Agenda Item Number 5

City of Sebastopol

Mayor
Sarah Gurney,
Mayor
City Council
Una Glass, Vice
Mayor
John Eder
Robert Jacob
Patrick Slayter
City Manager/City
Attorney
Larry McLaughlin
City Clerk
Mary Gourley

Agenda Report Reviewed by City Manager/City Attorney

Meeting Date: Meeting of November 15, 2016
To: Mayor and City Council
From: Kenyon Webster, Planning Director
Subject: Proposed General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report
Funding: Currently Budgeted: __x_ Yes ____ No ___N/A
Net General Fund Cost:
If Cost to Other Fund(s),
Recommendation: Adopt Resolutions Certifying Final EIR and Adopting General Plan

Introduction: Through an extensive process, a draft General Plan for the City has been created, and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared to analyze its effects. This memorandum recommends that the City approve resolutions certifying the Final EIR and adopting the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan.

This has been a major undertaking for the City, and has included extensive outreach and public process. In particular, the Council, Commission, General Plan Advisory Committee, and a number of members of the public have demonstrated leadership and dedication to the public process. The proposed General Plan is intended to reflect community values, and carry the City forward into the future.

General Plan Update Process: The process to update the Sebastopol General Plan began in March 2014, and will be completed with the adoption of the General Plan by the City Council. The 2016 Sebastopol General Plan was developed with extensive community input and reflects the community's vision for Sebastopol. A summary of the community outreach and public participation process is provided below.

Visioning Workshops

In April and May 2014, the General Plan Update team held two public visioning workshops and a housing workshop to help kick-off the General Plan Update process. City residents and stakeholders attended workshops at the Sebastopol Center for the Arts. The workshops provided an opportunity for the public to offer their thoughts on what they value about their community and the city, and what important issues should be addressed in updating the General Plan. Each workshop included a presentation by the consultant team that explained the role of the General Plan, an overview of the General Plan Update process, and an opportunity for the workshop participants to ask questions and seek clarification on the process and the role of the community. Workshop participants were asked to complete activities and exercises in order to provide information to the General Plan Update team. Each workshop focused on different themes and topics to be addressed in the General Plan. A summary of the visioning workshops is provided in Chapter 2.0 of the Issues and Opportunities Report, which is available for review online at: www.sebastopol.generalplan.org.

Online Surveys and Polls

City staff and the consultant team developed an online survey to gather additional information from the public related to the General Plan Update. The online survey was available through the General Plan Update website, and was developed to pose similar questions to those posed at the visioning workshops, and to gather additional details regarding City service levels, residential homeownership, employment locations, and economic development priorities. The survey included 21 specific questions, and was

completed or partially completed by approximately 700 people, an excellent participation rate for a small town. Detailed survey results and responses are contained in Appendix C of the Issues and Opportunities Report, which is available for review online at: www.sebastopol.generalplan.org.

General Plan Update Website

The City maintains a website (www.sebastopol.generalplan.org) devoted to informing the public about, and encouraging participation in, the General Plan Update process. The website includes all public notices, all workshop materials, presentations given to the GPAC, Planning Commission, and City Council, background materials, draft policy documents, and draft versions of the General Plan Land Use Map.

General Plan Update Newsletters

Periodic newsletters were prepared and disseminated to the public via e-mail, the General Plan Update website, and posted in locations throughout the city. The newsletters provided information regarding the status of the work efforts, upcoming meetings and workshops, and opportunities for public participation.

General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)

The City Council appointed a 16-member General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), which consisted of members from the Planning Commission, local business owners, residents, and the community at-large. The GPAC collaborated with City staff and the General Plan Update consultant team throughout the development of the General Plan. The GPAC met 12 times between July 2014 and December 2015, to identify key issues and challenges that Sebastopol faces over the next 20-30 years, and to develop the comprehensive set of goals, policies, and actions contained in the General Plan. Each GPAC meeting was open to the public, and numerous members of the public and other local interested agencies attended the meetings and provided detailed input to the GPAC.

Community Open House Workshop

Approximately 50 people attended the Open House Workshop on November 19, 2015. The workshop began with a presentation by the consultant team that provided a summary of the GP Update process, explained the role of the General Plan, and then transitioned into an informal workshop with various stations that identify and explain key General Plan issues and approaches (circulation/traffic, land use, economic development, conservation, etc.). Many workshop participants asked questions and provided input on key issues they think should be addressed in the General Plan Update. Some participants filled out comment cards in order to provide written comments. In general, the issues and concerns raised by the public during the workshop were similar to the issues and concerns raised during the initial public visioning workshops at the outset of the General Plan Update.

City Council and Planning Commission Workshops and Hearings

The City Council and Planning Commission has held a number of public workshops and hearings to review and consider the goals and policies of the existing General Plan, review input from the Visioning Workshops, receive information relevant to the specific topics addressed at the GPAC meetings, and provide specific direction and guidance to staff and the consultant team regarding how goals should be achieved and how to address current issues in the General Plan Update. Following formulation of the 'GPAC' Draft General Plan, the Commission and Council held three public work sessions in January, February, and March of this year, including public input, to provide direction on modifications to the GPAC Draft General Plan. The Draft General Plan reflects this direction.

Planning Commission Review

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the Final EIR and Draft General Plan at its meeting of August 9. The Commission adopted a resolution recommending certification of the Final EIR. On August 23, 2016, the Commission continued its review of the Draft General Plan and completed formulation of a number of recommendations for revisions to the General Plan.

City Council Review

The Council conducted public hearings and detailed review of the draft General Plan at three meetings, on September 6, September 20, and October 17, 2016. The Council provided for public comment at multiple points in the review process. The Council directed numerous revisions, which are set forth in the memorandum prepared by the City's consultants, and reflected in the attached General Plan recommended for adoption.

General Plan Elements: The 2016 Sebastopol General Plan includes a comprehensive set of goals, policies, and actions (implementation measures), as well as a revised Land Use Map (Figure 2.0-3).

- The **Land Use Element** designates the general distribution and intensity of residential, commercial, industrial, open space, public/semi-public, and other categories of public and private land uses. The Land Use Element includes the Land Use Map, which identifies land use designations for each parcel in the city limits and SOI/UGB.

- The **Circulation Element** correlates closely with the Land Use Element, and identifies the general locations and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, and alternative transportation facilities necessary to support a multi-modal transportation system. This element is intended to facilitate mobility of people and goods throughout Sebastopol by a variety of transportation modes, with an emphasis on bicycle, pedestrian, and transit.

- The **Community Services and Facilities Element** includes goals, policies, and actions that address public services and facilities, including: parks, trails, and recreation facilities; police services; fire protection services; schools; and civic, library, medical, and other community facilities. While not specifically required by State law for inclusion in the General Plan, the Community Services and Facilities Element is a critical component in meeting the infrastructure and public services needs of businesses and residents.

- The **Conservation and Open Space Element** addresses the conservation, development, and use of natural resources, riparian environments, native plant and animal species, soils, mineral deposits, cultural/historical resources, air quality, and alternative energy. It also details plans and measures for preserving open space for natural resources and the managed production of resources.

- The **Noise Element** establishes standards and policies to protect the community from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise levels. This element includes strategies to reduce land use conflicts that may result in exposure to unacceptable noise levels.

- The **Community Design Element** focuses on the ways in which Sebastopol's buildings, streets, and open spaces work together to define the City's sense of place. The purpose of this Element is to provide an overall policy framework for the continued design improvement and evolution of the City.

- The **Safety Element** establishes policies and programs to protect the community from risks associated with geologic, flood, and fire hazards, as well as setting standards for emergency preparedness.

- The **Economic Vitality Element** seeks to sustain and diversify the city's economy, recognizing the importance of supporting existing and local businesses while broadening and expanding the employment base and economic opportunities within the city. Long-term fiscal sustainability will be supported by economic growth from increasing the range of business, commercial services, and high-quality jobs in the city. Providing a broader economic base is intended to improve the city's economic vitality while increasing access for residents to local goods and services and local employment opportunities.

- The **Community Health and Wellness Element** addresses a wide range of community health topics, including access to healthy foods, substance abuse, access to medical care, and maintaining healthy lifestyles.

Environmental Determination (CEQA):

Notice of Preparation

The City circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the project on March 1, 2016 to trustee and responsible agencies, the State Clearinghouse, and the public. A scoping meeting was held on March 22, 2016 with the Sebastopol

Planning Commission. No public or agency comments on the NOP related to the EIR analysis were presented or submitted during the scoping meeting. However, during the 30-day public review period for the NOP, which ended on March 31, 2016, three written comment letters were received. A summary of the NOP comments is provided in Section 1.8 of the Draft EIR. The NOP and all comments received on it are presented in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

Draft Environmental Impact Report

The City, as lead agency, determined that the General Plan Update is a "project" within the definition of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR prior to approving any project that may have a significant impact on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term "project" refers to the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]).

An EIR must disclose the expected direct and indirect environmental impacts associated with a project, including impacts that cannot be avoided, growth-inducing effects, impacts found not to be significant, and significant cumulative impacts, as well as identify mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce or avoid its adverse environmental impacts. CEQA requires government agencies to consider and, where feasible, minimize environmental impacts of proposed development, and an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

The Draft EIR was prepared according to CEQA requirements to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the General Plan. The Draft EIR also discusses alternatives to the General Plan, and proposes mitigation measures that will offset, minimize, or otherwise avoid significant environmental impacts. The Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA, California Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.; the Guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3).

The City published a public Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR on May 23, 2016, inviting comment from the general public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. The NOA was filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH# 2016032001) and was published pursuant to the public noticing requirements of CEQA. The Draft EIR was available for public review from May 23, 2016 through July 8, 2016. The Public Draft 2016 General Plan was also available for public review and comment during this time period.

Final Environmental Impact Report

The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan project has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and State CEQA Guidelines. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15132 requires that an FEIR consist of the following:

- The Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) or a revision of the draft;
- Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR, either verbatim or in summary;
- A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR;
- The responses of the lead agency to significant environmental concerns raised in the review and consultation process; and
- Any other information added by the lead agency.

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15132(a), the Draft EIR is incorporated by reference into the Final EIR.

The Sebastopol City Council is required to review and consider the Final EIR. If the City finds that the Final EIR is "adequate and complete," the City Council may certify the Final EIR in accordance with CEQA. The rule of adequacy generally holds that an EIR can be certified if:

- The EIR shows a good faith effort at full disclosure of environmental information; and

- The EIR provides sufficient analysis to allow decisions to be made regarding the proposed project in contemplation of environmental considerations.

Upon review and consideration of the Final EIR, the City Council may take action to approve, revise, or reject the project. A decision to approve the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan, for which the EIR identifies significant environmental effects, must be accompanied by written findings in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program would also be adopted in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 for mitigation measures that have been incorporated into or imposed upon the project to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The Sebastopol General Plan has been prepared to be a self-mitigating document. The policies and actions provided in the General Plan provide mitigation for potentially significant and significant environmental impacts, to the extent feasible. No additional mitigation is available, as described in the Findings of Fact. The annual report on general plan status required pursuant to the Government Code will serve as the monitoring and reporting program for the project.

Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Consideration

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires Sebastopol, as the CEQA lead agency to:

- Make written findings when it approves a project for which an environmental impact report was certified; and

- Identify overriding considerations for significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR.

The findings explain how the City, as the lead agency, approached the significant and potentially significant impacts identified in the environmental impact report prepared for the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan (the Project). The statement of overriding considerations identifies economic, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project that override any significant environmental impacts that would result from the Project.

Next Steps: Following adoption of the General Plan, a major update of the Zoning Ordinance is required to implement a number of policy changes identified in the General Plan. It is important to maintain the momentum of the planning process and proceed to Plan implementation. In anticipation of this, the Fiscal Year 2016-17 budget provided funding sufficient for this Fiscal Year. The Council has authorized a contract amendment for De Novo Planning Group to lead the effort to complete the Zoning Ordinance update, which is expected to take approximately 18 months to complete.

Recommendation:

The Council has conducted a public hearing and directed final revisions to the draft General Plan. Staff recommends that the Council:

- Adopt the attached Resolution certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan project, including the adoption of Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations

- Approve the attached resolution adopting the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution recommending certification of Final EIR and adoption of Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations
2. Resolution adopting the proposed General Plan
3. De Novo Memorandum listing City Council revisions to draft General Plan
4. General Plan for adoption

City of Sebastopol City Council

City Council Resolution No. ____

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report, including the Adoption of Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations, for the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan Update Project

Whereas, on August 22, 2013, the City of Sebastopol issued a Request for Proposals to prepare a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan and preparation of an Environmental Impact Report; and

Whereas, on December 9, 2013, the City entered into a contract with De Novo Planning Group to prepare a comprehensive update to the Sebastopol General Plan and preparation of an Environmental Impact Report; and

Whereas, the City of Sebastopol has determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should be prepared to analyze both the potential impacts and any necessary mitigation measures for the General Plan Update Project; and

Whereas, the EIR evaluates impacts, mitigation, and alternatives at a program-level for the General Plan Update project; and

Whereas, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed project was circulated on March 1, 2016 to trustee and responsible agencies, the State Clearinghouse, and the public; and

Whereas, a scoping meeting was held on March 22, 2016 with the Planning Commission, and no public or agency comments on the NOP related to the EIR analysis were presented or submitted during the scoping meeting; and

Whereas, during the 30-day public review period for the NOP, which ended on March 31, 2016, three written comment letters were received on the NOP, and a summary of the NOP comments in provided in Chapter 1.0 of the Draft EIR; and

Whereas, a Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIR was circulated to the State Clearinghouse, all relevant agencies, and interested parties for a 45-day public comment period, beginning on May 23, 2016 and ending on July 8, 2016; and

Whereas, a total of two written comments were received on the Draft EIR during the public review period, and written responses to those comments have been prepared and included as part of the Final EIR, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, and

Whereas, on August 9, 2016, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider the following:

1. The recommendation that the City Council certify the Final EIR and adopt the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the General Plan Update project; and
2. The recommendation that the City Council adopt the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan.

