

CITY OF COLUSA

RESOLUTION NO. 07-29

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL CERTIFYING THE MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT AND ADOPTING FINDINGS, A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING
CONSIDERATIONS, AND A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
FOR THE CITY OF COLUSA GENERAL PLAN**

The Colusa City Council DOES RESOLVE as follows:

Part 1. Recitals

A. The City of Colusa was incorporated in 1868. The City adopted the current General Plan (pursuant to Resolution No. 94-22) on October 1994. Since 2004, the City has been working with the previously prepared preliminary land use plan to draft an updated General Plan, consistent with State Law. In the process, the City has solicited extensive input from the public and regulatory agencies with relevant authority or expertise related to the General Plan and held several workshops and public hearings.

B. Consistent with state statute, the updated General Plan (occasionally referred to herein as the "Project" or the "General Plan") consists of a Land Use Map and the following elements: Land Use Element; Community Character and Design Element; Circulation Element; Safety Element; Parks, Recreation and Resource Conservation Element; Noise Element; and Municipal Facilities and Services Element. The General Plan addresses land uses in the Planning Area, which is coterminous with the proposed Sphere of Influence (SOI), consisting of the existing incorporated City and a larger study area (totaling approximately 3,805 acres), selected based on the City limits and surrounding areas that are anticipated to be incorporated into the City in the future.

C. The City, as lead agency, completed an Initial Study for the General Plan, consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15063, and determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required in order to analyze the project and environmental effects thereof and suggest appropriate mitigation measures. The City decided to prepare a Master Environmental Impact Report (occasionally referred to herein as the "EIR" or the "MEIR"). A Notice of Preparation ("NOP") dated July 27, 2005 was circulated with the Initial Study to public agencies and interested parties for consultation on the scope of the MEIR, and a scoping meeting was held on August 17, 2005, to receive additional comments. A second NOP was circulated on April 5, 2007, although the proposed changes to the Project, which prompted the recirculation, did not raise any new issues that were not previously identified in the scoping meeting.

D. The City completed a draft of the General Plan and circulated it for public comment on May 8, 2007. On July 24, 2007, the City released for public comment a Draft Master Environmental Impact Report ("MEIR") (SCH# 2005072145), which analyzed the potential environmental impacts that potentially could occur from adoption of the General Plan in and surrounding the Planning Area, along with program-level analysis of three anticipated development projects: Colusa Riverbend, Colusa Crossing, and Brookins Ranch. The public review period ended on September 6, 2007 (45 days total). In response to comments received on the Draft MEIR, the City prepared and distributed the comments and responses to comments on the General Plan (the "Final MEIR"). The Draft MEIR and the Final MEIR reflect the City's

independent judgment and analysis on the potential environmental impacts of the General Plan and the three development projects, at a program level, which constitute the MEIR for the General Plan and the three projects, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15089 and 15132, and 15175(a). The Draft MEIR and Final MEIR are incorporated herein by reference.

E. On October 25, 2006, the Planning Commission held a noticed public hearing on the General Plan. The Commission considered the staff report, all other evidence in the record, and all oral and written comments presented to it. Based on this information, the Planning Commission recommended adoption of the draft General Plan. A staff report, dated October 12, 2006, and incorporated herein by reference, described and analyzed the General Plan for the Planning Commission

F. On January 16, 2007, following staff's presentation and Council's review of the Planning Commission's recommended draft General Plan, the Council approved a schedule that directed staff to conduct a series of three public meetings toward finalizing the draft General Plan for circulation.

G. On January 23, 2007, staff provided a summary of the draft General Plan to the City Council and the public. This summary included the history of the City's General Plan update process, description of the General Plan and MEIR, description of elements and corresponding goals, and review of the proposed schedule for General Plan adoption and MEIR certification. Public comments were received.

H. On February 27, 2007, the Council directed staff to finalize the draft document for transmittal to the State Clearinghouse, distribution to public agencies, and general release to the public for review and comment. In the interim, the Community Character and Design Element was to be finalized and presented to the Planning Commission for recommendation of adoption and to the City Council for final approval.

I. On February 28, 2007 and March 28, 2007, the Planning Commission held public meetings on the Community Character and Design Element of the General Plan. The Commission considered the staff report, all other evidence in the record, and all oral and written comments presented to it. Based on this information, the Planning Commission recommended that the element be incorporated into the draft General Plan and considered by the Council for adoption.

J. On March 21, 2007, the Council directed staff to make any needed revisions to the Draft Community Character and Design Element pertaining to items discussed during the meeting and transmit the Community Character and Design element as amended with the Draft General Plan to the State Clearinghouse, distribute to public agencies, and provide general release to the public for review and comment.

K. On May 8, 2007, the Draft General Plan update was transmitted to State Clearinghouse for public/agency review and comment.

L. Between May 8, 2007 and July 23, 2007 the MEIR was finalized, and on July 24, 2007, the MEIR was released to the public and transmitted to state and local agencies for review and comment.

M. On August 14, 2007, the Planning Commission and City Council held a noticed joint public hearing on the General Plan MEIR, at which time the Commission and the City

Council considered a written staff report on the General Plan, the complete MEIR, and all other oral and written comments presented to it. A motion was made to accept staff recommendations (with the exception of level of service) regarding minor additions/modifications to policy and program language and that the Council certify the MEIR and adopt the General Plan. The motion carried. The public hearing was continued to September 4, 2007, at which time the Council heard final public comments on the MEIR and General Plan regarding level of service

N. The Final MEIR identifies the potential for significant effects on the environment from development of the General Plan Planning Area, most of which can be substantially reduced through MEIR mitigation measures. Therefore, approval of the General Plan must include mitigation findings as set forth in Part 4, Section A below.

O. Some of the significant effects identified in the Final MEIR cannot be lessened to a level of less-than-significant; therefore, approval of the Project must include findings regarding alternatives and a Statement of Overriding Considerations as set forth below in Part 4, Sections B and C, respectively.

P. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), as required by CEQA, is attached as Attachment 2 and is incorporated herein by reference. The MMRP has been prepared pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code, which requires public agencies to “adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.” An MMRP is required for the proposed project because the MEIR has identified significant adverse impacts, and measures have been identified to mitigate those impacts. These measures have been incorporated into the General Plan, as appropriate, with additional mitigation measures cited separately for the three development projects.

Q.. Documents and other materials constituting the record of the proceedings upon which the City’s decision and its findings are based, including the Draft and Final MEIR, are located at the City of Colusa Planning Division, located at 425 Webster Street, Colusa, CA.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and made a part of this resolution.

Part 2. Other Findings

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council finds as follows:

A. The City Council finds that issues raised during the public comment period of the Draft MEIR do not involve any new significant impacts or “significant new information” that would require recirculation of the Draft MEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

B. Since completion of the Final MEIR, the City Council has modified the General Plan to strengthen policy and program language. These modifications to the General Plan would not result in any new significant environmental impacts, a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact, or “significant new information” that would require recirculation of the Draft MEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

Part 3. Certification of MEIR

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council certifies as follows with respect to the Final MEIR:

A. The Final MEIR for this project consists of the Draft MEIR, dated July 2007, and the Comments and Responses to Comments and Revisions to the Draft MEIR, dated October 2007.

B. Based on the evidence and oral and written testimony presented at the public hearings, and based on all the information contained in the Planning Department's files on the General Plan, including, but not limited to, the Final MEIR for the General Plan, the staff report for all public hearings on the General Plan and General Plan MEIR, the City Council does certify, in accordance with Section 15090 of the State CEQA Guidelines, that:

(1) The Final MEIR for the Project was prepared in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq. and the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15000, et seq.; and

(2) The Final MEIR was presented to the City Council of the City of Colusa and that the City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final MEIR prior to approving the Project; and

(3) The Final MEIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City Council of the City of Colusa; and

(4) The Final MEIR adequately describes the Project, its environmental impacts, reasonable alternatives, and appropriate mitigation measures.

Part 4. Adoption of Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council adopts the following in conjunction with approval of the Project:

(1) Mitigation Findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, as set forth in Section A below and incorporated herein by reference.

(2) Findings concerning alternatives, as set forth in Section B below and incorporated herein by reference.

(3) Statement of Overriding Considerations, as set forth in Section C below and incorporated herein by reference.

(4) Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, attached as Attachment 2 and incorporated herein by reference.

Section A. MITIGATION FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091

With respect to mitigation of significant and potentially significant impacts of the proposed General Plan, the City Council makes each of the findings set forth below. References to the page of the Draft MEIR (or “DMEIR”) and Final MEIR on which identification and discussion of the relevant impact commences are provided below. In many cases, as identified for each impact in this Section A, the Draft MEIR identifies General Plan goals, policies, and action items that help reduce the potential for the relevant impact in question to occur. The goals, policies and action items are listed in full in the in the Draft MEIR, and refined through the General Plan review process:

4.1 Land Use

Impact 4.1.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could lead to inconsistency with other land use plans, particularly the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for the Colusa County Airport. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Finding: This General Plan Land Use Element includes a comprehensive land use update based on anticipated changes in land use that are proposed within the CLUP safety zones; the clear zone, approach/departure zone and over flight zone. Mitigation measures that can reduce this impact to less than significant are to restrict parks, recreation, and open space uses that result in congregation of less than 10 persons per acre. Similarly, residential density within the over flight zone would need to be restricted to no more than one dwelling per five acres, in contrast to the four to eight dwellings per acre that are proposed with the land use map. Specific economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The CLUP map is currently under review due to a proposal to Colusa County for a low-to-high density project within the over flight zone. All specific projects within the CLUP safety zones will be reviewed by the ALUC, and by the City of Colusa or County of Colusa, as applicable, for consistency with the CLUP and compatibility with surrounding land uses in accordance with the City or County’s development review process. A project within these zones may be denied approval by the lead agency (i.e., City or County) if the proposed project is found to be inconsistent with the CLUP.

