Exhibit A

FINDINGS OF FACT FOR THE

ROSELAND CREEK COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN

I.
INTRODUCTION

The City of Santa Rosa ("City"), as lead agency, prepared an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") for the proposed Roseland Creek Community Park Master Plan ("Master Plan" or just "Plan"). In its entirety, the Final EIR consists of the April 2024 Draft EIR ("Draft EIR" or "EIR"), the September 2024 Responses to Comments, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), (State Clearinghouse No. 2022080148).

These findings have 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.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Location

Santa Rosa is located in central Sonoma County, in the north-western part of the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. Santa Rosa is about 55 miles north of San Francisco and 70 miles southwest of Sacramento. The approximately 19.49-acre project site consists of four City-owned parcels located at 1027 McMinn Avenue, and 1360, 1370 and 1400 Burbank Avenue in the Roseland area of southwest Santa Rosa, Sonoma County. The project site is bounded by Burbank Avenue to the west, McMinn Avenue to the east, and private residential property to the north and south.

B. Project Description

The project proposes to construct a new community park to serve the Roseland neighborhood. The proposed Master Plan for the park shows two paved vehicle entrances to the park, both from Burbank Avenue. Each of the two entrances leads to a small parking lot, the more northerly lot containing 19 parking spaces and the southerly lot containing 17 parking spaces. The proposed parking lots would both include a vehicular gate that would restrict access after-hours.

The parking lots would be added concurrent with the proposed improvements they are intended to serve on each side of Roseland Creek. A multi-use trail runs from the southwest corner of the site to the northeast corner, following the south side of the Roseland Creek riparian corridor across the southern portion of the site and crossing the creek near the eastern park boundary. The proposed multi-use trail creek crossing would be a prefabricated bridge placed on abutments outside the top of bank. The multi–use trail meanders through the oak woodland habitat area in the center of the site and connects to McMinn Avenue. The trail would be a paved 10-foot-wide path with two-foot-wide gravel shoulders on either side, providing ADA access. A network of smaller trails and walkways would provide pedestrian circulation throughout the park, providing interconnectivity to the other features of the park as well as a pedestrian connection between the Burbank Avenue and McMinn Avenue neighborhoods on the west and east sides of the park. A secondary creek crossing on the western side of the park to connect the smaller proposed trails would also be a prefabricated bridge placed on abutments outside the top of bank. All proposed parking areas and walkways would be constructed with permeable pavement, except for areas where extra support is needed for ADA compliance.

The park is designed to preserve and enhance the habitat values of the existing grassland, oak woodland, riparian and purple needlegrass habitat areas on the site. Trails, interpretive signs, and upland habitat restoration in existing grasslands are proposed for the northern section of the park. The City, in coordination with community groups, would plant native grassland species to enhance and restore habitat in the northern section of the park. The central portion of the site contains the oak woodland habitat, which would be left intact and would also contain trails and interpretive signs. A nature center and restroom building would be constructed near the parking lot on the west side of the park, north of the creek. A picnic area and outdoor classroom or community garden are proposed to be located along the northern side of the riparian corridor at the edge of the oak woodland.

On the south side of the riparian corridor, there would be a restroom near the parking lot, picnic areas (including single-use BBQs), a nature-themed play area, a lawn area, and sports court. A trail surrounding the lawn and play areas would include fitness stations. The existing purple needlegrass grassland area near the southeast corner of the site would be preserved, with trails encircling it. A potential future off-site trail connection to the multi-use trail is proposed near the eastern park boundary along the south side of Roseland Creek.

The proposed park would operate from sunrise (6:00 a.m.) to sunset (6:00 p.m. PST or 9:00 p.m. PDT), seven days per week consistent with City policies. The proposed parking lots would include vehicular gates that would restrict access after-hours. The proposed gates would be opened and closed manually on a daily basis by the City.

Development of the proposed park on the project site would adhere to existing conservation easements on 1027 McMinn Avenue, and 1360 and 1400 Burbank Avenue that are held by the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District (SCAPOSD). A conservation easement would also likely be granted for 1370 Burbank Avenue by the SCAPOSD. The conservation easement restricts development on the northerly two parcels to the development of minor structures and improvements in connection with low-intensity and educational uses. Impervious surfaces on the northerly parcels are also restricted to five percent of the total easement

area. The conservation easement for 1400 Burbank Avenue limits structures and improvements within the "Natural Area" along Roseland Creek to trails and associated bridges which may provide emergency vehicle access. The easement also designates an "Oak Preservation Area" that allows for improvements in connection with low-intensity recreational and educational uses. Park improvements shall not result in impervious surfaces of more than 20 percent on the 1400 Burbank Avenue property. A conservation easement is anticipated to be granted for 1370 Burbank Avenue with similar provisions to the existing conservation easements on the project site and consistent with the proposed Master Plan.

C. Project Objectives

Based on substantial community input received in over 30 meetings for the project, the City has identified a variety of objectives for the proposed park, as described below.

The City's core objectives for Roseland Creek Community Park include the following:

- Increase park acreage in the southwest area of the City to meet General Plan standards of 3.5 acres of City parks per 1,000 residents, and
- Provide a publicly accessible Community Park in the Roseland area to serve residents generally within a one-mile radius with equal opportunities for passive and active recreation, and
- Develop park uses consistent with conservation easements held for the property by SCAPOSD, and
- Provide amenities for the site consistent with input provided by tribal nations registered with the City of Santa Rosa such as providing drinking fountains, restrooms, group picnic areas, barbecues, parking near play equipment and picnic areas, parking for elders, interpretation of tree species, and
- Provide non-permeable bicycle and pedestrian public access across and throughout the site for community members of all abilities, including ADA-compliant features to provide equal access for all, and
- Provide large industry standard and natural youth play equipment with areas for children ages 2-5 and 5-12, and
- Provide for emergency vehicle access to all areas of the park to ensure public safety.