Whereas, on that date, the Planning Commission did adopt a resolution recommending certification of the Final EIR; and

Whereas, on September 6, 2016, the City Council held a public hearing on the Final Environmental Impact Report and the Draft General Plan, and accepted and considered public comments, with additional reviews and opportunity for public comment at City Council meetings on September 20 and October 17, 2016; and

Whereas, on August 23, 2016, the Planning Commission completed its recommendations regarding the General Plan, and recommended its adoption, as revised, to the City Council.

Now, therefore, after consideration of the record in these proceedings, including the testimony, exhibits, and materials presented at the City Council hearing, the City Council resolves as follows:

1. That the Environmental Impact Report for the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan Project, which consists of the Draft EIR and the Final EIR (collectively the EIR), has been completed in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines; and

2. That the EIR was prepared, published, circulated, and reviewed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, and constitutes an adequate, accurate, objective, and complete Final Environmental Impact Report in full compliance with the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; and

3. That the EIR has been presented to it, that the City Council has reviewed the EIR and has considered the information contained in the EIR prior to acting on the proposed project, and that the EIR reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis; and

4. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093, and in support of its approval of the project, the City Council hereby certifies the Final EIR (Exhibit "A") and adopts the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit "B") in support of approval of the project; and

5. The City Council directs that, upon approval of the project, the City's Planning Department file a notice of determination with the County Clerk of Sonoma and, if the

project requires a discretionary approval from any State agency, with the State Office of Planning and Research, pursuant to the provisions of CEQA Section 21152; and

6. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e), the documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council has based its recommendation are located in, and may be obtained from, the City of Sebastopol Planning Department at 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, California.

Adopted by the City of Sebastopol City Council November 15, 2016 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nayes:

Abstain:

Absent:

Attest: _____

Mayor Sarah Glade Gurney

Certified by: _____

Mary Gourley, City Clerk

Exhibit A

Final Environmental Impact Report

Exhibit B

Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

FOR THE

2016 SEBASTOPOL GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

REQUIRED UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
(Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq)

I. INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the City of Sebastopol (City), as the CEQA lead agency to: 1) make written findings when it approves a project for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified, and 2) identify overriding considerations for significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR.

These findings explain how the City, as the lead agency, approached the significant and potentially significant impacts identified in the environmental impact report (EIR) prepared for the 2016 General Plan Update (2016 General Plan, General Plan, or Project). The statement of overriding considerations identifies economic, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project that override any significant environmental impacts that would result from the Project.

As required under CEQA, the Final EIR describes the Project, adverse environmental impacts of the Project, and mitigation measures and alternatives that would substantially reduce or avoid those impacts. The information and conclusions contained in the EIR reflect the City's independent judgment regarding the potential adverse environmental impacts of the Project.

The Final EIR (which includes the Draft EIR, comments on the Draft EIR, responses to comments on the Draft EIR, and revisions to the Draft EIR) for the Project, examined several alternatives to the Project that were not chosen as part of the approved project (the No Project Alternative, the Increased Open Space Alternative, and the Downtown Intensification Alternative).

The Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth below ("Findings") are presented for adoption by the City Council (Council) as the City's findings under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Public Resources Code, §21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, § 15000 et seq.) relating to the Project. The Findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of this Council regarding the Project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures, alternatives to the Project, and the

overriding considerations, which in this Council's view, justify approval of the 2016 General Plan, despite its environmental effects.

II. GENERAL FINDINGS AND OVERVIEW

A. Project Background

The process to update the Sebastopol General Plan began in March 2014, and is scheduled to be completed with the adoption of the General Plan by the City Council in late 2016. The 2016 Sebastopol General Plan (General Plan, General Plan Update, or proposed project) was developed with extensive community input and reflects the community's vision for Sebastopol. A summary of the community outreach and public participation process is provided below.

In April and May 2014, the General Plan Update team held two public visioning workshops and a housing workshop to help kick-off the General Plan Update process. Additionally, City staff and the consultant team developed an online survey to gather additional information from the public related to the General Plan Update. The online survey was available through the General Plan Update website, and was developed to pose similar questions to those posed at the visioning workshops, and to gather additional details regarding City service levels, residential homeownership, employment locations, and economic development priorities. The survey included 21 specific questions, and was completed or partially completed by approximately 700 people.

The City Council appointed a 16-member General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), which consisted of members from the Planning Commission, local business owners, residents, and the community at-large. The GPAC collaborated with City staff and the General Plan Update consultant team throughout the development of the General Plan. The GPAC met 12 times between July 2014 and December 2015, to identify key issues and challenges that Sebastopol faces over the next 20-30 years, and to develop the comprehensive set of goals, policies, and actions contained in the General Plan. Each GPAC meeting was open to the public, and numerous members of the public and other local interested agencies attended the meetings and provided detailed input to the GPAC.

The City Council and Planning Commission has held, and continues to hold, public workshops and hearings to review and consider the goals and policies of the existing General Plan, review input from the Visioning Workshops, receive information relevant to the specific topics addressed at the GPAC meetings, and provide specific direction and guidance to staff and the consultant team regarding how goals should be achieved and how to address current issues in the General Plan Update.

The updated Sebastopol General Plan includes a framework of goals, policies, and actions that will guide the community toward its common vision. The General Plan is supported with a variety of maps, including a Land Use Map and Circulation Map.

B. Procedural Background

The City of Sebastopol circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the Project on March 1, 2016 to trustee and responsible agencies, the State Clearinghouse, and the public. A scoping meeting was held on March 22, 2016 with the Sebastopol Planning Commission. No public or agency comments on the NOP related to the EIR analysis were presented or submitted during the scoping meeting. However, during the 30-day public review period for the NOP, which ended on March 31, 2016, three written comment letters were received. Concerns raised in response to the NOP were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR.

The City published a public Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR on May 23, 2016, inviting comment from the general public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. The NOA was filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH # 2016032001) and the County Clerk, and was published pursuant to the public noticing requirements of CEQA. The Draft EIR was available for public review from May 23, 2016 through July 8, 2016. The Public Draft 2016 General Plan was also available for public review and comment during this time period.

The Draft EIR contains a description of the project, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. The Draft EIR identifies issues determined to have no impact or a less than significant impact, and provides detailed analysis of potentially significant and significant impacts. Comments received in response to the NOP were considered in preparing the analysis in the Draft EIR.

The City received two comment letters regarding the General Plan Draft EIR from public agencies, organizations and members of the public during the public comment period. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, a Final EIR was prepared that responded to the written comments received, as required by CEQA. The Final EIR document and the Draft EIR, as amended by the Final EIR, constitute the Final EIR.

C. Record of Proceedings and Custodian of Record

For purposes of CEQA and the findings set forth herein, the record of proceedings for the City's findings and determinations consists of the following documents and testimony, at a minimum:

- The NOP, comments received on the NOP, Notice of Availability, and all other public notices issued by the City in relation to the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan Update EIR.
- The 2016 Sebastopol General Plan Update Final EIR, including comment letters and technical materials cited in the document.
- All non-draft and/or non-confidential reports and memoranda prepared by the City of Sebastopol and consultants in relation to the EIR.
- Minutes of the discussions regarding the Project and/or Project components at public hearings held by the City.
- Staff reports associated with Planning Commission and City Council meetings on the Project.
- Those categories of materials identified in Public Resources Code Section 21167.6.

The City Clerk is the custodian of the administrative record. The documents and materials that constitute the administrative record are available for review at the City of Sebastopol at the Planning Department, at 7120 Bodega Avenue, Sebastopol, CA 95472.

D. Consideration of the Environmental Impact Report

In adopting these Findings, this Council finds that the Final EIR was presented to this Council, the decision-making body of the lead agency, which reviewed and considered the information in the Final EIR prior to approving the 2016 General Plan. By these findings, this City Council ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the analysis, explanation, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the Final EIR. The City Council finds that the Final EIR was completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Final EIR represents the independent judgment and analysis of the City.

E. Severability

If any term, provision, or portion of these Findings or the application of these Findings to a particular situation is held by a court to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remaining provisions of these Findings, or their application to other actions related to the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan, shall continue in full force and effect unless amended or modified by the City.

III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

A. Aesthetics and Visual Resources

General Plan Implementation Could Result in Substantial Adverse Effects on Visual Character, Including Impacts to Scenic Vistas or Scenic Resources (EIR Impact 3.1-1)

(a) **Potential Impact**. The potential for the Project to result in substantial adverse effect on visual character, including scenic vistas and resources, is discussed at pages 3.1-11 through 3.1-23 of the Draft EIR.

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. No feasible mitigation is available. This impact was mitigated to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on pages 3.1-11 through 3.1-23 of the Draft EIR, the Project includes numerous policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the extent feasible. However, even with the implementation of the policies and actions in the 2016 General Plan, the potential for new development to interrupt scenic views, particularly new industrial and commercial development on agricultural or undeveloped lands, would remain. Existing scenic views may be diminished or obscured. While the 2016 General Plan policies and programs would ensure that impacts are reduced to the greatest extent feasible, the only method to completely avoid impacts to scenic resources would be to severely limit the development potential on all undeveloped lands, including development of jobs-generating uses along the State Route 116 corridor. This type of mitigation is not consistent with the objective of the 2016 General Plan to support local employment opportunities and expand the local jobs base. Therefore, this would represent a significant and unavoidable impact of the Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any

remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with impacts to scenic resources and visual character.

B. Hydrology and Water Quality

General Plan Implementation Could Place Housing and Structures Within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area as Mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or Other Flood Hazard Delineation Map (EIR Impact 3.9-5)

(a) **Potential Impact**. The potential for the Project to place housing and structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, is discussed at pages 3.9-33 through 3.9-37 of the Draft EIR.

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. No feasible mitigation is available. This impact was mitigated to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on pages 3.9-33 through 3.9-37 of the Draft EIR, the Project includes numerous policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the extent feasible. However, even with the implementation of policies and actions that would reduce flood hazard impacts, the potential remains to place housing and structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. The General Plan Safety Element includes numerous policies specifically designed to address flood hazards. However, even with the implementation of the policies, actions, and requirements provided within the General Plan could result additional people and structures placed within a delineated flood hazard area. This impact is mitigated to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan policies and actions. However, even with implementation of these polices, actions, and requirements, this would represent a significant and unavoidable impact of the Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with impacts to placing housing and structures within a 100-year flood hazard area.

C. Noise

General Plan Implementation May Result in Exposure to Significant Traffic Noise Sources (EIR Impact 3.11-1)

(a) **Potential Impact**. The potential for the Project to result in exposure to significant traffic noise sources is discussed at pages 3.11-20 through 3.11-29 of the Draft EIR.

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts** As described on pages 3.11-20 through 3.11-29 of the Draft EIR, the Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the greatest extent feasible. While implementation of the proposed policies and actions of the General Plan will reduce noise and land use compatibility impacts from vehicular traffic noise sources, and would ensure that new development is designed to include noise-attenuating features, some traffic noise impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level due the proximity of sensitive receivers to major roadways, and because noise attenuation may not be feasible in all circumstances. There would be a significant increase in ambient noise levels with buildout of the General Plan to the City Planning Area as shown in Table 3.11-11 of the Draft EIR. The proposed General Plan would have a significant and unavoidable impact relative to traffic noise. This would represent a significant and unavoidable impact of the Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with transportation noise sources.

D. Transportation and Circulation

General Plan Buildout as Well as Regional Growth Would Require Improvements on Caltrans Facilities (SR 12 and SR 116) (EIR Impact 3.13-2)

(a) **Potential Impact**. The potential for the Project to require improvements on Caltrans facilities is discussed at pages 3.13-21 through 3.13-26 of the Draft EIR.

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts** As described on pages 3.13-21 through 3.13-26 of the Draft EIR, development allowed under buildout of the Project would result in increased use of SR 12 and SR 116, regional highway facilities owned and operated by Caltrans that also serve local traffic within Sebastopol. Caltrans has established a standard of LOS D for intersections in the study area that are on the State highway system, consistent with the City of Sebastopol's standard. With the installation of traffic controls at these intersections, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. However, because the City does not control the funding or timing of these improvements, the City cannot determine that the improvements will be made in time to accommodate regional and local growth, this impact would represent a significant and unavoidable impact of the Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with requiring improvements on Caltrans facilities.

E. Utilities

General Plan Buildout has the Potential to Exceed Wastewater Treatment Capacity or the Requirements of the RWQCB (EIR Impact 3.14-3)

(a) **Potential Impact**. The potential for the Project to exceed wastewater treatment capacity or the requirements of the RWQCB is discussed at pages 3.14-27 through 3.14-30 of the Draft EIR.