Impact 4.1.5 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in the loss of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Local Importance, as designated under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Mitigation Measure 4.1.5 As part of the Development Review process associated with Implementing Action LU-2.1.a, the City shall review development projects to mitigate for loss of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance by: (1) granting a farmland conservation easement to or for the benefit of the City and/or a qualifying entity approved by the City, at a 1:1 ratio for each acre developed, (2) if the City adopts a farmland conservation program, by payment of an in lieu fee as established by the farmland conservation program, which shall be reviewed and adjusted periodically to ensure that the fee is adequate to offset the cost of purchasing farmland conservation easements at a 1:1 ratio, or (3) other form of compensation at a 1:1 ratio, such as improvements to existing agricultural land, that is acceptable to the City and conserves the farmland in perpetuity. The City shall prepare guidelines identifying requirements for conservation

easements, including timing of conservation easements, location of land to be preserved, land mitigation ratio and quality, and minimum standards for conservation easements.

Finding: Even with the implementation of the above mitigation measure, which is incorporated into the General Plan as a measure that will be applied to subsequent development, this impact remains significant. Presently there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the General Plan project outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The planning staff of the County of Colusa, cities within the County, and Colusa County LAFCO are actively working on drafting an agricultural land mitigation program that would preserve farmland located within the County, but outside the urban areas (coterminous with the SOIs) through the private purchase of conservation easements. This program, if adopted by the cities and the County, will facilitate the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.1.5.

Impact 4.1.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could lead to inconsistency with the policies of the Colusa County LAFCo regarding agricultural preservation.

Mitigation Measure 4.1.5 As part of the Development Review process associated with Implementing Action LU-2.1.a, the City shall review development projects to mitigate for loss of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance by: (1) granting a farmland conservation easement to or for the benefit of the City and/or a qualifying entity approved by the City, at a 1:1 ratio for each acre developed, (2) if the City adopts a farmland conservation program, by payment of an in lieu fee as established by the farmland conservation program, which shall be reviewed and adjusted periodically to ensure that the fee is adequate to offset the cost of purchasing farmland conservation easements at a 1:1 ratio, or (3) other form of compensation at a 1:1 ratio, such as improvements to existing agricultural land, that is acceptable to the City and conserves the farmland in perpetuity. The City shall prepare guidelines identifying requirements for conservation easements, including timing of conservation easements, location of land to be preserved, land mitigation ratio and quality, and minimum standards for conservation easements.

Finding: Even with the implementation of the above mitigation measure, which is incorporated into the General Plan as a measure that will be applied to subsequent development, this impact remains significant. Presently there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the General Plan project outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The planning staff of the County of Colusa, cities within the County, and Colusa County LAFCO are actively working on drafting an agricultural land mitigation program that would preserve farmland within the County, but outside the urban areas (coterminous with the SOIs) through the private purchase of conservation easements. This program, if adopted by the cities and the County, will facilitate the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.1.5.

4.2 Population and Housing

Impact 4.2.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could result in a substantial increase in population and the number of housing units. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

While there are no specific mitigation measures to reduce the level of this impact, the MEIR contains, in the relevant sections of the Draft MEIR, mitigation measures, where appropriate, to reduce or eliminate potentially significant impacts associated with specific environmental issues associated with population growth and related development, such as increased demand for water supply, treatment of wastewater, and loss of agricultural land. Refer to Sections 4.1 and 4.3 through 4.12 for a discussion of environmental effects associated with population growth and related development allowed under the proposed General Plan Update and mitigation measures, where necessary and feasible. However, even with implementation of General Plan policies and mitigation measures, as noted in Section 8.0, implementation of the General Plan and its associated growth is expected to result in several significant and avoidable effects to the environment.

Finding: There are no mitigation measures that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. There are no feasible alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and still provide for planned urban uses. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Substantial new residential development is being proposed by property owners and developers adjacent to the City of Colusa's city limits. The City is better equipped than the County to extend municipal services to these developments. Furthermore, the City desires that new residents of these future developed areas be considered an integral part of the urbanized community, and the City can better accomplish this through annexation of these areas into the City. General Plan policies and programs will mitigate this impact to some extent by providing for a phased, logical growth pattern, ensuring that municipal services are available to serve these new residents without creating adverse impacts on existing residents. These include a land use plan, a circulation plan, and a community character and design element that would promote alternative modes of transportation (bicycle and pedestrian access) to city services, mixed use development (i.e., housing in close proximity to retail and employment centers), and efficient use of vacant land.

4.3 Transportation and Circulation

Impact 4.3.1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in increased traffic volumes and a decrease in LOS on area roadways. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Mitigation Measure 4.3.1a Project applications considered prior to adoption of the Streets and Roadways Master Plan, the Capital Improvement Program update, and the Development Impact Fee Program update, shall provide for the infrastructure improvements, as determined to be feasible by the City, necessary to mitigate the fair-share of significant traffic impacts identified in this MEIR. This shall occur either through payment of a fair-share percentage of the total cost for the necessary improvement as approved by the City or through construction of the necessary improvement, whichever approach is determined to be appropriate by the City. Fair-share calculation shall be determined based

on the amount of traffic associated with an individual project on an impacted facility, a percentage of the total new traffic projected over the time horizon anticipated for the Capital Improvement Program, or other time horizon acceptable to the City.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.1b Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS on Fremont Street. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Widen Fremont Street to a four-lane facility from 10th Street to Bridge Street
- Modify the Circulation Diagram to promote other east-west routes such as Sunrise Boulevard and the Railroad Collector.
- Create a one-way couplet of Fremont Street and Sioc Street.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.1c Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS on Sioc Street. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Widen Sioc Street to a four-lane facility from 10th Street to Bridge Street.
- Modify the Circulation Diagram to promote other east-west routes such as Sunrise Boulevard and the Railroad Collector.
- Create a one-way couplet of Fremont Street and Sioc Street.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.1d Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS on Colus Avenue. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Configure Colus Avenue without on-street parking and stripe turn lanes.
- Modify the Circulation Diagram to promote other east-west routes such as Sunrise Boulevard and the Railroad Collector.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.1e Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS on the Farinon Road Extension. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Widen Farinon Road to a four-lane arterial street.
- Modify the GPU Circulation Diagram to promote other east-west streets, such as Sunrise Boulevard.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.1f Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS on Wescott Road between the Cynthia Avenue and the Railroad Collector. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Re-designate Wescott Road as a two-lane arterial street in this area and reconstruct accordingly.
- Modify Circulation Diagram to reduce traffic volume on Wescott Road by extending Sunrise Boulevard to Wescott Road and prohibiting northbound traffic on Wescott at Tenant Drive.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.1g Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS on Will S Green Avenue. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Add auxiliary lanes to the segments of Will S Green Avenue north and south of SR 20 and to the SR 20/Will S Green intersection to include separate right turn, through, and left turn lanes approaching SR 20.
- Re-designate the portion of Will S Green immediately north and south of SR 20 as a four lane arterial street.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.1h Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS on the Proposed East Collector. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Re-designate the East Collector as an arterial street and construct accordingly as development occurs.

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would fully reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and, at the same time, achieve the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The General Plan policies and implementing actions provide for maintaining LOS C or better on all local roadways, and LOS D or better on State highways and intersections—in accordance with Caltrans standards for state highways in urban areas. Traffic impact analyses will be undertaken with all new development projects that could potentially result in adverse impacts on roadways within the City limits. Implementation of General Plan mitigation, coupled with site-specific mitigation that would be required for all approved development projects, would provide service levels consistent with the City’s LOS standards. However, potential issues with funding, right-of-way acquisition, the effect of regional traffic through the City, the timing for obtaining required permits, and coordination with Colusa County and Caltrans could result in delays in delivering roadway improvements prior to deficient LOS conditions having developed in the interim period. The proposed General Plan policies and implementing actions attempt to establish similar timing for development and the provision of roadway improvements. However, for the aforementioned reasons, the City cannot ensure that these improvements will be timely in all circumstances.

