Planning Director
Kenyon Webster
Assistant Planner
Jonathan Atkinson
Administrative Assistant
Rebecca Mansour

City of Sebastopol
Planning Commission Staff Report

Meeting Date:	August 9, 2016
Agenda Item:	9A
To:	Planning Commission
From:	Kenyon Webster, Planning Director
Subject:	Public Hearing on Final EIR and Draft General Plan
Recommendation:	Conduct Public Hearing, Adopt Resolutions Recommending Certification of FEIR, Adoption of Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Adoption of the Draft General Plan
CEQA Status:	Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

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 Planning Commission conduct a public hearing, review and consider public comments received on the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan and corresponding Draft EIR, provide any final edits or revisions to the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan, and approve a resolution recommending City Council adoption of the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan, and a resolution recommending certification of the Final EIR and adoption of the CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

State General Plan Law

California Government Code Section 65300 et seq. requires all counties and cities in the State to prepare and maintain a general plan for the long-term growth, development, and management of the land within the jurisdiction's planning boundaries. The general plan acts as a "constitution" for development, and is the City's lead legal document in relation to growth, development, and resource management issues. Development regulations (e.g., zoning and subdivision standards and public improvement plans and projects, such as a Capital Improvement Program) are required by law to be consistent with the General Plan.

General plans must address a broad range of topics, including, at a minimum, the following mandatory elements: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. At the discretion of each jurisdiction, the General Plan may combine these elements and may add optional elements relevant to the physical features of the jurisdiction.

The California Government Code also requires that a General Plan be comprehensive, internally consistent, and plan for the long term. The General Plan should be clearly written, easy to administer, and available to all those concerned with the community's development.

State planning and zoning law (California Government Code Section 65000 et seq.) establishes that zoning ordinances are required to be consistent with the general plan and any applicable specific plans, area plans, master plans, and other related planning documents. When amendments to the general plan are made, corresponding changes in the zoning ordinance may be required within a reasonable time to ensure consistency between the revised land use designations in the general plan (if any) and the permitted uses or development standards of the zoning ordinance (Gov. Code Section 65860, subd. [c]).

General Plan Update Process

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 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. 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 provide 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, 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.

Key General Plan Documents Prepared

Existing Conditions Report

The Existing Conditions Report identifies development patterns, natural resources, socioeconomic conditions, and environmental constraints in the city, and identifies the regulatory environment for each topic. This report is a resource for the City Council, Planning Commission, General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), City staff, and the De Novo Planning Group team for the General Plan Update and Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Existing Conditions Report makes extensive use of maps and graphics to help make it accessible to the general public. The Existing Conditions Report provides background data and serves as a technical framework, while the General Plan will focus on goals, policies, and action programs. The Existing Conditions Report was completed and published in August 2014.

Issues and Opportunities Report

Based on public input from community visioning workshops, information contained in the Existing Conditions Report, stakeholder interviews, and direction from City staff, this report identifies key issues and opportunities to be addressed in the General Plan and summarizes input provided by participants of the visioning workshops. This Issues and Opportunities Report provides the General Plan Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission, and the City Council with tools and information for the development of the General Plan Policy Document and associated Land Use and Circulation Maps.

Housing Element

The Housing Element of the General Plan was completed in advance of the rest of the General Plan in order to comply with State-mandated adoption deadlines. The Housing Element was presented to the Planning Commission and City Council over a series of meetings in late 2014 and early 2015, and was adopted by the City Council on March 30, 2015.

Public Draft General Plan

The Public Draft General Plan represents the culmination of all of the project efforts completed thus far, particularly the successful and collaborative work of the GPAC. The Public Draft General Plan was released for a 45-day public review and comment period that commenced on May 23, 2016 and ended on July 8, 2016. Prior to release of the Public Draft General Plan, the Planning Commission and City Council were asked to review a Preliminary Draft General Plan in detail over the course of three workshops in early 2016, in order to make edits and revisions, and prepare the document for the public review and comment period. The Public Draft General Plan included all input received from the Planning Commission and City Council during the three joint workshops in early 2016.

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 will 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.

Comments Received on the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR

A total of three comment letters were received that addressed the content of the Draft General Plan and/or the Draft EIR. Comments were received from the following agencies, organizations, and individuals:

1. **California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).** The letter from Caltrans suggested that the City should make fair-share contributions (payments) towards the planned safety enhancement project that would install a High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk (HAWK) beacon at the southern leg of the McKinley Street (SR 116)/Petaluma Avenue (SR 116)/Laguna Park Way intersection. A detailed response to this comment is provided in the Final EIR, and staff recommends no changes to the General Plan as a result of this comment.

2. **Sonoma Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).** The letter from LAFCO compliments the City in the preparation of a General Plan and EIR that properly addresses future growth-related impacts in the City's SOI and UGB, and lauds the City for ongoing cooperation and coordination with other local agencies to solve issues of regional concerns (such as traffic). The letter noted some minor inconsistencies in the Draft EIR text, which have been corrected in the Final EIR. A detailed response to this comment is provided in the Final EIR, and staff recommends no changes to the General Plan as a result of this comment.

3. **Nancy Prebilich (Sebastopol Resident).** This letter was submitted to formally request that the property at 7600 Leland Street and the adjacent property at 7605 Bodega Ave. be designated "Low Density Residential" Land Use, and subsequently rezoned "Residential Agricultural District," as part of the officially adopted General Plan Update. The letter also proposes an ordinance amendment that would allow for roadside accessory buildings within the Residential Agricultural and Rural Residential Districts for the expressed purpose of selling/buying locally produced goods in accordance with H.R. 10339 "Farm-To-Consumer Direct Marketing Act" of 1979 and AB 1616 "California Homemade Food Act" of 2012.

The City's existing (1994) General Plan Land Use Map designates both of these parcels as Medium Density Residential (MDR). The proposed (2016) Land Use Map continues to designate the parcel at 7600 Leland Street as MDR, and designates the parcel at 7605 Bodega Avenue as High Density Residential (HDR). The direction to change 7605 Bodega Avenue to HDR was provided by the GPAC, and was based on the desire to see an expanded and contiguous stretch of HDR parcels along this portion of Bodega Avenue. The Planning Commission may wish to discuss and consider this parcel change request.

The comment letter from Ms. Prebilich did not address the EIR or the adequacy of the environmental analysis. As such, this letter is not included or responded to in the Final EIR. However, the letter from Ms. Prebilich has been provided to the Planning Commission and City Council for their consideration during hearings on the General Plan.

Recommendation

- Adopt the attached Resolution recommending that the City Council certify 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.

- Adopt the attached Resolution recommending that the City Council approve 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 recommending adoption of the proposed General Plan
3. 2016 Sebastopol General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, July 2016
4. 2016 Sebastopol General Plan, May 2016 (previously transmitted)
5. Public comments on 2016 General Plan

City of Sebastopol

Planning Commission Resolution

A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Sebastopol recommending that the City Council certify 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.

Now, Therefore, after consideration of the record in these proceedings, including the testimony, exhibits, and materials presented at the hearing, the Planning Commission 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 Planning Commission 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 Planning Commission'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 Planning Commission recommends that the City Council certify the Final EIR (Exhibit "A") and adopt the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit "B") in support of approval of the project; and

5. The Planning Commission recommends 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 Planning Commission 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 Planning Commission on _____, 2016 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nayes:

Abstain:

Absent:

Certified by: _____

Kenyon Webster, Planning Director

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

Planning Commission Resolution

A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Sebastopol recommending that the City Council adopt 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, the Planning Commission has adopted a Resolution recommending that the City Council certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and adopt Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission of the City of Sebastopol held a public hearing on this project at its regular meeting of August 9, 2016; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission has considered the staff report, supporting documents, public testimony, and all appropriate information that has been submitted with the proposed project.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Planning Commission 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 requested 2016 Sebastopol General Plan.

2. Approval of the requested 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 recommends that the City Council adopt the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan.

