQ-1: The proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.</p>	<p>MM AQ-1: Implement Construction Best Management Practices. The Applicant shall require all construction contractors to implement the basic construction mitigation measures recommended by the BAAQMD to reduce fugitive dust emissions. Emission reduction measures will include, at a minimum, the following measures. Additional measures may be identified by the BAAQMD or contractor as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) will be watered two times per day; b) all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, 	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 and Mitigation Measure AQ-2, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p> <p>Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR found that while the unmitigated construction emissions from the Project were predicted to fall below BAAQMD's significance threshold, construction emissions presented a heightened potential health risk to existing onsite and adjacent residents. This was a potentially significant effect. Feasible mitigation measures that would reduce this potential impact to less than significant levels are MM AQ-1 (Implement Construction Best Management Practices) and MM AQ-2 (Minimize Exhaust Emissions).</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>or other loose material offsite will be covered;</p> <p>c) all visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads will be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited;</p> <p>d) all vehicle speeds on unpaved roads will be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph);</p> <p>e) all roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved will be completed as soon as possible. Building pads will be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used; and</p> <p>f) idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or by</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485 of CCR). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</p> <p>g) all construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.</p> <p>h) a publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the City regarding dust complaints. This person will respond and take</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD phone number will also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</p> <p>i) substitute electrified equipment for diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment where practical.</p> <p>MM AQ-2: Minimize Exhaust Emissions. Exhaust emissions shall be minimized during construction activities with the use of off-road equipment engines that meet or exceed CARB's Tier 3 or Tier 4 engine emissions standards for large (greater than 120 horsepower [hp]) off-road equipment. At a minimum, all welding rigs, dozers, and graders shall be certified as compliant with the Tier 4 engine emissions standards as provided in CCR, Title 13,</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	section 2423(b)(1)(B). Engines can achieve these standards through the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, or other options as they become available.		
<p>Impact AQ-2: The proposed Project could potentially result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)</p>	No mitigation necessary	Less than significant	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)</p> <p>Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR found that both the construction emissions and operational emissions for this Project fell below BAAQMD’s threshold of significance. Further mitigations are therefore not required.</p>
<p>Impact AQ-3: The proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>Implement MM AQ-1 and MM AQ-2.</p> <p>MM- AQ-3: MERV Filtration System Rating. The applicant shall require that a MERV filter rating of 13 be</p>	Less than significant	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2 and AQ-3, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	used for the indoor air filtration system within both the Caritas Center and Caritas Home facilities.		<p>incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p> <p>Section 3.2 of the EIR found that the Project location had the potential to expose sensitive receptors to PM10 dust and diesel fumes. These risks would already be reduced to less than significant levels through implementing MM AQ-1 and AQ-2. Analysis of the Project’s potential to expose sensitive receptors to Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions (TACs) showed that the Carcinogenic Inhalation Health Risk and chronic health risks to Project residents from vehicle exhaust would exceed BAAQMD thresholds if left unmitigated. Any other potential air quality hazards discussed were found to expose sensitive receptors at less than significant levels. These impacts could be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels through MM AQ-3 (MERV Filtration System Rating), requiring that the indoor air filtration systems in Project buildings have a MERV filter rating of 13.</p>
Section 3.3 – Biological Resources			
Impact BIO-1: The proposed Project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on	MM BIO-1: Avoid Disturbance of Nesting Birds. If Project activities occur during the nesting season for native birds (February 1 to August 31), the	Less than significant	Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>	<p>following measures shall be implemented to avoid or minimize the potential for adverse impacts on nesting migratory birds and raptors: A pre-construction nesting bird survey for species protected by the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code will be conducted by a qualified biologist within a 250-foot radius of proposed construction activities for passerines and a 500-foot radius for raptors no more than 2 weeks prior to the start of construction activities. If an active nest is found, the qualified biologist will establish an appropriate no-work buffer around the nest, unless a smaller buffer zone is approved by CDFW. Construction within the no-work buffer may resume once it is determined by a qualified biologist that the young have left the nest. If a lapse in construction activities of 7</p>		<p>required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p> <p>Section 3.3 of the EIR found that Project had the potential to disturb nesting bird species if construction occurred during a species' breeding season, potentially resulting in incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings and/or nest abandonment. This could be feasibly mitigated to a less-than-significant level through MM BIO-1 (Avoid Disturbance of Nesting Birds), which involves conducting surveys prior to construction and creating buffer zones surrounding any nests found in the Project Area for the duration of the nesting season. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes have been incorporated into the Project that avoids the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>days or more occurs during the nesting season, an additional nesting bird survey is recommended to ensure that no nests were established in the area while construction activities were on hold.</p>		
<p>Impact BIO-2: The proposed Project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.</p>	<p>MM BIO-2: Tree Replanting. Removed trees will be mitigated through replanting, following all terms and conditions included in the City’s tree ordinance permit.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p> <p>The Project requires removing 55 trees, 40 of which would require a tree removal permit. As part of the tree removal permit application process, Applicants will be required to work with the City to create a plan for planting new trees to replace the ones removed, which implements MM BIO-2 (Tree Replanting). This would reduce the impact from removing trees to a less than significant level.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 – Cultural Resources</p>			
<p>Impact CUL-1: The proposed Project would cause a substantial adverse change in</p>	<p>MM CUL-1: Salvage Report. A Salvage Report shall be prepared prior to the</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable impact</p>	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2 and CUL-3, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.</p>	<p>demolition of the relevant structure(s). This report shall identify character-defining features of each of the individual buildings, as well as the broader St. Rose Historic Preservation District. Based upon these identification efforts, noteworthy materials, and architectural features at 520 and/or 608 Morgan Streets shall be identified for potential salvage and reuse throughout the district or, if agreed upon by relevant City staff, other historic preservation districts within the City that have comparable architectural character, historical significance, and period of construction where reuse would not be deemed inappropriate. The Salvage Report shall be prepared by an architectural historian or historic architect that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Professional Qualifications.</p>		<p>impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council finds that the environmental effect has been mitigated to the maximum extent feasible, that no feasible mitigation or alternative exists that would avoid the significant effect and therefore, the impact is significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>The Historical Resources Report prepared for the proposed Project identified two historical resources within the Project site: the single-family residence at 520 Morgan Street and the historic fourplex apartment building at 608 Morgan Street, both of which are eligible contributors to the St. Rose Historic Preservation District. The CEQA Guidelines state that the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired by demolition, which destroys a resource’s ability to convey its significance. Therefore, the proposed demolition of the historic single-family residence at 520 Morgan Street and the historic fourplex apartment building at 608 Morgan Street would result in a significant impact. CUL-1 through CUL-4 require preparation of a public report and interpretive materials for the historic resources in conjunction with the City and interested local parties including but not limited to Santa Rosa’s CHB, local preservation groups, and any local neighborhood groups that may express</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Local preservation groups and the City shall be consulted in the preparation of the Salvage Report and all relevant plans.</p> <p>MM CUL-2: Public Report Documentation. The buildings at 520 and 608 Morgan Streets shall be documented prior to commencement of any work associated with the Project. This documentation will be consistent with the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation Level II, although will not require submittal to the Library of Congress. The HABSlike documentation shall include large format photographs and a written history of the properties, including historical contexts related to the St. Rose Historic Preservation District. Materials shall be prepared by an architectural historian, historic architect, or historian that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional</p>		<p>interest in the historic resources. Although implementation of mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-4 would partially mitigate the negative impact to the historic resources these mitigation measures would not fully reduce the impact below the level of significance. As such, demolition of the two historic structures at the project site would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to both 520 and 608 Morgan Street. The loss of this historical material from the demolition of these two buildings would perpetuate the loss of contributors in this particular area and overall degradation of historical integrity of the St. Rose Historic Preservation District. Therefore, the demolition of the historic single-family and fourplex would qualify as a substantial adverse change per CEQA Guideline 15064.5 (b)(2)(B), which outlines that the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a Project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources. While the demolition of these two contributors would not result in the loss of the district as a whole, the alteration to the district would result in a substantial adverse change to the St. Rose Historic Preservation District.