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts** As described on pages 3.14-27 through 3.14-30 of the Draft EIR, upon full buildout of the General Plan within the City limits, total sewer demand is projected to increase by 0.44 mgd. Within the entire Planning Area, the sewer demand would be approximately 0.853 mgd upon full buildout of the General Plan. These projections exceed the Current Capacity Entitlement allocation under the existing Sub-regional Treatment System agreement terms. General Plan policies and actions would assist in reducing wastewater generation flows to the greatest extent feasible, and would ensure that new development is not approved until it can be demonstrated that adequate wastewater treatment capacity exists to serve new and existing development demands. Implementation of these policies and actions would assist in ensuring that adequate treatment plant capacity and permitted capacity is available prior to the approval of new development, including wastewater demands generated by the City of Sebastopol and the rest of the Regional Partners. The Proposed General Plan Policies and Actions would reduce this impact to the greatest extent feasible. However, at the time of preparation of this EIR, an increase in permitted capacity cannot be guaranteed. As such, this impact would represent a significant and unavoidable impact of the Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with the potential to exceed wastewater treatment capacity or the requirements of the RWQCB.

D. Cumulative Impacts

1. Aesthetics - Cumulative Degradation of the Existing Visual Character of the Region (EIR Impact 4.1)

(a) **Potential Impact**. The potential for the Project to result in a considerable contribution to the cumulative degradation of visual character is discussed at pages 4.0-4 and 4.0-6 of the Draft EIR.

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. No feasible mitigation measures are available.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Mitigation and Remaining Impacts**. As described on pages 4.0-4 and 4.0-6 of the Draft EIR, the Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the greatest extent feasible. However, even with implementation of adopted policies and regulations, the 2016 General Plan has the potential to considerably contribute to permanent changes in visual character, such as obstruction of scenic views, conversion of existing visual character, and increased lighting. No feasible mitigation is available to fully reduce the cumulative effect on visual character, or to mitigate the proposed project's contribution to a less-than-significant level. This would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution by the Project to the significant and an unavoidable cumulative impact.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with cumulative degradation of visual character.

2. **Noise - Cumulative Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Noise in Excess of Normally Acceptable Noise Levels or to Substantial Increases in Noise (EIR Impact 4.11)**

(a) **Potential Impact**. The potential for the Project to result in a considerable contribution to the cumulative noise impacts is discussed at pages 4.0-13 and 4.0-14 of the Draft EIR.

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. No feasible mitigation measures are available.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Mitigation and Remaining Impacts**. As described on pages 4.0-13 and 4.0-14 of the Draft EIR, the Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the greatest extent feasible. However, it may not be feasible to mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level in all instances, particularly in areas where existing development is located near proposed development. Although the policy and regulatory controls for noise related impacts are in place in the cumulative

analysis area, subsequent development projects may result in an increase in ambient noise levels at specific project locations, which may subject surrounding land uses to increases in ambient noise levels. No feasible mitigation is available to fully reduce the cumulative effect on noise, or to mitigate the proposed project's contribution to a less-than-significant level. This would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution by the Project and a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with cumulative increases in noise levels.

3. Transportation and Circulation - Cumulative Impact on the Transportation Network (EIR Impact 4.13)

(a) **Potential Impact**. The potential for the Project to result in a considerable contribution to the cumulative impacts on the transportation network is discussed at pages 4.0-14 and 4.0-15 of the Draft EIR.

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. No feasible mitigation measures are available.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Mitigation and Remaining Impacts**. As described on pages 4.0-14 and 4.0-15 of the Draft EIR, the Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the greatest extent feasible. However, it may not be feasible to mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level in all instances, particularly along SR 12 and SR 116, regional highway facilities owned and operated by Caltrans that also serve local traffic with Sebastopol. With the installation of traffic controls at these intersections, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. However, because the City does not control the funding or timing of these improvements, the City cannot determine that the improvements will be made in time to accommodate regional and local growth, this would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to the Project and a significant and unavoidable impact.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project, as stated more fully in the

Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with cumulative impacts on the transportation network.

4. Utilities and Service Systems - Cumulative Impact on Utilities (EIR Impact 4.14)

(a) **Potential Impact**. The potential for the Project to result in a considerable contribution to the cumulative impacts on utilities is discussed at pages 4.0-15 and 4.0-19 of the Draft EIR.

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. No feasible mitigation measures are available.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Mitigation and Remaining Impacts**. As described on pages 4.0-15 and 4.0-19 of the Draft EIR, cumulative growth that occur within the cumulative analysis area over the life of the Project will result in increased demand for water service, sewer service, and solid waste disposal services. Implementation of the policies and actions identified in Section 3.14 of the Draft EIR would assist in reducing potential impacts. However, at the time of preparation of the Draft EIR, an increase in permitted wastewater capacity cannot be guaranteed. Therefore, this would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to the Project and a significant and unavoidable impact.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with cumulative impacts utilities.

K. Significant Irreversible Effects

1. Irreversible Effects (EIR Impact 4.15)

(a) **Potential Impact**. The potential for the Project to result in a significant irreversible effect associated with the consumption of nonrenewable resources and irretrievable commitments/irreversible physical changes is discussed at pages 4.0-21 and 4.0-22 of the Draft EIR.

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. No feasible mitigation measures are available.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Mitigation and Remaining Impacts**. As described on pages 4.0-21 and 4.0-22 of the Draft EIR, the Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the greatest extent feasible. One of the objectives of the 2016 General Plan is to conserve open spaces and other natural resources within the SOI/UGB. As such, the proposed General Plan focuses most new development to infill areas, and areas surrounding existing neighborhoods and urbanized areas. As a result of this design, the General Plan would minimize the potential for impacts to the nonrenewable resources in the Planning Area, including agricultural resources, biological resources, water resources, and energy resources, and the irretrievable commitment of resources and irreversible physical changes. In summary, the 2016 General Plan includes an extensive policy framework that is designed to address land use and environmental issues to the greatest extent feasible while allowing growth and economic prosperity for the City. However, even with the policies and actions that will serve to reduce potential significant impacts, the 2016 General Plan will result in significant irreversible changes. This would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution by the Project to the significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with irreversible effects.

IV. Findings and Recommendations Regarding Those Impacts Which are Less Than Significant, Less Than Cumulatively Considerable, or have No Impact

A. Specific impacts within the following categories of environmental effects were found to be less than significant as set forth in more detail in the Draft EIR.

1. **Aesthetics and Visual Resources:** The following specific impact was found to be less than significant:

   a. Impact 3.1-2: General Plan implementation could result in the creation of new sources of nighttime lighting and daytime glare

2. **Agricultural Resources:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

   a. Impact 3.2-1: General Plan implementation would result in the conversion of farmlands, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance
   b. Impact 3.2-2: General Plan implementation may result in conflicts with existing Williamson Act Contracts, or Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use

3. **Air Quality:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

   a. Impact 3.3-1: The General Plan would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan
   b. Impact 3.3-2: General Plan implementation would not cause health risks associated with toxic air contaminants
   c. Impact 3.3-3: The General Plan would not create objectionable odors
   d. Impact 3.3-4: The General Plan would not conflict with Regional Plans

4. **Biological Resources:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

   a. Impact 3.4-1: General Plan implementation could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
   b. Impact 3.4-2: General Plan implementation could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
   c. Impact 3.4-3: General Plan implementation could have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means
   d. Impact 3.4-4: General Plan implementation would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident

or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites

e. Impact 3.4-5: The General Plan would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance

f. Impact 3.4-6: General Plan implementation would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan

5. **Cultural Resources:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

   a. Impact 3.5-1: General Plan implementation could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource

   b. Impact 3.5-2: Implementation of the General Plan could lead to the disturbance of human remains

   c. Impact 3.5-3: General Plan implementation may result in damage to or the destruction of paleontological resources

6. **Geology, Soils, and Minerals:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

   a. Impact 3.6-1: General Plan implementation has the potential to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction

   b. Impact 3.6-2: General Plan implementation has the potential to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil

   c. Impact 3.6-3: General Plan implementation has the potential to result in development located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse

   d. Impact 3.6-4: General Plan implementation has the potential to result in development on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property

   e. Impact 3.6-5: General Plan implementation does not have the potential to have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water

f. Impact 3.6-6: General Plan does not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; or result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan

7. **Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

   a. Impact 3.7-1: General Plan implementation could generate GHGs, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant effect on the environment
   b. Impact 3.7-2: General Plan implementation would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases

8. **Hazards:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

   a. Impact 3.8-1: General Plan implementation has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment
   b. Impact 3.8-2: General Plan implementation has the potential to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school
   c. Impact 3.8-3: General Plan implementation has the potential to have projects located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5
   d. Impact 3.8-4: The General Plan Area is not located an airport land use plan, two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area
   e. Impact 3.8-5: General Plan implementation does not have the potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan
   f. Impact 3.8-6: General Plan implementation does not have the potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands

9. **Hydrology and Water Quality:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

   a. Impact 3.9-1: General Plan implementation could result in a violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements
   b. Impact 3.9-2: General Plan implementation could result in the depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge
   c. Impact 3.9-3: General Plan implementation could alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, flooding, or polluted runoff
   d. Impact 3.9-4: General Plan implementation could otherwise substantially degrade water quality
   e. Impact 3.9-5 General Plan implementation could place housing and structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map
   f. Impact 3.9-6: The General Plan would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of failure of a levee or dam, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow

10. **Land Use and Population:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant or to have no impact:

   a. Impact 3.10-1: General Plan implementation has the potential to physically divide an established community
   b. Impact 3.10-2: General Plan implementation has the potential to conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect
   c. Impact 3.10-3: General Plan implementation has the potential to induce substantial population growth
   d. Impact 3.10-4: General Plan implementation has the potential to displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing

11. **Noise:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

   a. Impact 3.11-2: Stationary Noise Sources
   b. Impact 3.11-3: Construction Noise Sources
   c. Impact 3.11-4: Construction Vibration

12. **Public Services and Recreation:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

    a. Impact 3.12-1: General Plan implementation could result in adverse physical impacts on the environment associated with governmental facilities and the provision of public services
    b. Impact 3.12-2: General Plan implementation may result in adverse physical impacts associated with the deterioration of existing parks and recreation facilities or the construction of new parks and recreation facilities

13. **Transportation and Circulation:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

    a. Impact 3.13-1: Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in acceptable traffic operation at the study intersections and roadways segments controlled by the City of Sebastopol
    b. Impact 3.13-3: The proposed General Plan would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program
    c. Impact 3.13-4: The proposed General Plan would not result in a change in air traffic patterns
    d. Impact 3.13-5: Implementation of the proposed General Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature
    e. Impact 3.13-6: Emergency Access
    f. Impact 3.13-7: The proposed General Plan would accommodate increased demand for public transit and supports a shift in trips from automobile to transit modes
    g. Impact 3.13-8: The proposed General Plan is consistent with adopted bicycle and pedestrian plans, and supports enhancements that emphasize bicycle and pedestrian circulation

14. **Utilities:** The following specific impact was found to be less than significant:

    a. Impact 3.14-1: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed
    b. Impact 3.14-2: Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects
    c. Impact 3.14-4: Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects

d. Impact 3.14-5: The project would be served by a landfill for solid waste disposal needs and will require compliance with various laws and regulations

15. **Growth-Inducing:** The 2016 General Plan was found to result in a less than significant impact related to growth inducement (pages 4.0-19 through 4.0-21 of the Draft EIR).

B. The project was found to have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to specific impacts within the following categories of environmental effects as set forth in more detail in the Draft EIR.

1. **Agricultural Resources:** The project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on agricultural land (Impact 4.2).

2. **Air Quality:** The project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on air quality (Impact 4.3).

3. **Biological Resources:** The project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on Biological Resources Including Habitats and Special Status Species (Impact 4.4).

4. **Cultural Resources:** The project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on known and undiscovered cultural resources (Impact 4.5).

5. **Geology, Soils, and Minerals:** The project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to geology and soils (Impact 4.6).

6. **Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change:** The project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts related to increased greenhouse gas emissions that may contribute to climate change (Impact 4.7).

7. **Hazards:** The project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts from hazardous materials and risks associated with human health (Impact 4.8).

8. **Hydrology and Water Quality:** The project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality (Impact 4.9).

9. **Land Use and Population:** The project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts associated with communities and local land uses (Impact 4.10).

10. **Public Services and Recreation:** The project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on public services and recreation (Impact 4.12).

C. The above impacts are less than significant or less than cumulatively considerable for one of the following reasons:

1. The EIR determined that the impact is less than significant for the Project.

2. The EIR determined that the Project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative impact.

V. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

A. Identification of Project Objectives

An EIR is required to identify a "range of potential alternatives to the project [which] shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic purposes of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one of more of the significant effects." Chapter 2.0 of the Draft EIR identifies the Project's goals and objectives. The Project objectives include:

- Protect Sebastopol's small-town charm, unique character, and strong sense of community.
- Support and enhance local businesses to sustain a vibrant Downtown core and strong community identity.
- Improve traffic conditions in Downtown through reduced congestion, reduced speeds, and expanded facilities for bicycles and pedestrians.
- Emphasize sustainability and environmental stewardship in future planning decisions.