Adopted by the City of Sebastopol Planning Commission on _____, 2016 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nayes:

Abstain:

Absent:

Certified by: _____

Kenyon Webster, Planning Director

July 7, 2016

Dear City Council,

By recommendation of city staff, I would like to formally request that both my property at 7600 Leland Street and the adjacent property at 7605 Bodega Ave. be designated "Low Density Residential" Land Use, and subsequently rezoned "Residential Agricultural District," as part of the officially adopted General Plan Update. Furthermore, I would like to propose an ordinance amendment that would allow for roadside accessory buildings within the Residential Agricultural and Rural Residential Districts for the expressed purpose of selling/buying locally produced goods in accordance with H.R. 10339 "Farm-To-Consumer Direct Marketing Act" of 1979 and AB 1616 "California Homemade Food Act" of 2012. I am attaching the 114/124 (respectively) unsolicited signatures of neighboring residents who lend their support and share in this request. I have reviewed the General Plan Update draft and can demonstrate the already existing support for this request as outlined in the GPU's guiding principles and vision, and as they pertain specifically to Land Use, Circulation, Conservation and Open Space, Economic Vitality, and Community Health and Wellness.

Throughout the GPU process, a primary guiding principle has been to "Protect Sebastopol's small-town charm, unique character, and strong sense of community," with a particular emphasis on "sustainability and environmental stewardship." I submit that the retention and promotion of small-scale agricultural practices, even within city limits, inherently encompasses the goal of natural resource conservation and open space preservation while preserving Sebastopol's unique history, culture, and charm. It is also proactive and forward thinking in areas of economic vitality, sustainability and community wellness, as it is a well-known fact that urban farming is a key strategy towards food sovereignty. Since the late 1800's, American leaders, from Detroit Mayor Hazen S. Pingree (1893) to Woodrow Wilson, Eleanor Roosevelt and most recently Michelle Obama, have called upon the American people to practice urban subsistence farming, particularly during our most depressed moments in history, not as a novelty, but as a necessity towards creating income opportunity, food security, and community health and vitality. One has only to look at the recently revealed success of Cuba's urban farming to understand that it is in the best interest of self-preservation to encourage and protect one's right to farm. The properties at 7600 Leland St. and 7605 Bodega Ave. have historically utilized small farming practices and have continued to do so for the past 80 years. Now is the time and the GPU is the process by which to protect both Sebastopol's history and future.

One of the goals within the GPU Land Use element is to set forth a vision for how open space and agricultural use "will occur in the city limits." This vision is congruent with California state law requiring "proposed general distribution, general location, and extent of uses of land for... open space, including agriculture, natural resources, recreation, and enjoyment of scenic beauty." Both 7600 Leland Street and 7605 Bodega Ave. are currently designated as "Medium Density Residential," allowing for 2.1 to 6.0 units/acre and eligible to be zoned "Rural Residential." A re-zoning of these properties, as they currently exist, would be in keeping with the last remaining Rural Residential properties that stretch adjacently from Jewel/Leland/First St. to the city's southern border. More progressive, however, would be a change to "Low Density Residential" which would be in keeping with the also adjacent "Residential Agricultural District," stretching from Leland Street to the southern border. While this change would be reducing the number of potentially permitted units, it would be a bold move towards open space preservation and natural resource conservation, particularly considering that Calder Creek runs through both

these properties. Additionally, continuing the linear "Residential Ag" land use application would help to optimize the natural health benefits associated with strategic land management practices such as rotational planting and livestock grazing.

A change in the Land Use designation and zoning of these two properties, and making the suggested amendment to allow farm stands, also sets a progressive example in the area of "Circulation." By preserving and embracing one of the oldest neighborhoods in Sebastopol, where "Shared Space" currently minimizes ever-increasing vehicular traffic, and creating more destination points outside of the Downtown Core, the city residents can enjoy making pedestrian and bicycle transportation a reasonable and practical way of daily life. Roadside farm stands will accomplish Goal CIR3 "Coordinate Circulation Facilities with Land Use and Development Patterns to Create an Environment that Encourages Walking, Bicycling, and Transit Use," and actively reinforce policies CIR 3-1 through CIR 3-8.

Perhaps the single most significant justification for granting this request is in the area of "Conservation and Open Space." As stated, "this element also addresses the topics of energy conservation, air quality, water quality, and the preservation of cultural and historical resources." Policy COS 1-1 notes that the City strive "to establish Sebastopol as a leader in environmental protection, environmental stewardship, and sustainability." Part of protecting and enhancing sensitive habitats, including creek corridors (Policy 2-1) *is* to preserve biodiversity including agricultural lands (Policy 2-2). These two properties should be considered part of a "high priority conservation area" (COS 2-3) as the creek corridor provides habitat for native species. They too should be "managed with minimal interference from nearby urban land use."

While it is often argued by the uninformed that naturally sensitive areas should remain untouched in order to preserve them, it is a well-known fact among practical conservationists that sustainable agricultural/permacultural practices not only maintain, but also repair and enhance such areas. Such sustainable practices include the recycling of food waste as animal nutrition, which leads to natural soil fertilization, aeration, and compression, which encourages vegetative propagation, which in turn controls soil erosion, protects water quality, and reduces potential flooding (Policy COS 9-12/9-14). These very practices have been in existence on the two mentioned properties for over 80 years. To legitimately allow them to continue would not only be environmentally responsible, it would fulfill Policy COS 10-5: "Protect important historical resources and use these resources to promote a sense of place and history in Sebastopol" Policy COS 10-6: "Encourage the voluntary identification, conservation, and re-use of historical structures, properties, and sites with special and recognized historic, architectural, or aesthetic value, Policy COS 11-4: "Preserve and protect prominent views of scenic resources...", Policy COS 12-2: "Preserve open space for conservation, recreation, and agricultural uses in order to enhance the quality of life and the quality of the environment in Sebastopol," Policy COS 12-5: "Recognize urban open space as essential to maintaining a high quality of life within the city limits of Sebastopol," Policy COS 12-7: "Encourage public and private efforts to preserve open space," Policy COS 12-16: "Minimize conflicts between agricultural and urban land uses," **Policy COS 12-18: "Assist agricultural landowners and farmers, as feasible, with a variety of programs aimed at preserving agricultural lands, increasing opportunities for local sales of agricultural products, and increasing access to local commodities markets,"** and last but not least **Policy COS 12-19: "Encourage small -scale food production,**

such as community gardens and cooperative neighborhood growing efforts, on parcels within city limits."

The GPU draft has also identified several "Key industries to attract" within its "Economic Vitality Element." Among these are "green business, agricultural research and development, and ecotourism." While the "Economic Vitality element" is not mandated by State law, it is the expressed desire of the city to create "more economic diversity and emphasize culture, arts, and cultural diversity." It is the goal of the Economic Vitality Element to "Provide Services and Goods that Reflect the City's Values" (Goal EV 1) as well as to "Support Home-based Work" (Goal EV 5).

Preserving agricultural land use and accommodating direct-to-consumer outlets would be actively "encouraging micro-enterprises, entrepreneurial ventures, home-based businesses..." (Policy EV 5-3) The allowance of accessory buildings to serve as roadside farm stands would directly accomplish Policy EV 1-7: "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..."

Lastly, I would like to reference the opening remarks under the "Community Health and Wellness" element:

> Land use and planning decisions play a role in determining community members' behavioral and lifestyle choices that ultimately impact their physical health and mental wellbeing. The quality, safety, location, and convenience of the pedestrian or bicycle environment, such as sidewalks, bicycle lanes, signals, and crosswalks, can impact a resident's decision to use them, which in turn influences physical activity levels. Similarly, neighborhood parks and open space provide an avenue for increased physical activity. Infrastructure and zoning to support local food processing and distribution enables local food to be used in the community where it was grown. Access to full-service grocery stores and farmers' markets is also correlated with increased consumption of fruits and vegetables....
>
> ...
>
> Addressing public health and wellness in the Sebastopol General Plan acknowledges the profound effects of the built environment on travel choices, access to food, levels of physical activity, and exposure to risk from accidents or pollution. Each of these has a health impact, and the General Plan provides an opportunity to prevent further disease and injury and sustain healthy lifestyle choices for Sebastopol residents. Through the creation of a healthy general plan, Sebastopol can focus on opportunities to affect changes in the overall health and wellbeing of the community.
>
> As such, the issues that affect and surround community health and wellness are addressed throughout all elements of this General Plan. For example:

> The Land Use Element addresses the built environment including the mix of uses, density and intensity and creating a walkable environment.
>
> The Circulation Element includes goals and policies on creating a multi-modal transportation system that promotes walkability, bicycle use, and alternatives to single-passenger vehicle use.
>
> The Conservation and Open Space Element lays out goals and policies to improve the amount of, access to, and quality of parks and open spaces in and around Sebastopol, addresses key aspects of environmental health, including clean water, clean air, and the protection of natural resources.
>
> ...
>
> The Economic Vitality Element includes a range of policies and programs aimed at improving local economic conditions, providing increased job opportunities, and supporting local businesses that serve as the backbone of the local economy.
>
> ...
>
> This Community Health and Wellness Element addresses public health at a broad level in order to support a healthy community through increasing access to necessary services, considering public health in land use decisions, and encouraging provision of healthy foods.