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Qualifications. Produced materials shall be submitted to local repositories, which should include the City of Santa Rosa Public Library and the Museum of Sonoma County. While public documentation is instrumental in understanding and cataloguing alterations to historical resources, it should be noted that Section II.C-Demolition in the Design Guidelines specifically states that public documentation is not sufficient as a stand-alone mitigation measure.</p> <p>MM CUL-3: Interpretive Materials. At least three sets of interpretive materials related to the history of the property as well as the broader St. Rose Historic Preservation Historic District shall be produced and installed. The exact medium of the interpretive materials will not be specified so as not to inhibit creativity, although</p>		<p>The proposed mitigation measures would reduce indirect impacts to the St. Rose Historic Preservation District but would not reduce direct impacts to a level less than significant. The demolition of the historic resources at 520 and 608 Morgan Street, both contributors to the St. Rose Historic Preservation District, would still occur. Additionally, preservation guidance developed by the City of Santa Rosa, which outlines the preference for preservation and adaptive reuse over demolition, is not consistent with the objectives of the Project, namely the efficient development of new, high density affordable housing that maximizes the proposed site.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>typical efforts include panels, signage, museum exhibits, or interactive landscape elements, such as play elements or site furnishings. Interpretive materials shall be located adjacent to, and accessible from, the public right-of-way, and in the vicinity of the following: 1) the Catholic Charities entrance area; 2) the homes entrance area; and 3) the entrance near the parking lot. The specific historical themes reflected at each specific location as should reflect on the development of the St. Rose Historic District and associated historic contexts and themes. Interpretive materials shall feature physical elements that reflect the character-defining features of the historic district, including materials, architectural forms, details, and other unifying elements. Proposed interpretive material</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>designs, including narratives, will be presented to the Santa Rosa Cultural Heritage Board for comment and approval prior to installation.</p> <p>MM CUL-4: Compatible Design. The developer of the Project shall work with a historic architect or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards to ensure that the proposed Project meets the relevant requirements of the City of Santa Rosa Design Guidelines, particularly under Section 2.4: Historic Districts within the Downtown Area and Station Area and Section 4.7: Historic Properties and Districts-III.G-new Construction. A presentation will be made to the Santa Rosa Cultural Heritage Board that outlines the finalized Project design and its compatibility with the</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	surrounding historic district; this will be subject to Cultural Heritage Board comments and approval.		
<p>Impact CUL-2: The proposed Project could potentially cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5</p>	<p>MM CUL-5: Cultural Resource Awareness Training. Prior to the initiation of the Project, a cultural resources training shall be provided to supervisors, the contract foreman, construction crew members, and any additional key construction personnel. A qualified archaeologist shall administer the training. The purpose of the training is to increase awareness and knowledge of cultural resources and appropriate protocols in the event of an inadvertent discovery. The training shall include a discussion of the procedures for stopping work and notification of key City personnel if an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources occurs during Project construction. If human remains</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-5, CUL-6 and CUL-7, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p> <p>Although there are no records of archaeological or resources on the site, or evidence of subsurface cultural resources in preliminary subsurface testing done at the site, there are previously recorded cultural resource deposits close enough to the Project site that it is possible that cultural resources could be uncovered inadvertently. The potential significant impact of such a discovery can feasibly be mitigated through MM CUL-5 (Cultural Resource Awareness Training), CUL-6 (Construction Monitoring), and CUL-7 (Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources), which cover the measures taken prior to and during the discovery of a cultural resource. Implementing</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>are discovered, the appropriate protocols shall also be discussed. Upon completion of the training, participants shall be able to define cultural resources, describe the policies and procedures for identifying and protecting cultural resources, know how to locate and receive assistance from the qualified archaeologist and coordinate with other sources, and describe steps to be taken when cultural resources are encountered during Project implementation. All new construction personnel added after construction commences shall receive the same training and orientation before working onsite. If Native American monitors are used, it shall be necessary for tribal representatives to also participate in the training.</p> <p>MM CUL-6: Construction Monitoring. If evidence of any prehistoric or historic-era</p>		<p>these measures would reduce this potential impact to less-than-significant levels.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>subsurface archaeological features or deposits are discovered during excavation or other earth-moving activities, the qualified archaeologist shall assess the significance of the find(s) and determine the appropriate treatment. Appropriate treatment may include recordation and/or additional excavation. A monitoring report shall be completed by the archaeological monitor at the end of construction. This report shall include a brief summary of the pre-construction cultural resource awareness training and the results of monitoring. The monitoring report shall be kept on file with the City.</p> <p>MM CUL-7: Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources. If prehistoric or historic-era cultural resources are encountered during the course of grading or</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>construction, all ground-disturbing activities within 50 feet of the find shall cease. The qualified archaeologist shall evaluate the significance of the resources and recommend appropriate treatment measures. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(A), Project redesign and preservation in place shall be the preferred means to avoid impacts to significant archaeological sites. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C), if it is demonstrated that resources cannot be avoided, the qualified archaeologist shall develop additional treatment measures in consultation with the City, which may include data recovery or other appropriate measures. The City shall consult with appropriate Native American representatives in determining appropriate treatment for</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>unearthed cultural resources if the resources are prehistoric or Native American in nature. Archaeological materials recovered during any investigation shall be curated at an accredited curational facility. The qualified archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting evaluation and additional treatment of the resource. A copy of the report shall be provided to the City and to the NWIC. Construction shall recommence based on direction of the qualified archaeologist.</p>		
<p>Impact CUL-3: The proposed Project could potentially disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</p>	<p>MM CUL-8: Procedures for Human Burials Encountered During Construction. If ground-disturbing activities uncover previously unknown human remains, Section 7050.5 of HSC applies, and the following procedures shall be followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the area where the human 	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-8, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p> <p>There are no known human remains within the Project area and no indications that the Project site</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>remains were found or within 100 feet of the find until the Sonoma County Coroner and the appropriate City of Santa Rosa representative are contacted. Duly authorized representatives of the Coroner and the City shall be permitted onto the Project site and shall take all actions consistent with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Government Code Sections 27460, et seq. Excavation or disturbance of the area where the human remains were found and an area within 100 feet of the find shall not be permitted to re-commence until the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to the provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage 		<p>has been used for burial purposes in the past. While it is unlikely that human remains would be encountered, the discovery of previously unknown human burial sites during excavation and grading would potentially present a significant environmental impact. This can feasibly be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through MM CUL-8 (Procedures for Human Burials Encountered During Construction), which outlines the measures that would be taken if human remains were discovered on the Project Site.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the “most likely descendant” (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The MLD may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the landowner shall reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance. If the landowner does not accept the MLD’s recommendations, the owner or the MLD may request mediation by NAHC.</p>		
Section 3.5 – Greenhouse Gases			
Impact GHG-1: The proposed Project would generate	No mitigation necessary	Less than significant	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.			<p>Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)</p> <p>Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR found that the estimated future Project emissions fall below the respective efficiency thresholds for each year. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant greenhouse gas impact, and no further mitigations are required.</p>