The City's full objectives for Roseland Creek Community Park, include the following:

- Provide spaces for picnic events, site specific unique features, natural areas, community gardens and a recreational facility for community use, and
- Provide fitness equipment and sport court areas for promoting a healthy lifestyle, and
- Provide one large, irrigated lawn area or artificial turf to allow for casual picnicking, casual ball and frisbee type play, yoga, casual children's activities and similar recreation on a stable lawn or artificial turf surface, and
- Provide active uses such as community garden and outdoor classroom gathering area, and

- Provide a park that minimizes the number of trees that need to be removed to improve the park site and provide recreation, and
- Provide interpretive and educational signs throughout the park in at least three different languages, and
- Provide fencing that will function as a natural barrier between vehicles and pedestrians traveling adjacent to Burbank Avenue and to help guide students to the future street crossing.

D. Discretionary Approvals

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

The proposed project would require the following approvals and discretionary and ministerial actions by the City of Santa Rosa:

- City Council
  - Certification of the EIR pursuant to CEQA
  - Adoption of the Master Plan

Future activity that could occur following certification of the EIR includes, but is not limited to, the following, provided they are consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and comply with CEQA:

- Conservation easement(s).
- Funding approval of capital projects.
  Issuance of permits and other approvals that may be necessary for implementation of the proposed project.

Responsible and Trustee Agencies

State law requires that all EIRs be reviewed by Responsible and Trustee Agencies. A Responsible Agency, defined pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15381, includes all public agencies other than the Lead Agency which have discretionary approval power over actions taken as a result of implementing the proposed project. A Trustee Agency is defined in Section 15386 of the CEQA Guidelines as a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project that are held in trust for the people of the State of California. Responsible and Trustee Agencies were provided the Notice of Preparation and Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR. Implementation of the proposed project could require subsequent actions or consultation from Responsible or Trustee Agencies.

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

- North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District (SCAPOSD)

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 August 8, 2022. 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 # 2022080148) and a 30-day public review period ended on September 9, 2022. The City also held a scoping meeting on August 17, 2022 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 City published the Draft EIR (SCH# 2022080148) for public and agency review on April 25, 2024. A public review period of 53 days was provided on the Draft EIR, which period ended on June 17, 2024. 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 September 13, 2024. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, the Final EIR includes responses to all comments received by the City of Santa Rosa on the Draft EIR.

On __, the City Council held a public meeting to consider whether to certify the Final EIR and whether to approve/implement the Master Plan and the related CEQA findings of fact and mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP).

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 Plan includes the following documents:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the Master Plan;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP;
- The Notice of Availability of and the Draft EIR for the Master Plan and all appendices;

- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR;
- The Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR for the Master Plan;
- Documents cited or referenced in the Draft EIR and Responses to Comments;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Master Plan;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the City Council in connection with the Master Plan and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Master Plan 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 Master Plan;
- All documents submitted to the City by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Master Plan, up through the close of the City Council public hearing on September 24, 2024;
- Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the City in connection with the Plan;
- 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 Plan, 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 Jen Santos, Parks Deputy Director, City of Santa Rosa, Recreation and Parks Department, 55 Stony Point Road, Santa Rosa, CA 95401.

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 (or Plans) 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 Plan, 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 terms "avoid" or "avoided" refer to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant 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 modifications 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.)

Analysis conducted in the EIR concluded that implementation of the Master Plan would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts. Therefore, a Statement of Overriding Considerations is not required. Further, findings rejecting alternatives are required only if one or more significant environmental effects will not be avoided by mitigation measures. An agency need not make findings rejecting alternatives described in the EIR if all of the project's significant impacts will be avoided by mitigation measures. Thus, because all of the project's potentially significant impacts will be reduced to insignificant levels by the mitigation measures identified in the EIR, findings rejecting the project alternatives discussed in the EIR also are not required.

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 Master Plan 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 Master Plan and these findings.

VII.
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared for the Plan 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 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 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 evaluated the potential for implementation of the Master Plan to result in potentially significant environmental effects (or impacts) that the Master Plan will cause or to which it will contribute. As discussed and demonstrated in the EIR, all of the potentially significant impacts associated with the Master Plan can be fully avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. The City Council's findings 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.

Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines does not require specific findings to address environmental effects that an EIR identifies as having "no impact" or a "less than significant" impact. However, these findings account for all resource categories where environmental effects could potentially result. Table A does not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, Table A provides a summary description of each impact, describes the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and adopted by the City Council, and states the City Council'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 Final EIR, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in those documents supporting the Final EIR's determinations regarding the Project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In addition, the City Council Staff Report for certification of the EIR and approval or recommendation on approval of the Master Plan and City Council Resolution No._ include discussions supporting the Final 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 Final EIR, the City Council Staff Report for certification of the EIR and approval of the Master Plan, and Resolution No. ___and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR and City Council Staff Report for certification of the Final EIR and approval of the Master Plan and 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.

IX.
GROWTH INDUCEMENT

CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR "discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)). This analysis must also consider the removal of obstacles to population growth, such as improvements in the regional transportation system.

As discussed and demonstrated in Section 4.0 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would develop a community park within a residential neighborhood. The project would not generate any

new residents or jobs within the City. Therefore, the project would not foster or stimulate significant economic or population growth in the surrounding environment.

X.
SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

CEQA Guideline section 15126(c) requires an EIR to discuss significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved if the proposed project is implemented. A resource commitment is considered irretrievable when the use or consumption of the resource is neither renewable nor recoverable for use by future generations. Irreversible changes and irretrievable commitments of non-renewable resources anticipated by the proposed project include the following issues. The Master Plan would involve two types of resources: (1) general industrial resources including fuels and construction materials; and (2) project-specific resources such as land and biological resources on the project site.

As discussed and demonstrated in Section 5.0 of the Draft EIR, implementation of the Master Plan could result in the long-term commitment of various resources to the project site. During construction and operation of the project, nonrenewable resources would be consumed. Given the nature of the proposed community park, the project would not result in a substantial increase in demand for nonrenewable resources. Additionally, all projects in the City of Santa Rosa are required to meet CalGreen and Title 24 energy efficiency requirements, thus lessening overall energy demand. The project is located in an area with urban uses and would not result in development in an area where urban development does not already exist. The project proposes a community park that is not a uniquely hazardous use nor likely to cause environmental accidents that impact adjacent areas and would not result in irreversible damage that may result from environmental accidents.