Granting this request will serve to fulfill Actions CHW-1a, 1c, 1d, 1l, and particularly noteworthy CHW 3f: "***Work with the Sonoma County Food System Alliance, Health Action, non-profits, community groups and regulatory agencies to explore the potential for creating, expanding and sustaining local urban agriculture, including community gardens, and orchards. The work effort should explore the feasibility of implementing the following strategies:***

- ***Promoting urban agriculture as a desirable civic activity that improves the quality of urban life, food security, neighborhood safety and environmental stewardship;***
- ***Supporting the development of appropriate agriculture in residential, industrial, business, and open space zones;***
- ***Support farm to institution (such as schools, hospitals, nursing homes, daycare centers) and businesses (such as restaurants and food outlets), while creating economic opportunities for urban growers and related industries;***
- ***Support efforts of local gardening organizations to promote the development and expansion of family and community gardens as well as edible landscaping;***
- ***Encourage and promote local garden food exchanges and local food cooperatives; and***
- ***Work with representatives of local farming organizations to meet needs unique to urban farm enterprises."***

Moreover, it would fulfill the following Policies:

Policy CHW 3-1: Promote the availability of locally grown and locally sourced fresh fruits and vegetables, meats, dairy, eggs, and other natural and nutritional food options.
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.
Policy CHW 3-3: Recognize that small-scale community agriculture programs, including but not limited to community 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.
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.

I hope that I have clearly demonstrated all the reasons why the land use and zoning re-designation of 7600 Leland St. and 7605 Bodega Ave, and the amendment to the limitation of accessory buildings within the Rural Residential/Residential Agricultural Districts, would not only be in compliance with the Goals and Actions Plans laid out in the General Plan Update, but would be in the best overall interest of the City of Sebastopol and its residents. I would also like to remind you that this is not only a personal request, but a request supported by over 100 residents who live, walk, bike, drive by these properties each and every day. If I had wanted to go door-to-door to solicit support, I am without a doubt that the number of signatures would have soared into the hundreds, however, I thought it'd speak for itself; the fact that the support demonstrated was unsolicited and unpressured. It is a true and genuine reflection of the will of the people whose lives would be positively impacted by granting this request. I sincerely hope you will take it to heart and act accordingly.

Respectfully,
Nancy Prebilich

7600 Leland St.
Sebastopol, CA 95472

We, the undersigned residents of Sebastopol hereby petition the City of Sebastopol to adopt an ordinance allowing for roadside accessory buildings within the Residential Agricultural and Rural Residential Districts for the expressed purpose of selling/buying locally produced goods in accordance to H.R. 10339 "Farm-To-Consumer Direct Marketing Act" of 1976 and AB 1616 "California Homemade Food Act" of 2012.

(Signees must be residents of Sebastopol and at least 18 years of age)

NAME (Print)	ADDRESS	PHONE	SIGNATURE
Nancy Pabich	7602 Leland St Seb	707 477 0879	
Dave Schneider	1293 Pine Tree Lane Seb	707-696-0623	
[illegible]	" "	707-695-0405	
Denise Meier	10200 Bloomfield Rd	707 824 0220	
[illegible]	7100 1st St Seb	707 823-4526	
Ryan Nice	559 Pleasant Hill Rd	415 823-4951	
Laura Sanchez	851 Robinson Rd	831 392 6670	
KEITH DALE	7109 LELAND ST	707 575 4373	
[illegible]	[illegible]		
[illegible]	[illegible]		
Norma Rosenthal	7105 Fellers Loop		
[illegible]			
[illegible]			
[illegible]			
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]		
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	7225 Bonisgal Ave	[illegible]	
Mike [illegible]	2515 Bella Vista Ave	707 4087 3526	
Mona [illegible]	7777 Bodega Ave #45	[illegible]	
Matthew [illegible]	4777 Bodega Ave	[illegible] 4565	
Louis Hartmann	100 [illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
Lucy [illegible]	280 1st St Sebastopol	818-642-2234	
[illegible]	[illegible]	(707) 823 1295	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
SAndra Ashmen	7220 Snow St. Seb	707.548.5619	
[illegible]	1870 Sandelos rd Seb	707 590 5846	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible] Dushenbaugh	7174 Palm Ave Seb	415 706-1619	
[illegible]	885 1st St Seb	707 835 4500	

We, the undersigned residents of Sebastopol hereby petition the City of Sebastopol to adopt an ordinance allowing for roadside accessory buildings within the Residential Agricultural and Rural Residential Districts for the expressed purpose of selling/buying locally produced goods in accordance to H.R. 10339 "Farm-To-Consumer Direct Marketing Act" of 1976 and AB 1616 "California Homemade Food Act" of 2012.

(Signees must be residents of Sebastopol and at least 18 years of age)

NAME (Print)	ADDRESS	PHONE	SIGNATURE
[illegible]	9526 LELAND [illegible]	707-[illegible]	[illegible]
JERRY CHAPMAN	7777 BODEGA	292-[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mary Robson	7145 Maple Ave	[illegible]	[illegible]
Steve Einstein	685 ROBINSON Rd	829 4647	[illegible]
Karen Einstein	685 Robinson Rd. Seb	707-953-9646	[illegible]
Lewis Richter	776 Pinecrest Av Seb	707 [illegible]	[illegible]
LEONARD BARON	7777 BODEGA #[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
A. Clark	7725 Bodega	—	[illegible]
D. McCarthy	7400 CALDER AVE	707-881-[illegible]	[illegible]
CHRIS KASICKA	7450 CALDER AVE	855-254-[illegible]	[illegible]
Danielle Zuckerman	631 Vine Ave Seb	917-251-9416	[illegible]
JON ZUCKERMAN	631 VINE AVE	617 [illegible]	[illegible]
Jeanne Cliff	746 Robinson Rd	[illegible]	[illegible]
Alan Whitlock	507 Bodega Ct.	[illegible]	[illegible]
Jan [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
R. Garcia	900 McFarlane Ave	—	[illegible]
Sarah Shamir	901 McFarlane Ave		[illegible]
[illegible]	763 [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	505 Hill St		[illegible]
Roger Burns	529 High St		[illegible]
[illegible]	7725 [illegible] Ave		[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	629 M. Ave	[illegible]
Jerome [illegible]	7717 Bodega	917-733-117[illegible]	[illegible]
HAROLD BUSCH	7777 BODEGA AVE. G-6	707-798-3553	[illegible]
Christa McGee	661 [illegible] Ave	707-823-4451	[illegible]
KATHY O'[illegible]	76[illegible] [illegible] ST		[illegible]
BONNEY MEYER	740 PINECREST AVE	707-824-155[illegible]	[illegible]
Elena Lan	6604 Robinson Rd	707-491-8227	[illegible]
D. O'Dell	680 Robinson Rd		[illegible]
Susan MacDonald	793 Rainsford	415-414-7298	[illegible]
[illegible]	160 1st ST	707 332-2832	[illegible]
Angela Vega	7776 Leland St	415 358 [illegible]	[illegible]

We, the undersigned residents of Sebastopol hereby petition the City of Sebastopol to adopt an ordinance allowing for roadside accessory buildings within the Residential Agricultural and Rural Residential Districts for the expressed purpose of selling/buying locally produced goods in accordance to H.R. 10339 "Farm-To-Consumer Direct Marketing Act" of 1976 and AB 1616 "California Homemade Food Act" of 2012.