- Provide opportunities for extensive community input and participation in the General Plan Update process.

B. Alternatives Analysis in EIR

1. Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative is discussed on pages 5.0-3 through 5.0-6 of the Draft EIR. Under Alternative 1, the City would continue to implement the adopted 1994 General Plan and no changes would be made to address the requirements of state law. Since adoption of the 1994 General Plan, state legislation has been passed requiring the City to address new safety and circulation requirements in the General Plan and to address greenhouse gas emissions. These requirements of state law would not be addressed. The General Plan goals, objectives, policies, and actions as well as the Land Use Map would not be updated to address the vision and concerns of the City's residents, property owners, decision-makers, and other stakeholders that actively participated in the Visioning and goal and policy development process.

Alternative 1 would result in the continuation of existing conditions and development levels, as described in Chapter 2.0, Land Use, and shown in Table 2.0-5. New growth would be allowed as envisioned under the 1994 General Plan, with land uses required to be consistent with the 1994 General Plan Land Use Map, as shown on Figure 5.0-1. As shown in Figure 5.0-1, Alternative 1 would not combine the General Commercial and Office Land Use designations into a single Commercial Office designation.

Alternative 1 would also provide for a decrease in allowable residential density within the residential land use designations and the Commercial/Office and Light Industrial land use designations, when compared to the proposed project. Under Alternative 1, there would be a reduction in residential growth (-130 units), a decrease in office uses (-13,508 s.f.), and an increase in commercial uses (50,909 s.f.) within the City limits, when compared to the proposed General Plan.

Under Alternative 1, the 1994 General Plan policy framework would still be in effect, which would constitute a business-as-usual approach to land use regulation in the City. The policy framework proposed by the General Plan Update that encourages a mix and balance of uses to provide an improved ratio of local jobs to population, would ensure that development pays its fair-share of necessary roadway, public service, and other infrastructure improvements, and provides for protection of natural resources would not occur. This alternative would not include safety policies, particularly those related to flooding, required by State law. This alternative would not include various policies provided to ensure protection of environmental resources, both at the project level and under cumulative conditions, consistent with the objectives of CEQA.

Further, this alternative would not prevent all potential impacts associated with increased development, because development would continue to occur. The land disturbance associated with this alternative is expected to be less than the proposed project under project-level conditions and slightly less than the proposed project under cumulative conditions. The reduction in land disturbance would result in a reduction in associated impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, and hydrology and water quality compared to the proposed project.

At the project level, development within the City limits would result in a slight increase in the amount of trip generation (approximately 14 more trips), resulting in comparable traffic and associated air quality and noise impact increases. Under cumulative conditions, this alternative would result in a slight increase of approximately 91 trips generated within the SOI compared with the Project and would result in a slight increase in associated traffic-related impacts, particularly along SR 12 and SR 116. There would be less demand for public services and utilities, resulting in a reduction in environmental impacts associated with facilities improvements to provide public services and utilities.

a. **Findings:** The No Project Alternative is rejected as an alternative because it would not achieve the Project's objectives.

b. **Explanation:** This alternative would not realize the benefits of the Project and fails to achieve some of the Project objectives. This alternative would not reflect the current goals and vision expressed by city residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other stakeholders associated with increased opportunities for economic development and job-creating land uses. This alternative would also not be consistent with the land use vision identified by city residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other stakeholders during the Visioning and General Plan Advisory Committee processes. Additionally, this alternative would not fully avoid or mitigate any of the impacts associated with the Project.

2. Alternative 2: Increased Open Space Alternative

The Increased Open Space Alternative is discussed on pages 5.0-6 and 5.0-10 of the Draft EIR. Under Alternative 2, the City would adopt and implement the proposed General Plan, but the Land Use Map would be revised to include expanded areas of Open Space and Very Low Density Residential Uses around the periphery of the City, primarily within the SOI and UGB, as shown in Figure 5.0-2 of the Draft EIR.

Under Alternative 2, all of the proposed General Plan goals, policies, and action items would be adopted, but development levels and intensities under Cumulative General Plan Buildout Conditions would decrease.

Table 5.0-4 of the Draft EIR shows the maximum level of new development that may occur within the existing City limits under Alternative 2, while taking into account growth restrictions identified under the proposed General Plan. As shown in the table, when accounting for the growth restrictions, Alternative 2 would result in 328 single family units, 422 multi-family units, 341,159 s.f. of commercial uses, 137,375 s.f. of office uses, 59,959 s.f. of industrial uses, and 173 hotel rooms.

Table 5.0-5 of the Draft EIR shows the maximum level of new development that may occur within the existing City limits and the City's SOI and UGB under Alternative 2, if every single parcel in the City and the SOI/UGB developed at or near the higher end of densities and intensities allowed under the alternative. As shown in the table, when accounting for the growth restrictions, Alternative 2 would result in 330 single family units, 628 multi-family units, 341,159 s.f. of commercial uses, 137,375 s.f. of office uses, 560,429 s.f. of industrial uses, and 173 hotel rooms.

As shown in Table 5.0-4, under Alternative 2, there would be an equal amount of residential growth, an equal amount of office uses, and an equal amount of commercial uses within the City limits.

Under cumulative conditions, development in the SOI under Alternative 2 would result in a decrease in residential units (-227 units), an equal amount of commercial uses, an equal amount of office uses, and a decrease in industrial uses (-124,460 s.f.).

Potentially significant impacts that would be reduced to less than significant as described in Sections 3.1 through 4.0 would also be reduced to less than significant with implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and actions described in Sections 3.1 through 4.0. Alternative 2 would not result in an increase in the significance of any impacts or new environmental impacts in comparison to the proposed project. The potential for Alternative 2 to reduce or avoid significant and unavoidable impacts that would occur under the proposed project is discussed below.

a. **Findings:** The Increased Open Space Alternative is rejected as an alternative because it would not reflect the City's vision for its development.

b. **Explanation:** This alternative would not reflect the City's vision for its development. This alternative would not be consistent with the land use vision identified by City residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other

stakeholders during the Visioning and General Plan Advisory Committee processes for the areas outside of the city limits. Furthermore, this alternative would be less likely to support and enhance local businesses to sustain a vibrant Downtown core and strong community identity (one of the project objectives).

3. Alternative 3: Downtown Intensification Alternative

The Downtown Intensification Alternative is discussed on pages 5.0-10 and 5.0-15 of the Draft EIR. Under Alternative 3, development potential within the Downtown Core would be intensified, and residential uses would not be permitted in non-residential land use designations outside of the Downtown Core (precluding residential development in the Commercial/Office, Office/Light Industrial, and Office designations). The minimum FAR in the Downtown Core designation would increase from 1.0 under the Proposed General Plan to 1.5 under Alternative 3. Additionally, all new development within the Downtown Core designation would be required to provide on-site residential uses at a density of 44 dwelling units/acre above ground-floor commercial or office uses. This alternative further assumes that a downtown parking district would be created, and that the majority of on-site parking requirements for structures in the Downtown Core would be accommodated via an in-lieu fee payment towards the construction of a new parking structure.

Under Alternative 3, the FAR in the Commercial/Office Land Use Designation would decrease from 0.7 (under the proposed project) to 0.5. Additionally, the FAR in the Office/Light Industrial and the Light Industrial Land Use Designations would decrease from 0.5 (under the proposed project) to 0.4. Under Alternative 3 development intensities within the Downtown Core would increase, while development intensities throughout other areas of the City would decrease.

Table 5.0-6 shows the maximum level of new development that may occur within the existing City limits under Alternative 3, while taking into account growth restrictions identified under the proposed General Plan. As shown in the table, when accounting for the growth restrictions, Alternative 3 would result in 328 single family units, 481 multi-family units, 424,037 s.f. of commercial uses, 157,654 s.f. of office uses, 50,041 s.f. of industrial uses, and 173 hotel rooms.

Table 5.0-7 shows the maximum level of new development that may occur within the existing City limits and the City's SOI and UGB under Alternative 3, if every single parcel in the City and the SOI/UGB developed at or near the higher end of densities and intensities allowed under the alternative. As shown in the table, when accounting for the growth restrictions, Alternative 3 would result in 514 single family units, 594 multi-

family units, 424,037 s.f. of commercial uses, 157,654 s.f. of office uses, 674,970 s.f. of industrial uses, and 173 hotel rooms.

a. **Findings:** The Downtown Intensification Alternative is rejected as an alternative because it would not reflect the City's vision for its development.

b. **Explanation:** This alternative would not reflect the City's vision for its development. This alternative would not be consistent with the land use vision identified by City residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other stakeholders during the Visioning and General Plan Advisory Committee processes for the areas within the downtown.

CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives that are analyzed in the EIR. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, an EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). The environmentally superior alternative is that alternative with the least adverse environmental impacts when compared to the proposed project.

As discussed in Chapter 5.0 of the Draft EIR and summarized in Table 5.0-8 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 2 (Increased Open Space) is the environmentally superior alternative because Alternative 2 would provide the greatest reduction of potential impacts in comparison with the other alternatives. As such, Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative for the purposes of the EIR analysis.

As previously discussed, Alternative 2 would not reflect the City's vision for development, and it would not be consistent with the land use vision identified by City residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other stakeholders during the Visioning and General Plan Advisory Committee processes for the areas outside of the city limits. Throughout the preparation of the General Plan Update, the City Council, Planning Commission, and Advisory Committee all expressed a desire and commitment to ensuring that the General Plan not only reflect the community's values and priorities, but also serve as a self-mitigating document and avoid significant environmental impacts to the greatest extent feasible. The result of this approach and this process is a proposed General Plan and Land Use Map that has reduced potentially significant impacts to the environment to the greatest extent feasible, while still meeting the basic project objectives identified by the City of Sebastopol. For these economic, social, and other reasons, the Project is deemed superior to Alternative 2, the Increased Open Space Alternative.

VI. STATEMENTS OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(b) and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City of Sebastopol has balanced the benefits of the proposed General Plan against the following unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the proposed General Plan and has included all feasible mitigation measures as policies and action items within the General Plan. Sebastopol has also examined alternatives to the proposed project, and has determined that adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan is the most desirable, feasible, and appropriate action. The other alternatives are rejected as infeasible based on consideration of the relevant factors discussed in Chapter 5.0 of the Draft EIR.

A. Significant Unavoidable Impacts

Based on the information and analysis set forth in the EIR and reiterated in Section III of these Findings, implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the following project-specific significant impacts related to: aesthetics and visual resources, hydrology and water quality, noise, traffic and circulation, utilities, cumulative degradation of visual character, cumulative exposure to noise-sensitive land uses, cumulative impact on the transportation network, cumulative impact on utilities, and irreversible effects.

- Impact 3.1-1: General Plan Implementation could result in Substantial Adverse Effects on Visual Character, including Scenic Vistas or Scenic Resources (significant and unavoidable)
- Impact 3.9-5: General Plan Implementation Could Place Housing and Structures Within a 100-year Flood Hazard Area As Mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or Other Flood Hazard Delineation Map (significant and unavoidable)
- Impact 3.11-1: General Plan buildout Could Contribute to an Exceedance of the City's Transportation Noise Standards and/or Result in Significant Increases in Traffic Noise Levels at Existing Sensitive Receptors (Significant and Unavoidable)
- Impact 3.13-2: General Plan Buildout Would Require Improvements to Caltrans Facilities (SR 12 and SR 116) (Significant and Unavoidable)
- Impact 3.14-3: Potential to Exceed Wastewater Treatment Capacity or the Requirements of the RWQCB (Significant and Unavoidable)
- Impact 4.1: Cumulative Degradation of the Existing Visual Character of the Region (Considerable Contribution and Significant and Unavoidable)
- Impact 4.11: Cumulative Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Noise in Excess of Normally Acceptable Noise Levels or to Substantial Increases in Noise (Considerable Contribution and Significant and Unavoidable)

- Impact 4.13: Cumulative Impact on the Transportation Network (Considerable Contribution and Significant and Unavoidable)
- Impact 4.14: Cumulative Impact on Utilities (Considerable Contribution and Significant and Unavoidable)
- Impact 4.15: Irreversible Effects (Significant and Unavoidable)

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Buildout of the proposed 2016 General Plan would allow for new development to occur in areas that have historically been used for agricultural operations, open space, and areas that have been previously undeveloped. The introduction of new development into previously undisturbed areas or areas that have been historically used for agricultural operations may result in potentially significant impacts to scenic resources or result in the degradation of the Planning Area's visual character.

Even with the implementation of the policies and actions in the 2016 General Plan, the potential for new development to interrupt scenic views, particularly new industrial and commercial development on undeveloped lands, would remain. Existing scenic views may be diminished or obscured. While the 2016 General Plan policies and programs would ensure that impacts are reduced to the greatest extent feasible, the only method to completely avoid impacts to scenic resources would be to severely limit the development potential on all undeveloped lands, including development of jobs-generating uses along the State Route 116 corridor. This type of mitigation is not consistent with the objective of the 2016 General Plan to support local employment opportunities and expand the local jobs base. Therefore, the General Plan's contribution to this impact is considerable and the impact is significant and unavoidable.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The City of Sebastopol is subject to flooding problems along the natural creeks and drainages that traverse the area. The Laguna de Santa Rosa is the most prominent drainages in Sebastopol that is subject to flooding. Small areas in the western-most portion of the city are also subject to flooding from Atascadero Creek. The 100-year floodplain extends onto many properties that are located immediately adjacent to these drainages. Additionally, land near the Downtown Area, and in the southeast portions of the city is within the 500-year floodplain. The flood hazards in Sebastopol are illustrated in Figure 3.9-2 of the Draft EIR. Table 3.9-4 of the Draft EIR presents a breakdown of the acreage and percentage of the City, Sphere of Influence, and Urban Growth Boundary that are designated as a FEMA flood zone.

