

## How were these alternatives developed and analyzed?

The alternatives presented in this workbook are intended as a starting point to support thoughtful discussions among community members about **how Santa Rosa should grow or change** over the next few years and decades. Each alternative was created based on several key assumptions that came from either the community (during the *Visioning Community Discussions* held during Summer 2021) or from analysis on trends and market demand prepared by the Santa Rosa Forward project team. These assumptions include the following:

- ▶ Each alternative responds to and builds upon the concepts included in the **Vision Statement**, which are focused on ensuring Santa Rosa is a diverse, equitable, and sustainable community.
- ▶ While the State is expected to require that approximately 24,000 new homes be built in Santa Rosa by 2050, each alternative **accommodates up to 36,000 new homes** to match the current general plan. This approach results in a range of options about where housing should be built and how much should be devoted to low-income households and people transitioning from homelessness.
- ▶ Each alternative differs on where new housing would go, in addition to where it is already allowed today. **Central Corridors** concentrates housing near Downtown; **Neighborhood Main Streets** envisions a city of neighborhoods with new housing near small neighborhood centers; and **Distributed Housing** builds on what is already here, with future growth occurring across the city in proportion to what is on the ground today.

- ▶ Each alternative includes a similar amount of new **office, retail, and industrial** uses but distributes them differently based on where future housing growth would be concentrated. An economic analysis prepared by the project team identified a future demand from the additional 36,000 homes for approximately 1 million square feet of retail space, 2 million square feet of office space, and 1.5 million square feet of industrial space.

These assumptions, in addition to the following technical analysis, were used to develop the alternatives:

- ▶ Each alternative was analyzed through a **traffic model assessment** to estimate the future travel patterns of residents, employees, and visitors based on differences in the geographic relationship between housing, jobs, and services.
- ▶ Each alternative was assessed for how well it addresses **community safety and resilience** from natural and human-made hazards based on the location of future housing and jobs.
- ▶ **Equity and environmental justice are major priorities** for the City and community, and while the alternatives present key distinctions, they are not so different from each other that there can definitive conclusions about how one would better advance equity compared to another. Instead, this workbook offers a foundational understanding of existing inequities across the city to inform future discussions around policy making and funding priorities.

The following pages present the alternatives and provide a summary of their key distinctions and commonalities. This information is designed to inform the community on the benefits and trade-offs of each alternative and will be used as a starting point for community discussions.