(Signees must be residents of Sebastopol and at least 18 years of age)

NAME (Print)	ADDRESS	PHONE	SIGNATURE
Shanta Zuckerman	7777 Bodega Ave	634-6174	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible] Bodega Ave		[signature]
Rose [illegible]	1125 McFarlane Ave		[signature]
Dominic Allyn	1125 McFarlane Ave		[signature]
Kendra Mackie	851 Whitford Rd Sebastopol CA		[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
Rebecca Shirley	836 Mason Lane	707-827-6091	[signature]
[illegible]	555 [illegible]	707 484 1198	[signature]
Keith Anderson	375 Heathrow [illegible]	707 2257022	[signature]
Pamela [illegible]	7049 Leland St Seb	707 823 0529	[signature]
Mary McHaley	7833 Steffani Ct Seb	707-824-8686	[signature]
Maxime Stadler	7808 B Steffani Ct Seb	415597-6436	[signature]
Sharon [illegible]	7565 Bodega Ave Seb	408 455 1125	[signature]
TVi Wilschinsky	260 Jesse St	829-8212	[signature]
Don Vogel	777 robinson rd	707-487-8692	[signature]
Lynette Winters	280 Western Ave Seb	486 2029	[signature]
Emma Riggan	7236 Wilton Ave	707 829-2775	[signature]
Cheryl [illegible]	7545 Bodega Ave	707 823 8457	[signature]

18/124

We, the undersigned residents of Sebastopol, hereby petition the City of Sebastopol to designate the properties at **7600 Leland Street** and **7605 Bodega Ave** as "Low Density Residential" Land Use within the adopted 2016 General Plan Update, and to re-zone said properties as inclusive of the "Residential Agricultural District."

(Signees must be residents of Sebastopol and at least 18 years of age)

NAME (Print)	ADDRESS	PHONE	SIGNATURE
[illegible]			
Cynthia Stefanoni	[illegible] Seb	823 3853	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]		[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]		[signature]
[illegible]	554 [illegible] St. Seb		[signature]
[illegible]	77[illegible] Bodega [illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible] 1st St. [illegible]	861-2[illegible]	[signature]
Peter [illegible]	52 First St.	829 2441	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible] Sebastopol [illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible] Olmstead	172 Virginia [illegible] Seb	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	4015 Ross Road Seb	[illegible] 7124	[signature]
[illegible] DeMartini	7722 Bodega Ave #7	707 [illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	7722 Bodega Ave	707 [illegible]	[signature]
C. J. PELL	7777 Bodega Ave. #R-209	(707)824-1325	[signature]
Jamie Olmsted	850 Corona Rd Petaluma	530-[illegible]	[signature]

(a)

We, the undersigned residents of Sebastopol, hereby petition the City of Sebastopol to designate the properties at **7600 Leland Street** and **7605 Bodega Ave** as "Low Density Residential" Land Use within the adopted 2016 General Plan Update, and to re-zone said properties as inclusive of the "Residential Agricultural District."

(Signees must be residents of Sebastopol and at least 18 years of age)

NAME (Print)	ADDRESS	PHONE	SIGNATURE
Nancy Pichulich	7600 Leland St Seb	707 477 0879	[signature]
[illegible]	1293 [illegible] Seb	707-696-0035	[signature]
DAVID [illegible]	"	707-695-6907	[signature]
[illegible]	2310 Robinson Rd Seb	707 824 [illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	7620 1st St Seb	707 823 4866	[signature]
Ryan Nice	589 Pleasant Hill Rd.	415-823-4951	[signature]
Leila Sanchez	551 Robinson Rd	[illegible]	[signature]
KEVIN DALE	7675 LELAND ST	707 575 4322	[signature]
[illegible]	7620 Leland		[signature]
[illegible]	"		[signature]
[illegible]	7075 [illegible]		[signature]
Noriko Rosenthal	↓		[signature]
[illegible]	370 [illegible]	(925) 455 [illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]			
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	551 Robinson Rd	829 [illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible] Robinson Rd	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	7765 Bodega Ave [illegible]	707 [illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible] McCauley	[illegible]	707 824 [illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	516 Robinson Ave	707 [illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible] Bodega Ave [illegible]	[illegible] 583 [illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible] Bodega Ave	203 [illegible] 4868	[signature]
[illegible] Hartmann	[illegible] First	707 829 0158	[signature]
[illegible]	836 First St, Sebastopol	808-[illegible]	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] 9941	[signature]
Mildred [illegible]	566 First St. Sebastopol	(707) 823-1295	[signature]
[illegible]	[illegible] Ave [illegible]	(707) 874 8484	[signature]
[illegible] Asterian	7220 [illegible] St Seb	707.548.5619	[signature]
[illegible]	1815 [illegible] Rd Seb	707 590 5840	[signature]
[illegible]	676 [illegible] Seb	(707) 823-5825	[signature]
[illegible]	7719 [illegible] Ave Seb	415 706-1619	[signature]
Heather [illegible]	5505 [illegible] Seb	707-632-[illegible]	[signature]
Seth [illegible]	885 1st St Seb	707 835 4300	[signature]
Sophia M [illegible]	800 Robinson Rd	707 [illegible]	[signature]
Julian Titus	4617 Gravenstein Hwy N	707 324-9931	[signature]
EVA GUSTAFSSON	7400 Calder Ave Sebastopol	707 823 0652	[signature]
Am[illegible]	776 [illegible] Seb	510.485.4587	[signature]

We, the undersigned residents of Sebastopol, hereby petition the City of Sebastopol to designate the properties at **7600 Leland Street** and **7605 Bodega Ave** as "Low Density Residential" Land Use within the adopted 2016 General Plan Update, and to re-zone said properties as inclusive of the "Residential Agricultural District."

(Signees must be residents of Sebastopol and at least 18 years of age)

NAME (Print)	ADDRESS	PHONE	SIGNATURE
BRUCE LOFONE	7528 LELAND AVE	535-6355	[illegible]
JERRY CHAPMAN	7777 BODEGA	292-9068	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Betty Verse	7777 Bodega Ave N-9	821-1021	Betty Verse
[illegible]	7526 Leland St	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	7420 Pinecrest Ave	829-3359	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Karen Einstein	688 Robinson Rd. Seb	707-953-9646	[illegible]
STEVE EINSTEIN	688 ROBINSON Rd	824-9697	[illegible]
Lewis Buchner	776 Pinecrest Ave Seb	[illegible]	[illegible]
LEONARD BARON	7777 Bodega [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
A. Clotte	7725 Bodega		[illegible]
CHRIS LASULICA	7450 CALDER AVE SEB	858-254-6751	[illegible]
DIANE MCCARTHY	7433 CALDER AVE	707 887 8681	[illegible]
JON ZUCKERMAN	629 VINE AVE	917 200 6351	[illegible]
Danielle Zuckerman	629 Vine Ave Seb	917.251 9410	[illegible]
[illegible]	740 Robinson Rd	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	447 [illegible] Ave		[illegible]
[illegible]	" "		[illegible]
Sarah Shimizu	706 McFarlane Ave		[illegible]
Rebecca Guarda	706 McFarlane Ave		[illegible]
ROGER BURNS	505 High St		[illegible]
[illegible]	505 High St		[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]
HAROLD BUSCH	7777 BODEGA AV. G-6	707-755-8558	[illegible]
[illegible]	600 [illegible] Ave	707-523-4451	[illegible]
[illegible]	76[illegible] [illegible] St		[illegible]
BONNEY MEYER	740 PINECREST AL	707-824-1552	[illegible]
Elena Len	707-494-8227	664 Robinson Rd	[illegible]
[illegible] FRATE	707-917-0320	Homeless	[illegible]
Susan MacDonald	793 Robinson rd	415-419-7248	[illegible]
Barb Cotran	860 [illegible] ST	707-332-2832	[illegible]
Angela Bee	7526 Wright St	415 853 7181	[illegible]
RON MORGAN	400 ROBINSON RD #B	650-201-0855	[illegible]
Sonja Gilbert	" " "	925-787-7867	[illegible]
Ana Sullivan	Robinson Rd		[illegible]
Delora Porter	350 First St	823-2998	[illegible]

We, the undersigned residents of Sebastopol, hereby petition the City of Sebastopol to designate the properties at **7600 Leland Street** and **7605 Bodega Ave** as "Low Density Residential" Land Use within the adopted 2016 General Plan Update, and to re-zone said properties as inclusive of the "Residential Agricultural District."