Overall, areas prone to flooding within the Sebastopol Planning Area are largely built-out. However, even with the implementation of the various policies, actions, and requirements, implementation of the General Plan could result additional people and structures placed within a delineated flood hazard area. This impact is mitigated to the greatest extent feasible through

the General Plan policies and actions listed under Impact 3.9-5 of the Draft EIR. However, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable relative to this topic.

Noise

Buildout of the General Plan may contribute to an exceedance of the City's transportation noise standards and/or result in significant increases in traffic noise levels at existing sensitive receptors. As indicated by Table 3.11-10 of the Draft EIR, the related traffic noise level increases under buildout of the General Plan to City Limits are predicted to increase between 0.8 to 1.4 dB. Under Buildout of the General Plan to the City Planning Area, the increases would be 1.0 to 1.9 dB, as shown by Table 3.11-11 of the Draft EIR.

The General Plan includes Policies N 1-1 through N 1-10, N 2-2, N2-4 and Actions N-1a, N-1c through N-1e, which are intended to minimize exposure to excessive noise, including noise associated with traffic. Specifically, Policies N 1-1 and N 1-2 support noise-compatible land uses in the vicinity of traffic noise sources and require that new development and infrastructure projects be reviewed for consistency with the noise standards established in Table N-1. The proposed General Plan standards, required under Policies N 1-2 and Action N 1c, for exposure to traffic noise shown in Table 3.11-10 and Table 3.11-11 meet or exceed the noise level standards of the adopted General Plan shown in Table 3.11-6. Policy N 1-3 and N 1-4 and Actions N 1a and N 1c would ensure that new development mitigates potential noise impacts through incorporating the noise control treatments necessary to achieve acceptable noise levels. Policy N 1-7 establishes standards to determine the significance of increased noise levels associated with transportation. Policy N 1-5 requires the City to review and update the City's noise ordinance to address excessive noise from noise-generating land uses and to address vehicle noise to the extent allowed by State law; Action N 1a would ensure that the municipal code, including the new noise ordinance, is consistent with the noise standards established in the General Plan. Policy N 1-9 would limit truck traffic to specific routes to reduce potential noise impacts on residential streets. Policy N 1-10 would encourage working with Caltrans to ensure that adequate noise studies are prepared and that noise mitigation measures are considered in State transportation projects.

While implementation of the proposed policies and actions of the General Plan will reduce noise and land use compatibility impacts from vehicular traffic noise sources, and would ensure that new development is designed to include noise-attenuating features, some traffic noise impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level due the proximity of sensitive receivers to major roadways, and because noise attenuation may not be feasible in all circumstances. There would be a significant increase in ambient noise levels with buildout of the General Plan to the City Planning Area as shown in Table 3.11-11 of the Draft EIR. Therefore, the General Plan's contribution to this impact is considerable and the impact is significant and unavoidable.

Transportation and Circulation

Development allowed under buildout of the Sebastopol General Plan would result in increased use of SR 12 and SR 116, regional highway facilities owned and operated by Caltrans that also serve local traffic within Sebastopol.

With the installation of traffic controls and/or improvements at various intersections throughout the Plan area, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. However, because the City does not control the funding or timing of these improvements, the City cannot determine that the improvements will be made in time to accommodate regional and local growth, the General Plan's contribution to this impact is considerable and the impact is significant and unavoidable.

Utilities

The City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department is responsible for managing the Subregional Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation system, which handles the wastewater treatment for the City of Sebastopol. In 1975, the City of Santa Rosa executed an Agreement with the Cities of Rohnert Park, Sebastopol and the South Park County Sanitation District for treatment of wastewater at the Laguna Treatment Plant.

Sebastopol's ability to accommodate future development is limited by the City's entitlement in the Sub-regional Water Reclamation System. To estimate the treatment capacity available for future development, the 2015 Sebastopol LOS Report calculated flows from current project commitments. Table 3.14-3 provides information about ADDWF, estimated future water and sewer demand attributable to currently Approved Projects, and Projects Pending in the planning process.

The Sebastopol General Plan includes policies and actions to ensure wastewater treatment capacity is available to serve existing and future development. General Plan Policy CSF 4-1 requires the city maintains adequate sewage conveyance infrastructure to meet existing and projected demand throughout the buildout of the General Plan. Policy CSF 4-2 ensures sewage system capacity is adequate to match the rate of development. Policy CSF 4-5 ensures compliance with the current Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements concerning the operation and maintenance of the City's sanitary sewer collection system. Policy CSF 4-6 requires projects to demonstrate that existing services are adequate to accommodate the increased demand or that improvements to the capacity of the system to meet increased demand will be made prior to project implementation.

Implementation of the relevant policies and actions including with the General Plan would assist in ensuring that adequate treatment plant capacity and permitted capacity is available prior to the approval of new development, including wastewater demands generated by the City of Sebastopol and the rest of the Regional Partners. The Proposed General Plan Policies and Actions would reduce this impact to the greatest extent feasible. However, at the time of

preparation of this EIR, an increase in permitted capacity cannot be guaranteed. Therefore, the General Plan's contribution to this impact is considerable and the impact is significant and unavoidable.

B. Benefits of the Proposed General Plan/Overriding Considerations

The City of Sebastopol has (i) independently reviewed the information in the EIR and the record of proceedings; (ii) made a reasonable and good faith effort to eliminate or substantially lessen the impacts resulting from the proposed 2016 General Plan to the extent feasible by including policies and actions in the General Plan that effectively mitigate potential environmental impacts to the greatest extent feasible; and (iii) balanced the project's benefits against the project's significant unavoidable impacts.

Adoption and implementation of the 2016 General Plan would provide the following economic, social, legal, and other considerable benefits:

1. The 2016 General Plan promotes compact and environmentally-sustainable development through goals and policies that balance the need for adequate infrastructure, housing, and economic vitality with the need for resource management, environmental protection, and preservation of quality of life for Sebastopol residents.

2. The 2016 General Plan implements principles of sustainable growth by concentrating new urban development around existing urban development, around nodes of transportation, and along key commercial and transportation corridors; thereby minimizing land consumption while maintaining open space, habitat, recreation, and agricultural uses throughout the Planning Area.

3. The 2016 General Plan provides a land use map that accounts for existing development, physical constraints, agricultural preservation, economic development, hazards, and incompatible uses and assigns densities and use types accordingly to enhance the safety, livability, and economic vitality of Sebastopol.

4. The 2016 General Plan improves mobility options through the development of a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity, supports community development patterns, limits traffic congestion, promotes public and alternative transportation methods, and supports the goals of adopted regional transportation plans.

5. The 2016 General Plan directs the preservation and environmental stewardship of the vast array of agricultural, natural, cultural and historic resources that uniquely define the character and ecological importance of the City and greater region.

6. The 2016 General Plan addresses adverse environmental effects associated with global climate change by facilitating sustainable development, promoting energy efficiency, and promoting development that reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

7. The 2016 General Plan enhances the local economy and provides opportunities for future jobs and business development commensurate with forecasted growth by planning for commercial and industrial development near existing urbanized areas and transportation corridors.

8. The 2016 General Plan is the product of a comprehensive public planning effort driven by members of the public, the General Plan Advisory Committee, city stakeholders, the Planning Commission and the City Council through a series of public meetings, hearings and workshops that resulted in a thoughtful balance of community, economic, agricultural, and environmental interests.

VII. CONCLUSION

After balancing the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed project, the Council finds that the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified may be considered "acceptable" due to the specific considerations listed above which outweigh the unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project.

The Sebastopol City Council has considered information contained in the EIR prepared for the proposed General Plan as well as the public testimony and record of proceedings in which the project was considered. Recognizing that significant unavoidable aesthetics and visual resources, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation and circulation, and utilities impacts may result from implementation of the proposed General Plan, the Council finds that the benefits of the General Plan and overriding considerations outweigh the adverse effects of the Project. Having included all feasible mitigation measures as policies and actions in the General Plan, and recognized all unavoidable significant impacts, the Council hereby finds that each of the separate benefits of the proposed General Plan, as stated herein, is determined to be unto itself an overriding consideration, independent of other benefits, that warrants adoption of the proposed General Plan and outweighs and overrides its unavoidable significant effects, and thereby justifies the adoption of the proposed General Plan.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the record, the Council hereby determines that:

1. All significant effects on the environment due to implementation of the proposed General Plan have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible;

2. There are no feasible alternatives to the proposed 2016 General Plan which would mitigate or substantially lessen the impacts; and

3. Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations above.

City of Sebastopol City Council

City Council Resolution No. ____

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Sebastopol
Adopting the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan

Whereas, on August 22, 2013, the City of Sebastopol issued a Request for Proposals to prepare a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan and preparation of an Environmental Impact Report; and

Whereas, on December 9, 2013, the City entered into a contract with De Novo Planning Group to prepare a comprehensive update to the Sebastopol General Plan and preparation of an Environmental Impact Report; and

Whereas, as detailed in the General Plan and staff reports to the Planning Commission and City Council, there has been an extensive public process to develop the Draft General Plan; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission of the City of Sebastopol held a public hearing on the Final Environmental Impact Report and the Draft General Plan at its regular meeting of August 9, 2016, and accepted and considered public comments; and

Whereas, on August 9, 2016, following the public hearing, the Commission adopted a resolution recommending certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report on the Draft General Plan, and began formulating its recommendations for revisions to the Draft General Plan; and

Whereas, on August 23, 2016, the Commission completed identification of its recommended revisions to the General Plan and adopted a resolution recommending adoption of the General Plan with recommended revisions; and

Whereas, on September 6, 2016, the City Council held a public hearing on the Final Environmental Impact Report and the Draft General Plan and accepted and considered public comments, with additional reviews and opportunity for public comment at City Council meetings on September 20 and October 17, 2016; and

Whereas, in the course of its reviews, the City Council provided direction on revisions to the Draft General Plan, which are reflected in the General Plan presented for adoption; and

Whereas, in the review process, the City Council has considered the staff report, supporting documents, public testimony, Planning Commission recommendations, and all other appropriate information that has been submitted with the proposed project.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the City Council of the City of Sebastopol:

A. Hereby finds that:

1. The requested 2016 Sebastopol General Plan has been processed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Government Code and the California Environmental Quality Act, in that the public hearing was duly noticed and a Final Environmental Impact Report was prepared, including discussion of the Draft 2016 Sebastopol General Plan.

2. Approval of the Draft General Plan is in the public interest and accomplishes the goals identified by the Planning Commission, City Council, and the community.

3. The potential impacts of the requested General Plan have been assessed and have been determined not to be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare. All potentially significant impacts have been analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Report and have been mitigated to less-than-significant levels, with the exception of those related to Aesthetics and Visual Resources, Flooding, Noise, Traffic and Circulation, Wastewater Treatment, and Irreversible Effects, which have been noted as significant and unavoidable.

4. The requested General Plan establishes a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan that is internally consistent within and among the various elements, including the goals, policies, and actions of each.

B. Hereby adopts the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan.

Adopted by the City of Sebastopol City Council on November 15, 2016 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nayes:

Abstain:

Absent:

Attest: _____

Sarah Glade Gurney, Mayor

Certified by: _____

Mary Gourley, City Clerk

MEMORANDUM

TO:	Sebastopol City Council
FROM:	Ben Ritchie and Beth Thompson, De Novo Planning Group
SUBJECT:	**City Council Revisions to the Draft General Plan**
DATE:	November 2, 2016

INTRODUCTION

This memo provides a summary of the revisions and edits to the Public Draft General Plan (May 2016) that were provided by City Council during public hearings held on September 6, September 20, and October 17, 2016. These revisions include the Planning Commission recommendations, inclusive of any additional revisions that were subsequently provided by the City Council. Revisions to policies and actions are shown in ~~strikethrough~~/underline format. Edits and revisions are organized by General Plan Element.

The Council will also be provided with the City Council Review General Plan, which includes all of the revisions directed by the City Council and is formatted for final printing. Following the City Council's review of the revisions and adoption of the General Plan, the City Council Review General Plan will be revised to reflect any additional changes directed by the City Council and will be printed with the adoption date on the front cover.

Revisions to the Public Review Draft General Plan are summarized below.

GLOBAL EDITS

- All references to the "Downtown Core" land use designation have been changed to "Central Core". References to the "Downtown Core" geographical area have been changed to "Downtown". These changes are not all listed here for the sake of brevity, but are all included in the Final General Plan.

- Use of acronyms was reviewed and acronyms were identified at each first use in the document, then the acronym was used thereafter.