Impact 4.3.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in increased traffic volumes and a decrease in LOS on state highways (SR 20 and SR 45). *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Mitigation Measure 4.3.2a Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS on SR 20 segments to the extent feasible. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Widen SR 20 to a four-lane facility on 10th Street, Market Street and Bridge Street.
- Widen SR 20 to a six-lane facility through the new eastern commercial area.
- Modify the Railroad Collector alignment to draw more traffic away from SR 20 through Wheatland.
- Develop an access management plan for SR 20 that denotes the locations of auxiliary lanes.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.2b The City shall investigate mechanisms for future development to participate in a “fair share” contribution to the costs of improving roads outside the City limits, specifically segments of SR 20 and SR 45 that would be impacted by development under the proposed General Plan. Also, the City shall coordinate coordination with Caltrans and other interested agencies, such as Colusa County and the City of Williams, to develop a fair-share mechanism to address impacts of new development to the State highway system.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.2c Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS on SR 45 to the extent feasible. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Re-designate SR 45 north of Market Street as a four-lane arterial and widen SR 45 north of Market Street to four lanes.

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would fully reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and, at the same time, achieve the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The General Plan policies and implementing actions provide for maintaining LOS C or better on all local roadways, and LOS D or better on State highways and intersections—in accordance with Caltrans standards for state highways in urban areas. Traffic impact analyses will be undertaken with all new development projects that could potentially result in adverse impacts on roadways within the City limits. Implementation of General Plan mitigation, coupled with site-specific mitigation that would be required for all approved development projects, would provide service levels consistent with the City’s LOS standards. However, potential issues with funding, right-of-way acquisition, the effect of regional traffic through the City, the timing for obtaining required permits, and coordination with Colusa County and Caltrans could result in delays in delivering roadway improvements prior to deficient LOS conditions having developed in the interim period. The proposed General Plan policies and implementing actions attempt to establish similar timing for development and the provision of roadway improvements. However, for the aforementioned reasons, the City cannot ensure that these improvements will be timely in all circumstances.

Impact 4.3.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in increased traffic volumes and a decrease in LOS at street and roadway intersections. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Mitigation Measure 4.3.3a Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS at the SR 20/Sunrise Boulevard intersection. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Signalize the SR 20/Sunrise Boulevard intersection, widen SR 20 to a four-lane section through the intersection and provide separate left turn lanes on each approach.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.3b Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS at the SR 20/Wescott Road intersection. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Signalize the SR 20/Wescott Road intersection, widen SR 20 to a four-lane section through the intersection, and provide separate left turn lanes on each approach.
- Signalize the SR 20/Wescott Road intersection, widen SR 20 to create a northbound left turn lane and a separate southbound right turn lane (with overlap) on SR 20, and provide separate left turn and right turn lanes on the Wescott Road approach.
- Install a roundabout at the SR 20/Wescott Road intersection.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.3c Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS at the SR 20/Sioc Street intersection. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Widen SR 20 to a four-lane roadway through the intersection.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.3d Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS at the Bridge Street (SR 20)/Market Street intersection. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Signalize the Bridge Street (SR 20)/Market Street intersection; provide left-turn lanes on each approach and a separate right-turn lane with overlap on eastbound Market Street.
- Install a roundabout at this intersection.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.3e Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS at the Market Street/5th Street intersection. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Signalize the Market Street/5th Street intersection.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.3f Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS at the Lurline Avenue/13th Street and 13th Street/Market Street intersections. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Signalize the Lurline Avenue/13th Street intersection and prohibit northbound left turns from 13th Street.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.3g Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS at the 10th Street/Market Street intersection. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Install a traffic signal at the 10th Street/Market Street intersection.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.3h Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS at the 10th Street (SR 20)/Fremont Street intersection. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Signalize the 10th Street (SR 20)/Fremont Street intersection and widen SR 20 to a four-lane section through the intersection.
- Signalize the 10th Street (SR 20)/Fremont Street intersection, create a separate northbound right turn lane on SR 20, and provide separate left turn lanes on the Fremont Street approaches.

Mitigation Measure 4.3.3i Transportation improvements considered as part of the Capital Improvement Program required under *Implementing Action CIR-1.3a: Capital Improvement Program* shall include measures to provide acceptable LOS at the SR 20/Will S. Green Avenue intersections. These measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Signalize the SR 20/Will S. Green Avenue intersection, widen SR 20 to a four-lane section through the intersection, provide separate right-turn lanes on the SR 20 approaches, and provide three lanes (i.e., separate left turn, through and right turn lanes) on the Will S Green Avenue approaches.

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would fully reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and, at the same time, achieve the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The General Plan policies and implementing actions provide for maintaining LOS C or better on all local roadways, and LOS D or better on State highways and intersections—in accordance with Caltrans standards for state highways in urban areas. Traffic impact analyses will be undertaken with all new development projects that could potentially result in adverse impacts on roadways within the City limits. Implementation of General Plan mitigation, coupled with site-specific mitigation that would be required for all approved development projects, would provide service levels consistent with the City's LOS

standards. However, potential issues with funding, right-of-way acquisition, the effect of regional traffic through the City, the timing for obtaining required permits, and coordination with Colusa County and Caltrans could result in delays in delivering roadway improvements prior to deficient LOS conditions having developed in the interim period. The proposed General Plan policies and implementing actions attempt to establish similar timing for development and the provision of roadway improvements. However, for the aforementioned reasons, the City cannot ensure that these improvements will be timely in all circumstances.

4.4 Noise

Impact 4.4.3 Demolition of existing structures and construction activities associated with development under the proposed General Plan Update would temporarily increase noise levels at existing noise-sensitive receptors. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Mitigation Measure 4.4.3 Prior to adoption of the updated Noise Ordinance, the City shall condition development projects to mitigate construction noise to the maximum extent feasible. Construction noise mitigation measures include:

- Construction, as well as landscaping and park activities, shall be limited to the hours stipulated in the Chapter 11A Noise Regulations of the City of Colusa Code.
- All internal combustion engines used in conjunction with construction and landscaping shall be muffled according to the equipment manufacturer's requirements.
- Construction staging areas shall not be proximate to residential areas.

Finding: Even with the implementation of the above mitigation measure, the impact remains significant because it is not likely that excessive construction noise levels can be fully mitigated in all circumstances, and there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level while, at the same time, be able to meet the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the project outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Construction activities associated with buildout under the proposed General plan would expose existing and future residents to excessive noise levels, depending on the timing of the buildout of the various Special Planning Areas and other vacant land that could be subject to development. The General Plan specifies an update of the City's Noise Ordinance that will establish noise level performance standards for stationary noise exposure and maximum transportation noise exposure; mitigation of noise created by proposed non-transportation noise sources, to the extent feasible; limiting construction activity to certain hours, where in proximity to sensitive receptors; and mitigation of new transportation noise sources, to the extent feasible. However, despite implementation of this mitigation measure and site-specific mitigation with individual development projects, this impact would remain significant given that construction activities are sometimes required immediately adjacent to noise-sensitive land uses with little or no ability to provide buffers or noise barriers (e.g., infrastructure upgrades in existing residential areas).

Impact 4.4.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update could place new noise-sensitive land uses near the Colusa County Airport. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Finding: Even with the implementation of General Plan policies and implementing actions, coupled with project-specific mitigation measures, there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level while, at the same time, meet the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the project outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Special Planning Area (SPA) #5 is located within the safety zones (i.e., clear zone, approach/departure zone, and overflight zone) of the Colusa County Airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). The General Plan Land Use Map provides for the annexation and development of this area as low-density residential (LDR) on the western portion of the site; commercial-professional (CP) along the SR 20/45 corridor; and parks, recreation and open space (P/OS) within the CLUP clear and approach/departure zones. The City and the CLUP will require that an acoustical analysis and project-specific noise mitigation be prepared as a part of the City's Development Review process for all development within the Colusa County Airport safety zones. The project will also be subject to review and comment by the Colusa County Airport Land Use Commission. Noise contours will be considered in the acoustical analyses to help determine what mitigation may be required to reduce noise levels to meet the noise level performance standards of the City's Noise Ordinance (to be updated as part of the General Plan implementation). Land uses adjacent, or in proximity, to the airport will be subject to siting, use, and height restrictions, as specified in the CLUP and recommended in the noise analysis. Additional mitigation may include measures such as noise insulation to reduce interior noise levels, disclosure to purchasers of new residents within the Colusa County Airport safety zones, and the use of aviation easements, as appropriate. However, implementation of these mitigation measures would not fully mitigate single-event aircraft noise issues or the current conflict between SPA #5 and the existing CLUP. Consequently, this impact would remain significant.

Impact 4.4.5 Implementation of the General Plan, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development, would contribute to a cumulative increase in traffic noise. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Finding: This impact remains significant because it is not likely that cumulative traffic noise levels can be fully mitigated, and there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level while, at the same time, be able to meet the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the project outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Traffic noise associated with buildout under the proposed General plan would expose existing and future residents to excessive noise levels. The General Plan specifies an update of the City's Noise Ordinance that will establish noise level performance standards for stationary noise exposure and maximum transportation noise exposure; mitigation of noise created by new transportation noise sources, to the extent feasible. However, despite implementation of this mitigation measure and site-specific mitigation with individual development projects, this impact would remain significant given that some of the

increased noise will occur adjacent to existing noise-sensitive land uses with little or no ability to provide buffers or noise barriers due to lack of adequate buffer area or the infeasibility to retrofit existing residences with effective noise barriers.