<p>Impact GHG-2: The proposed Project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.</p>	No mitigation necessary	Less than significant	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)</p> <p>Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR found that the proposed Project would not conflict with the City’s Climate Action Plan, the County’s Climate Action Plan, the regional plan, or regulations adopted by the State of California to reduce GHG emissions. The proposed Project would be subject to Title 24 energy efficiency standards. Energy-efficient buildings require less electricity; therefore, increased energy efficiency reduces fossil fuel consumption and decreases GHG emissions. The proposed Project would comply with the California Green Building Standards Code, which includes requirements to increase recycling, reduce waste, reduce water use, increase bicycle use, and other measures that would reduce GHG emissions. Motor vehicle emissions</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			associated with the proposed Project would be reduced through compliance with State regulations on fuel efficiency and fuel carbon content. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no further mitigation measures are required.
Section 3.6 – Land Use and Planning			
Impact LU-1: The proposed Project would not 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.	No mitigation necessary	Less than significant	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.) Section 3.6 of the Draft EIR found that the proposed Project would comply with all applicable requirements of the Santa Rosa City Zoning Code. The Project would also be consistent with Plan Bay Area 2040’s goals of providing affordable housing, encouraging the reduction of vehicle usage, and promoting non-vehicular travel to decrease GHG emissions. Impacts would be less than significant, and therefore further mitigation is not required.
Section 3.7 - Noise			
Impact NOI-1: The proposed Project would not result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general	MM NOI-1: Construction Hours. Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM on Saturdays, with no noise generating construction on Sundays or holidays.	Less than significant	Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p>	<p>MM NOI-2: Construction Activity. Implementation of the following multipart mitigation plan is required to reduce the potential construction period noise impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use a comprehensive program of noise prevention through planning and mitigation and consider noise impacts as a crucial factor in Project approval. • Construct noise barriers such as temporary walls or piles of excavated material between noisy activities and noise-sensitive receivers. • Site equipment on the construction lot as far away from noise-sensitive sites as possible. • Construct walled enclosures around especially noisy activities or clusters of noisy 		<p>environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p> <p>Although standard building practices and the Project’s overall design would prevent ambient noise levels from reaching significant levels for the Project’s long-term activities, construction traffic and activities would present potentially significant short-term impacts that rise to noise levels that could be considered clearly unacceptable. Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR found that these impacts can feasibly be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the implementation of MM NOI-1 (Construction Hours), which limits the days and times for noise generating construction, and MM NOI-2 (Construction Activity) which outlines several best practices which would reduce the potential construction period noise impacts. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes have been incorporated into the Project that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>equipment. For example, shields can be used around pavement breakers, and loaded vinyl curtains can be draped under elevated structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine noisy operations to occur in the same time period. The total noise level produced shall not be significantly greater than the level produced if the operations were performed separately. • Avoid nighttime activities. Sensitivity to noise increases during the nighttime hours in residential neighborhoods. • Use rammed aggregate piers instead of pile driving to reinforce soils for the upper 20 feet of the project site to avoid impacts associated with pile driving. • Use specially quieted equipment, such as quieted and enclosed air 		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>compressors or mufflers, on all engines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select quieter demolition methods where possible. For example, sawing bridge decks into sections that can be loaded onto trucks results in lower cumulative noise levels than impact demolition by pavement breakers. • Post a construction site notice that includes the following information: job site address, permit number, name and phone number of the contractor and owner or owner's agent, hours of construction allowed by code or any discretionary approval for the site, and City telephone numbers where violations can be reported. The notice shall be posted and maintained at the construction site prior to the start of construction and displayed 		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	in a location that is readily visible to the public and approved by the City.		
<p>Impact NOI-2: The proposed Project would not result in the generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels.</p>	No mitigation necessary	Less than significant	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)</p> <p>Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR found that the ground borne vibrations associated with the equipment associated with this Project’s construction fall below the threshold of significance. Construction vibrations are not predicted to cause damage to existing buildings or cause annoyance to sensitive receptors. As such, implementation of the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact related to vibration and further mitigation is not required.</p>
Section 3.8 – Transportation			
<p>Impact TRANS-1: The proposed Project would not conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</p>	<p>MM TRANS-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan. A traffic management plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance for construction activities of any construction permits. The traffic management plan shall be prepared in accordance with</p>	Less than significant	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1, which has been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that this mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>both the California’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and Work Area Traffic Control Handbook. The traffic management plan shall route trucks into the sites avoiding 7th Street, A Street north of 7th Street, and Morgan Street north of 7th Street as much as possible. Avoiding these streets keeps construction traffic removed from the sensitive single-family homes along Morgan and A Streets. The traffic management plan shall also include strategies for minimizing impacts to traffic, effectively managing traffic flow and reducing the number of trips accessing the Project site during the peak hours of 7 AM to 9 AM and 4 PM to 6 PM These strategies shall include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary traffic control plan that addresses traffic safety and control through the work zone; 		<p>Although the proposed Project would not conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy in the long-term, the Project proposes improvements to the road right-of-way, and construction work is anticipated to occur as far away from the project site as the centerlines of A Street, 6th Street, and 7th Street and as close as 5 feet from the west curb along Morgan Street. These could present potentially significant impacts. These impacts could feasibly be mitigated through MM TRANS-1 (Construction Traffic Management Plan) which requires approval of a Traffic Management Plan that outlines strategies which will be implemented to reduce the impacts construction will have on traffic. This measure would feasibly reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directing construction traffic with a flagger; • Placing temporary signage, lighting, and traffic control devices if required, including but not limited to appropriate signage along access routes to indicate the presences of heavy vehicles and construction traffic; • Require parking within designated areas on the Project site and prohibit parking along the shoulders of adjacent roadways. • Provide for emergency vehicle movement through the Project site at all times during construction and operation. • Provide approved offsite parking for workers with shuttle services to transport them onsite when and if onsite parking becomes restricted or unfeasible. • Facilitate materials delivery during off-peak 		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>traffic hours and comply with regulations governing oversized loads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage vanpool and carpool for construction employees commuting to the Project site. 		
<p>Impact TRANS-2: The proposed Project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).</p>	<p>No mitigation necessary</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)</p> <p>Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR found that, because the Project is located within ½ mile of the SMART station, the proposed Project represents infill development and would represent a higher density development, and many of the proposed Caritas Center clients do not own vehicles and would access the site through alternative transportation modes, the proposed Project would have a less than significant transportation impact based on VMT. Further mitigation is therefore not required.</p>
<p>Impact TRANS-3: The proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.</p>	<p>No mitigation necessary</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)</p> <p>Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR found that the proposed traffic improvements would be constructed to meet</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>City standards and allow emergency access vehicles to egress and ingress to and from the project site and along the area roadways impacted by the Project. Additionally, the proposed Project would not affect any existing City emergency access routes. The proposed Project would be designed to incorporate all required Santa Rosa Fire Department (SRFD) standards to ensure that the Project would not result in hazardous design features or inadequate emergency access. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and further mitigation measures are not required.</p>
<p>Impact TRANS-4: The proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</p>	<p>No mitigation necessary</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)</p> <p>Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR found that the Project residents and clients are expected to have low private vehicle ownership. All residential development within the Specific Area Plan is considered transit supportive. The Project is expected to increase use of alternative transportation. As such, the proposed Project would not be in conflict with adopted policies for alternative transportation but would be considered to be supportive of alternative transportation. This impact would be less than significant and no further mitigation is necessary.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Section 3.9 – Tribal Cultural Resources			