XI.
ALTERNATIVES

A. Alternatives-Feasibility Analysis

1. Significant, Unavoidable Impacts of the Master Plan

All of the potential environmental impacts associated with adoption and implementation of the Master Plan were found to be either *less than significant* without mitigation or *less than significant with mitigation*. No impacts were determined to be *significant and unavoidable*.

Under CEQA, where a project's potentially significant impacts can all be reduced to insignificant levels solely by the adoption of mitigation measures, the agency, in drafting its required 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 Plan. (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); *Stevens v City of Glendale*

(1981) 125 CA3d 986, 996; *No Slo Transit, Inc. v City of Long Beach* (1987) 197 CA3d 241.)

2. **Scope of Necessary Findings and Considerations for Master Plan Alternatives**

As discussed in the subsection immediately above, because the all of the proposed project's potentially significant impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels through the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the EIR and MMRP, there is no legal requirement to make formal findings regarding the feasibility of the various alternatives. Nonetheless, for full disclosure and informational purposes, these findings will and do discuss issues related to the feasibility of the alternatives below. Under CEQA, "(f)easible 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 Master Plan, the project objectives described below were considered.

The City's core objectives for Roseland Creek Community Park include the following:

- Increase park acreage in the southwest area of the City to meet General Plan standards of 3.5 acres of City parks per 1,000 residents, and
- Provide a publicly accessible Community Park in the Roseland area to serve residents generally within a one-mile radius with equal opportunities for passive and active recreation, and
- Develop park uses consistent with conservation easements held for the property by SCAPOSD, and
- Provide amenities for the site consistent with input provided by tribal nations registered with the City of Santa Rosa such as providing drinking fountains, restrooms, group picnic areas, barbecues, parking near play equipment and picnic areas, parking for elders, interpretation of tree species, and
- Provide non-permeable bicycle and pedestrian public access across and throughout the site for community members of all abilities, including ADA-compliant features to provide equal access for all, and
- Provide large industry standard and natural youth play equipment with areas for children ages 2-5 and 5-12, and
- Provide for emergency vehicle access to all areas of the park to ensure public safety.

The City's full objectives for Roseland Creek Community Park, include the following:

- Provide spaces for picnic events, site specific unique features, natural areas, community gardens and a recreational facility for community use, and

- Provide fitness equipment and sport court areas for promoting a healthy lifestyle, and
- Provide one large, irrigated lawn area or artificial turf to allow for casual picnicking, casual ball and frisbee type play, yoga, casual children's activities and similar recreation on a stable lawn or artificial turf surface, and
- Provide active uses such as community garden and outdoor classroom gathering area, and
- Provide a park that minimizes the number of trees that need to be removed to improve the park site and provide recreation, and
- Provide interpretive and educational signs throughout the park in at least three different languages, and
- Provide fencing that will function as a natural barrier between vehicles and pedestrians traveling adjacent to Burbank Avenue and to help guide students to the future street crossing.

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 evaluated six Master Plan alternatives in accordance with the parameters set forth by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6. In addition, one other alternative was initially considered but determined to be infeasible and ultimately rejected from further consideration prior to release of the Draft EIR. The project alternatives were initially evaluated on their ability to meet the Master Plan objectives, feasibility, and whether they would avoid or substantially reduce the project's significant environmental impacts. Based on this initial evaluation, a Location Alternative was considered but ultimately rejected as the City's objective to locate a community park to serve Roseland residents, the existing General Plan designation for park use, the existing conservation easements, and park size would make finding an alternative location infeasible and an alternative location within Roseland would be subject to similar constraints as the project site.

Based on the requirements of CEQA Guidelines §15126.6 and the project objectives, the following alternatives to the project were identified:

- No Project Alternative,
- No Project – Existing General Plan Development Alternative,
- Active Use Master Plan Alternative,
- Artificial Turf Field Alternative,
- Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative, and
- 2010 Concept Plan Alternative.

The City Council finds that the range of alternatives studied in the EIR reflects a reasonable range and attempts to identify and evaluate various types of alternatives that would potentially be capable of reducing 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 Master Plan could reduce environmental impacts and the corresponding degree to which the alternatives would hinder the City's ability to achieve the project's objectives.

B. Analysis of Plan Alternatives

The Draft EIR identified and compared environmental effects of the six alternatives listed below with environmental impacts resulting from the Master Plan.

1. No Project Alternative

(a) Description

Consistent with Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project Alternative represents what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not adopted. The No Project Alternative assumes that the project site would remain as it is today with only remnant improvements such as foundations, building pads, driveways, refuse, fences, and underground utilities from the former residential uses on the site.

(b) Analysis of the No Project Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Impacts

Because no conditions would change the No Project Alternative would avoid all the project's environmental impacts.

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

The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives as no change would be made to the existing land uses at the site.

(d) Discussion of the No Project Alternative

Because the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives, it is much less desirable than the proposed Master Plan.

2. No Project – Existing General Plan Development Alternative

(a) Description

Under the No Project – Existing General Plan Development Alternative, the project is not approved and a portion of the project site (1370 Burbank Avenue) is redeveloped consistent with the General Plan designation of Medium – Density Residential. The Medium Density – Residential designation permits a range of housing types, including single family attached and multifamily developments with a density of 8.0-18.0 units per acre. Thus, development of the 2.61-acre parcel at 1370 Burbank Avenue (APN 125-252-003) would result in approximately 21 to 47 residential units. Associated infrastructure and roadway improvements would also be required to

accommodate the residential units. The City of Santa Rosa has an estimated 2.63 persons per household, thus, the 21 to 47 residential units would house approximately 55 to 124 residents.

(b) Analysis of the No Project – Existing General Plan Development Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Project Impacts

Because the No Project – Existing General Plan Development Alternative would require a longer and more intensive construction period, with more grading and paving required, construction and operation of residential development on the site would have more intensive impacts on the site when compared to the proposed project.

(c) Analysis of the No Project – Existing General Plan Development Alternative's Ability to Meet the Project Objectives

The No Project – Existing General Plan Development Alternative would result in development of a centrally located parcel on the project site with residential land uses and would not meet the City's objectives to provide a community park and associated facilities to the residents of Roseland.