(Signees must be residents of Sebastopol and at least 18 years of age)

NAME (Print)	ADDRESS	PHONE	SIGNATURE
Shula Zuckerman	7777 Bodega Ave	634-6174	[illegible]
Sharon Marlowe	7777 Bodega Ave.		Sharon Marlowe
[illegible]			[illegible]
[illegible] Johnson	1125 McFarlane Ave		[illegible]
[illegible] Ailey	1125 McFarlane Ave		[illegible]
[illegible] MARKLE	6151 Whitfield Rd Sebastopol CA		[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Rebecca Shirley	5363 Ma[illegible] Lane	707-827-6041	Rebecca [illegible]
Mary [illegible] Moore	535 Pleasant Hill Rd	707 494-1186	Mary [illegible] Moore
Kevin Anderson	375 Healdsburg	707 225 2027	[illegible]
[illegible]	7149 Leland St. Seb.	707 823 0509	[illegible]
[illegible] McCauley	7803 Steffensen Ct Seb	707-824-8655	[illegible] McCauley
Maxime Stadler	7808B Stefenson Ct Seb	415 517-6436	[illegible]
[illegible] Siegle	7565 Bodega Ave Seb	408 455 7124	
Benjamin Vogel	732 robinson rd	707-481-8692	[illegible]
[illegible]	77[illegible] Wilson Ave	707-829-2375	[illegible]
Carol [illegible]	7565A Bodega Ave	707-823-8457	[illegible]

70 / 114

We, the undersigned residents of Sebastopol hereby petition the City of Sebastopol to adopt an ordinance allowing for roadside accessory buildings within the Residential Agricultural and Rural Residential Districts for the expressed purpose of selling/buying locally produced goods in accordance to H.R. 10339 "Farm-To-Consumer Direct Marketing Act" of 1976 and AB 1616 "California Homemade Food Act" of 2012.

(Signees must be residents of Sebastopol and at least 18 years of age)

NAME (Print)	ADDRESS	PHONE	SIGNATURE
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leah Dean	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Kyle [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	642 Dicker Drive	707 829 7242	[illegible]
Lori Olmstead	173 [illegible]	573 [illegible]	[illegible]
Christina [illegible]	1605 Bloss Road Seb	530 [illegible] 7124	[illegible]
Mary [illegible]	7770 Bodega Ave #1	707 694-0872	[illegible]
[illegible]	7720 Bodega Ave	707 [illegible]	[illegible]
David J. Fall	7777 Bodega Ave #R209	(707) 824-1323	[illegible]
Jamie Olmstead	850 Corona Rd Petaluma	707-536-6805	[illegible]

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE

2016 SEBASTOPOL GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

SCH# 2016032001

JULY 2016

Prepared for:

City of Sebastopol
Planning Department
7120 Bodega Avenue
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Prepared by:

De Novo Planning Group
1020 Suncast Lane, Suite 106
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
www.denovoplanning.com

De Novo Planning Group

A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE

2016 SEBASTOPOL GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

SCH# 2016032001

JULY 2016

Prepared for:

City of Sebastopol
Planning Department
7120 Bodega Avenue
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Prepared by:

De Novo Planning Group
1020 Suncast Lane, Suite 106
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
www.denovoplanning.com

FINAL EIR

Chapter **Page Number**

Executive Summary ES-1

1.0 Introduction 1.0-1

1.1 Purpose and Intended Uses of the EIR 1.0-1

1.2 Environmental Review Process 1.0-2

1.3 Organization of the Final EIR 1.0-4

2.0 Comments on Draft EIR and Responses 2.0-1

2.1 Introduction 2.0-1

2.2 List of Commenters 2.0-1

2.3 Comments and Responses 2.0-1

3.0 Errata 3.0-1

3.1 Revisions to the Draft EIR 3.0-1

Table **Page Number**

Table 2-1: List of Commenters on Draft EIR 2.0-1

This page left intentionally blank.

INTRODUCTION

The City of Sebastopol (City) has determined that a program-level environmental impact report (EIR) is required for the proposed 2016 General Plan (Project) pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR prior to approving any project, which 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]).

A Program EIR is an EIR which examines the environmental impacts of an agency plan, policy, or regulatory program, such as a general plan update. Program EIRs analyze broad environmental impacts of the program, with the acknowledgement that site-specific environmental review may be required for particular aspects of the program, or particular development projects that may occur in the future.

The City of Sebastopol circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed 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. Subsequently, Sebastopol 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 in 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.

This Final EIR was prepared to address comments received in response to the Draft EIR. The City has prepared a written response to the Draft EIR comments and made textual changes to the Draft EIR where warranted. The responses to the comments are provided in this Final EIR in Section 2.0, and all changes to the text of the Draft EIR are summarized in Section 3.0. Responses to comments received during the comment period do not involve any new significant impacts or "significant new information" that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 2016 Sebastopol General Plan is the overarching policy document that guides land use, housing, transportation, infrastructure, community services, and other policy decisions throughout Sebastopol. The General Plan includes the seven elements mandated by State law, to the extent that they are relevant locally, including: Circulation, Conservation, Housing, Land Use, Noise, Open Space, and Safety. The City may also address other topics of interest; this General Plan includes elements related to Community Services and Facilities, Economic Vitality, Community Character, and Community Health and Wellness elements. The General Plan sets out the goals, policies, and actions in each of these areas, serves as a policy guide for how the City will make key planning

decisions in the future, and guides how the City will interact with Sonoma County, surrounding cities, and other local, regional, State, and Federal agencies.

The General Plan contains the goals and policies that will guide future decisions within the city. It also identifies actions that will ensure the goals and policies in the General Plan are carried out.

Refer to Section 2.0 (Project Description) of the Draft EIR for a more comprehensive description of the details of the proposed project.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project which would reduce or avoid significant impacts, and which could feasibly accomplish the basic objectives of the proposed project. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR are briefly described as follows:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative. Under Alternative 1, the City would not adopt the General Plan Update. The 1994 General Plan would continue to be implemented and no changes to the General Plan, including the Land Use Map (see Figure 3.10-1), Economic Vitality Element, Community Health and Wellness Element, Circulation Diagram, goals, policies, or actions would occur.

- Alternative 2: Increased Open Space Alternative. As shown on Figure 5.0-1, Alternative 2 would revise the proposed General Plan Land Use Map to include expanded areas of Open Space and Very Low Density Residential Uses around the periphery of the City, primarily within the Sphere of Influence (SOI) and Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). 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.

- Alternative 3: Downtown Intensification Alternative. 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.

Alternatives are described in detail in Section 5.0 of the Draft EIR. As summarized in Table 5.0-8 of the Draft EIR, Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative because it provides the greatest reduction of potential impacts in comparison to the other alternatives.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

The Draft EIR addresses environmental impacts associated with the proposed project that were known to the City, raised during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process, or raised during preparation of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR discusses potentially significant impacts associated with aesthetics/visual resources, agricultural/forest resources, air quality, biological/natural resources, cultural resources, geology/soils/minerals, greenhouse gases/climate change, hazards, hydrology/water quality, land use/population, noise, public services/recreation, transportation/circulation, utilities, and cumulative impacts.