<p>Impact TRI-1: The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource a tribal cultural resource listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, local register of historical resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1(k), or by the lead agency pursuant to criteria set forth in PRC section 5024.1(c).</p>	<p>Implement MM CUL-3, MM CUL-4, and MM CUL-5.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-3, CUL-4 and CUL-5, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p> <p>Section 3.9 of the Draft EIR found that although research and consultation with local tribes did not identify any tribal cultural resources within or near the project site, there is still the potential that excavating and grading would damage or destroy previously undiscovered tribal cultural resources. This is a potentially significant impact, however implementation of MM CUL-3, CUL-4 and CUL-5 described elsewhere in the Project findings would already reduce this to less-than-significant levels. The City Council has already directed that these</p>
Section 3.10 – Energy			
<p>Impact EN-1: The proposed Project would not result in a potentially significant impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or</p>	<p>No mitigation necessary</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			<p>Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR found that the Project would not open up a new geographical area for development such that it would draw mostly new trips, or substantially lengthen existing trips. The proposed Project would be well positioned to accommodate existing population and reduce VMT. For these reasons, it would be expected that vehicular fuel consumption associated with the proposed Project would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than for any other similar land use activities in the region. Building energy consumption associated with the proposed Project would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than for any other similar buildings in the region. Current state regulatory requirements for new building construction contained in the 2016 CALGreen and Title 24 would increase energy efficiency and reduce energy demand in comparison to existing residential structures, and therefore, would reduce actual environmental effects associated with energy use from the proposed Project. The impacts from energy consumption would be less than significant and therefore do not require further mitigation.</p>
Impact EN-2: Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	No mitigation necessary	Less than significant	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR found that the proposed Project would not conflict with the energy objectives of the General Plan, the Downtown Specific Plan, nor the strategies in its CAP. The proposed Project would constitute development within an established community and would not be opening up a new geographical area for development such that it would draw mostly new trips, or substantially lengthen existing trips. The proposed Project would be well positioned to accommodate existing population and reduce VMT. The proposed Project would not impede the City's bicycle and pedestrian network; the proposed project would include onsite and offsite improvements of pedestrian infrastructure (sidewalks) and would provide bicycle parking in accordance with the City's Municipal Code. The proposed Project would comply with the versions of CCR Titles 20 and 24, including CALGreen, that are applicable at the time that building permits are issued and with all applicable City measures. Therefore, the Project's impact is less than significant and does not require further mitigation.</p>
Section 3.11 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
<p>Impact HAZ-1: The proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the</p>	<p>MM HAZ-1: Removal of Biohazardous and Medical Waste. Prior to construction, the applicant shall retain a</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, HAZ-3 and HAZ-4, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
<p>routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</p>	<p>certified biohazardous waste contractor to inspect the project site and determine if biohazardous and medical wastes are present. If present, the certified contractor would remediate the project site in accordance with the California Department of Public Health regulations and Cal/OSHA worker safety requirements. The certified contractor would dispose of all biohazardous and medical wastes at a certified medical waste processing facility in accordance with the California Medical Waste Management Act to ensure that these materials are not released into the environment.</p> <p>MM HAZ-2: Removal of Asbestos Containing Materials and/or Lead Based Paint. A comprehensive survey for the presence of asbestos containing material and lead-based paint shall be</p>		<p>Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p> <p>Public comments expressed specific concerns with this Project regarding biohazardous and medical wastes (e.g., sharps, human waste). MM HAZ-1 (Removal of Biohazardous and Medical Wastes) would reduce the risk of exposure to these materials for construction workers by requiring a site inspection and removal of any biohazardous or medical wastes on site before construction begins. Because the Project involves demolition of structures that may contain asbestos materials, lead-based paints or other hazardous building materials, MM HAZ-2 (Removal of Asbestos Containing Materials and/or Lead Based Paint) would reduce the potential significant impacts of these site conditions by surveying for the presence of hazardous building materials and following Cal/OSHA standards for their disposal during the demolition process should any hazardous building materials be identified. MM HAZ-3 (Install Sharps Kiosk Station) would reduce public exposure to</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>conducted at the project site prior to any demolition activities. Demolition of buildings containing asbestos materials or lead based paint must be achieved in accordance with state and federal regulations, including the EPA's Asbestos National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, Cal/OSHA's Construction Lead Standard (8 CCR 1432.1), and California Department of Toxic Substances Control and EPA requirements for disposal of hazardous waste. Disposal of any asbestos-containing materials or lead-based paint found on the site shall be carried out by a contractor trained and qualified to conduct lead- or asbestos-related construction work and in accordance with the appropriate state and federal standards to ensure that these</p>		<p>medical waste during the Project's operation by requiring applicants install a sharps kiosk on site where residents and visitors can safely dispose of medical waste. Lastly, to discourage improper disposal of sharps and human waste and to encourage residents and visitors comply with applicants' "Good Neighbor Rules," MM HAZ-4 (Install Environmental Design Features) requires applicants install features such as lighting, surveillance cameras and disposal containers or other features as approved by the City. These measures would feasibly reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	<p>materials are not released into the air in the project vicinity.</p> <p>MM HAZ-3: Install Sharps Kiosk Station. The Applicant shall obtain a Home-Generated Sharps Consolidation Point permit from Sonoma County to install a Sharps Kiosk at the project site. The kiosk shall be placed onsite in an area that is accessible to visitors and residents. The Applicant shall retain a biohazardous waste contractor to collect the hazardous materials from the kiosk weekly and transport them to a certified medical waste processing facility for disposal in accordance with the California Medical Waste Management Act.</p> <p>MM HAZ-4: Install Environmental Design Features. The Applicant must install environmental design features at the project site to reduce illicit behaviors such as</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	loitering, trespassing, littering and garbage, disposal of sharps, and bathroom incivility. The design features must include additional lighting, camera surveillance, provision of proper disposal containers, or other design features approved by the City.		
<p>Impact HAZ-2: The proposed Project would not 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.</p>	<p>Implement MM HAZ-1, MM HAZ-2, MM HAZ-3, and MM-HAZ 4</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, HAZ-2, HAZ-3 and HAZ-4, which have been required or incorporated into the project, will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that these mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p> <p>Project construction and operations are not anticipated to involve hazardous materials that could create a significant public or environmental hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset or accidents. However, the conditions outlined in Impact HAZ-1 do present potential hazards, particularly through the collection and disposal of hazardous materials improperly left on the project site. MM HAZ-1,</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			<p>HAZ-2, HAZ-3 and HAZ-4 already include provisions that would reduce the potential significant impacts from upset or accident releasing these materials into the environment to less-than significant levels. The City Council already directed that these measures be implemented. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes have been incorporated into the Project that avoids the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.</p>
<p>Impact HAZ-3: The proposed Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p>	<p>No mitigation necessary</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)</p> <p>Section 3.11 of the EIR found that the project site is within ¼ mile of an existing school. However, the use of hazardous materials during construction would be confined to the project site and within existing roadways. The use of potentially hazardous materials is regulated by health and safety requirements under federal, state, and local regulations including handling, storage, and disposal of the materials as well as emergency spill response. Similarly, during operation of the proposed Project, health and safety requirements under federal, state, and local regulations would be applicable to address potential biohazardous and medical wastes. As such,</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
			the proposed Project would not expose an existing or proposed school to hazardous materials and the impacts would be less than significant and do not require further mitigation.
Section 3.12 – Public Services			
<p>Impact PS-1: The proposed Project would not require the construction of new or physically altered fire protection or police protection facilities, which could cause significant environmental impacts.</p>	No mitigation necessary	Less than significant	<p>Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4(a)(3), 15091.)</p> <p>Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR found that the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in the construction of a new fire station or the alteration of an existing fire station. The proposed Project would not result in the construction of a new police station or the alteration of the City’s existing police station. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant and would not require further mitigation.</p>