4.5 Air Quality

Impact 4.5.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would increase air pollutant emissions from land use activities within the City. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would fully reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and, at the same time, achieve the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The General Plan's land use plan, circulation plan, and Community Character and Design element would help to reduce project impacts on air quality by promoting alternative modes of transportation (bicycle and pedestrian access) to city services, mixed use development (i.e., housing in close proximity to retail and employment centers), and efficient use of vacant land. Furthermore, site-specific mitigation would be required for all approved development projects to further reduce the project's impacts on air quality.

Impact 4.5.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would increase traffic volumes that would potentially increase concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO) along streets and near intersections. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would fully reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and, at the same time, achieve the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The General Plan's land use plan, circulation plan, and Community Character and Design element would help to reduce project impacts on air quality by promoting alternative modes of transportation (bicycle and pedestrian access) to city services, mixed use development (i.e., housing in close proximity to retail and employment centers), and efficient use of vacant land. Furthermore, site-specific mitigation would be required for all approved development projects to further reduce the project's impacts on air quality.

4.10 Visual Resources/Light and Glare

Impact 4.10.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update may result in the obstruction of scenic vistas at the existing edges of urban development. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would fully reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and, at the same time, achieve the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Development that could occur under this General Plan could obstruct scenic vistas from existing development, primarily at the urban edge. On the eastern edge, proposed development east of SR 20/45 could obstruct views of the Sutter Buttes, while development along the western and northern edges of the City could impair views of the Coast Ranges. The policies contained in the General Plan's Community Character and Design Element, coupled with the element's implementing actions that update the City's Development Review process and provide for a new Design Review process would protect scenic vistas to the greatest extent feasible. Residences will also be subject to height restrictions as specified in the City's zoning ordinance. Individual development projects will be required to mitigate impacts to scenic vistas, where appropriate, as a condition of project approval. However, the only way to fully avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant impact would be to prohibit any development that would adversely affect views of scenic resources. This would be inconsistent with the objectives of the proposed General Plan Update and the proposed land use map.

5.1 Colusa Riverbend

Impact 5.1.1 The project would convert land from agricultural use to urban uses. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Mitigation Measure 5.1.1 The project applicant shall mitigate for loss of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance by either (1) granting a farmland conservation easement to or for the benefit of the City and/or an entity approved by the City, at a 1:1 ratio for each acre developed, or (2) if the City adopts a farmland conservation program, by payment of an in lieu fee as established by the farmland conservation program, which shall be reviewed and adjusted periodically to ensure that the fee is adequate to offset the cost of purchasing farmland conservation easements at a 1:1 ratio.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Colusa Planning Department.

Finding: Even with the implementation of the above mitigation measure, which is incorporated into the General Plan as a measure that will be applied to subsequent development, this impact remains significant. Presently there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the General Plan project outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The planning staff of the County of Colusa, cities within the County, and Colusa County LAFCO are actively working on drafting an agricultural land mitigation program that would preserve farmland within the County, but outside the urban areas (coterminous with the SOIs) through the private purchase of conservation easements. This program, if adopted by the cities and the County, will facilitate the implementation of practices to conserve Prime Farmland.

Impact 5.1.10 Implementation of the project would result in the loss of views of scenic area and change the visual character within the project vicinity. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would fully reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and, at the same time, achieve the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Development that could occur under this General Plan could obstruct scenic vistas from existing development, primarily at the urban edge. Proposed development east of SR 20/45 could obstruct views of the Sutter Buttes and of the Coast Ranges. The policies contained in the General Plan's Community Character and Design Element, coupled with the element's implementing actions that update the City's Development Review process and provide for a new Design Review process would protect scenic vistas to the greatest extent feasible. Residences will also be subject to height restrictions as specified in the City's zoning ordinance. Individual development projects will be required to mitigate impacts to scenic vistas, where appropriate, as a condition of project approval. However, the only way to fully avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant impact would be to prohibit any development that would adversely affect views of scenic resources. This would be inconsistent with the objectives of the proposed General Plan Update and the proposed land use map.

5.2 Colusa Crossing

Impact 5.2.1 The project would convert land from agricultural use to urban uses. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Mitigation Measure 5.2.1 The project applicant shall mitigate for loss of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance by either (1) granting a farmland conservation easement to or for the benefit of the City and/or an entity approved by the City, at a 1:1 ratio for each acre developed, or (2) if the City adopts a farmland conservation program, by payment of an in lieu fee as established by the farmland conservation program, which shall be reviewed and adjusted periodically to ensure that the fee is adequate to offset the cost of purchasing farmland conservation easements at a 1:1 ratio.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Colusa Planning Department.

Finding: Even with the implementation of the above mitigation measure, which is incorporated into the General Plan as a measure that will be applied to subsequent development, this impact remains significant. Presently there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the General Plan project outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The planning staff of the County of Colusa, cities within the County, and Colusa County LAFCO are actively working on drafting an agricultural land mitigation program that would preserve farmland within the County, but outside the urban areas (coterminous with the SOIs) through the private purchase of conservation easements. This program, if adopted by the cities and the County, will facilitate the implementation of practices to conserve Prime Farmland.

Impact 5.2.6 Implementation of the project would result in the loss of views of scenic area and change the visual character within the project vicinity. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would fully reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and, at the same time, achieve the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Development that could occur under this General Plan could obstruct scenic vistas from existing development, primarily at the urban edge. Development along the western and northern edges of the City could impair views of the Coast Ranges. The policies contained in the General Plan's Community Character and Design Element, coupled with the element's implementing actions that update the City's Development Review process and provide for a new Design Review process would protect scenic vistas to the greatest extent feasible. Residences will also be subject to height restrictions as specified in the City's zoning ordinance. Individual development projects will be required to mitigate impacts to scenic vistas, where appropriate, as a condition of project approval. However, the only way to fully avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant impact would be to prohibit any development that would adversely affect views of scenic resources. This would be inconsistent with the objectives of the proposed General Plan Update and the proposed land use map.

5.3 Brookins Ranch

Impact 5.3.1 The project would convert land from agricultural use to urban uses. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Mitigation Measure 5.3.1 The project applicant shall mitigate for loss of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance by either (1) granting a farmland conservation easement to or for the benefit of the City and/or an entity approved by the City, at a 1:1 ratio for each acre developed, or (2) if the City adopts a farmland conservation program, by payment of an in lieu fee as established by the farmland conservation program, which shall be reviewed and adjusted periodically to ensure that the fee is adequate to offset the cost of purchasing farmland conservation easements at a 1:1 ratio.

Timing/Implementation: Prior to issuance of grading permits.

Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Colusa Planning Department.

Finding: Even with the implementation of the above mitigation measure, which is incorporated into the General Plan as a measure that will be applied to subsequent development, this impact remains significant. Presently there are no feasible mitigation

measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the General Plan project outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The planning staff of the County of Colusa, cities within the County, and Colusa County LAFCO are actively working on drafting an agricultural land mitigation program that would preserve farmland within the County, but outside the urban areas (coterminous with the SOIs) through the private purchase of conservation easements. This program, if adopted by the cities and the County, will facilitate the implementation of practices to conserve Prime Farmland.

Impact 5.3.14 Implementation of the project would result in the loss of views of scenic area and change the visual character within the project vicinity. *Significant and unavoidable environmental impact.*

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would fully reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and, at the same time, achieve the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Development that could occur under this General Plan could obstruct scenic vistas from existing development, primarily at the urban edge. On the property's eastern edge, proposed development could obstruct views of the Sutter Buttes, while development along the western and northern edges of the site could impair views of the Coast Ranges. The policies contained in the General Plan's Community Character and Design Element, coupled with the element's implementing actions that update the City's Development Review process and provide for a new Design Review process would protect scenic vistas to the greatest extent feasible. Residences will also be subject to height restrictions as specified in the City's zoning ordinance. Individual development projects will be required to mitigate impacts to scenic vistas, where appropriate, as a condition of project approval. However, the only way to fully avoid or reduce this impact to a less-than-significant impact would be to prohibit any development that would adversely affect views of scenic resources. This would be inconsistent with the objectives of the proposed General Plan Update and the proposed land use map.

6.0 Cumulative Impacts

Impact 6.2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, in addition to existing, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development in Colusa County, would contribute to the cumulative loss of Prime Farmland and other valuable farmland in Colusa County, the Sacramento Valley and the State. *Significant and unavoidable/ Cumulatively Considerable environmental impact.*

Mitigation Measure Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1.5.

Finding: General Plan buildout, by definition, constitutes the cumulative scenario for loss of Prime Farmland. Even with the implementation of the above mitigation measure, which is incorporated into the General Plan as a measure that will be applied to subsequent

development, this impact remains significant. Presently there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the General Plan project outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: General Plan buildout, by definition, constitutes the cumulative scenario for loss of Prime Farmland. See Rationale for MM 4.1.5. The planning staff of the County of Colusa, cities within the County, and Colusa County LAFCO are actively working on drafting an agricultural land mitigation program that would preserve farmland within the County, but outside the urban areas (coterminous with the SOIs) through the private purchase of conservation easements. This program, if adopted by the cities and the County, will facilitate the implementation of practices to conserve Prime Farmland.