(d) Discussion of No Project – Existing General Plan Development Alternative

The No Project – Existing General Plan Development Alternative, allowing development of residential units on-site, would have more intensive impacts, particularly for construction-related impacts. The No Project – Existing General Plan Development Alternative would not meet the City's project objectives. For these reasons, this alternative is also less desirable than the proposed Master Plan.

3. **Active Use Master Plan Alternative**

(a) Description

The Active Use Master Plan Alternative assumes a public gathering area with a restroom and shaded pavilion where the former residence at 1027 McMinn Avenue was located. A universally accessible path/trail network and fitness course would be provided throughout the park property with two bridges crossing Roseland Creek. A semi-circular driveway would be provided from Burbank Avenue in front of the nature center and would provide access to a single large parking lot for the nature center and dog park. A group picnic area and dog park would be provided behind the nature center on the 1370 Burbank Avenue property. An outdoor classroom with benches would be provided within the western portion of 1360 Burbank Avenue. South of Roseland Creek an expanded turf area would be provided with a picnic area along the southern property boundary. Other uses on the 1400 Burbank Avenue property would include sports courts, hydration station, picnic area, restroom, nature-themed play area, and Pomo interpretive area. This Master Plan Alternative would also construct sidewalk along the Burbank Avenue project frontage, on-street parking, and a bike lane.

(b) Analysis of the Active Use Master Plan Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Project Impacts

The Active Use Master Plan Alternative would result in increased construction period and operational air quality emissions, GHG emissions, and noise from construction activity and increased vehicle trips. This alternative would also increase biological impacts requiring mitigation due to the removal of the purple needlegrass habitat for the larger lawn area. Energy use during construction and water use during operation would also increase with this alternative.

(c) Analysis of the Active Use Master Plan Alternative's Ability to Meet the Project Objectives

The Active Use Master Plan Alternative would meet most of the City's core objectives of providing a publicly accessible park, developed consistent with existing conservation easements and ADA accessible spaces. The Active Use Master Plan Alternative would not meet the request of local tribes to provide parking near play areas and locations for barbecues and would provide more limited access for emergency vehicles to 1400 Burbank Avenue due to the lack of vehicular access from Burbank Avenue. The Active Use Master Plan Alternative would meet some of the City's full project objectives to provide gathering spaces, provide sport courts and fitness equipment, provide a lawn area, and provide active use amenities.

(d) Discussion of Active Use Master Plan Alternative

Although the Active Use Master Plan Alternative would meet many of the City's objectives for the proposed park it would reduce the amount of passive park space provided under the proposed project, it would not meet the request of local tribes to provide parking near play areas and locations for barbecues and it would provide more limited access for emergency vehicles to 1400 Burbank Avenue due to the lack of vehicular access from Burbank Avenue. Additionally, this alternative would increase paving, increase water use, and eliminate the purple needlegrass habitat on the site. In sum, this alternative, while meeting some City objectives, would ultimately result in increased impacts on the site and is thus less desirable than the proposed Master Plan.

4. **Artificial Turf Field Alternative**

(a) Description

The Artificial Turf Field Alternative assumes that the proposed multi-use lawn area would be landscaped with artificial turf rather than grass. All other components of the proposed project would remain the same. The intent of this alternative would be to reduce the amount of water use on the project site.

(b) Analysis of the Artificial Turf Field Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Project Impacts

This alternative would increase impacts to biological resources on the site as the artificial surface would be considered hardscape and may increase the need for mitigation credits. Energy

use and GHG emissions would be reduced during the operational phase given that the artificial turf field would not need to be mowed. LID treatment areas would need to be increased to capture and treat stormwater runoff from hardscape areas. All other environmental impacts would be the same as the proposed project.

(c) Analysis of the Artificial Turf Field Alternative's Ability to Meet the Project Objectives

The Artificial Turf Field Alternative would meet all of the objectives of the project as it would only change the type of field provided on the 1400 Burbank Avenue portion of the project site.

(d) Discussion of the Artificial Turf Field Alternative

Although the Artificial Turf Field Alternative would reduce water usage of 198 gallons per day and would meet all of the project's objectives, an artificial turf field would be considered an impervious surface that would require increased treatment for stormwater runoff and mitigation for biological resources when compared to the proposed project. The additional impervious surfaces proposed by this alternative and resulting increased treatment requirements and mitigation, would make this alternative less desirable than the proposed Master Plan.

5. **Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative**

(a) Description

The Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative is based on a proposal submitted to the City by a citizens' group as an alternative to the City's proposed Master Plan. This alternative assumes development of one, 12-space parking lot adjacent to a smaller nature center at 1370 Burbank Avenue and a native plant greenhouse/nursery. This alternative includes a secondary emergency vehicle access at 1400 Burbank Avenue but would not include any parking spaces in the park south of Roseland Creek. The area south of the creek would also include a children's play area, two picnic tables, and upland habitat restoration with native plants to replace the lawn area. On the northerly end of the park property near Burbank Avenue, three seasonal wetlands would be constructed, and additional upland habitat restoration would occur in the non-native grassland area on this portion of the site. The trail network for this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

(b) Analysis of the Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Project Impacts

The Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative would result in slightly less impacts in most resource areas due to the limited number of improvements on the site. Temporary construction impacts on the northernmost parcel on the site would increase due to the construction of seasonal wetlands and the need to import soil and construct conveyance features to supply water to the wetlands.

(c) Analysis of the Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative's Ability to Meet the Project Objectives

The Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative would provide some recreational opportunities, primarily for residents within walking distance of the site but would not meet the City's core objective of accommodating residents within a one-mile radius due to its reduced number of parking spaces. The Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative would not meet the City's core objectives of providing barbecues and parking in proximity to picnic and play areas. This alternative would provide more limited ADA-compliant features and reduce the variety of amenities available to the community as compared to the proposed project. This alternative would also not meet the City's full project objectives of providing community gardens, fitness equipment and sport court areas, or a lawn or turf area for recreational use. This alternative, therefore, would meet some of the project objectives but to a more limited extent.