EXHIBIT B

TO CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. ____

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE CARITAS VILLAGE PROJECT

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

This Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Cal Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.) and its implementing guidelines (“CEQA Guidelines”) (Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 14 § 15000 et seq.)

II. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As set forth in the preceding sections, the City of Santa Rosa's approval of the Project will result in significant adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided even with the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures; and there are no feasible alternatives that would mitigate or substantially lessen the impacts. Despite the occurrence of these effects, however, the City Council approves the Project because, in its view, the economic, social, and other benefits that the Project will provide will render the significant effects acceptable.

A. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

As discussed in the EIR, the Project will result in the following potentially significant and unavoidable impact, even with the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures:

Impact CUL-1: The proposed Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. This Project would result in (1) the demolition of the structure at 520 Morgan Street; (2) the demolition of the structure at 608 Morgan Street; and (3) a substantial adverse change to the Saint Rose Historic Preservation District. Despite implementation of the proposed Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, and CUL-4, these are significant unavoidable effects.

B. Findings

The City Council has considered all potentially feasible mitigation measures to substantially lessen or avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts. Where feasible, mitigation measures will be adopted as part of the Project. The imposition of these measures will

reduce the identified impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. The City Council finds that it is not feasible to fully mitigate these impacts.

The City Council has also considered all potentially feasible alternatives to the Project. The City Council finds that there are no feasible alternatives that would reduce the above significant and unavoidable impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The Project's impact discussed above therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

C. Overriding Considerations

In the City Council's judgment, the Project and its benefits outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. The following statement identifies the specific reasons why, in the City Council's judgment, the benefits of the Project, if approved, outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. Any one of these reasons is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the City would be able to stand by a determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Exhibit B, and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings as defined in the Findings of Fact.

The Project provides a unique opportunity for both the City and the surrounding communities to address the impacts of an unprecedented homelessness crisis coupled with an affordable housing crisis, which was exacerbated by the 2017 Tubbs Fire that destroyed 3,000 homes within the city.

Addressing The Homelessness Emergency and Housing Crisis

The Project improves the facilities of the existing emergency services shelter, allowing Catholic Charities to better serve people experiencing homelessness in the City. The City and surrounding areas are experiencing an unprecedented crisis of people experiencing homelessness, and the deleterious effects of being homeless, as is set forth herein.

On August 9, 2016, the City Council passed Resolution 28839, declaring a state of local homeless emergency based on the high number of homeless people living unsheltered within the city, the low vacancy rate of affordable housing units, and the health and safety risks posed by living unsheltered. This state of emergency is regularly reviewed and was most recently reviewed and reaffirmed on December 17, 2019. (Res-2019-188.)

The Sonoma County Homeless Census Survey for 2019 is the most current Point-In-Time-Count (PITC) for Sonoma County's homeless population. Among other things, it found that there were 2,951 homeless people in Sonoma County, 1,803 of whom live in Santa Rosa. 57% of respondents have been homeless for a year or longer. 87% of respondents were living in Sonoma County before becoming homeless, and 70% of respondents had been residents of Sonoma County for ten or more years before becoming homeless. 19% of people experiencing

homelessness in the local area were affected by the fires. Over half of these people were living in Santa Rosa when the fires hit. The average life expectancy for people experiencing homelessness is 25 years shorter than those with stable housing. 68% of those surveyed during the PITC reported at least one health condition. Domestic violence and partner abuse can be the primary cause of homelessness for many people. 34% of those surveyed during the PITC had previously experienced domestic abuse. Locally, 50% of the PITC participants experienced homelessness for the first time before the age of 25.

The Homeless Policy Workshop provides an overview of the federal context and requirements which drive much of the homeless-related work carried out by the Community Development Commission (Commission) on behalf of Sonoma County. It also describes the current state of program delivery, including what's working and what could be improved, as context for the Commission's launch of a redesign of the homeless system. The paper notes that in 2017, there were only 605 year-round emergency shelter beds in Sonoma County.

According to the Association of Bay Area Government's Regional Housing Needs Allocation for 2014-2022, the City of Santa Rosa needs to develop 1,528 new low and very-low income housing units within that period in order to meet the housing needs of its growing population.

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development issued a Comprehensive Housing Market Analysis for Santa Rosa, California on April 1, 2017. Among other things, it noted that the apartment market experienced a 3.5-percent vacancy rate during the first quarter of 2017. The average apartment rent of \$1,623 was up nearly 5 percent. The National Low Income Housing Coalition's statistics on affordable housing in Santa Rosa currently list the fair market rate for a two-bedroom rental as \$1,887/month.

The Council has considered the homelessness emergency in the City, as well as the housing and affordable housing crisis in the City. Homelessness affects people of all ages, families, adults, and children. Homelessness takes a dire toll on human beings; people experiencing homelessness are subjected to more health conditions and violence relative to those with housing. The toll of homelessness on a human being is so significant that it reduces a person's life expectancy by an average of 25 years. Consolidating the Catholic Charities Programs that already operate out of multiple buildings on the Project Site in one building would allow Catholic Charities to provide its services to more homeless families efficiently, serve a greater number of people, and provide new programs to better assist the City's homeless population. The proposed Project would allow 62 more residents in the Family Support Center, 8 more residents in the Transitional Residency Program, and 56 more daily clients to the Coordinated Entry Program. Of the new programs in the proposed Project, the proposed Project would allow 40 residents in the Nightingale Program and 90 daily clients at the medical services office.