- Edits to fix minor typographical errors and formatting have been made, but are not listed below.
- The Urban Growth Boundary description on page 2-3 and the policies and actions under Goal LU 2 were updated to reflect Ordinance 1090.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- - Change "7. Community Character" to "7. Community Design"

2. LAND USE

- Fix typos to introductory language, first page, second paragraph:

  State law requires the Land Use Element to address:

  - Proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of the land for housing, business, industry, open space, including agriculture, natural resources, recreation, and enjoyment of scenic beauty, education, public buildings and grounds, solid and liquid waste disposal facilities, and other categories of public and private uses of land;
  - Population density and building intensity; ~~and~~
  - Areas subject to flooding; and.
  - Areas subject to flooding are addressed in the Safety Element.

- Throughout this chapter changed "tiny houses" to "very small houses" (other chapters do not reference tiny housing and changes were not made to the adopted Housing Element)

- Revise Policy LU 1-1:

  Policy LU 1-1: Through appropriate land use practices, m~~M~~aintain a supply of developable mixed-use, commercial, industrial, and residential lands sufficient to meet desired growth and economic needs over the planning period.

- Revise Policy LU 1-4:

  Policy LU 1-4: Assign the following range of land use designations throughout the City and to parcels within the UGB, as shown in the Land Use Map (Figure 2.1):

  Very Low Density Single Family Residential: *Designates areas suitable for single family dwellings at a density up to one unit per acre. Smaller existing parcels within this designation would not be precluded from developing one housing unit.*

  Low Density Single Family Residential: *Designates areas suitable for single family dwellings at a density of 1.1 to 2.5 units per acre. Smaller existing parcels within this designation would not be precluded from developing one housing unit.*

  Medium Density ~~Single Family~~ Residential: *Designates areas suitable for ~~single family~~residential dwellings at a density of 2.6 to 12.0 units per acre. Smaller existing parcels within this designation would not be precluded from developing one housing unit.*

  High Density ~~Single Family~~ Residential: *Designates areas suitable for multifamily dwellings at a density of 12.1 to 25 units per acre. This designation is suitable for duplexes, apartments, townhouses, and other attached dwelling units.*

  Commercial/Office: *This designation provides areas for commercial and office uses with off-street parking and/or clusters of street-front stores. This designation ~~permits~~ allows primarily local-serving retail establishments, specialty shops, banks, professional offices, motels, professional, administrative, medical, dental, and business offices, bed and breakfast users, and business and personal services, along with ancillary commercial and service uses. This designation is typically assigned to parcels, located on a major arterial street, that can provide sufficient land for commercial establishments that do not benefit from high-volume pedestrian concentrations found Downtown. The following types of retail uses are discouraged in this land use designation: factory outlets; large regional-serving shopping centers; and other similar retail*

uses generating high traffic volumes. Maximum floor area ratio (FAR) shall not exceed 1.5. Residential uses are permitted as a secondary use to the primary commercial uses permitted in this land use designation if generally located above the ground floor at the High Density Residential density of 12.1 to 25 units per acre. The residential space will not be counted in calculating the FAR for a development.

~~Downtown~~ Central Core: *This designation applies to portions of Sebastopol's Downtown and nearby areas. The Central Core designation allows ~~and permits~~ office, commercial, and retail uses, as well as mixed-use residential developments. Residential uses are ~~permitted~~ allowed at a density of 15.1 to 44 units per acre if combined with commercial land uses, such as office and retail. Projects shall achieve a minimum FAR of 1.0, and the maximum FAR shall not exceed 2.5 (not including the residential use). This designation is intended to implement the Downtown Plan and enhance the vitality and character of Sebastopol's historic commercial area. Housing is encouraged on upper stories.*

Office/Light Industrial: *This designation synthesizes Office and Light Industrial classifications and is intended to promote well planned, integrated business parks, which will serve as major employment center within the community. The Office/Light Industrial designations only applies to sites of three (3) acres or larger and must be implemented through the PC-Planned Community zoning process. Land uses within business parks shall be limited to non-polluting, "clean" industries and businesses with primary permitted uses including corporate and administrative offices and research development uses. Ancillary uses shall be ~~permitted~~ allowed under this designation, which may include warehousing and distribution, exercise facilities, child care uses, and food service uses which provides support services to primary uses. Residential uses are allowed as a secondary use to the primary office/light industrial uses allowed in this land use designation at the High Density Residential density of 12.1 to 25 units per acre. FAR shall not exceed 0.75 (not including the residential use). Maximum FAR shall not exceed 1.5.*

Light Industrial: *This designation provides for a wide variety of commercial, wholesale, service, and processing uses which do not generate excessive adverse environmental impacts. Other uses ~~permitted~~allowed in this designation include office ancillary to industrial uses; warehousing and agricultural products sales and services; auto sales and repair; food and drink processing; construction yards; research and development, laboratories, light manufacturing; and similar uses. Residential uses are permitted as a secondary use to the primary light industrial uses ~~permitted~~ allowed in this land use designation at the High Density Residential density of 12.1 to 25 units per acre. Maximum FAR shall not exceed 0.75 (not including the residential use).*

Open Space: *This designation applies to areas of land which are essentially unimproved and devoted to the preservation of natural resources, agriculture, outdoor recreation, and for the maintenance of public health and safety. ~~The only~~ Sstructures ~~permitted~~ allowed are shelters, restrooms, storage sheds, and other structures needed to accommodate public use or provide for maintenance of the land. Maximum FAR shall not exceed 0.10.*

Parkland: *This designation applies to existing and proposed active and passive parks, and linear parks (landscaped paths) in urban areas. Structures allowed are shelters, restrooms, storage sheds, other structures needed to accommodate public use or provide for maintenance of the land, and recreational facilities. Maximum FAR shall not exceed 0.10.*

Community Facilities: *This designation includes public buildings and facilities, utility facilities and related easements, public libraries, city offices, fire and police stations, and school*

sites. Maximum FAR shall not exceed 2.0, except municipal facilities shall be allowed a FAR of 3.0.

- Revise Policy LU 1-5:

  Policy LU 1-5: The Land Use Map ~~may~~ shall be amended from time to time to ensure that there is an adequate supply of commercial, industrial, public facility, parks, residential, and other lands to serve the City's needs.

- Add Policy LU 1-10:

  Policy LU 1-10: Encourage development and planning that is consistent with this General Plan and furthers the implementation of the Sebastopol Priority Development Area (see Figure 2.3).

- Add description of Sebastopol Priority Development Area, including Figure 2-3 to identify the PDA Boundary. See page 2-9 of the City Council Draft General Plan.

- Revise Action LU 1c:

  Action LU 1c: Revise the Zoning Code to establish a minimum ~~FAR of 1.0 for~~height of two stories for new major development projects within the ~~Downtown~~ Central Core. This requirement shall not apply to rehabilitation or improvements to existing uses.

- Revise the eighth bullet under Action LU 1e:

  - *Review and update standards and provisions for community gardens ~~and small urban farms~~;*

- Revise the fourteenth bullet under Action LU 1e:

  - *Establish appropriate standards and regulations for medical and, if made legal, non-medical cannabis dispensaries and related operations and activities;*

- Add new bullet under Action LU 1e:

  - *Develop standards that guide allowed uses in the Light Industrial area located west of Morris Street, between Bodega Avenue and Laguna Park Way;*

- Updated policies and goals associated with Goal LU 2 to reflect Ordinance 1090. The original Policies 2-1 through 2-8 were replaced with new Policies 2-1 through 2-4. Action LU 2c was deleted. See pages 2-10 through 2-12 of the City Council Draft General Plan.

- Add Policy LU 3-3:

  Policy LU 3-3: Encourage the County to focus growth in urban areas and along the central Highway 101 corridor and discourage densification and intensification in areas in the vicinity of Sebastopol that would exceed City and local resources, including transportation, water supply, sewer, groundwater recharge, and public services.

- Revised the last bullet of Action LU 3b as follows:

  - *Include provisions for ~~tiny~~ very small houses and mixed use units to count as a reduced allocation (e.g., one mixed use unit or ~~tiny~~ very small house unit is counted as 0.5 of an allocation).*

- Add Policy LU 4-2 (Note: Policy COS 12-13 and Actions COS 12c and 12g provide additional support for community separators):

  Policy LU 4-2: Support and maintain community separators and encourage expansion of community separators in the north, west, and south areas surrounding Sebastopol.

- Revise Action LU 4a:

  Action LU 4a: *Identify a referral area that surrounds the UGB and formally request that the County provide the City with notice of development applications and related actions within the referral area and provide the City an opportunity to comment on land use changes and development proposals under review. The City's review of projects within the referral area shall emphasize the importance of:*

  - *The protection of agricultural lands and open space;*
  - *The protection of biological resources, including riparian habitat and corridors;*
  - *The protection of groundwater recharge areas and watersheds;*
  - *Reducing sprawl;*
  - *Maintaining and expanding community separators; and*
  - *Ensuring quality development that is consistent with the character and values of Sebastopol.*

- Revise Policy LU 5-1:

  Policy LU 5-1: Locate residences away from areas of excessive noise, smoke, ~~or~~ dust, odor, and lighting, and ensure that adequate provisions, including buffers or transitional uses, are made to ensure the health and well-being of existing and future residents.

- Revise Policy 5-3:

  Policy LU 5-3: Commercial, industrial, and other non-residential development that interfaces with residential land use designations and existing residential neighborhoods shall be designed to ensure compatibility between the uses and to reduce any potential negative impacts associated with aesthetics, noise, ~~and~~ safety, odor, and lighting.

- Revise Action LU 5a:

  Action LU 5a: *Through the design review process, screen development proposals for land use compatibility and ensure that development proposals are designed to be compatible with existing residential and other land uses, are designed to reduce aesthetic, noise, ~~and~~ safety, odor and lighting impacts to residential areas, and are consistent with Sebastopol's unique, small-town character.*

- Revised Policy LU 6-3 as follows:

  Policy LU 6-3: Encourage and support the construction and occupation of very small~~tiny~~ houses and micro apartments.

- Deleted Action LU 6b.

- Add Action LU 6b:

  - *Action LU 6b: Consider Zoning Code revisions to allow duplexes and/or attached housing in appropriate Medium Density Residential areas.*

- Revise Policy LU 7-5:

  Policy LU 7-5: Actively promote implementation of the Downtown Specific Plan and the Sebastopol Downtown Portfolio, and Downtown Design Standards and periodically update these long-range planning documents as necessary.

- Revise Policy LU 7-7:

  Policy LU 7-7: In mixed use, commercial, office, and other non-residential developments, ~~maintain non-~~encourage non-residential uses on the ground floor while allowing residential uses on the ground floor where appropriate.

- Revise Policy LU 7-10:

  Policy LU 7-10: Maintain ~~balanced~~ Zoning Ordinance controls on formula businesses that strengthen the City's unique character, support the local economy, and ensure the provision of needed goods and services.

- Revise Figures 2.3 and 2.4 to fix shading (see General Plan document for figure revisions)

- Add Action LU 7e:

  Action LU 7e: Adopt a Specific Plan for the Northern Gateway District. The Specific Plan should resolve issues such as improving the northern gateway to the city and identifying appropriate commercial, office, industrial, and mixed use development that would contribute to the character of the area and meet the City's economic and fiscal needs.

3. CIRCULATION

- Revise Policy CIR 1-2:

  Policy CIR 1-2: Ensure that the City's circulation network is a well-connected system of streets, roads, sidewalks, multi-use trails, routes, and paths that effectively accommodates vehicular and non-vehicular traffic in a manner that considers the context of surrounding land uses and the needs of all roadway users.

- References to LOS have been reviewed and, where appropriate, revised to reflect the approach to using LOS as a decision-making tool rather than as a strict standard. Policy 1-10 was deleted and the following changes were made to Policies CIR 1-6 and 1-7:

  Policy CIR 1-~~7~~6: In evaluating circulation improvement needs, and in reviewing major development proposals, consider ~~level of service conditions and~~ impacts for all modes of transportation, including ~~vehicles, transit,~~ pedestrians, ~~and~~ bicyclists, transit, and vehicles.

  Policy CIR 1-7: P~~P~~rojects that would substantially impact circulation conditions shall provide a circulation impact report. This report will serve as a decision-making tool for the City, recognizing that maintaining and improving the community's social fabric and economic vitality includes consideration of a project's effects on pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit as well as the overall effect of improvements associated with achieving appropriate Level of Service ~~(LOS) objectives~~. LOS is not intended to be used as the primary method to limit the size or density of a project, but rather to provide decision-makers with a picture of the impacts associated with a project and allow decision-makers to determine appropriate improvements to alleviate traffic impacts, to the extent appropriate and feasible. The Planning

Department will determine whether a circulation impact report is required as part of the initial project application review process.

Circulation impact reports shall evaluate:

- Project effects on all modes of travel, including pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and vehicles;

- Improvements to accommodate the project with a focus on access and safety; and

- Impacts to vehicle travel ~~using a LOS objective of D at intersections~~, as determined by the Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual. This analysis is intended to ~~identify improvements necessary to: 1) maintain LOS D at intersections that operate at LOS D or better, and 2) ensure that there is no more than a 5 percent increase in delay at an intersection currently operating at an unacceptable LOS. This analysis should~~ provide a menu of potential improvements but ~~shall~~ should not mitigate LOS by reducing project size, either by intensity or density.