NOP Comments

During the NOP process, the City received comments from the following public agencies, organizations, or individuals:

- California Native American Heritage Commission
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- County of Sonoma Permit and Resource Management Department

Draft EIR Comments

During the Draft EIR review process, the City received comments from the following public agencies, organizations, or individuals:

- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 4
- Sonoma Local Agency Formation Commission

Acting as lead agency, the City of Sebastopol has prepared a response to the Draft EIR comments. The responses to the comments are provided in this Final EIR in Section 2.0 (Comments on Draft EIR and Responses) and all changes to the text of the Draft EIR are summarized in Section 3.0 (Errata). Responses to comments received during the comment period do not involve any new significant impacts or "significant new information" that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

This page left intentionally blank

This Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15132). The City of Sebastopol is the lead agency for the environmental review of the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan (General Plan, General Plan Update, or Project) and has the principal responsibility for approving the project. This FEIR assesses the expected environmental impacts resulting from approval and adoption of the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan and responds to comments received on the Draft EIR.

The 2016 Sebastopol General Plan is the overarching policy document that guides land use, housing, transportation, infrastructure, community services, and other policy decisions throughout Sebastopol. The General Plan includes the seven elements mandated by State law, to the extent that they are relevant locally, including: Circulation, Conservation, Housing, Land Use, Noise, Open Space, and Safety. The City may also address other topics of interest; this General Plan includes elements related to Community Services and Facilities, Economic Vitality, Community Character, and Community Health and Wellness elements. The General Plan sets out the goals, policies, and actions in each of these areas, serves as a policy guide for how the City will make key planning decisions in the future, and guides how the City will interact with Sonoma County, surrounding cities, and other local, regional, State, and Federal agencies.

1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR A FINAL EIR

This FEIR for the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan 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 this Final EIR.

An EIR must disclose the expected environmental impacts, 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 projects, and obligates them to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

PURPOSE AND USE

The City of Sebastopol, as the lead agency, has prepared this Final EIR to provide the public and responsible and trustee agencies with an objective analysis of the potential environmental impacts resulting from approval and implementation of the 2016 General Plan. Responsible and trustee agencies that may use the EIR are identified in Chapter 1.0 of the Draft EIR.

The environmental review process enables interested parties to evaluate the proposed project in terms of its environmental consequences, to examine and recommend methods to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts, and to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the project. While CEQA requires that consideration be given to avoiding adverse environmental effects, the lead agency must balance adverse environmental effects against other public objectives, including the economic and social benefits of a project, in determining whether a project should be approved.

This EIR will be used as the primary environmental document to evaluate all subsequent planning and permitting actions associated with the proposed project. Subsequent actions that may be associated with the proposed project are identified in Chapter 2.0 (Project Description) of the Draft EIR. This EIR may also be used by other agencies within Sonoma County, including the Sonoma Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), which may use this EIR during the preparation of environmental documents related to annexations, Municipal Service Reviews, and Sphere of Influence decisions in the Sebastopol Planning Area.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The review and certification process for the EIR has involved, or will involve, the following general procedural steps:

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The City of Sebastopol circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed 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.

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND DRAFT EIR

The City of Sebastopol 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.

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.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS/FINAL EIR

The City of Sebastopol received 2 comment letters on the Draft EIR from public agencies, organizations, and members of the public during the 45-day review period. These comment letters, and written responses, are provided in Chapter 2.0 of this Final EIR.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, this Final EIR responds to the written comments received on the Draft EIR. The Final EIR also contains minor edits to the Draft EIR, which are included in Chapter 3.0 (Errata). This document and the Draft EIR, as amended herein, constitute the Final EIR.

CERTIFICATION OF THE EIR/PROJECT CONSIDERATION

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

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

2) 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 Sebastopol City Council may take action to approve, revise, or reject the project. A decision to approve the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan, for which this EIR identifies significant environmental effects, must be accompanied by written findings in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093.

Policies and actions to mitigate potential environmental impacts have been incorporated into the project, to the extent feasible. No additional mitigation is feasible or available, as described in Chapters 3.1 through 4.0 of the Draft EIR. The annual report on general plan status required pursuant to the Government Code will serve as the monitoring and reporting program for the project.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL EIR

This Final EIR has been prepared consistent with Section 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which identifies the content requirements for Final EIRs. This Final EIR is organized in the following manner:

CHAPTER 1.0 – INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1.0 briefly describes the purpose of the environmental evaluation, identifies the lead agency, summarizes the process associated with preparation and certification of an EIR, and identifies the content requirements and organization of the Final EIR.

CHAPTER 2.0 – COMMENTS ON DRAFT EIR AND RESPONSES

Chapter 2.0 provides a list of commenters, copies of written comments made on the Draft EIR (coded for reference), and responses to those written comments.

CHAPTER 3.0 - ERRATA

Chapter 3.0 consists of minor revisions to the Draft EIR in response to comments on the Draft EIR. The revisions to the Draft EIR do not change the intent or content of the analysis or mitigation.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

No new significant environmental impacts or issues, beyond those already covered in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan Update, were raised during the comment period. Responses to comments received during the comment period do not involve any new significant impacts or "significant new information" that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 states that: *New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement.*

Chapters 2.0 and 3.0 of this Final EIR include information that has been added to the EIR since the close of the public review period in the form of responses to comments and errata.

2.2 LIST OF COMMENTERS

Table 2-1 lists the comments on the Draft EIR that were submitted to the City during the 45-day public review period. The assigned comment letter number, letter date, letter author, and affiliation, if presented in the comment letter or if representing a public agency, are also listed.

TABLE 2-1: LIST OF COMMENTERS

RESPONSE LETTER	INDIVIDUAL OR SIGNATORY	AFFILIATION	DATE
A	Patricia Maurice, District Branch Chief	California Department of Transportation, District 4	7-6-16
B	Mark Bramfitt, Executive Officer	Sonoma Local Agency Formation Commission	7-7-2016

2.3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

REQUIREMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO COMMENTS ON A DRAFT EIR

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that lead agencies evaluate and respond to all comments on the Draft EIR that regard an environmental issue. The written response must address the significant environmental issue raised and be detailed, especially when specific comments or suggestions (e.g., additional mitigation measures) are not accepted. In addition, the written response must be a good faith and reasoned analysis. However, lead agencies only need to respond to significant environmental issues associated with the project and do not need to provide all of the information requested by the

commenter, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a)).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 recommends that commenters provide detailed comments that focus on the sufficiency of the Draft EIR in identifying and analyzing the possible environmental impacts of the project and ways to avoid or mitigate the significant effects of the project, and that commenters provide evidence supporting their comments. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 also recommends that revisions to the Draft EIR be noted as a revision in the Draft EIR or as a separate section of the Final EIR. Chapter 3.0 of this Final EIR identifies all revisions to the 2016 Sebastopol General Plan Update Draft EIR.

RESPONSES TO COMMENT LETTERS

Written comments on the Draft EIR are reproduced on the following pages, along with responses to those comments. To assist in referencing comments and responses, the following coding system is used:

- Each comment letter is lettered (i.e., Letter A), each comment within each letter is numbered (i.e., Comment A-1, Comment A-2, etc.), and each response is numbered correspondingly (i.e., Response A-1, Response A-2, etc.).

Where changes to the Draft EIR text result from the response to comments, those changes are included in the response and identified with revisions marks (underline for new text, ~~strike-out~~ for deleted text).

Jul 06 2016 2:24PM HP LASERJET FAX p.1

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 4
P.O. BOX 23660
OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
PHONE (510) 286-5528
FAX (510) 286-5559
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

Serious Drought. Help save water!