(d) Discussion of the Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative

The Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative would meet some of the project objectives, primarily with a focus on passive recreational uses. However, this alternative would reduce the active recreational space on the site and provide more limited access to the park for Roseland area residents within the one-mile service radius of the park. This alternative would result in slightly less impacts in most resource areas due to the decrease in amenities proposed on the site but temporary construction impacts on the northernmost parcel would increase due to the construction of seasonal wetlands and the need to import soil and construct conveyance features to supply water to the proposed new wetlands. Importantly, based on a review by WRA, the watershed available to supply runoff to the proposed new wetland areas to be created under this alternative would likely be insufficient for these locations to establish wetland characteristics in normal and above average rainfall years. The constructed wetlands proposed in this alternative, therefore, may not be successful. This alternative would reduce access to the site, provide more limited amenities for the community, and construct wetlands that are unlikely to be successful on the site. For these reasons, this alternative is also less desirable than the proposed Master Plan.

6. **2010 Concept Plan Alternative**

(a) Description

The 2010 Concept Plan Alternative was an early iteration of the plan for construction of the Roseland Creek Community Park. The plan was prepared for the City with input from Roseland area residents. The 2010 Concept Plan Alternative would provide a nature center at 1370 Burbank Avenue accessed by a semi-circular driveway with a single, large parking lot. No vehicular access south of Roseland Creek would be provided. A large, constructed wetland would be located on the eastern side of 1370 Burbank Avenue with an adjacent outdoor classroom and just north of the Roseland Creek riparian zone. Four smaller constructed wetlands would be located in the northwestern portion of the park. Native grassland restoration areas would be located in the northeastern portion of the site. Trails would be located throughout the park and two bridges would cross Roseland Creek. A large lawn area would be located south of Roseland Creek. A picnic area, restroom, and children's play area would be located between the trail and lawn area on the western

side of 1400 Burbank Avenue. An additional picnic area and Pomo Interpretive Village would be located on the east side of the lawn area.

(b) Analysis of the 2010 Concept Plan Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Project Impacts

The 2010 Concept Plan Alternative would result in increased construction period impacts for air quality, energy, and GHG emissions due to the larger lawn area and construction of wetlands on the site. Biological resource impacts would increase due to the removal of purple needlegrass habitat and need for mitigation. Water use during operation of the project would increase due to the larger lawn area. All other resources area impacts would be similar to the project or slightly reduced.

(c) Analysis of the 2010 Concept Plan Alternative's Ability to Meet the Project Objectives

Development of a variety of recreational uses throughout the project site would meet most of the City's core objectives for the proposed park by serving residents within a one-mile radius, providing uses consistent with existing conservation easements, and ADA accessible trails. The 2010 Concept Plan Alternative would not meet the City's core objective to provide parking near play areas and locations for barbecues south of Roseland Creek. The 2010 Concept Plan Alternative would meet some of the City's full objectives by providing a large lawn area, picnic areas, and an outdoor classroom. This alternative, therefore, would meet some of the project objectives but to a more limited extent.

(d) Discussion of the 2010 Concept Plan Alternative

The 2010 Concept Plan Alternative would meet some of the project objectives but would result in greater maintenance requirements due to the construction of wetlands on the site. This alternative would also increase the amount of irrigation required due to the larger lawn area and impact the purple needlegrass habitat on the site. Additionally, WRA's review of the potential to construct wetlands on the site showed the watershed available to supply runoff to the proposed wetland areas would likely be insufficient for these locations to establish wetland characteristics in normal and above average rainfall years. The constructed wetlands proposed in this alternative, therefore, may not be successful. Due to the increased impacts to purple needlegrass habitat, increase in water use, and inclusion of constructed wetlands that are unlikely to succeed, this alternative has been determined to be less desirable than the proposed Master Plan.

7. **The Environmentally Superior Alternative**

The environmental effects of each alternative in relation to the proposed Master Plan are summarized in the table on the following page.

CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6) require the identification of an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives analyzed. If the alternative with the least environmental impact is the No Project Alternative, then the EIR must also identify the next most environmentally superior

alternative. The environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project is the No Project Alternative because all of the project's significant environmental impacts would be avoided. In addition to the No Project Alternative, the Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative would lessen several of the project's less than significant impacts due to reduced activity on the project site but would not meet all of the City's objectives for the project. Similar to the proposed project, the Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative would result in less than significant impacts for hydrology and water quality, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems and impacts mitigated to a less than significant level for biological resources, cultural resources, and noise. However, the slight reduction in impacts achieved by the Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative would be the result of a reduction in park amenities on the site south of Roseland Creek, including the removal of the following from the Master Plan: parking, restroom facilities, sports court, and lawn area. The removal of these proposed facilities would result in the Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative being only partially consistent with the City's objectives for the Community Park Master Plan. Given that the Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative would not meet the City's core objectives of accommodating residents within a one-mile radius due to its reduced number of parking spaces, would not provide parking in proximity to picnic and play areas, would limit ADA-compliant features, and would reduce the number of amenities available to the community, and because substantial evidence indicates that the Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative's proposal to construct new wetlands may not be successful given the natural characteristics of the site, the City deems the Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative to be less desirable than the proposed Master Plan.