Decision-makers shall evaluate projects based on the merits of a project, including contribution to City character, and shall determine whether the City is best served by either implementing improvements to address potential circulation impacts~~LOS (either achieve LOS D or reduce delay by no more than 5 percent where LOS E or F currently occurs)~~ or, if improvements are determined to not be appropriate or feasible, ensuring that a project provides a certain level of density and intensity, as envisioned by Figure 2-2 (Land Use Map) to contribute to the social fabric of the community and meet the City's goals for economic development, economic vitality, and adequate housing.

~~Projects may be exempted from the LOS objectives established in this policy in cases where the City finds that:~~

- ~~The infrastructure improvements needed to maintain vehicle LOS (such as roadway or intersection widening or intersection control modifications) would:~~

- ~~Be in conflict with goals of improving multimodal circulation;~~

- ~~Would lead to other potentially undesirable impacts (reduced project size, increased right-of-way that would affect important resources, etc.);~~

- ~~Would adversely impact the character of Sebastopol; and/or~~

- ~~Would not facilitate desirable downtown area development.~~

Multimodal improvements, traffic calming improvements, or other system-wide transportation network improvements ~~have been~~ may be required in lieu of requiring mitigations to the impacted road or intersection in order to reduce the overall impacts to mobility. This approach could apply to the use of traffic impact fees collected from developments as well.

- Revise Policy CIR 1-10 (formerly Policy CIR 1-11):

  Policy CIR 1-10~~1~~: Consider all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access, and mobility for all roadway users and avoid dead-end streets and cul-de-sacs.

- Revise Policy CIR 1-14 (formerly Policy CIR 1-15):

  Policy CIR 1-14~~5~~: Maintain and improve critical transportation facilities ~~for~~ to provide logical emergency vehicle access and emergency evacuation needs.

- Revise Policy CIR 1-17:

  Policy CIR 1-17~~8~~: Consider ~~converting collector and local streets to~~ a "shared space" design where pedestrian activity is welcomed.

- Add Policy CIR 1-21:

  Policy CIR 1-21: Monitor the development and implementation of self-driving, autonomous vehicle technologies and consider appropriate methods to accommodate and adapt to these technology changes.

- Revise Action CIR 1b:

  Action CIR 1b: *Coordinate with the County of Sonoma, ~~and~~ Caltrans, and the City of Santa Rosa to investigate, and as appropriate, determine feasible alternative routes, bypasses or "beltway connector" routes, including both north-south and east-west routes, (e.g. Llano Road extension from SR 12 to Occidental Road, or measures to divert some Hwy. 116 traffic at the southern terminus of Llano Road, or diversion of some Hwy. 12 traffic to Occidental Road at Fulton Road, or improving Ragle Road) and evaluate benefits provided by these routes. If appropriate, work collaboratively with the County of Sonoma and Caltrans to determine the extent of roadway improvements needed to support these bypass routes, add the project to ~~future~~ the City's Capital Improvement Plans (CIP~~s~~) and/or seek County or other agencies plan improvements, encourage proactive participation and coordination by the SCTA and support funding through the SCTA or other sources, and as appropriate, update both City and County General Plan Circulation Elements to include these routes.*

- Revise Action CIR 1d:

  Action CIR 1d: *~~Complete~~ Consider the following roadway improvements and projects included in the CIP to maintain the safety and efficiency of the current circulation system, and to support buildout of the General Plan.*

  - *Healdsburg Avenue (SR 116)/Covert Lane intersection - install a traffic signal or roundabout*
  - *Healdsburg Avenue (SR 116)/Murphy Avenue intersection - install a traffic signal or roundabout*
  - *Gravenstein Highway South (SR 116)/Fircrest Avenue intersection - install a traffic signal or roundabout*
  - *McKinley Street/Laguna Park Way/Petaluma Avenue intersection - install a ~~HAWK beacon (also referred to as a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon)~~ beacon or appropriate pedestrian crossing improvements on the southern leg pedestrian crossing*
  - *Willow Street - extend the street through the City parking lot from Main Street to Petaluma Avenue to enhance grid connectivity*

- *Abbott Avenue - change route to parallel Sebastopol Avenue, with a potential connection to Morris Street*

– Revise Action CIR 1f:

Action CIR 1f: *As part of the development review process, the Planning Department, ~~and the~~ Public Works Department, Police Department, and Fire Department shall review development projects to ensure that developers:*

- *Construct transportation improvements along property frontages when appropriate*
- *Address the project's proportional-share of impacts to the City's circulation network through payment of traffic mitigation fees*
- *Provide for complete streets to the extent feasible; facilitating walking, biking, and transit modes*
- *Provide appropriate on-site pedestrian and bicycle features*
- *Fund traffic impact studies that identify on-site and off-site project effects and mitigation measures*
- *Provide adequate emergency vehicle access*
- *Minimize driveway cuts consistent with access and site planning considerations*

– Revise Action CIR 1f:

Action CIR 1g: *Update the City's Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) schedule to include, as appropriate, the roadway improvements necessary to support buildout of the General Plan.*

– Revise Action CIR 1q:

Action CIR 1q: *Provide outreach and opportunities for public engagement with transportation planning issues and project initiatives, including use of citizen ~~committees~~ bodies such as the Planning Commission ~~and a Complete Streets Committee~~.*

– Revise Action CIR 1r:

Action CIR 1r: *Coordinate with Caltrans to implement traffic calming, vehicle safety, and bicycle/pedestrian network improvements throughout Sebastopol. Also encourage Caltrans to maintain good pavement conditions on State Highways within Sebastopol, in order to reduce traffic-related roadway noise.*

– Add Action CIR 1s:

Action CIR 1s: Coordinate with Caltrans, SCTA, Sonoma County, school districts, and other appropriate entities to coordinate and optimize the use of circulation and mobility resources.

– Revise Policy CIR 2-3:

Policy CIR 2-3: Incorporate bicycle facilities according to the Sebastopol Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (including bicycle lanes, pavement markings, pavement ~~treatments, bicycle~~treatments, bicycle route and destination signs, and bicycle detection at traffic signals).

– Moved one policy and changed associated policy numbers. Policy CIR 2-9 was moved up and is now Policy CIR 2-8. The former Policy CIR 2-8 is now 2-9.

- Revise Policy CIR 2-15:

  Policy CIR 2-15: Ensure that all crossings where trails and roads meet include ~~enhanced, high visibility~~ best practices for crossing design for these conflict points.

- Revise Action CIR 2c:

  Action CIR 2c: Ensure that bicycle loop detectors are present at traffic signals, ~~and~~ clearly identified with stencils, and tested and maintained regularly.

- Revise Action CIR 2g:

  Action CIR 2g: Focus on the identification of more Class I multi-user trails and Class IV separated bike facilities. In particular, pursue Class I or Class IV alternatives to SR 116, SR 12 and Bodega Avenue, Class II Bike lanes, and sharrow markings to create viable north-south and east-west mobility opportunities for bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages, as identified in the Sebastopol Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

- Revise Action CIR 2h:

  Action CIR 2h: As funding becomes available, the City shall encourage Sonoma County Transit to provide faster and more efficient routes, more frequent headways, extend service hours, and serve a greater portion of the City. The City would review and renew the contract as necessary and, when feasible, include provisions for:.

  - *Consideration of an additional route.*
  - *Bus headways of 15~~45~~ minutes or less ~~are desirable~~ on routes serving Sebastopol.*
  - *Local bus service operating until 10 PM ~~would be desirable~~.*
  - *Saturday and Sunday bus services with expanded weekend hours ~~are desired~~.*

- Revise Action CIR 2l:

  Action CIR 2l: Identify potential bicycle and pedestrian connections between residential areas and school campuses and incorporate into the Sebastopol Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

- Revise Action CIR 2r:

  Action CIR 2r: Issue guidelines and incorporate assessment of multimodal LOS as a routine component of transportation impact analyses once the ~~Public Works~~Planning Department determines a multimodal LOS methodology that is deemed suitable for application in Sebastopol.

- Revise Action CIR 2s:

  Action CIR 2s: Periodically review priorities in the Sebastopol Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and update as necessary, incorporating current best practices.

- Add Policy CIR 3-13:

  Policy CIR 3-13: Use urban design techniques, such as minimizing curb cuts and driveways, to improve the pedestrian and bicycle environment.

- Revise Action CIR 3d:

  Action CIR 3d: The City shall develop a new truck route plan and associated signage that is consistent with the policies outlined in this Circulation Element.

- Revise Action CIR 5d:

  Action CIR 5d: Establish standards and requirements for electric vehicle parking, including the installation of electric vehicle charging stations, in new development projects.

- Revise Policy CIR 6-1:

  Policy CIR 6-1: Maximize the use of existing downtown parking areas, emphasizing the use of shared parking wherever possible, including provision of multi-purpose parking facilities~~lots~~ that serve both residential and commercial uses.

- Revise Policy CIR 6-5:

  Policy CIR 6-5: Look for ways to generate revenue from areas of high-demand parking to put towards bicycle facilities~~, schools,~~ and public spaces.

- Add Policy CIR 6-7:

  Policy CIR 6-7: Require parking facilities to provide for pedestrian access and safety, including delineated paths and walkways.

- Delete Action CIR 6f and renumber subsequent actions.
- Revise Action 6f (formerly Action 6g):

  Action CIR 6~~f~~g: Explore mechanisms, such as establishment of a parking district, funding parking facilities (structure(s) or lots) through payment of in-lieu or development impact fees, ~~metered parking,~~ and expanding the City's shared parking provisions, to allow proposed development downtown to not have to provide on-site parking.

4. COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES

- Revise Policy CSF 2-4:

  Policy CSF 2-4: Encourage and support the development of an integrated trails and routes network extending and connecting local and regional trails and routes to schools, open space areas, park and recreation facilities, and residential areas to serve both recreational and utilitarian travel

- Revise Action CSF-2a:

  Action CSF 2a: Develop and adopt a Parks and Recreation Master Plan. The plan should include and address:

  - *Needs Assessment for future park locations*
  - *Types of users and amenities needed*
  - *Coordinated efforts to integrate plans including: the Laguna Wetlands Preserve Restoration and Management Plan, Ives Park Master Plan, and Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*
  - *Opportunities to enhance bicycle and pedestrian connectivity*
  - *Maintenance needs and requirements for new and existing facilities*
  - *Future sites and facilities development for parks acquisition*
  - *Financial plan and funding sources*
  - *Use the CIP as a reference tool*

5. CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE

- Global revision to the Draft General Plan: add "or successor program" following references to CalGreen Tier 1 and CalGreen Tier 2

- Add Policy COS 8-7:

  Policy COS 8-7: Move toward becoming carbon neutral in municipal operations.

- Add Policy COS 9-7 (subsequent policies will be renumbered accordingly):

  Policy COS 9-7: Promote efforts and programs, including increased access to clean technologies such as electric vehicles and charging stations, to encourage residents, businesses, and local organizations to use clean energy sources to supplant dirty technologies.

- Add Policy COS 12-20:

  Policy COS 12-20: Discourage new automobile crossings of regional multi-use trails to preserve open space characteristics.

6. NOISE

Minor revisions for formatting and typos. No significant revisions to the goals, policies, or actions.

7. COMMUNITY DESIGN

- Revise Policy CD 1-6:

  Policy CD 1-6: Maintain and enforce Zoning Ordinance provisions and design guidelines that prohibit auto-centric strip development~~, where appropriate, along South Main Street, Gravenstein Highway South, Gravenstein Highway North, Healdsburg Avenue, and Sebastopol Avenue~~.

- Revise Policy CD 1-10:

  Policy CD 1-10: Encourage and support increased nighttime hours of operation for restaurants, retail centers, commercial hubs, community and special events, and similar uses in order to enhance community vibrancy, without adversely impacting the tranquility of residential neighborhoods.

- Revise Action CD 1b:

  Action CD 1b: Develop and update urban design guidelines to include design standards and goals for key districts, areas, or types of development throughout the community, including, but not limited to, the Downtown, Gravenstein Highway (north and south), as well as single family and multifamily types of development. Design guidelines should include provisions that enhance and support the unique qualities of areas, as well as supporting the character of residential neighborhoods. The design guidelines should allow for creative design solutions and architectural diversity. Consideration should be given to incorporating form-based code components into the design guidelines.

- Revise Action CD 1c:

  Action CD 1c: *Provide design and development guidelines for gateways to the city to encourage special features and to discourage the establishment of new fast-food establishments, auto-dependent businesses, and similar uses and minimize sidewalk driveway cuts to the maximum extent possible.*

- Revise Action CD 1i:

  Action CD 1i: *Identify priority street improvements that would make a substantial contribution to the character and connectivity of centers and commercial hubs, including widening sidewalks, narrowing travel lanes, creating attractive medians, landscaping, standards for parklets, and the establishment of "green corridors" and passageways that provide connectivity for non-vehicular travelers.*

- Add Action CD 1l:

  Action CD 1l: Regularly monitor the status and condition of all City-owned signs and conduct maintenance activities and periodic upgrades to City signs in order to improve the visual appearance of the city.

- Revise Policy CD 2-3:

  Policy CD 2-3: Upgrade and enhance the Downtown plaza, surrounding areas, and nearby parking to improve functionality and provide better connectivity throughout the Downtown and between ~~the~~ Downtown ~~Core~~ and surrounding areas~~, including the Barlow~~.