Providing Affordable Housing Downtown

The Caritas Homes portion of this Project would provide up to 128 new housing units, all of which, with the exception of two units for building managers, will be priced affordable for

lower income households consistent with California Health and Safety Code Section 50053. This would contribute to the City's efforts to meet the demand for affordable housing.

Providing New Employment Opportunities

The proposed Project would create 65 new jobs at the Caritas Center. It is important to the City to continue to support the creation of jobs.

D. Determination and Adoption of Statement of Overriding Considerations

The City Council has weighed the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed Project, as set forth above, against the significant unavoidable impacts of the Project identified in the EIR.

The City Council hereby determines that those benefits, namely, provide more homeless services to more homeless families, provide affordable housing sited near the Downtown Transit Mall and SMART Station, and support the creation of new jobs, outweigh the risks and adverse environmental impacts of the Project, and further determine that the Project's significant unavoidable impacts are acceptable.

Accordingly, the City Council hereby adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations, recognizing that significant unavoidable impacts will result from implementation of the Project. Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, as discussed in the EIR; (ii) rejected alternatives to the Project, as discussed in the EIR; and (iii) recognized the significant unavoidable impacts of the Project, the City Council hereby finds that each of the separate benefits of the proposed Project, as stated herein, is determined to be unto itself an overriding consideration, independent of other benefits, that warrants approval of the Project and outweighs and overrides its significant unavoidable impacts, and thereby justifies the approval of the Project.

EXHIBIT C

TO CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. ____

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
FOR THE CARITAS VILLAGE PROJECT**

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
Section 3.2 Air Quality				
<p>MM AQ-1: Implement Construction Best Management Practices.</p> <p>The applicant shall require all construction contractors to implement the basic construction mitigation measures recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to reduce fugitive dust emissions. While additional measures may be identified by the BAAQMD or contractor as appropriate, emission reduction measures will include, at a minimum, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) will be watered two times per day; b) all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material offsite will be covered; c) all visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads will be removed using wet power 	<p>The Applicant and Contractor</p>	<p>During construction</p>	<p>During construction regular inspections shall be performed by an Applicant representative and reports shall be kept on file by the Applicant for inspection by the BAAQMD, City, or other interested parties.</p>	<p>Visible particles and construction dust are kept to the lowest practicable level during construction periods. Activities that would generate air quality complaints from the public are avoided</p>

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
<p>vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited;</p> <p>d) all vehicle speeds on unpaved roads will be limited to 15 miles per hour;</p> <p>e) all roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved will be completed as soon as possible. Building pads will be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used; and</p> <p>f) idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or by reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</p> <p>g) all construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.</p> <p>h) a publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the City regarding dust complaints. This person will respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD phone number will also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</p>				

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
i) substitute electrified equipment for diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment where practical.				
MM AQ-2: Minimize Exhaust Emissions. Exhaust emissions shall be minimized during construction activities with the use of off-road equipment engines that meet or exceed the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) Tier 3 or Tier 4 engine emissions standards for large (greater than 120 horsepower [hp]) off-road equipment. At a minimum, all welding rigs, dozers, and graders shall be certified as compliant with the Tier 4 engine emissions standards as provided in CCR, Title 13, section 2423(b)(1)(B). Engines can achieve these standards through the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, or other options as they become available.	The Applicant and Contractor	During construction	During construction regular inspections shall be performed by an Applicant representative and reports shall be kept on file by the Applicant for inspection by the BAAQMD, City, or other interested parties.	CARB Tier 3 or Tier 4 equipment will be used for all construction equipment greater than 120 hp. Construction emissions are minimized to meet CARB’s standards.
MM- AQ-3: MERV Filtration System Rating. The applicant shall require that a minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV) filter rating of 13 be used for the indoor air filtration system within both the Caritas Center and Caritas Home facilities.	The Applicant and Contractor	Post-Construction	All indoor air filters shall be inspected for a MERV filter rating of 13.	Indoor air pollutants are minimized post-construction.
Section 3.3 Biological Resources				
MM BIO-1: Avoid Disturbance of Nesting Birds. If project activities occur during the nesting season for native birds (February 1 to August 31), the following measures shall be implemented to avoid or	The Applicant	Prior to and during construction	The survey(s) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist	No disturbance of special status species or nesting birds

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
<p>minimize the potential for adverse impacts on nesting migratory birds and raptors:</p> <p>A pre-construction nesting bird survey for species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code will be conducted by a qualified biologist within a 250-foot radius of proposed construction activities for passerines and a 500-foot radius for raptors no more than 2 weeks prior to the start of construction activities.</p> <p>If an active nest is found, the qualified biologist will establish an appropriate no-work buffer around the nest, unless a smaller buffer zone is approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Construction within the no-work buffer may resume once it is determined by a qualified biologist that the young have left the nest. If a lapse in construction activities of 7 days or more occurs during the nesting season, an additional nesting bird survey is recommended to ensure that no nests were established in the area while construction activities were on hold.</p>			<p>and a brief survey report shall be documented and kept on file by the Applicant.</p>	<p>covered under the MBTA. Exclusion buffers and fencing shall be installed and monitored as necessary.</p>
<p>MM BIO-2: Tree Replanting.</p> <p>Removed trees will be mitigated through replanting, following all terms and conditions included in the City's tree ordinance permit.</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>During and post-construction</p>	<p>The Applicant shall verify that the removal and replanting of trees is followed per the City's tree ordinance.</p>	<p>Impacts to trees that are removed as a result of the project would be avoided by appropriately replanting trees,</p>

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
				per the City's tree ordinance.
Section 3.4 Cultural Resources				
<p>MM CUL-1: Salvage Report. A Salvage Report shall be prepared prior to the demolition of the relevant structure(s). This report shall identify character-defining features of each of the individual buildings, as well as the broader St. Rose Historic Preservation District. Based upon these identification efforts, noteworthy materials, and architectural features at 520 and/or 608 Morgan Streets shall be identified for potential salvage and reuse throughout the district or, if agreed upon by relevant City staff, other historic preservation districts within the City that have comparable architectural character, historical significance, and period of construction where reuse would not be deemed inappropriate. The Salvage Report shall be prepared by an architectural historian or historic architect that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Professional Qualifications. Local preservation groups and the City shall be consulted in the preparation of the Salvage Report and all relevant plans.</p>	The Applicant	Prior to construction	The Applicant shall develop the Salvage Report prior to construction activities by a qualified historian or historic architect.	Impacts to relevant structures are avoided or appropriately document for defining features.
<p>MM CUL-2: Public Report Documentation. The buildings at 520 and 608 Morgan Streets shall be documented prior to commencement of demolition of those structures. This documentation will be</p>	The Applicant	Prior to construction	The buildings at 520 and 608 Morgan Street will be	The buildings at 520 and 608 are appropriately cataloged in accordance with