Impact 6.3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, in addition to existing, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development in the area, could result in a cumulative increase in population and housing growth in the County and associated environmental impacts. *Significant and unavoidable/ Cumulatively Considerable environmental impact.*

Finding: General Plan buildout, by definition, constitutes the cumulative scenario for population and housing. There are no mitigation measures that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant. There are no feasible alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and still provide for planned urban uses. Specific economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: General Plan buildout, by definition, constitutes the cumulative scenario for population and housing. Substantial new residential development is being proposed by property owners and developers adjacent to the City of Colusa's city limits. The City is better equipped than the County to extend municipal services to these developments. Furthermore, the City desires that new residents of these future developed areas be considered an integral part of the urbanized community, and can better accomplish this through annexation of these areas into the City. General Plan policies and programs will mitigate this impact to some extent by providing for a phased, logical growth pattern, ensuring that municipal services are available to serve these new residents without creating adverse impacts on existing residents. These include a land use plan, circulation plan and community character & design element that would promote alternative modes of transportation (bicycle and pedestrian access) to city services, mixed use development (i.e., housing in close proximity to retail and employment centers), and efficient use of vacant land.

Impact 6.4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, in addition to existing, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development in the area, could result in a cumulative increase in traffic. *Significant and unavoidable/ Cumulatively Considerable environmental impact.*

Mitigation Measure Implement Mitigation Measures 4.3.1a, 4.3.2a, and 4.3.2b; please see above.

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would fully reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level and, at the same time, achieve the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: The General Plan policies and implementing actions provide for maintaining LOS C or better on all local roadways, and LOS D or better on State highways and intersections—in accordance with Caltrans standards for state highways in urban areas. Traffic impact analyses will be undertaken with all new development projects that could potentially result in adverse impacts on roadways within the City limits. Implementation of General Plan mitigation, coupled with site-specific mitigation that would be required for all approved development projects, would provide service levels consistent with the City's LOS standards. However, potential issues with funding, right-of-way acquisition, the effect of regional traffic through the City, the timing for obtaining required permits, and coordination with Colusa County and Caltrans could result in delays in delivering roadway improvements prior to deficient LOS conditions having developed in the interim period. The proposed General Plan policies and implementing actions attempt to establish similar timing for development and the provision of roadway improvements. However, for the aforementioned reasons, the City cannot ensure that these improvements will be timely in all circumstances.

Impact 6.5 Implementation of the General Plan Update, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development, would contribute to a cumulative increase in traffic noise on regional roadways. *Significant and unavoidable/ Cumulatively Considerable environmental impact.*

Finding: This impact remains significant because it is not likely that cumulative traffic noise levels can be fully mitigated, and there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level while, at the same time, be able to meet the project objectives. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the project outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Traffic noise associated with buildout under the proposed General plan would expose existing and future residents to excessive noise levels. The General Plan specifies an update of the City's Noise Ordinance that will establish noise level performance standards for stationary noise exposure and maximum transportation noise exposure; mitigation of noise created by new transportation noise sources, to the extent feasible. However, despite implementation of this mitigation measure and site-specific mitigation with individual development projects, this impact would remain significant given that some of the increased noise will occur adjacent to existing noise-sensitive land uses with little or no ability to provide buffers or noise barriers due to lack of adequate buffer area or the infeasibility to retrofit existing residences with effective noise barriers.

Impact 6.6 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, in combination with existing, approved, proposed and reasonably foreseeable development, would exacerbate existing NSVAB problems with ozone and particulate matter. *Significant and unavoidable/ Cumulatively Considerable environmental impact.*

Mitigation Measure Implement Mitigation Measures 4.5.1 and 4.5.2; please see above.

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Consequently, this impact is significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and implementing actions would assist in the improvement of air quality conditions. The General Plan's land use plan, circulation plan and Community Character & Design Element would help to reduce project impacts on air quality by promoting alternative modes of transportation (bicycle and pedestrian access) to city services, mixed use development (i.e., housing in close proximity to retail and employment centers), and efficient use of vacant land. Furthermore, site-specific mitigation that would be required for all approved development projects to further reduce the project's impacts on air quality. Nevertheless, there are no feasible methods to completely offset air pollutant emission increases from land uses proposed in the General Plan, and still provide for planned urban land uses.

Impact 6.9 Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, in addition to existing, approved, proposed and reasonably foreseeable development in the Planning Area and larger regional context would result in a cumulative loss of biological resources in the region. *Significant and unavoidable/ Cumulatively Considerable environmental impact.*

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Consequently, this impact is significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Implementation of the General Plan policies and implementing actions would reduce the contribution of General Plan buildout to cumulative biological impacts in the region. However, the General Plan's contribution would remain cumulatively considerable, as implementation of the proposed General Plan along with cumulative development throughout the region would contribute to the loss of habitat for special state plant and wildlife species. The only mitigation for this impact would be to restrict the majority of development proposed in the General Plan Planning Area, which is not considered feasible given that it would not meet the project objectives and would fundamentally conflict with the many of the goals and policies of the General Plan.

Impact 6.14 Buildout of the proposed General Plan Update would result in the cumulative increase of greenhouse gases including CO₂ emitted into the atmosphere. *Significant and unavoidable/ Cumulatively Considerable environmental impact.*

Finding: There are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Consequently, this impact is significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and implementing actions would assist in the improvement of air quality conditions. The General Plan's land use plan,

circulation plan and Community Character & Design Element would help to reduce project impacts on air quality by promoting alternative modes of transportation (bicycle and pedestrian access) to city services, mixed use development (i.e., housing in close proximity to retail and employment centers), and efficient use of vacant land. Furthermore, site-specific mitigation that would be required for all approved development projects to further reduce the project's impacts on air quality. Nevertheless, there are no feasible methods to completely offset air pollutant emission increases from land uses proposed in the General Plan, and still provide for planned urban land uses.

Impact 6.15 The impacts of global climate change would cumulatively result in the potential decrease in water supply, increase in air pollutants, and increase in health hazards. *Significant and unavoidable/ Cumulatively Considerable environmental impact.*

Finding: While all policies and implementing actions provided in the General Plan to reduce the impacts would help to reduce regional impacts on global climate change as a result of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce this cumulative effects of global climate change on the City, or the effects of the project on global climate change to a less-than-significant level. Consequently, this impact is significant and unavoidable. Specific economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the proposed General Plan outweigh this significant impact, as further set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below.

Rationale: While all policies and implementing actions outlined in the General Plan and Draft MEIR would assist in the reduction of GHG emissions, effect on water supply and flooding, climate change is a result of global GHG emissions. A complete elimination of GHG emissions in the City would not significantly reduce GHG emissions on a global scale nor decrease the effects of global climate change on the City's residents.

Section B. ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1 – No Update/No Development Projects

The "No Project" alternative is discussed in pages 7.0-4 through 7.0-13 of the Draft MEIR. Under this alternative, the proposed Colusa General Plan and its associated Land Use Map would not be adopted, and the existing City of Colusa General Plan policy document and Land Use Map would remain in effect. The City would utilize its existing zoning and other regulations regarding development within the City limits. No expansion of the City's Sphere of Influence and Planning Area would take place. Infrastructure would be installed under existing plans, if applicable. None of the specific projects discussed in the Draft MEIR (Colusa Riverbend, Colusa Crossings, Brookins Ranch) would be developed. Instead, all unincorporated areas outside the City limits would develop in accordance with the General Plan designations and zoning of Colusa County and not be annexed by the City. Buildout under Alternative 1 would result in approximately 3,725 residential dwelling units and an associated population of 10,617. Alternative 1 would result in the fewest number of new residential units and residents.

Finding: Alternative 1 was considered and subsequently rejected for the following reasons:

1. This alternative would fail to achieve several project objectives because it would not be based on a land use plan that provides for the development of the Special Planning

Areas, as described in the Land Use Element of the General Plan. Instead, this alternative would result in an incremental approach to land use planning and development, and would not provide the tools to help ensure that growth can occur in a phased and well-planned manner with resulting new development that bears some relation in its character and connectivity to existing city neighborhoods and commercial centers.