- Revise Policy CD 2-5:

  Policy CD 2-5: Encourage, promote, and assist with the development of housing opportunities within Downtown that include a mix of income levels and housing types, and ~~where feasible~~ to the maximum extent possible explore adaptive re-use opportunities within existing buildings.

- Revise Action CD 2d:

  Action CD 2d: *Implement the policies and actions in the Circulation Element ~~that~~ to consider establishing flexible parking standards to facilitate an effective utilization of parking spaces, promote increased walkability and bicycle use, and provide traffic calming measures that increase safety and visual appeal within the Downtown ~~Core~~.*

- Revise Action CD 2f:

  Action CD 2f: *Consider revising the Downtown planning boundary or revising zoning designations to include areas such as ~~the Barlow and~~ South Main Street and the Light Industrial area west of Morris Street between Bodega Avenue and Laguna Park Way.*

- Revise Action CD 2j:

  Action CD 2j: *Continue to seek opportunities to enhance the Town Plaza in order to provide for a centralized gathering place in the Downtown ~~Core~~. Enhancements may include better orientation between the adjacent businesses and the Plaza; the exploration of possible relocation of all or portions of the existing parking spots on Weeks Way to accommodate additional pedestrian-oriented community space and an enlarged plaza; and traffic calming measures to improve the pedestrian experience.*

– Revise Action CD 3e:

Action CD 3e: *Develop a priority list for the restoration and preservation of ~~City owned~~significant structures in the City~~, such as City Hall~~.*

– Revise Goal CD 4:

Goal CD 4: Support Art ~~and SculptureOff~~of All Types Throughout the Community

– Revise Policy CD 4-1:

Policy CD 4-1: Support and encourage public art ~~and sculpture~~of all types that reflects the cultural values of the community.

– Revise Action CD 4e:

Action CD 4e: *Inventory and document significant public art and ensure timely and appropriate removal of temporary installations.*

8. SAFETY

– Revise Policy SA 2-9:

Policy SA 2-9: ~~Disallow~~ Prohibit development in the 100-year flood zone unless requirements of the City's Flood Damage Protection Ordinance criteria are met.

– Revise Action SA 2a:

Action SA 2a: If critical facilities, new development, and/or infrastructure are proposed in a flood hazard zone, evaluate whether the use is appropriate for the flood hazard zone. Any new development and infrastructure in the 100-year flood zone or other special flood hazard area as identified by Federal Emergency Management Agency shall be subject to the City's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance and built in accordance with best practices and shall be flood-resistant or shall incorporate methods to minimize flood damage, such as being adequately anchored to prevent flotation or collapse, constructed with flood resistant materials below the base flood elevation, and designed or located such that floodwater is prevented from entering or accumulating in the components that are not flood resistant.

– Add Action SA 2p:

Action SA 2p: Encourage use of permaculture and site design techniques to increase groundwater recharge in development, including in residential yards.

– Revise Policy SA 3-3:

Policy SA 3-3: Provide an effective communications system to properly respond to emergencies and ensure interoperability with all County and State communications systems.

– Revise Policy SA 3-6:

Policy SA 3-6: Support and encourage community awareness of local and regional disaster planning and emergency response efforts, including the Sebastopol Community Emergency Response Training (CERT) program to provide emergency response training, the Multi-Jurisdictional Local Government Hazard Mitigation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area, Map Your Neighborhood programs, outreach to

business and property owners regarding the Emergency Preparedness Plan, outreach to the community to ensure residents and business owners know where gas and electrical shut-offs are located, and other tools available to neighborhood and community groups to improve disaster preparedness.

- Revise Policy SA 4-3:

  Policy SA 4-3: Continue to adequately fund and staff the Sebastopol Fire Department to ensure a high level fire services and emergency response and continue to collect and review annually a broad range of data regarding fire department operations and response times to adequately evaluate staffing and funding needs.

- Revise Policy SA 4-5:

  Policy SA 4-5: Continue to evaluate and update the personnel and equipment requirements of the Fire Department to maintain a high level of readiness and ensure equipment compatibility with mutual aid partners.

- Revise Action SA 4k:

  Action SA 4k: Obtain the equipment and trained personnel to provide emergency medical defibrillation for people suffering from cardiac arrest and identify community facilities where automatic electronic defibrillators are needed and ensure automatic electronic defibrillators are funded and installed in these locations.

- Revise Policy SA 5-6:

  Policy SA 5-6: Continue to ensure a strong relationship between the Police Department and the local community through a range of public events, community outreach, and transparency in Police Department operations designed to benefit all segments of the community and conduct sensitivity training to establish communication and rapport to continue exemplary Police Department relations with all segments of the community.

- Revise Action SA 5b:

  Action SA 5b: Continue community-based police outreach services and programs for all segments of the community, including but not limited to, minorities, neighborhood watch, volunteers in police service, and crime and safety needs of seniors, and continue Police Department training and policies to address emergencies, including mental health issues, and to de-escalate potentially violent situations.

- Revise Policy SA 6-4:

  Policy SA 6-4: Develop, in cooperation with the County, Caltrans, and neighboring cities, regulations prohibiting through-transport by truck of hazardous materials ~~on the local street systems, and requiring that this activity be limited to State highways~~through Downtown and identify alternate routes for the transport hazardous materials.

- Add Action 6i:

  Action SA 6i: Encourage use of the County and local medication drop-off programs to ensure safe disposal of prescription and other medications.

9. ECONOMIC VITALITY

- Add Policy EV 1-4:

  Policy EV 1-4: Recognize that socially conscious businesses should pay a living wage to all workers and that failure to do so results in social and environmental effects and becomes a burden on the economy.

- Revise Policy EV 1-5:

  Policy EV 1-5~~4~~: Ensure that adequate sites are available through appropriate land use practices to accommodate a diverse range of desired businesses, including professional, technical, industrial, retail, and service-oriented, in order to provide goods and services to the West County region and to provide skilled, high-paying jobs for local residents.

- Revise Policy EV 1-6:

  Policy EV 1-6~~5~~: Consider economic and fiscal impact information in making key land use and other decisions that affect the City and encourage a diverse economic base that does not rely unduly on any one single industry, recognizing that a diverse economy is less susceptible to sector-specific economic downturns. Discourage overreliance on single economic and industry sectors for economic well-being.

- Revise Policy EV 1-8:

  Policy EV 1-8~~7~~: Encourage local-serving neighborhood retail uses readily accessible to residential areas. The intent of this policy is to encourage small-scale developments, compatible with the immediately surrounding area. ~~For example, local pedestrian-oriented stores would be encouraged, while larger-scale, auto-oriented enterprises would be discouraged near neighborhood areas.~~

- Revise Policy EV 1-10:

  Policy EV 1-10~~9~~: Encourage partnerships and collaboration between the City, the Sebastopol Chamber of Commerce, the Center for the Arts, Cittaslow Sebastopol, Sebastopol Entrepreneurs Project, the Downtown Association, other cities in the region, Sonoma County Economic Development Board, and various industry organizations in order to pursue regional economic development opportunities and improve relations with private industry.

- Revise Action EV 1b:

  Action EV 1b: *Require large-scale development projects to submit a ~~Community Impact~~ r~~R~~eport~~, as required by Action CSF-1h,~~ that analyzes the economic and fiscal costs and benefits of the proposed project.*

- Revise Action EV 1h:

  Action EV 1h: *Work with telecommunications service providers to ensure the access and availability of a wide range of state-of-the-art telecommunication systems and services for households, businesses, institutions, and public agencies throughout the community and work with property owners and landlords to identify the highest and best use for properties.*

- Revise Action EV 1i:

  Action EV 1i: Update the Zoning Code to identify appropriate areas for ground-floor residential in zoning districts that are primarily non-residential or allow a mix of uses and to

identify areas where ground-floor residential uses are prohibited, such as fronting the primary streets in the City's business districts.

- Revise Policy EV 2-5:

  Policy EV 2-5: Identify business and service needs that are underrepresented locally and encourage new development that meets the City's needs and provides for a stronger tax base. Discourage oversupply of similar businesses in a single sector that could result in inter-business cannibalization.

- Revise Action EV 2d:

  Action EV 2d: Review and update the City's existing Formula Business Ordinance to consider prohibiting formula businesses in the Downtown, and establishing limits on the number of formula businesses that may be permitted in other areas of the City in order to avoid an over-concentration of such businesses in any given area of the City.

- Revise Action EV 2e:

  Action EV 2e: Consider whether the Zoning Code should be revised to address concentration and limitation of certain types of uses, including alcohol sales and wine-tasting rooms.

- Revise Policy EV 3-1:

  Policy EV 3-1: Recognize and support the Downtown, Northern Gateway, and Southern Gateway as distinct, but connected, business districts.

- Revise Policy EV 3-4:

  Policy EV 3-4: Ensure that there is adequate connectivity, including pedestrian and bicyclist, to the ~~Downtown~~business districts.

- Revise Action EV 3f:

  Action EV 3f: Consider expanding the Downtown Association to include the Light Industrial area west of Morris Street between Bodega Avenue and Laguna Park Way.

- Revise Goal EV 4:

Goal EV 4: Emphasize Sebastopol's Role as a ~~Tourism,~~ Market, ~~and~~ Service, and Tourism Hub for the West County and as a Gateway to the Coast

- Revise Policy EV 4-6:

  Policy EV 4-6: Encourage people traveling through Sebastopol to stop, visit, and shop, including through emphasizing ~~the Park Once and Walk, Sebastopol Ped Line, and other~~ pedestrian- and visitor-oriented programs.

- Revise Policy EV 4c:

  Action EV 4c: Encourage ~~more~~ festivals and community events that promote an enhanced arts and culture environment.

– Revise Goal EV 5:

Goal EV 5: Enhance the City's Existing Businesses, Encourage Start-up Businesses, and Support Home-based ~~Work~~Businesses

– Revise Policy EV 7-1:

Policy EV 7-1: Provide~~mote~~ transparency in City fiscal policy and activities, including the City budget, annual City audits, Capital Improvement Program, development impact fee schedule, and user fees schedule for various City services, and ensure that City documents and materials are user-friendly and intuitive.

– Revise Policy EV 7-3:

Policy EV 7-3: ~~Establish~~ Continue to maintain a budget reserve policy to ensure funds are available to cover reasonably foreseeable emergencies and economic declines.

– Revise Action EV 7a:

Action EV 7a: As part of the development of the City budget and annual financial audits, ensure that information is readily available to the public, presented in a user-friendly manner, including text and graphics to describe budget information and multi-year spending trends and forecasts, and encourage the public to review and comment on the City budget and annual audit.

– Revise Action EV 7c:

Action EV 7c: Consider the creation of an Economic Development Corporation as a means to acquire property~~, develop property,~~ and issue use rights for the purpose of encouraging business development that is consistent with the City's vision and goals and generating revenue streams to the City's General Fund to support desired services and development projects.

10. COMMUNITY HEALTH AND WELLNESS

– Revise Action CHW 1e:

Action CHW 1e: Implement the policies and actions in the Housing Element to ensure a range of safe and secure housing types accessible to ~~special needs groups, including~~ low income families, workforce families, ~~the~~ elder~~sly~~, and people with disabilities.

– Revise Policy CHW 3-2:

Policy CHW 3-2: Encourage sustainable local food systems including farmer's markets, community gardens, edible school yards, community supported agriculture, neighborhood garden exchanges, ~~urban agriculture,~~ federal food assistance programs, and healthy food retailers and recognize that water use to support local food systems is an appropriate use and is not considered comparable to water use for a lawn or landscaping.

– Revise Policy CHW 3-3:

Policy CHW 3-3: Recognize that small-scale community agriculture programs, including but not limited to community and private gardens, ~~urban farms~~, residential chicken-raising, and bee keeping have the potential to supplement the availability of fresh fruits, vegetables, and other food resources in the community, provide economic

opportunities to Sebastopol residents, lower food costs, reduce overall energy consumption and build social cohesion.

- Revise Policy CHW 3-4:

  Policy CHW 3-4: Encourage ~~new and existing~~ convenience stores, supermarkets, liquor stores, and neighborhood markets to stock nutritional food choices, including local produce, local meats and dairy, 100% juices, and whole-grain products.

- Revise Action CHW 5e:

  Action CHW 5e: Add additional information to the City's website that informs the public about and celebrates the City's cultural heritage, including Sebastopol's First Peoples.

- Revise Policy CHW 6-1:

  Policy CHW 6-1: Address responsible alcohol consumption through outreach and efforts intended to reduce adult high-risk drinking ~~and underage access to alcohol~~ and its related problems.

- Add Policy CHW 6-2:

  Policy CHW 6-2: Continue to support measures to eliminate underage drinking, tobacco use, and drug use.

- Revise Policy CHW 6-3:

  Policy CHW 6-~~3~~2: Reduce exposure to all sources of second- and third-hand ~~tobacco~~ smoke.

- Add Policy CHW 6g:

  Action CHW 6g: Support programs that link people that have been drinking or are otherwise at-risk with safe rides home.

11. HOUSING

No revisions – this element was adopted in 2015.

12. IMPLEMENTATION

This chapter has been revised to include all of the revisions to the actions identified in the General Plan. Please see Chapter 12 of the City Council Review General Plan.