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
<p>consistent with the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation Level II, although will not require submittal to the Library of Congress. The HABS-like documentation shall include large format photographs and a written history of the properties, including historical contexts related to the St. Rose Historic Preservation District. Materials shall be prepared by an architectural historian, historic architect, or historian that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications. Produced materials shall be submitted to local repositories, which should include the City of Santa Rosa Public Library and the Museum of Sonoma County. While public documentation is instrumental in understanding and cataloguing alterations to historical resources, it should be noted that Section II.C-Demolition in the Design Guidelines specifically states that public documentation is not sufficient as a stand-alone mitigation measure.</p>			<p>appropriately cataloged and analyzed by a qualified historic architect or architectural historian. All produced materials shall be submitted to the applicable parties.</p>	<p>regulations and the appropriate parties are notified.</p>
<p>MM CUL-3: Interpretive Materials. At least three sets of interpretive materials related to the history of the property as well as the broader St. Rose Historic Preservation Historic District shall be produced and installed. The exact medium of the interpretive materials will not be specified so as not to inhibit creativity, although minimal efforts include panels, signage, museum exhibits, or interactive</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Prior to and post-construction</p>	<p>The Applicant shall develop the interpretative sign and ensure that it is approved through the Santa Rosa Cultural Heritage Board,</p>	<p>Impacts related the impacted structures will be cataloged and presented to the public through interpretative materials.</p>

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
<p>landscape elements, such as play elements or site furnishings.</p> <p>Interpretive materials shall be located adjacent to, and accessible from, the public right-of-way, and in the vicinity of the following: 1) the Catholic Charities entrance area; 2) the homes entrance area; and 3) the entrance near the parking lot. The specific historical themes reflected at each specific location a should reflect on the development of the St. Rose Historic District and associated historic contexts and themes. Interpretive materials shall feature physical elements that reflect the character-defining features of the historic district, including materials, architectural forms, details, and other unifying elements. Proposed interpretive material designs, including narratives, will be presented to the Santa Rosa Cultural Heritage Board for comment and approval prior to installation.</p>			prior to placement.	
<p>MM CUL-4: Compatible Design.</p> <p>The developer of the project shall work with a historic architect or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards to ensure that the proposed project meets the relevant requirements of the City of Santa Rosa Design Guidelines, particularly under Section 2.4: Historic Districts within the Downtown Area and Station Area and Section 4.7: Historic Properties and Districts-III.G-new Construction. A presentation will be made to the Santa Rosa Cultural Heritage Board that outlines the finalized project</p>	The Applicant	Prior to construction, during final design.	The applicant shall verify that a historic architect or architectural historian is consulted during the final design phase for the project to ensure that applicable regulations at met.	The Santa Rosa Cultural Heritage Board shall approve the design prior to issuance of a building permit. The design of the project shall be consistent

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
design and its compatibility with the surrounding historic district; this will be subject to Cultural Heritage Board comments and approval.				
<p>MM CUL-5: Cultural Resource Awareness Training.</p> <p>Prior to the initiation of the project, a cultural resources training shall be provided to supervisors, the contract foreman, construction crew members, and any additional key construction personnel. A qualified archaeologist shall administer the training. The purpose of the training is to increase awareness and knowledge of cultural resources and appropriate protocols in the event of an inadvertent discovery. The training shall include a discussion of the procedures for stopping work and notification of key City personnel if an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources occurs during project construction. If human remains are discovered, the appropriate protocols shall also be discussed. Upon completion of the training, participants shall be able to define cultural resources, describe the policies and procedures for identifying and protecting cultural resources, know how to locate and receive assistance from the qualified archaeologist and coordinate with other sources, and describe steps to be taken when cultural resources are encountered during project implementation. All new construction personnel added after construction commences shall receive the same training and orientation before working onsite.</p>	The Applicant	Prior to and during construction	The training shall be conducted by a qualified Applicant representative and documented (by sign-in or other method) by the Applicant's contractor for the dates the training occurred, and the staff trained. Retention of the Cultural Resource Awareness Training reference pamphlets shall also be kept on the construction site and within the Applicant's files.	Construction personnel are trained in the key characteristics for identifying and avoiding impacts to cultural resources.

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
If Native American monitors are used, it shall be necessary for tribal representatives to also participate in the training.				
<p>MM CUL-6: Construction Monitoring.</p> <p>If evidence of any prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits are discovered during excavation or other earth-moving activities, the qualified archaeologist shall assess the significance of the find(s) and determine the appropriate treatment. Appropriate treatment may include recordation and/or additional excavation. A monitoring report shall be completed by the archaeological monitor at the end of construction. This report shall include a brief summary of the pre-construction cultural resource awareness training and the results of monitoring. The monitoring report shall be kept on file with the City.</p>	The Applicant	During construction	A qualified archeologist shall report and asses any find(s) in accordance with applicable regulations. The monitoring report shall be kept on file by the Applicant and submitted to the City of their records.	Previously undiscovered cultural resources are protected and avoided throughout construction activities.
<p>MM CUL-7: Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources.</p> <p>If prehistoric or historic-era cultural resources are encountered during the course of grading or construction, all ground-disturbing activities within 50 feet of the find shall cease. The qualified archaeologist shall evaluate the significance of the resources and recommend appropriate treatment measures. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(A), project redesign and preservation in place shall be the preferred means to avoid impacts</p>	The Applicant	During construction	If prehistoric or historic-era resources are encountered during any project- related activity, the Applicant shall comply with the requirements of this mitigation measure and	The recording, evaluation, and treatment of any discovered prehistoric or historic-era resources is applied in accordance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
<p>to significant archaeological sites. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C), if it is demonstrated that resources cannot be avoided, the qualified archaeologist shall develop additional treatment measures in consultation with the City, which may include data recovery or other appropriate measures. The City shall consult with appropriate Native American representatives in determining appropriate treatment for unearthed cultural resources if the resources are prehistoric or Native American in nature. Archaeological materials recovered during any investigation shall be curated at an accredited curational facility. The qualified archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting evaluation and additional treatment of the resource. A copy of the report shall be provided to the City and to the Northwest information Center. Construction shall recommence based on direction of the qualified archaeologist.</p>			<p>appropriate documentation provided to applicable agencies.</p>	
<p>MM CUL-8: Procedures for Human Burials Encountered During Construction. If ground-disturbing activities uncover previously unknown human remains, Section 7050.5 of Health and Safety Code (HSC) applies, and the following procedures shall be followed: There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the area where the human remains were found or within 100 feet of the find until the Sonoma County Coroner and the appropriate City of Santa</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>During construction</p>	<p>If human remains are encountered (or are suspected) during any project-related activity, the Applicant shall comply with the requirements of the HSC as</p>	<p>The recording, evaluation, and treatment of any discovered human remains is applied in accordance with this mitigation measure.</p>

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
<p>Rosa representative are contacted. Duly authorized representatives of the Coroner and the City shall be permitted onto the project site and shall take all actions consistent with HSC Section 7050.5 and Government Code Sections 27460, et seq.</p> <p>Excavation or disturbance of the area where the human remains were found and an area within 100 feet of the find shall not be permitted to recommence until the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to the provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death.</p> <p>If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the “most likely descendant” (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The MLD may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the landowner shall reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance. If the landowner does not accept the MLD’s recommendations, the owner or the MLD may request mediation by NAHC.</p>			outlined in this mitigation measure.	