2. Under this alternative, the existing land use designations, specifically the residential densities, would remain inconsistent with the CLUP and would, therefore, result in the same impact level with respect to conflicts with land use plans and policies as with the proposed General Plan.
3. Under this alternative, the lesser amount of land available for commercial, professional office, and industrial development could result in an increase in commuter traffic on roads, as residents travel to other communities for jobs. The Urban Reserve designation in the proposed General Plan allows the City to designate additional land within its SOI to jobs-producing land uses that would provide opportunities for new employment centers as residential growth occurs. Under Alternative 1, it is estimated that development of commercial and industrial land could generate up to 2,863 employees, which would lead to a jobs-to-housing ratio of 0.77, less than the 0.96-1.24 range under the proposed project and below the desired minimum ratio of 1.00. This would indicate that under the Alternative 1, more people would have to find work outside the City, adding to traffic on roads to other employment centers, most of which are outside Colusa County.
4. This alternative would fail to improve circulation throughout the City and Planning Area (i.e., though roadways and pedestrian and bicycle connectivity) as effectively as the proposed General Plan. Development is anticipated to occur, whether under the City's current General Plan and the County's General Plan (outside the SOI), or under the proposed General Plan, with lands to be annexed into the City consistent with the proposed Circulation Plan. Both the proposed Circulation Element and the proposed Community Character and Design Element incorporate streets and roadway patterns that are intended to accommodate the increased traffic and move vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians in a more efficient manner. The proposed General Plan includes provisions for a Streets and Roadways Master Plan that will enable residents and visitors in Colusa increased opportunities for connectivity among the various existing and planned neighborhoods. Alternative 1 does not provide this approach to increased connectivity. .
5. This alternative would not implement a Community Character and Design Element, which will provide clear direction to developers as to how Colusa residents desire to see the City develop in terms of its aesthetics, mix of land uses, streets and blocks design, and architectural character.
6. This alternative would not create as many walkable neighborhoods as the proposed General Plan. It would not encourage revitalization of infill and existing developed areas within the Riverfront District and along the SR 20/45 corridor. It would not foster the same quantity or quality of distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place.
7. Under this alternative, there would remain significant and unavoidable impacts and/or

cumulative impacts in the areas of land use compatibility, loss of Prime Farmland, traffic, noise, air quality, exposure to hazardous materials and contaminated agricultural sites, hydrology and water quality, and GHG emissions. Some of these impacts—specifically those associated with exposure to hazardous materials and contaminated agricultural sites and hydrology and water quality, are reduced to a less-than-significant level with the proposed General Plan.

8. Under this alternative, a portion of the proposed General Plan (Land Use Map and policy document) would be implemented only within the existing City boundaries and existing SOI. The Colusa County General Plan would guide development in areas of the Planning Area outside the City and existing SOI. The City's existing Circulation Map would also be implemented only within the existing City limits and SOI.

Alternative 2 – No Update/ Development Projects Only

Alternative 2 is discussed in pages 7.0-14 through 7.0-23 of the Draft MEIR. This alternative is similar to Alternative 1 in that the proposed Colusa General plan and its associated Land Use Map and Circulation Map would not be adopted. The existing General Plan and its Land Use Map would guide future development within the City limits. However, under Alternative 2, the three specific projects (Colusa Riverbend, Colusa Crossings, Brookins Ranch) would be annexed into the City and developed as described in the MEIR. The City would utilize its existing zoning and other regulations regarding development within the City limits and on the project sites. Infrastructure would be installed under existing plans, if applicable. However, infrastructure on the project sites would be installed as described in the MEIR. Buildout under Alternative 2 would result in a maximum of approximately 8,219 residential dwelling units and an associated population of 23,424.

Finding: This alternative was considered and subsequently rejected for the following reasons:

1. This alternative would fail to achieve several project objectives because it would not be based on a land use plan that provides for the development of the Special Planning Areas, as described in the proposed Land Use Element of the General Plan. While this alternative would allow for annexation and development of the three development projects, it would nevertheless fail to achieve a comprehensive approach to the land use planning and development of these projects. The projects would be developed under the City's current plan and zoning ordinance, without the tools provided in the proposed General Plan (e.g., specific plans, design guidelines and development standards) that would help ensure that the developments are constructed in a manner that will enhance, rather than detract from, the City's unique character, and that the projects' designs will bears some relation to the City's character, including enhanced connectivity to existing city neighborhoods and employment and commercial centers.
2. Under this alternative, the existing land use designations, specifically the residential densities within the CLUP planning area, would remain inconsistent with the CLUP and would, therefore, result in the same impact level with respect to conflicts with land use plans and policies as with the proposed General Plan.
3. Under this alternative, the lesser amount of land designated for commercial, professional office, and industrial development, and no Urban Reserve, could result in an increase in commuter traffic on roads, as residents travel to other communities for jobs. The proposed Colusa Riverbend, Colusa Crossings, and Brookins Ranch are

primarily intended as residential neighborhoods (some commercial is proposed within Colusa Crossings). Therefore, as with Alternative 1, fewer opportunities for job-creation would be available under this alternative as compared with the proposed General Plan. Housing in these development projects would occur at a higher density than if they were built under the County's General Plan. Therefore, more people would have to find work outside the City than under the proposed General Plan or under Alternative 1, adding substantially to traffic on roads to other employment centers, most of which are outside Colusa County.

4. This alternative would fail to improve circulation throughout the City and Planning Area (i.e., though roadways and pedestrian and bicycle connectivity) as effectively as the proposed General Plan. With the significant new residential development that would occur with Colusa Riverbend, Colusa Crossings, and Brookins Ranch, both the proposed Circulation Element and the proposed Community Character and Design Element would incorporate streets and roadway patterns that would accommodate the increased traffic and move vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians in a more efficient manner. The proposed General Plan includes provisions for a Streets and Roadways Master Plan that will enable increased opportunities for connectivity among the various existing and new neighborhoods. Alternative 1 does not provide this approach to increased connectivity.
5. This alternative would not implement a Community Character and Design Element, which will provide clear direction to developers as to how Colusa residents desire to see the City develop in terms of its aesthetics, mix of land uses, streets and blocks design, and architectural character.
6. This alternative would not create as many walkable neighborhoods as the proposed General Plan. It would not encourage revitalization of infill and existing developed areas within the Riverfront District and along the SR 20/45 corridor. Absent the Community Character and Design element, it would not ensure the same quantity or quality of distinctive, attractive new development as with the proposed General Plan.
7. Under this alternative, there would remain significant and unavoidable impacts and/or cumulative impacts in the areas of land use compatibility, loss of Prime Farmland, traffic, noise, air quality, exposure to hazardous materials and contaminated agricultural sites, hydrology and water quality, and GHG emissions. Some of these impacts—specifically those associated with exposure to hazardous materials and contaminated agricultural sites and hydrology and water quality, are reduced to a less-than-significant level with the proposed General Plan.
8. Under this alternative, a portion of the proposed General Plan (Land Use Map and policy document) would be implemented only within the existing City boundaries and existing sphere of influence (SOI). The Colusa County General Plan would guide development in areas of the Planning Area outside the City and existing SOI. The City's existing Circulation Map would also be implemented only within the existing City limits and SOI.

Alternative 3 – Increased Density of Development

Alternative 3 is discussed in pages 7.0-23 through 7.0-31 of the Draft MEIR. This alternative would have a similar buildout scenario to that under the proposed General Plan in terms of population and number of dwelling units. However, this alternative would designate more

acreage for medium-density and high density residential development. The result would accommodate the same anticipated population at buildout of the proposed General Plan but on less land. In this scenario, more intensive residential development would occur at the three development project sites (Colusa Riverbend, Colusa Crossings and Brookins Ranch). Implementation of this alternative would result in the same number of dwelling units and new residents as the proposed project, but at a higher density on less acreage.

Finding: This alternative is infeasible and is rejected for the following reasons:

1. This alternative provides for a higher intensity of development on residential parcels, which is inconsistent with the current character of Colusa.
2. The total number of units would remain the same and would not improve the levels of service on local roadway segments or at roadway intersections.
3. This alternative allows for long-term retention of agricultural land use activities within the Planning Area. The proposed General Plan intends that land within the SOI/Planning Area would be annexed into the City for urban level development and served with the City's municipal services. In conjunction with development of agricultural land, the City would require mitigation for loss of Prime Farmland and work with Colusa County and farmland trusts to ensure equal amounts of Prime Farmland remain in agricultural production in perpetuity. If large tracts of agricultural land are to remain undeveloped within the City's Planning Area under this alternative, it is unlikely that property owners of these agricultural lands would require municipal services nor request annexation into the City. Therefore, this alternative would not meet the City's objectives for land within the SOI.

Alternative 4 – Revised Circulation Alternative

Alternative 4 is discussed in pages 6.0-32 through 7.0-43 of the Draft MEIR. This alternative would 1) revise Implementing Action CIR-1.1.a to establish LOS D as the minimum acceptable LOS for the city streets and intersections along SR 20/45 and provide for an alternative circulation pattern that designates a more direct route between SR 20/45 on the southeast side of the Planning Area and SR 20 to the southwest. This alternative includes a modification to the proposed future development of a four-lane arterial street along the existing railroad right-of-way coterminous with the southern boundary of the City's SOI. When future traffic volumes and levels of service warrant, this roadway would be constructed similarly to what was proposed with the Circulation Map under the Draft General Plan, but the roadway alignment would make a more direct connection than was originally proposed. As with the draft Circulation Map, Alternative 4 provides a route that would minimize the need for future through-traffic to pass through the City via Sioc Street, Fremont Street and Market Street. All other aspects of Alternative 4, including the remainder of the originally proposed Circulation Map and all other elements of the General Plan would remain the same as with the proposed Project. Alternative 4 would have the same land use designations, buildout population and number of housing units as with the proposed General Plan.

Finding: This alternative was considered and subsequently rejected for the following reasons:

1. This alternative would not substantially reduce project impacts nor improve levels of service on Fremont Street, Sioc Street or Bridge Street.

2. A Level of Service (LOS) D could be accomplished through the revision of the proposed Implementing Action CIR-1.1.a (Streets and Roadways Master Plan) by reducing the LOS standard to D along State Route 20/45 (Bridge Street and Market Street) and SR 20 (10th Street), consistent with the Caltrans standard of LOS D for state highways in urban areas.
3. Buildout of the General Plan is expected to take a number of years, if not decades. As new development occurs and traffic volumes increase, the Council will have future opportunities to address levels of service and the traffic circulation both through project-specific mitigation and as a part of future General Plan updates.