Summary of Project and Project Alternative Impacts							
Impacts	**Proposed Project**	**No Project Alternative**	**No Project Existing GP Development Alternative**	**Active Use Alternative**	**Artificial Turf Field Alternative**	**Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative**	**2010 Concept Plan Alternative**
Aesthetics	LTS	**NI**	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Agricultural and Forestry Resources	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Air Quality	LTS	**NI**	*LTS*	*LTS*	LTS	LTS	LTS
Biological Resources	SM	**NI**	*SM*	*SM*	*SM*	**SM**	*SM*
Cultural Resources	SM	**NI**	SM	SM	SM	**SM**	SM
Energy	LTS	**NI**	*LTS*	*LTS*	LTS	LTS	LTS
Geology and Soils	LTS	**NI**	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LTS	**NI**	*LTS*	*LTS*	LTS	LTS	LTS
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	SM	**NI**	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM
Hydrology and Water Quality	LTS	**NI**	LTS	*LTS*	LTS	**LTS**	**LTS**
Land Use	LTS	**NI**	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
Mineral Resources	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Noise	SM	**NI**	*SM*	*SM*	SM	**SM**	SM
Population and Housing	NI	**NI**	LTS	NI	NI	NI	NI
Public Services	LTS	**NI**	*LTS*	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Summary of Project and Project Alternative Impacts							
Impacts	**Proposed Project**	**No Project Alternative**	**No Project Existing GP Development Alternative**	**Active Use Alternative**	**Artificial Turf Field Alternative**	**Neighborwood Master Plan Alternative**	**2010 Concept Plan Alternative**
Recreation	NI	**NI**	LTS	NI	NI	NI	NI
Transportation/Traffic	LTS	**NI**	*LTS*	LTS	LTS	**LTS**	LTS
Tribal Cultural Resources	SM	**NI**	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM
Utilities and Service Systems	LTS	**NI**	*LTS*	*LTS*	LTS	**LTS**	*LTS*
Wildfire	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Meets City's Objectives?	Yes	No	No	Partially	Yes	Partially	Partially
Notes: SU = Significant unavoidable impact; SM = Significant impact, but can be mitigated to a less than significant level; LTS = Less than significant impact; and NI = No impact. **Bold** text indicates being environmentally superior to the proposed project where the impact is to a lesser extent. *Italicized* text indicates increased effect with same overall impact as project.							

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Biological Resources			
Impact BIO-1a: Demolition of the footbridge and tree removal on the project site could potentially impact special-status bat species that may use them as a roost, and could result in the direct removal, abandonment, or destruction of the maternity roost. **(Significant Impact)**	**MM BIO-1a.1:** A qualified biologist shall conduct a roost assessment survey of trees and structures located within the project site prior to removal. The survey will assess use of the features for roosting as well as potential presence of bats. To prove absence, one to two nocturnal surveys with appropriate night vision equipment must be conducted during those times when bats would be occupying a roost (i.e., during the maternity season). If the biologist finds no evidence of, or potential to support bat roosting, no further measures are recommended as long as removal occurs within seven days of the survey. If evidence of bat roosting is present, additional measures described below shall be implemented: • If evidence of bat roosting is discovered during the pre-construction roost assessment and demolition is planned March 1 through April 14, or September 1 through October 14 (outside the winter hibernation, and bat maternity roosting season), a qualified biologist should implement passive exclusion measures to prevent bats from re-entering the structures. After sufficient time to allow bats	Less Than Significant	Finding: Implementation of MM BIO-1a.1, which has been required or incorporated in the Master Plan, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that the mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in the Master Plan that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: Implementation of MM BIO-1a.1 would ensure that construction activities would not result in the take of bats that may roost on-site by either confirming that bats are not present or implementing avoidance measures to ensure that

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	to escape and a follow-up survey to determine if bats have vacated the roost, demolition may continue and impacts to special-status bat species will be avoided. For tree removal that occurs during this time, trees should be felled in a two-step method as follows: o Remove limbs of trees first and leave them unprocessed on the site for at least 24 hours. o After the 24 hour period passes, the remainder of the tree can be felled and debris can be processed. • If a pre-construction roost assessment discovers evidence of bat roosting in structures or trees during the maternity roosting season (April 15 through August 31) or winter hibernation season (October 15 to February 28), and determines maternity roosting bats or hibernating bats are present, demolition of maternity roost or hibernation structures will be avoided during the maternity roosting and hibernation seasons or until a qualified biologist determines the roost has been vacated. Any trees removed during this time shall follow the two-step method of removal described above.		bats on-site are given adequate time to vacate their roosts prior to demolition activities that would impact potential roosting locations.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Impact BIO-1b: Construction activities associated with the project could potentially impact Northwestern Pond Turtle (NPT) adjacent to Roseland Creek. **(Significant Impact)**	**MM BIO-1b.1:** To avoid impacting NPT, a pre-construction survey shall determine if the species or its nests are present within work impact areas within 300 feet of Roseland Creek. The pre-construction survey shall be completed within 48 hours prior to commencement of work to locate any NPT nests or individual turtles. If no NPT are located, the work may proceed without further actions. If NPT or active NPT nests are found within the work area, they shall be avoided by 50 feet and be allowed to leave on their own accord. If NPT is in a work area that cannot be avoided and/or does not leave the area, CDFW shall be consulted to determine the procedure for relocation. Any active NPT nest shall be avoided by 15 feet and if it cannot be avoided, CDFW shall be consulted to determine next steps. If NPT is listed under the Federal Endangered Species Act, and cannot be avoided, CDFW and USFWS shall be consulted to determine next steps, as no "take" can occur without USFWS authorization.	Less Than Significant	<u>Finding:</u> Implementation of MM BIO-1b.1, which has been required or incorporated in the Master Plan, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that the mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in the Master Plan that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR. <u>Explanation:</u> Implementation of MM BIO-1b.1 would ensure that project construction activities would not result in the take of NPTs that may be present on site by either confirming that there are no NPTs present, avoiding NPTs and their nests, or relocating individuals in consultation with the CDFW and USFWS to avoid impacts to the species.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Impact BIO-1c: Construction activities associated with the project could potentially impact California Tiger Salamander (CTS) occurring on the site and up to 1.37 acres of upland dispersal habitat. **(Significant Impact)**	**MM BIO-1c.1:** The project shall implement the following avoidance and mitigation measures contained in the Santa Rosa Plan Conservation Strategy: • No ground disturbing activities shall be conducted during the wet season (October 15 through June 15) when CTS migrate to and from breeding habitats. • The City or the project biologist shall consult the 72-hour weather forecast from the National Weather Service (NWS) prior to the start of ground disturbing activities. Ground disturbing activities shall not begin unless a no precipitation forecast is obtained and necessary erosion control measures are implemented. • Prior to the commencement of ground disturbing activities, the site shall be inspected for burrows or other refugia that could support CTS. If none are detected, work can proceed without further measures. If burrows or other refugia with potential to support CTS are detected and cannot be avoided, the project shall consult with CDFW to determine if any additional measures, including an incidental take permit, may be required.	Less Than Significant	Finding: Implementation of MM BIO-1c.1 and MM BIO-1c.2, which have been required or incorporated in the Master Plan, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that the mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in the Master Plan that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: With implementation of MM BIO-1c.1 and MM BIO-1c.2, the project would utilize avoidance measures to ensure that construction activities do not affect CTS that may be present on-site and the project would provide replacement habitat or compensatory mitigation for permanent impacts to CTS habitat in the event an incidental take permit is required.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	• To substantiate that no CTS are present and/or affected by the project, a qualified biological monitor will be present during initial ground disturbance. The biological monitor will conduct a training session for all construction workers before work is started on the project. If any CTS are encountered during ground disturbing activities, all work will stop and not commence until authorization to commence work has been given by CDFW and USFWS. Such authorization may come in the form of take permits, if required. • Access routes and number and size of staging and work areas will be limited to the minimum necessary. • All foods and food-related trash items will be enclosed in sealed trash containers at the end of each day, and removed completely from the site once every three days. • No pets will be allowed anywhere in the project site during construction. • All equipment will be maintained such that there will be no leaks of automotive fluids such as gasoline, oils, or solvents. • Hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, etc., will be stored in sealable containers in a designated location that is at least 200 feet from Roseland Creek. All		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	fueling and maintenance of vehicles and other equipment and staging areas will occur at least 200 feet from Roseland Creek. **MM BIO-1c.2:** If it is determined that an incidental take permit is needed because a reasonable expectation of take has been found and cannot be avoided, mitigation for impacts to CTS may be determined to be necessary. In this case, CTS habitat that is permanently and adversely impacted by the project would be mitigated in accordance with the ratios described in the Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy. The applicable ratio for mitigation in this area is one to one. This ratio would be applied to the net loss of suitable CTS habitat that results from the project. The square footage of developed areas on-site that would be removed (resulting in temporary impacts of approximately 1.88 acres), and restored to their natural state, may be used to offset novel impacts that result from the project. A maximum of 1.37 acres of permanent impacts are expected to result from the project, however, final mitigation ratio and acreage requirements shall be finalized in consultation with CDFW and/or the USFWS. Permanent loss of CTS habitat shall be mitigated at a one to one ratio.		
Impact BIO-4: Construction activities and tree removal associated	**MM BIO-4.1:** Construction shall be scheduled to avoid the nesting season to the extent feasible. The nesting season for most birds, including most	Less Than Significant	Finding: Implementation of MM BIO-4.1 and MM BIO-4.2, which have been