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
Section 3.7 Noise				
<p>MM NOI-1: Construction Hours. Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM on Saturdays, with no noise generating construction on Sundays or holidays.</p>	The Applicant and Contractor	During construction	The Applicant shall document timing of construction activities and verify that construction timing restrictions are being met throughout construction activities.	Compliance with construction hour limitations.
<p>MM NOI-2: Construction Activity. Implementation of the following multi-part mitigation plan is required to reduce the potential construction period noise impacts. Use a comprehensive program of noise prevention through planning and mitigation and consider noise impacts as a crucial factor in project approval. Construct noise barriers such as temporary walls or piles of excavated material between noisy activities and noise-sensitive receivers. Site equipment on the construction lot as far away from noise-sensitive sites as possible. Construct walled enclosures around especially noisy activities or clusters of noisy equipment. For</p>	The Applicant and Contractor	Prior to and during construction	During construction, regular inspections shall be performed for construction noise prevention measures by an Applicant representative and reports shall be kept on file by the Applicant for inspection interested parties.	Noise throughout construction activities is minimized. Sensitive receptors are notified of possible construction noise in compliance with this measure.

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
<p>example, shields can be used around pavement breakers, and loaded vinyl curtains can be draped under elevated structures.</p> <p>Combine noisy operations to occur in the same time period. The total noise level produced shall not be significantly greater than the level produced if the operations were performed separately.</p> <p>Avoid nighttime activities. Sensitivity to noise increases during the nighttime hours in residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>Use rammed aggregate piers instead of pile driving to reinforce soils for the upper 20 feet of the project site to avoid impacts associated with pile driving.</p> <p>Use specially quieted equipment, such as quieted and enclosed air compressors or mufflers, on all engines.</p> <p>Select quieter demolition methods where possible. For example, sawing bridge decks into sections that can be loaded onto trucks results in lower cumulative noise levels than impact demolition by pavement breakers.</p> <p>Post a construction site notice that includes the following information: job site address, permit number, name and phone number of the contractor and owner or owner's agent, hours of construction allowed by code or any discretionary approval for the site, and City telephone numbers where violations can be reported. The notice shall be posted and maintained at the construction site prior to the start of construction and displayed in a</p>				

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
location that is readily visible to the public and approved by the City.				
Section 3.8 Transportation				
<p>MM TRANS-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>A traffic management plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance for construction activities of any construction permits. The traffic management plan shall be prepared in accordance with both the California’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and Work Area Traffic Control Handbook. The traffic management plan shall route trucks into the sites avoiding 7th Street, A Street north of 7th Street, and Morgan Street north of 7th Street as much as possible. Avoiding these streets keeps construction traffic removed from the sensitive single-family homes along Morgan and A Streets. The traffic management plan shall also include strategies for minimizing impacts to traffic, effectively managing traffic flow and reducing the number of trips accessing the project site during the peak hours of 7 AM to 9 AM and 4 PM to 6 PM These strategies shall include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary traffic control plan that addresses traffic safety and control through the work zone; Directing construction traffic with a flagger; Placing temporary signage, lighting, and traffic control devices if required, including but not 	The Applicant and Contractor	Prior to and during construction	The Applicant shall monitor and coordinate with the contractor during construction meetings to ensure that the construction management plan is implemented successfully as documented in inspection logs, and the construction traffic management plan shall remain on file at the Applicant offices and provided to the City for their files.	<p>Traffic flow remains at acceptable levels during construction. Emergency access is not restricted and remains reasonably possible at all times.</p> <p>The project area remains in compliance with all applicable transportation goals, policies, and requirements.</p>

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
<p>limited to appropriate signage along access routes to indicate the presences of heavy vehicles and construction traffic;</p> <p>Require parking within designated areas on the project site and prohibit parking along the shoulders of adjacent roadways.</p> <p>Provide for emergency vehicle movement through the project site at all times during construction and operation.</p> <p>Provide approved offsite parking for workers with shuttle services to transport them onsite when and if onsite parking becomes restricted or unfeasible.</p> <p>Facilitate materials delivery during off-peak traffic hours and comply with regulations governing oversized loads.</p> <p>Encourage vanpool and carpool for construction employees commuting to the project site.</p>				
Section 3.11 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
<p>MM HAZ-1: Removal of Biohazardous and Medical Waste.</p> <p>Prior to construction, the applicant shall retain a certified biohazardous waste contractor to inspect the project site and determine if biohazardous and medical waste are present. If present, the certified contractor would remediate the project site in accordance with the California Department of Public Health regulations and the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) worker safety requirements. The certified contractor would</p>	The Applicant	Prior to construction	The Applicant shall ensure that the certified biohazards waste contractor inspected the site prior to construction activities and document any biohazardous or	The project site will be appropriately remediated for biohazardous and medical wastes in compliance with Cal/OSHA and the California Department of

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
dispose of all biohazardous and medical waste at a certified medical waste processing facility in accordance with the California Medical Waste Management Act to ensure that these materials are not released into the environment.			medical wastes that are removed.	Public Health requirements.
<p>MM HAZ-2: Removal of Asbestos Containing Materials and/or Lead Based Paint. A comprehensive survey for the presence of asbestos-containing material and lead-based paint shall be conducted at the project site prior to any demolition activities. Demolition of buildings containing asbestos materials or lead based paint must be achieved in accordance with state and federal regulations, including the United States Environmental Protection Agencies (USEPA) Asbestos National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, Cal/OSHA’s Construction Lead Standard (8 CCR 1432.1), and California Department of Toxic Substances Control and USEPA requirements for disposal of hazardous waste. Disposal of any asbestos-containing materials or lead-based paint found on the site shall be carried out by a contractor trained and qualified to conduct lead- or asbestos-related construction work and in accordance with the appropriate state and federal standards to ensure that these materials are not released into the air in the project vicinity.</p>	The Applicant	Prior to and during construction	Documentation of the survey shall be kept on file at the Applicants office and provided to the City for their records. Demolition of buildings documented for asbestos containing materials or lead based paint shall comply with federal and State regulations outline in this measure.	Impacts related to release of asbestos or lead are minimized and applicable state and federal regulations are met.
MM HAZ-3: Install Sharps Kiosk Station.	The Applicant	Prior to and post-construction	The Applicant shall ensure that	Impacts related to biohazards are

Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring and Reporting Program	Standards for Success
<p>The applicant shall obtain a Home-Generated Sharps Consolidation Point permit from Sonoma County to install a Sharps Kiosk at the project site. The kiosk shall be placed onsite in an area that is accessible to visitors and residents. The applicant shall retain a biohazardous waste contractor to collect the hazardous materials from the kiosk weekly and transport them to a certified medical waste processing facility for disposal in accordance with the California Medical Waste Management Act.</p>			<p>the Sharps Kiosk is installed on the project site prior to building construction.</p>	<p>minimized on the project site.</p>
<p>MM HAZ-4: Install Environmental Design Features.</p> <p>The applicant must install environmental design features at the project site to reduce illicit behaviors such as loitering, trespassing, littering and garbage, disposal of sharps, and bathroom incivility. The design features must include additional lighting, camera surveillance, provision of proper disposal containers, or other design features approved by the City.</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Prior to and post-construction</p>	<p>The Applicant shall incorporate environmental design features that will reduce illicit behaviors into the design of the project. The design plans shall be approved by the City prior to issuance of a building permit.</p>	<p>Impacts related to illicit behaviors are minimized.</p>