Section C. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed General Plan will result in significant unavoidable impacts to land use, agricultural resources, population and employment, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, and visual resources, as set forth in Section B, above. The City Council has balanced these significant unavoidable impacts of the Project against the Project benefits and based on the entire record before it, hereby determines that the identified impacts are acceptable.

After review of the entire administrative record, including the Final MEIR, the City Council staff report, and the oral and written testimony and evidence presented at public hearings, the City Council finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other anticipated benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, and therefore justify the approval of this Project. The proposed General Plan has eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects on the environment where feasible, and the City Council finds that, on balance, the remaining significant unavoidable impacts of the Project are acceptable because the benefits of the Project outweigh them. The City Council finds that each of the overriding considerations set forth below constitutes a separate and independent ground for such a finding. The Project will result in the following substantial benefits, which constitute the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that justify the approval of the proposed General Plan:

The proposed General Plan will provide diverse housing opportunities for all economic levels.

The proposed General Plan will provide a foundation for comprehensive planning and clear direction to large annexations and extensive new development that is anticipated to occur with adoption of this General Plan. The policies and programs contained in the General Plan will help the City to maintain a compact urban form inside the Planning Area, which allows for existing and future commercial and industrial development (with related jobs and revenue benefits), while minimizing the development pressure on agricultural land uses outside of the Planning Area. The Project establishes "Special Planning Areas" ("SPAs") that include smart growth principals through a system of neighborhoods within the SPAs that integrate with and bear relationship to the historic city center, and that establish a more walkable and sustainable community. In addition, the Project would provide an improved circulation network, as the City grows, which would include improved connectivity between existing and new areas of the City, as well as improvements to pedestrian and bicycle forms of transportation.

The proposed General Plan's policies and programs will facilitate opportunities for economic benefits that the City would derive from implementation of the General Plan. Along with

residential growth, the Project is expected to result in the retention of existing and attraction of new business and industry, which will create new jobs for City residents, including a relatively long-term source of construction and other jobs as the project builds out over time. The Project will contribute to the City's economic vitality and provide commercial sales and property tax revenue.

The proposed General Plan would accommodate projected regional growth by proposing a concentrated development pattern that balances employment, residential, retail, and recreational uses, linked to transportation system improvements. By accommodating projected regional growth, the proposed General Plan would lessen the pressure for development in the unincorporated area, which could lead to additional and more severe environmental impacts at the regional level, particularly the removal of large tracts of prime agricultural land.

The proposed General Plan will provide significant acreage of parks in the City for use by residents, employees and visitors. It will establish a comprehensive trails and pathways network, and inter-jurisdictional/interagency cooperation to mitigate impacts on natural resources.

The proposed General Plan will provide school expansion and new schools to address local need for educational facilities.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of on the 30th day of October, 2007 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Robert J. MacKaben, Mayor

ATTEST:

Pete Rodda, City Clerk

1022135_1

RESOLUTION NO. 07-30

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COLUSA ADOPTING THE COLUSA GENERAL PLAN

WHEREAS, the City of Colusa ("City") has been in the process of preparing a General Plan update (occasionally referred to herein as the "Project" or the "General Plan"); and

WHEREAS, it is now the City's desire to adopt this General Plan update to replace the previous General Plan adopted on October 4, 1994; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 65351 of the California Government Code, the City has facilitated public participation in the General Plan adoption process through the following hearings, all of which were publicly noticed and provided opportunity for public comment:

- On October 19, 2004, the City Council approved the General Plan scope of work and authorization for staff to proceed to draft the General Plan update and prepare the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR); and
- On April 12, 2005, the City Council endorsed a preliminary Land Use Diagram and corresponding land use designations that would serve as the basis for the General Plan Update and MEIR; and
- On April 11, 2006, following staff's presentation and Council/Commission's review of the first draft of the General Plan at a publicly-noticed hearing, and having received public comment, the Council approved a schedule that directed staff to begin a series of public meetings toward finalizing the draft General Plan for circulation with the MEIR; and
- On April 26, 2006, the draft Land Use Element was presented by staff to the Planning Commission and the public at a publicly noticed hearing. The element was also available for review on the City's website. At the close of the meeting, having received public comment, the Commission directed staff as to which changes should be made to the draft Land Use Element, with an understanding of the effects that such changes would have on the remaining General Plan elements and the MEIR; and
- On May 5, 2006, the Planning Commission reviewed the checklist of recommended changes to the Land Use Element and approved the changes to the draft element. The draft Circulation Element was then presented to the Planning Commission and the public. At the close of the meeting, the Commission continued the hearing for further discussion on the draft Circulation Element to May 24, 2006; and
- On May 24, 2006, the Planning Commission continued discussions on draft Circulation Element and considered a staff-recommended Urban Reserve land use designation be added to the Land Use Map. At the close of the meeting, the Commission directed staff as to which changes should be made to the draft Circulation Element, with an understanding of the effects that such changes would have on the remaining General Plan elements and the MEIR; and
- On June 7, 2006, the Planning Commission continued discussions on changes to the

draft Circulation Map, the General Plan's discussion of the Colusa County Airport, and the Urban Reserve land use designation. At the close of the meeting, the Commission directed staff as to which changes should be made to the draft Circulation Element and Land Use Element; and

- On June 21, 2006, the draft Community Character and Design Element and the Safety Element were presented by staff to the Planning Commission and the public at a publicly noticed hearing. The elements were also available for review on the City's website. At the close of the meeting, having received public comment, the Commission directed staff as to which changes should be made to the draft Community Character and Design Element and the draft Safety Element ; and
- On July 12, 2006, at a publicly-noticed meeting, the Commission received the proposed changes to the Circulation Map and Safety Element and discussed with staff further minor changes required to the Land Use map and flood hazard map. Staff then presented the Noise Element, Parks Recreation and Resource Conservation Element, and Municipal Facilities and Services Element. At the close of the meeting, the Commission directed staff as to which changes should be made to the draft elements; and
- On October 25, 2006, at a publicly-noticed meeting, the Planning Commission signed a resolution recommending that the October 2006 *City of Colusa Draft General Plan* update be delivered to the Colusa City Council, with final incorporated changes as directed by the Planning Commission on this date, for the Council's review and consideration. This draft General Plan excluded the Community Character and Design Element, which would require further review by the Planning Commission prior to delivery to the City Council; and
- On January 16, 2007, at a publicly-noticed meeting, following staff's presentation and Council's review of the Planning Commission's recommended draft General Plan, the Council approved a schedule that directed staff to conduct a series of three public meetings toward finalizing the draft General Plan for circulation; and
- On January 23, 2007, at a publicly-noticed meeting, staff gave a summary of the draft General Plan to the City Council and the public. This summary included the history of the City's General Plan update process, a description of the General Plan and MEIR, a description of elements and corresponding goals, and a review of the proposed schedule for General Plan adoption and MEIR certification. Public comments were received; and
- On February 22, 2007, at a publicly-noticed meeting, the Council directed staff to finalize the draft document for transmittal to the State Clearinghouse, distribution to public agencies, and general release to the public for review and comment; and
- On March 21, 2007, at a publicly-noticed meeting, the Council directed staff to make any needed revisions to the Draft Community Character and Design Element pertaining to items discussed during the meeting and transmit the Community Character and Design element as amended with the Draft General Plan to the State Clearinghouse, distribute to public agencies, and provide general release to the public for review and comment; and

- On May 8, 2007, the Draft General Plan update was transmitted to State Clearinghouse for public/agency review and comment; and
- On August 14, 2007, a publicly-noticed joint Planning Commission-City Council meeting was held on the General Plan MEIR. At that time, the Planning Commission recommended to the Council that it go forward with adoption of the General Plan and certification of the MEIR, incorporating staff's recommended changes, with the exception of the change in level of service, for which the Council determined that an additional meeting be held; and
- On September 4, 2007, the City Council held a final publicly-noticed hearing on the Draft MEIR to continue discussion on staff's recommendation to reduce the proposed LOS C standard to LOS D on state highways. Following City Council discussion and clarification from staff, the Council moved to amend the Draft General Plan to allow the proposed LOS C to be modified to LOS D on State highways 20/45 and 20 (i.e., Bridge Street, Market Street, 10th Street). This change did not result in any additional adverse impacts that were not previously evaluated in the MEIR; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Government Code Section 65352, the City circulated the draft General Plan update through the State Clearinghouse for a period of five months and referred the proposed draft General Plan to numerous other local and agencies and interested/responsible parties, and provided each with adequate time in which to comment on the draft General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City determined that a Master Environmental Impact Report should be prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) dated July 27, 2005 through the State Clearinghouse to state agencies and transmitted to numerous other public agencies and interested parties for consultation on the scope of the MEIR; and

WHEREAS, a second NOP was circulated through the State Clearinghouse on April 5, 2007, with proposed changes to the Project, which did not raise any new issues that were not previously identified in the scoping meeting; and

