From: Karina Zappa
To: Mary Gourley

Subject: Police spending- budget comment for Tuesday **Date:** Sunday, February 14, 2021 9:50:38 AM

Hello,

I am writing to urge City Council to please NOT adopt the budget with increased police spending. It is important that we know how our taxpayer dollars are being used, and they have spent enough money on lawsuits, re-training officers, and new staff in the last few years to necessitate not only a review, but honestly reduced funding, not additional spending.

Additionally, Santa Rosa as well as other cities, counties, and states, are adopting alternatives to policing and I would like our funding to go to programs like this. I feel very strongly about this and encourage City Council to proactively and publicly look into these options.

Thank you, Karina 95472 From: Kamryn Trinkino
To: Mary Gourley

Subject: Do not increase Police Spending!!

Date: Saturday, February 13, 2021 12:21:26 PM

THE PEOPLE WANT MONEY TO BE SPENT ON PUBLIC HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND COMMUNITY!!! INVEST IN YOUR COMMUNITY FOR A SAFER COMMUNITY, POLICE DO NOT SOLVE OR KEEP CRIME LOW!!! POLICE BRING CRIME.

Assistant City Manager/City Clerk, MMC Mary Gourley

I urge the City Council to not increase police spending and to look to cities like Santa Rosa and San Francisco (as well as other cities all across the country), which are implementing mental health professionals to respond to nonviolent 911 calls about intoxication, homelessness, overdose, and mental health crises.

From: <u>Jojo Sanders</u>
To: <u>Mary Gourley</u>

Subject: Public Comment for Council Meeting on 2/16 **Date:** Saturday, February 13, 2021 11:51:34 AM

To: Sebastopol City Council,

This public comment is regarding Agenda Item #6 Discussion of Mid-Year Budget Review. Specifically, I want to address point 5 on the Mid-year Budget Adjustments Staff Report, about the money being requested by the Police Department.

I urge the City Council to not approve this spending. I also encourage the City Council to implement a similar system to what Santa Rosa Police Department is implementing. The Santa Rosa Police Department is entering into a 1 year contract with the Oregon nonprofit White Bird Clinic, and will send trained mental health workers to respond to nonviolent calls without needing a police officer present (Press Democrat). Calls related to mental health, intoxication/overdose, and homelessness will also be responded to by these mental health workers. This program will cost 2% of the entire SRPD yearly budget.

This model is being implemented in cities all over the country, and Sebastopol should join these cities.

Thank you for your hard work and consideration.

Jojo Sanders, Sebastopol Resident

From: <u>katy spyrka</u>

To: <u>Mary Gourley</u>; <u>Diana Rich</u>

Subject: Here is the correct video for Spyrka Electric and letter Please disregard other letter

Date: Saturday, February 13, 2021 12:02:26 PM

City Council Members

My husband and I own business and work at 380 Morris St ste G. Our business are Spyrka Electric and Collaborative Care Coordination & Fiduciary Services. We have been renting the space for 18 years.

Over the last 18 months the issues with the people living in the motor homes have gotten much worse. zBecause of the issues, we have had to install cameras on the outside of the building, cages in our trucks and exterior security locks on the outside of our vans to prevent theft. We have video of them trying ot break into the vans and taking papers from the garbage. We have called the police, and they have assisted when they can. We were told that the motor homes are to be moved every 72 hours and that the city council is not agreement of this.

I use to beable to work at the warehouse and feel safe. Over the last 18 months, during the day we have had the strangers wander into our warehouse looking for someone supposedly, they are actually scoping out our materials. There are random people from the motor homes and drug addicts going around the area outside our warehouse and others. We have had people living in the vehicles in the parking lot. We have video of these people taking papers out of our dumpsters and trying to break in our vans. They have broken in our tenants van. They are doing drugs behind the main garbage area. We have found syringe needles. They are congregating daily and selling drugs on the Morris street. The other day one of them pulled a u turn and hit the front of a car and then became aggressive and took off.