July 6, 2016

SONVAR179
SON-VAR-VAR
SCH # 2016032001

Mr. Kenyon Webster
Planning Department
City of Sebastopol
7120 Bodega Avenue
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Sebastopol General Plan Update – Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Webster:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Sebastopol General Plan Update. Our comments seek to promote the State's smart mobility goals and are based on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Additional comments may be forthcoming pending final review. Please also reference Caltrans previous letter dated March 29, 2016 as these comments still apply. A-1

Project Understanding

The proposed project is a comprehensive update to the City of Sebastopol's (City) General Plan, which was last comprehensively updated in 1994. The General Plan identifies the community's vision for the future and would be updated to reflect current issues and policies. Proposed updates include sets of goals, policies, and actions that the City has identified for each plan element. These include: Land Use, Circulation, Community Services and Facilities, Conservation and Open Space, Noise, Community Character, Safety, Economic Vitality, Community Health and Wellness, and Housing. The City is located in the southern portion of Sonoma County with the cities of Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park positioned to the west. Regional access to the City is gained via State Route (SR) 116 and SR 12. A-2

Fair Share Contribution

The City should make a fair share contribution towards Caltrans pedestrian safety enhancement project – EA 1G840K. As a part of the project, Caltrans will install a High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk (HAWK) beacon on the southern leg of the McKinley Street (SR 116)/Petaluma Avenue (SR 116)/Laguna Park Way intersection. Currently, the project is in the Project Initiation Document (PID) phase with a tentative completion date of January 2023. Page 3.13-22 of section McKinley Street/Laguna Park Way/Petaluma Avenue of the DEIR recommends the installation of A-3

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"

Jul 06 2016 2:24PM HP LASERJET FAX p.2

Mr. Kenyon Webster, City of Sebastopol
July 6, 2016
Page 2

a HAWK beacon on the southern leg crossing of this intersection; but incorrectly states that there is no identified funding source for this improvement. A fair share contribution would help mitigate the General Plan Update's significant and unavoidable impact on the intersection, as noted on page 3.13-22 of the DEIR. A-3 Cont

Project Scope Clarification
Please correct the information provided in the Caltrans Traffic Impact Study Guide section, on page 3.13-11, of the DEIR. This section incorrectly states that Caltrans oversees the operations of US 101 and its on- and off-ramps within the City. Although it is correct that Caltrans is the owner and operator of the State transportation network, US 101 facilities do not exist within Sebastopol city limits. A-4

Should you have any questions regarding this letter or require additional information, please contact Cole Iwamasa at (510) 286-5534 or cole.iwamasa@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA MAURICE
District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

Cc: State Clearinghouse

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"

Response to Letter A Patricia Maurice, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 4

Response A-1: The commenter provides introductory remarks and states that the comments are intended to promote the State's mobility goals. The commenter also references the NOP comment letter submitted by Caltrans, dated March 29, 2016. The March 29th letter was included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR, and all issues raised in this letter were addressed in the Draft EIR.

Response A-2: The commenter provides a summary of the project components.

Response A-3: The commenter states that Caltrans is in the Project Initiation Document (PID) phase of planned safety improvements to the southern leg of the McKinley Street/Petaluma Avenue/Laguna Park Way intersection, with a tentative completion date of January 2023. The commenter suggests that the City make a fair share contribution towards this improvement project. The City appreciates this comment. General Plan Action Item CIR 1r calls on the City to coordinate with Caltrans to implement traffic calming, vehicle safety, and bicycle/pedestrian network improvements throughout Sebastopol. Additionally, Action CIR 1j calls for the City to provide support and a staff liaison to agencies such as Caltrans to help improve the efficiency of the roadway network in western Sonoma County.

The City will continue to coordinate with Caltrans on roadway system and safety improvements within and around the city. The City Council will determine if funding assistance for the improvement identified above is available and warranted. Regardless of City-provided funding for improvements to the above-referenced intersection, this intersection remains under the jurisdictional control of Caltrans, and the City cannot guarantee implementation of the planned improvements. For this reason, DEIR Impact 3.13.2 would remain significant and unavoidable.

Response A-4: The commenter notes a minor error in the DEIR, which states that Caltrans oversees operations of US 101 ramps within the City. While it is correct that Caltrans oversees operations of US 101 ramps, this highway does not pass through the City of Sebastopol. This correction has been made in Section 3.0, Errata, of this Final EIR. This minor correction does not alter any of the conclusions or analysis contained in the Draft EIR.

SONOMA LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
575 ADMINISTRATION DRIVE, ROOM 104A, SANTA ROSA, CA 95403
(707) 565-2577 FAX (707) 565-3778
www.sonomalafco.org

July 7, 2016

Kenyon Webster, Planning Director
City of Sebastopol
7120 Bodega Avenue
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the City of Sebastopol General Plan

Dear Mr. Webster:

Thank you for providing Sonoma LAFCO the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the City of Sebastopol General Plan ("DEIR"). B-1

In that LAFCO is the agency authorized to promote the efficient provision of governmental services and discourage urban sprawl, pursuant to state law LAFCO is charged with determining the sphere of influence of cities and special districts within the County. "Sphere of influence" is defined in state law as "a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency." B-2

Based on Figure 2.0-2 in the DEIR, it appears that the City is interested in amending its sphere to include a few parcels just east and just north of the City and has, in its DEIR, analyzed the impact of build-out of these and other areas outside the City boundary but within the current or desired sphere. B-3

In its consideration of an amendment to the sphere of influence that the City may propose, in accordance with state law, the Commission must prepare a written statement of determinations for: (1) the present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands; (2) the present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area; (3) the present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide; and (4) the existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency. B-4

In general, LAFCO's interests, to be evaluated in an environmental document, include: consistency between proposed general plan land-use designations and zoning districts; traffic and circulation impacts, infrastructure impacts related to the capacity of City water, sanitation, and flood control systems to support proposed density; impacts on the provision of other public services which the City provides, such as fire and police services, and impacts of meeting local housing needs.

The DEIR appears to address a number of the areas cited above. Provision of water and sanitary sewer services to meet needs of proposed development are of key interest to LAFCO, and it appears that in the DEIR analysis, sufficient water would be available at projected build-out. B-5

Regarding provision of wastewater services, we understand the City's reliance on the Subregional Water Reclamation System's permitted capacity and its current restrictions and acknowledge the City's commitment to require development projects to demonstrate adequate service capacity or improvements to meet increased demand prior to approval (Policy CSF 4-6) B-6

We note some inconsistencies in information provided in the DEIR regarding current and projected demand and capacity and suggest that clarification would assist readers' understanding. Specifically, on page 3.14-20, information is provided about the Average Daily Dry Weather Flow, the demand for approved and pending projects, reserve treatment capacity, and what would remain under the current entitlement. It appears that much of this is based on 2012 information. Table 3.14-3, on page 3.14-27, however, uses 2015 data, citing different numbers which, in our opinion, makes it difficult for a reader to discern which numbers to use. Perhaps the information on page 3.14-20 could simply be updated to reflect what is provided on page 3.14-27. B-7

Lastly, regarding Table 3.14-3, if the "Subtotal-Treatment Capacity Used, Reserved and Committed" is intended to be the sum of the first three lines on the table, the total does not add up, and that number affects most of the remaining numbers. B-8

Regarding traffic and circulation, the DEIR indicates significant and unavoidable impacts on Highways 12 and 116, both CalTrans regional highways. LAFCO lauds the City for including in the DEIR actions by which the City will cooperate with other jurisdictions to reduce or attempt to alleviate transportation congestion affecting City streets, to provide a supportive environment for its residents and visitors to the area. B-9

To the extent that development in the City resulting from General Plan build-out impacts traffic and circulation in other jurisdictions, like the County of Sonoma or nearby cities, the City should consider contributing to a regional fund to help mitigate those impacts. As an example, when Sonoma LAFCO approved the annexation of the Northwest Specific Plan Area to the City of Rohnert Park in 2015, the approval was conditioned on the City and County's agreeing to establish and collect regional traffic impact fees from the City, pursuant to a nexus study B-10

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comment. We look forward to working with the City in implementation of its General Plan.

Sincerely,

Mark Bramfitt
Executive Officer

Response to Letter B Mark Bramfitt, Sonoma Local Agency Formation Commission

Response B-1: The commenter provides introductory remarks.

Response B-2: The commenter provides a summary of LAFCO's purpose and mandate.

Response B-3: The commenter notes that the City appears interested in amending its sphere to include a few parcels east and north of the City, and that the DEIR has analyzed the impact of buildout of these areas and other areas outside of the City boundary. This comment is correct, and no changes to the DEIR are warranted.

Response B-4: The commenter provides a summary of the steps and requirements that LAFCO must complete in order to process and approve revisions to the City's SOI. The City concurs with the summary provided by the commenter.