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
with the proposed project could result in the loss of fertile eggs, nesting raptors and other migratory birds. Nest abandonment could also occur. **(Significant Impact)**	raptors in the San Francisco Bay area, extends from February 1 through September 1. **MM BIO-4.2:** If it is not possible to schedule demolition and construction between September and January, pre-construction surveys for nesting birds shall be completed by a qualified ornithologist no more than seven (7) days prior to the start of work to ensure that no nests will be disturbed during project implementation. During this survey, the ornithologist will inspect all trees and other possible nesting habitats immediately adjacent to the construction areas for nests. If an active nest is found sufficiently close to work areas to be disturbed by construction, the ornithologist, in consultation with CDFW, will determine the extent of a construction-free buffer zone to be established around the nest, typically 50 to 250 feet with the lesser distance for smaller passerine birds and the greater distance for raptors, to ensure that raptor or migratory bird nests will not be disturbed during project construction. Project activities may resume within the buffer zone only after the young have fledged the nest or the nest otherwise becomes inactive. If disturbance does not commence within 7 days of the completed nesting survey, the survey should be repeated to ensure that active nesting has not begun since the previous survey.		required or incorporated in the Master Plan, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that the mitigation measures be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in the Master Plan that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: Implementation of MM BIO-4.1 and MM BIO-4.2 would ensure that avoidance measures are taken during project construction to avoid the take of any nesting or migratory birds on-site. The project would either schedule construction outside the nesting season or complete pre-construction surveys for nesting birds and avoid their nests, if present. Thus, the project will not have substantial adverse effects on any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or nursery sites.
Cultural Resources			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Impact CUL-3: Construction activities associated with the proposed project could result in the disturbance of subsurface prehistoric and/or historic resources, including a 19th century cemetery. **(Significant Impact)**	**MM CUL-3.1:** No prehistoric or historical archaeological sites were found within the study area but a 19th century cemetery is reported to be within the study area. Therefore, any ground disturbing activities in the northeast part of the parcel at 1400 Burbank Avenue (APN 125-331-001) shall be monitored by a professional archaeologist and/or a tribal monitor from culturally affiliated Tribe(s). Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to prehistoric and historic resources to less than significant levels. • If cultural resources are discovered during the project construction (inadvertent discoveries), all work in the area of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and representatives of the culturally affiliated tribe(s) shall be retained by the project sponsor to investigate the find and make recommendations as to treatment and mitigation of any impacts to those resources. A qualified archaeological monitor will be present and will have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities, in consultation with any designated tribal monitors, to evaluate the significance of any archaeological resources discovered on the property. • If human remains are encountered, consistent with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, no further disturbance shall	Less Than Significant	<u>Finding:</u> Implementation of MM CUL-3, which has been required or incorporated in the Master Plan, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that the mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in the Master Plan that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR. <u>Explanation:</u> Implementation of MM CUL-3.1 in the event of an inadvertent discovery would ensure that any buried cultural resources encountered on-site during construction would be treated in accordance with existing regulations so as to avoid adversely affecting the discovered resource. Project construction at 1400 Burbank Avenue would be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and tribal monitor. If remains are found, the Sonoma County Coroner and, as needed,