WHEREAS, the City prepared a Draft MEIR dated July 25, 2007, which reflected the independent judgment of the City as to the potential environmental effects of the Project. The Draft MEIR was circulated for the required 45-day public review period; and

WHEREAS, the City Council and Planning Commission received oral comments from the public at a joint City Council-Planning Commission hearing held on August 14, 2007, regarding the Draft MEIR, and reviewed all written comments received prior to the close of the public comment period. Staff prepared a preliminary analysis of comments received, which was presented to the City Council and Planning Commission. Staff's good faith, reasoned preliminary analysis concluded that no new information was received that would require recirculation of the Draft MEIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. Staff recommended changes to the General Plan based on those comments and responses that are contained in the Final MEIR; and

WHEREAS, a staff report, dated August 9, 2007, and incorporated herein by reference, described and analyzed for the City Council and Planning Commission, at the August 14, 2007, publicly-noticed joint public hearing, the Draft MEIR and staff's conclusions regarding the public comments and responses; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission and the City Council reviewed the staff report and the Draft MEIR at the August 14, 2007, publicly-noticed joint public hearing, at which time all interested parties had the opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Draft MEIR identified the following significant and unavoidable environmental impacts of the General Plan:

1. Inconsistency with other land use plans, particularly the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Colusa County Airport (Impact 4.1.2);
2. Loss of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Local Importance as designated under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (Impact 4.1.5);
3. Inconsistency with the policies of the Colusa County LAFCo regarding agricultural preservation (Impact 4.1.6); substantial increase in population and the number of housing units (Impact 4.2.1);
4. Increased traffic volumes and a decrease in LOS on area roadways (Impact 4.3.1);
5. Increased traffic volumes and a decrease in LOS on state highways (SR 20 and SR 45) (Impact 4.3.2);
6. Increased traffic volumes and a decrease in LOS at street and roadway intersections (Impact 4.3.3);
7. Temporary increase in noise levels at existing noise-sensitive receptors due to demolition of existing structures and construction activities associated with development (Impact 4.4.3);
8. Potential placement of new noise-sensitive land uses near the Colusa County Airport (Impact 4.4.4);
9. Contribution to a cumulative increase in traffic noise (Impact 4.4.5); increase air pollutant emissions from land use activities within the city (Impact 4.5.2);
10. Increase in traffic volumes that would potentially increase concentrations of carbon monoxide along streets and near intersections (Impact 4.5.4);
11. Potential obstruction of scenic vistas at the existing edges of urban development (Impact 4.10.3);
12. Conversion of land from agricultural use to urban uses for Colusa Riverbend (Impact 5.1.1), Colusa Crossings (Impact 5.2.1) and Brookins Ranch (Impact 5.3.1);
13. Loss of views of scenic areas and changes to the visual character within project vicinity if the following projects were approved: Colusa Riverbend (Impact 5.1.10), Colusa Crossing (Impact 5.2.6), and Brookins Ranch (Impact 5.3.14);
14. Contribution to cumulative loss of Prime Farmland and other valuable farmland in Colusa County, the Sacramento Valley and the state (Impact 6.2);
15. Contribution to cumulative increase in population and housing growth in the County and associated environmental impacts (Impact 6.3);
16. Contribution to cumulative increase in interregional traffic on state highways (Impact 6.4);

17. Contribution to exacerbation of existing NSVAB problems with ozone and particulate matter (Impact 6.6);
18. Contribution to cumulative loss of biological resources in the region (Impact 6.9);
19. Contribution to cumulative increase of greenhouse gases including CO₂ emitted into the atmosphere (Impact 6.14); and
20. Contribution to global climate change resulting in potential decrease in water supply, increase in air pollutants, and increase in health hazards (Impact 6.15).

Approval of the General Plan will, therefore, require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Draft MEIR identified several potentially significant impacts that will be reduced to insignificance with specified mitigation measures. Approval of the General Plan will therefore require adoption of mitigation findings and a Mitigation Monitoring Program; and

WHEREAS, the Draft MEIR and the staff report prepared for the August 14, 2007 joint Planning Commission-City Council hearing regarding the Draft MEIR, including the preliminary analysis of the public comments, reflect the City's independent judgment and analysis; and

WHEREAS, the Draft General Plan released to the public on May 8, 2007, consisted of the seven elements required by state law plus two optional elements— specifically, the Land Use Element; Community Character and Design Element; Circulation Element; Safety Element; Parks, Recreation and Resource Conservation Element (includes Open Space); Noise Element; and Municipal Facilities and Services Element. (Note: Housing Element was previously adopted in June 2004.); and

WHEREAS, the Draft General Plan contains goals, policies, and programs to guide the physical development of the City and the conservation of its resources. Thus, the Draft General Plan contains all content for the mandatory general plan elements as required by State law, including the proposed general distribution, location, and extent of land uses in the Planning Area for residential, commercial, industrial, public, open space and parks, and other categories of public and private uses of land, and including standards of population density and building intensity; and

WHEREAS, the Draft General Plan was reviewed in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act through the preparation and review of a Master Environmental Impact Report; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission received oral comments from the public at a hearing held on October 25, 2006, at which time all interested parties had an opportunity to comment regarding the Draft General Plan, and reviewed all written comments received prior to the close of the public comment period; and

WHEREAS, all public and agency comments received on the General Plan and the MEIR were considered in finalizing the General Plan update; and

WHEREAS, in response to comments received by Caltrans, MM 4.3.2c on page 4.3-27 of the Draft MEIR was modified to show clarify the option that SR 45 north of Market Street could not only be re-designated as a four-lane arterial, but could also be reconstructed [when

traffic volumes/conditions warrant]. As a result of the agency's comments, some discussion of interim improvements has been added, identifying that with the 16 intersections that could require signalization upon buildout of the General Plan, that on an interim basis, all-way stops and side street turn prohibitions can be alternatives to signalization; and

WHEREAS, in response to comments received by Jarvis, Fay and Doporto, LLP, the Table 5.3.2 on page 5.3-6 has been changed to delete reference to lack of a project-specific geotechnical report. Furthermore, the following were dismissed from further discussion because they were considered to either have a less-than-significant impact or no impact on the following standards based on reasoning listed and therefore not further analyzed in the MEIR for the Brookins Ranch project:

- Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks) – the City of Colusa does not currently have any policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. While the General Plan includes Implementing Action CIR-4.1 requiring the preparation and adoption of a Bike Master Plan, this Plan has not been developed at this time.
- Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) – the project does not include any roadway design features which increase to potential for roadway hazards. Additionally, the project is subject to the City's roadway standards including all safety standards. Therefore, the Brookins Ranch project is considered to have a less than significant impact.
- The project may result in inadequate parking capacity – the project is for residential development and is required by adhere to the parking standards of the City. Therefore, the Brookins Ranch project is considered to have a less than significant impact.

WHEREAS, on October 30, 2007, the City Council held a noticed public hearing on the Draft General Plan, at which time all interested parties had the opportunity to be heard. The City Council adopted Resolution No. 07-29, incorporated herein by reference, certifying the Master Environmental Impact Report as adequate and complete pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, the Final MEIR, incorporated herein by reference, is available for review in the City Planning Department and on the City's website.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. **Recitals Adopted.** The foregoing recitals are true and correct and made a part of this resolution.

2. **Findings.** The City Council hereby finds that:

A. **Internal consistency.** The General Plan is internally consistent. Key community issues are consistently expressed throughout the General Plan in numerous instances. For example, the Community Character and Design, Circulation, Land Use, and Parks, Recreation and Resource Conservation Elements all share the goal of developing a network of pedestrian and bicycle routes throughout the community. Additionally, the Land Use, Circulation, and Municipal Facilities and Services Elements all consist of policies and actions that will help

ensure that development of public infrastructure meets the long-term needs of residents. This will be accomplished by adopting an annexation phasing plan for the development of public facilities in a logical manner that encourages orderly development. Lastly, another key community issue that is consistently expressed throughout the General Plan is that new development be designed and developed in a manner that bears some relationship to the downtown historic core, a theme that is consistently stated in the Land Use, Community Character and Design, Circulation, and Parks, Recreation and Resource Conservation Elements.

B. Public Interest. Adoption of the General Plan is in the public interest of the City. The General Plan will serve as a roadmap for future growth and development in the City. It will support the City's development as a vibrant community where people desire to live, work, and play. The General Plan will allow Colusa to be a regional destination and not just a suburb for regional employment centers. The City's land use pattern will emphasize a healthy mix of land uses, including public spaces, services, public art and culture, and open space and recreation, in addition to well-planned roadways, and pedestrian and bicycle pathways. The Plan provides an integrated network of neighborhoods and business districts, which will be emphasized as building blocks for the community's growth and revitalization to promote job expansion in this live-work-play community.

C. CEQA compliance. The City has complied with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act by adopting Resolution No. 07-29.

3. Approval of the General Plan. Based upon the all the information in the record, including without limitation the above findings, the City Council, hereby adopts the General Plan draft dated May 2007, as amended on August 14, 2007, and September 4, 2007.

4. Effective Date. This Resolution shall take effect and be enforced thirty (30) days after its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of on the 30th day of October, 2007 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Robert J. MacKaben, Mayor

ATTEST:

Pete Rodda, City Clerk