I use to beable to work at the warehouse and feel safe. I do not leave the warehouse after 430 pm and do not work on weekends because of the homeless people and safety I feel that the city council needs to take action and remove the motor homes and people. We have considered moving our business as has many others who are renting warehouses on Morris. It is the responsibility of the City Council to take care of us the Business owners not the people living for free in motor homes stealing and leaving trash and doing drugs . I follow all the rules and the city makes no exceptions for us so, there should be no exceptions for the people living in motor homes.

I have attached videos of this weekend.

The dumpster was at 7:43 pm 2-12-21 https://my.arlo.com/#/viewShared/A459974943878B6E_202102 them in dumpster

From: <u>Katie Sanderson</u>
To: <u>Mary Gourley</u>

Subject: More-than-significant NOT less-than-significant **Date:** Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:54:23 PM

Hi Ms.Gourley,

Could you please forward my email below to all the members of the City Council.

Thank you, Katie

Dear Council Members,

I have just learned, from my neighbor Jacque, the news regarding the application withdrawal and new tactics by Pacific.

I wanted to send you my comments below to express encouragement to you & others to continue to do all you can.

Thank you. Katie Sanderson

February 16, 2021

To: David Hogan

Planning Department of the City of Sebastopol

Design Review Board Members

Members of the City Council

As a concerned Sebastopol resident I have endeavored to compare the January 13, 2021 review by Mr. Weinberger, W-Tran, with the updated Draft Transportation Impact Analysis Report submitted by TJKM on October 2,2020 for the developer, Pacific West.

My focus was drawn to the Conclusions and Recommendations of the TIA in Section 9.0 on pg.55. I strongly disagree with the recurring statement throughout this section that the project will have "a less-than-significant" impact. In my opinion the project will have a More-than-significant impact on the Bodega corridor, surrounding streets, the safety of pedestrians, and pollution.

Note the first item in Section 9.0, Projected Trip Generation. They state that the project "is expected to generate approximately 528 daily trips"...with 34 weekday a.m. peak hour trips (7:00 -8:15)...and 43 weekday p.m. peak hour trips (4:00-5:45). I have to question such numbers given the projected population of 300+ (192 bedrooms). Will only 73 residents need to exit and enter in those peak hours to get to work, school, childcare, etc.?

Take this gross underestimate of traffic and combine it with an examination of the multitude of pages with graphs and data in the TIA. Each study of the traffic was ONLY done on 2 weekdays, in December 2019, and tracking ONLY the peak hours. Would not an accurate projection of the number of vehicles, many hundred more than included, exiting/entering Woodmark's driveways significantly change this data?

Furthermore, data must be collected throughout the day, not just on weekdays, but also weekends and in a variety of seasons (Bodega is a major route for residents of Sonoma County and beyond who are traveling to the coast.)

Would not the inclusion of accurate numbers of Woodmark's vehicles also significantly change the TIA analysis/data of the project's impact on the several signaled and non-signaled intersections in the study? And the length of the queuing lanes on Bodega, into the development and to Robinson Rd., which have also been grossly underestimated?

Additionally, most certainly the residents traveling to work will be driving. Given that the Sonoma County Transit Stop on Bodega, between Nelson and Virginia, erroneously noted by Pacific as a transit stop, is in fact just a shuttle stop to a hub and not a viable alternative for getting to work.

I believe that the applicant's repeated conclusions of less-than-significant need full scrutiny.

A review, such a Mr.Weinberger has summited, is severely limited by the fact that he is responding to the TIA produced by TJKM for Pacific West reflecting their self serving biases. This makes Weinberger's review incomplete.

An in-depth, accurate and independent traffic study, one commissioned by the City, and funded by Pacific West, is vital to the city's decision process. Anything less will result in the disastrous consequence of further gridlock on Bodega and forcing even more dangerous conditions on ring roads throughout the city.

As City staff, dedicated board members, and elected officials, you must take aggressive measures to address the More-than-significant impact of the entire Woodmark development or we will all have a less-than-significant Sebastopol.