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	occur until the Sonoma County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin of the remains. Further, consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), human remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. • If the Sonoma County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within twenty-four (24) hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall immediately identify the "most likely descendant(s)" and notify them of the discovery. The "most likely descendant(s)" shall make recommendations within forty-eight (48) hours, and engage in consultations with the landowner concerning the treatment of the remains, as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.		the Native American Heritage Commission would be consulted. Thus, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on subsurface cultural resources.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Impact HAZ-2: The presence of lead in soils adjacent to previous structures on the site and a reported refuse dump on the northwest side of	**MM HAZ-2.1:** Any debris or soil containing lead-based paint or coatings or known to contain elevated lead concentrations would be disposed of at landfills that meet acceptance criteria for the waste being disposed.	Less Than Significant	Finding: Implementation of MM HAZ-2.1, which has been required or incorporated in the Master Plan, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Roseland Creek containing glass containers and household debris including automobile parts could present a material threat of a potential release of hazardous substances. **(Significant Impact)**	Soil sampling and analytical testing shall be performed on that portion of the site identified as the "refuse dump" in the report entitled Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Roseland Creek Community Park, 1400 Burbank Avenue, APN 125-331-001, Santa Rosa, California, prepared by Econ, dated February 19, 2010. If hazardous materials are detected at levels that exceed regulatory thresholds, the extent of the contamination shall be identified, and recommendations for a Health and Safety Plan (HSP), Soil Management Plan (SMP), and methods for a cleanup shall be implemented, as applicable. This work shall be performed under the oversight of a regulatory agency such as the Sonoma County Department of Environmental Health and Safety or the Department of Toxic Substances Control.		Council hereby directs that the mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in the Master Plan that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR. Explanation: Implementation of MM HAZ-2.1 would ensure that potentially hazardous materials would be properly handled so as to protect construction workers from being adversely affected or otherwise exposed to dangerous levels of hazardous materials at the project site during construction. Any cleanup required would be performed under the oversight of the Sonoma County Department of Environmental Health and Safety or the Department of Toxic Substances Control.
Noise			
Impact NOI-1: The project would construct a proposed park adjacent to	**MM NOI-1.1:** The City's contractor will develop a construction noise mitigation plan to ensure noise levels would be reduced to 80 dBA L_{eq} at	Less Than Significant	Finding: Implementation of MM NOI-1.1, which has been required or

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT

noise sensitive, residential and educational uses which could result in temporary disturbances during construction. **(Significant Impact)**	sensitive receptors. The construction noise mitigation plan may incorporate, but would not be limited to, the following best management practices:
	• Maximize the physical separation between noise generators and noise receptors. Such separation includes, but is not limited to, the following measures:
	  o Locate stationary equipment to minimize noise impacts on the community;
	  o Minimize backing movements of equipment;
	• Construct temporary noise barriers, where feasible, to screen noise-generating equipment. Temporary noise barrier fences would provide a five dBA noise reduction where the noise barrier interrupts the line-of-sight between the noise source and receptor when constructed in a manner that eliminates any cracks or gaps.
	• Use quiet construction equipment whenever possible and properly maintained and muffled internal combustion engine-driven construction equipment;
	• Impact equipment (e.g., jack hammers and pavement breakers) shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically-powered tools.
			incorporated in the Master Plan, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that the mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in the Master Plan that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR.
			
			<u>Explanation:</u>
			Implementation of MM NOI-1.1 would reduce construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors by ensuring construction noise generated from the project site would be reduced to 80 dBA L_{eq} at nearby sensitive receptors. A variety of methods to reduce construction noise levels have been identified and would be incorporated in a construction noise mitigation plan. The construction contractor, in coordination with the City, would notify surrounding land uses of the construction schedule and identify a point of contact for further coordination. Thus, the project would not result in a substantial

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	• Compressed air exhaust silencers shall be used on other equipment. • Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines. • Limit construction hours from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm Mondays through Saturdays, and 10:00 am to 6:00 pm on Sundays and holidays. • The Director of Recreation and Parks shall designate a "disturbance coordinator" for construction activities. The coordinator would be responsible for responding to any local complaints regarding construction noise and vibration. The coordinator would determine the cause of the noise or vibration complaint and would implement reasonable measures to correct the problem. • The construction contractor shall send advance notice in conjunction with the City of Santa Rosa Recreation and Parks Department to neighborhood residents within 300 feet of the project site as well as the Roseland Elementary School and Roseland Accelerated Middle School administrators regarding the construction schedule and including the telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site.		temporary noise impact during construction.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Tribal Cultural Resources			
Impact TCR-1: The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k) with implementation of mitigation. **(Significant Impact)**	**MM CUL-3.1:** No prehistoric or historical archaeological sites were found within the study area but a 19th century cemetery is reported to be within the study area. Therefore, any ground disturbing activities in the northeast part of the parcel at 1400 Burbank Avenue (APN 125-331-001) shall be monitored by a professional archaeologist and/or a tribal monitor from culturally affiliated Tribe(s). Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to prehistoric and historic resources to less than significant levels. • If cultural resources are discovered during the project construction (inadvertent discoveries), all work in the area of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and representatives of the culturally affiliated tribe(s) shall be retained by the project sponsor to investigate the find and make recommendations as to treatment and mitigation of any impacts to those resources. A qualified archaeological monitor will be present and will have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities, in consultation with any designated tribal monitors, to evaluate the significance of any archaeological resources discovered on the property. • If human remains are encountered, consistent with California Health and Safety Code	Less Than Significant	<u>Finding:</u> Implementation of MM CUL-3, which has been required or incorporated in the Master Plan, would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. The City Council hereby directs that the mitigation measure be adopted. The City Council, therefore, finds that changes or alterations have been required in the Master Plan that avoid the significant environmental effect, as identified in the Final EIR. <u>Explanation:</u> Implementation of MM CUL-3.1 in the event of an inadvertent discovery would ensure that any buried tribal cultural resources encountered on-site during construction would be treated in accordance with existing regulations so as to avoid adversely affecting the discovered resource. Project construction at 1400 Burbank Avenue would be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and tribal monitor. If remains are found, the Sonoma
Impact TCR-2: The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in		Less Than Significant	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 with implementation of mitigation. **(Significant Impact)**	Section 7050.5, no further disturbance shall occur until the Sonoma County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin of the remains. Further, consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), human remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. • If the Sonoma County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within twenty-four (24) hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall immediately identify the "most likely descendant(s)" and notify them of the discovery. The "most likely descendant(s)" shall make recommendations within forty-eight (48) hours, and engage in consultations with the landowner concerning the treatment of the remains, as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.		County Coroner and, as needed, the Native American Heritage Commission would be consulted. Thus, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on subsurface tribal cultural resources.