Response B-5: The commenter notes that the DEIR addresses the areas cited in the previous paragraph, and notes the DEIR conclusion that sufficient water supplies are available at project buildout. The City appreciates this comment and agrees that the DEIR has accurately and completely analyzed full buildout of the General Plan, inclusive of all areas within the City's desired sphere.

Response B-6: The commenter notes the City's reliance on the Subregional Water Reclamation System's permitted capacity and current restrictions, and acknowledges the City's commitment to require development projects to demonstrate adequate capacity or provide improvements to meet increased demand prior to approval. The City appreciates this comment.

Response B-7: The commenter notes some minor inconsistencies in data provided for sewer treatment capacity in Section 3.14 of the DEIR (2012 data used on page 3.14-20 and 2015 data used in the analysis on page 3.14-27). This comment is noted, and minor corrections to this information have been provided in Section 3.0 of this Final EIR. These minor corrections do not alter any of the analysis or conclusions contained in the DEIR.

Response B-8: The commenter notes a minor math error in Table 3.14-3 regarding the Subtotal-Treatment Capacity Used, Reserved, and Committed. The commenter is correct that the math overstates the total treatment capacity used, reserved, and committed by 0.01. This is an exceedingly minor discrepancy, and actually overestimates used capacity, rather than underestimating used capacity. This issue has no bearing on the environmental analysis or conclusions contained in the DEIR, given the minute size of the mathematical error.

Response B-9: The commenter lauds the City for including actions in the General Plan and DEIR calling on the City and other local agencies to attempt to alleviate transportation congestion in Sebastopol. The City appreciates this comment.

Response B-10: The commenter suggests that the City consider contributing to a regional fund to mitigate traffic impacts from future projects developed in the City. The City appreciates this comment, and will continue to coordinate with regional agencies such as SCTA, Sonoma County, Caltrans, etc. to improve regional traffic conditions. This comment has been forwarded to the City Council for their consideration.

This page left intentionally blank

This chapter includes minor edits to the EIR. These modifications resulted from responses to comments received during the Draft EIR public review period.

Revisions herein do not result in new significant environmental impacts, do not constitute significant new information, and do not alter the conclusions of the environmental analysis that would warrant recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. Changes are provided in revision marks with underline for new text and ~~strike-out for deleted text~~.

3.1 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

No changes were made to the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR (DEIR).

1.0 INTRODUCTION

No changes were made to Chapter 1.0 of the DEIR.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

No changes were made to Chapter 2.0 of the DEIR

3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

No changes were made to Section 3.1 of the DEIR.

3.2 AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES

No changes were made to Section 3.2 of the DEIR.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

No changes were made to Section 3.3 of the DEIR.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES

No changes were made to Section 3.4 of the DEIR.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

No changes were made to Section 3.5 of the DEIR.

3.6 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERALS

No changes were made to Section 3.6 of the DEIR.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE

No changes were made to Section 3.7 of the DEIR.

3.8 HAZARDS

No changes were made to Section 3.8 of the DEIR.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

No changes were made to Section 3.9 of the DEIR.

3.10 LAND USE AND POPULATION

No changes were made to Section 3.10 of the DEIR.

3.11 NOISE

No changes were made to Section 3.11 of the DEIR.

3.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

No changes were made to Section 3.12 of the DEIR.

3.13 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

The following changes are made to page 3.13-11 of the DEIR:

CALTRANS TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY GUIDE

The Caltrans *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies*, 2002, includes criteria for evaluating the effects of land use development and changes to the circulation system on State highways. In Sebastopol, Caltrans oversees operation on ~~US 101,~~ Gravenstein Highway (SR 116), SR 12, and the ~~freeway on- and-off-ramps~~ intersections serving these two facilities. Caltrans generally endeavors to maintain a target level of service at the transition between LOS "C" and LOS "D," though for select facilities has designated lower LOS targets.

The following changes are made to page 3.13-22 of the DEIR:

McKinley Street/Laguna Park Way/Petaluma Avenue

The intersection of McKinley Street/Laguna Park Way/Petaluma Avenue would operate at LOS F on the Laguna Park Way and McKinley Street stop-controlled approaches. These volumes meet peak hour traffic signal warrants during the PM peak hour under both the General Plan Buildout and General Plan Cumulative Buildout scenarios. Of primary concern is the volume of pedestrian crossings on the south leg of the intersection and the potential increase to these crossings with continued development to the east in the Barlow area. It is recommended that a HAWK (High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk) beacon be installed at the south leg crossing while also narrowing the northbound approach to one lane. The inside lane is generally only used by traffic as a passing lane since the majority of traffic on this approach turns right onto North Main Street. The HAWK will

allow for protected pedestrian crossings, stopping traffic only as needed. When activated, the break in traffic will provide gaps for traffic on the southbound approach of Laguna Park Way and the westbound approach of McKinley Street to proceed from the stop-controlled approach.

~~Since there is no identified funding source for this improvement and the~~ The intersection is controlled by Caltrans, outside the control of the City of Sebastopol. Caltrans has indicated that a project to install a HAWK beacon at the south leg of the crossing is currently in the Project Initiation Document (PID) stage, and project completion is anticipated in January 2023. However, the City cannot guarantee the timing or full funding of this improvement, as the intersection is under Caltrans' jurisdiction. The City will continue to coordinate with Caltrans on this improvement, however, this would be considered a **significant and unavoidable** impact.

3.14 UTILITIES

The following changes are made to page 3.14-20 of the DEIR:

WASTEWATER FLOWS

Wastewater flows are typically evaluated for several conditions, including:

- Average Dry Weather Flow (ADWF) – This is the flow rate that is considered to be the actual wastewater flow from homes and businesses in the community (although it may include some flow resulting from groundwater entering the sewer system). It is measured during the summer, when the weather is dry and there is minimal infiltration and no inflow. This flow is dependent on the number of residents and number and type of businesses within the community. It varies throughout the day, with the peak diurnal flow typically occurring in the morning as the community residents wake up and prepare for the day.

- Infiltration and Inflow (I&I) – This is flow that enters the sewer system from rainfall and from increased levels of groundwater caused by the rainfall or by seasonal variation of groundwater levels.

- Peak Hour Wet Weather Flow (PHWWF) – This is the sum of the peak WWF and the peak I&I. The PHWWF is the peak flow rate that is expected to occur during large storm events.

The City's average dry weather flow to the Laguna WWTP in ~~2012~~ 2015 was ~~.474~~ .413 mgd, about ~~56%~~ 49% of the City's treatment entitlement. The 2005 Sewer Master Plan indicates that the City's existing wastewater collection and conveyance system is adequately designed to accommodate current collection and conveyance demands. The Plan also identifies areas where sewer lines require replacement. Additionally, assuming recommended repairs are made, the collection and conveyance system should be adequate to accommodate projected future growth within the City limits. However, the

system may not be adequate to accommodate future projected growth within the City's sphere of influence (SOI).

The City's ability to accommodate future development is limited by the entitlement in the Subregional Water Reclamation System. To estimate the treatment capacity available for future development, the estimated flows were calculated based on ~~2012~~ 2015 flow rates. Projected sewer demand for approved projects is ~~0.020~~ 0.008 mgd, and projected demand for pending applications is ~~0.021~~ 0.028 mgd. Combining these figures with the ~~2012~~ 2015 ADDWF of ~~0.474~~ 0.413 mgd and the existing General Plan requirement to reserve treatment capacity of 5% (0.042 mgd), the ADDWF for all current and planned future commitments is ~~0.557~~ 0.473 mgd. This rate leaves ~~0.283~~ 0.339 mgd available for future projects under the current entitlement of 0.840 mgd. (Water Production and Usage, and Wastewater statistics for Annual Level of Service Report ~~2012~~ 2015).

4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

No changes were made to Section 4.0 of the DEIR.

5.0 ALTERNATIVES

No changes were made to Chapter 5.0 of the DEIR.

6.0 REPORT PREPARERS

No changes were made to Chapter 6.0 of the DEIR.