Sincerely,

Katie Sanderson

Bears Meadow

Sent from my iPhone

https://my.arlo.com/#/viewShared/6C68204F8DCC007C_202102 https://my.arlo.com/#/viewShared/9530A1E2F7BC68F9_202102

This was 10:12 2-12-21

 $\frac{\text{https://my.arlo.com/}\#/\text{viewShared/A08501AB5AF9CE13}_202102}{\text{bike guy before he goes around the back of truck}}$

https://my.arlo.com/#/viewShared/95E05469C607DAE0_202102 he is coming out from behind our truck at the very beginning as he was trying to break in. https://my.arlo.com/#/viewShared/5DCA8E117524199C_202102 He is walking back from checking out Solar company

--

Thank You, Katy Spyrka From: <u>Janis Dolnick</u>
To: <u>Mary Gourley</u>

Subject: Woodmark Development and Traffic Impact
Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:49:21 PM

Mary – I understand that you will make sure that members of the City Council will receive this letter. Thank you, Janis

To: David Hogan

Planning Department, City of Sebastopol

Sebastopol City Council

Design Review Board, City of Sebastopol

Re: Woodmark Development and Traffic Impact

I am reminded to write this letter to you as I watched at 2:30 p.m. the traffic gridlocked and backed up on Bodega Avenue at Robinson Road, heading east on a gray Sunday afternoon in February. This is not an uncommon occurrence, even during a pandemic. "They" say to keep letters to one page or they will not be read. I cannot do it. So please do read this 2 ½ page letter to you.

I am responding to the letter dated January 13, 2021 from the Planning Department in reply to Caleb Roope: "Re: 7716, 7760 Bodega Ave./Permit Number 2020-080 Woodmark Apartments Project - Incompleteness Review."

There are so many comments I would make regarding the profoundly negative impact on traffic this project will have, but I shall limit my responses only to what is presented in the January 13 reply to Caleb Roope, following it item by item, bullet point by bullet point, and ask that you do the same to understand what I am saying here.

With two exceptions (each related to the Attachment regarding the Traffic Analysis documented later in the City's reply), I will keep my responses here specifically directed to Steve Weinberger's reply to David Hogan listed under **Attachment B Memorandum from W-Trans.** The two items/exceptions are:

Item #23(4) under Completeness Items Planning Department:

This item implies that vehicles exiting from the Woodmark property will be using the same exit as vehicles currently use exiting from the Bears Meadow HOA and *will turn left* onto Bodega Ave. At 2:30 on a gray Sunday in February, turning left from a 27-unit HOA, with a population of approximately 40, is impossible.

Adding 84 units with an approximate population of 300 (192 bedrooms), will foreseeably be untenable, regardless of the proposed changes in height to the retaining wall as requested by the Planning Department to improve visibility.

Item #24. under Completeness Items Planning Department:

I propose that the City initiate a new traffic study "at the applicant's expense, at the appropriate time." I am taking my cue from the language used here in the CEQA compliance requirements response, for which the City states that "To reduce the total cost of these items, the City will initiate these studies, at the applicant's expense, at the appropriate time." [my italics]

I also propose that this be item number 29 under the **Traffic Consultant** section.

Attachment B Memorandum from W-Trans

As I read through this section, making copious comments and notes, I feared you would not take the time to read them were I to go through them as thoroughly as I would like. Suffice it to say that the first Bullet Point under *Existing Traffic Counts* is deceptive. Deception applies to the second Bullet Point as well. The statement "Traffic volumes in 2016 were on par with these volumes," is, I assume, comparing the misleading October 2, 2020 report of the Transportation Impact Analysis (done *only at peak hours on two mid-week days*, Thursday, December 12 and Tuesday, December 17, 2019) with the 2016 study. It asserts that the 2016 traffic count is 15-28% higher in peak hours than in the study of December, 2019. Of course not. Robinson Road/Leland Street is now a highly used alternate route used for eastbound and southbound vehicles which stay off of the congested Bodega Avenue.

I do not see in the January 13 letter the issue of "traffic light timing" of eastbound and westbound traffic at Bodega Ave/Robinson Rd. When eastbound traffic from the Pleasant Hill traffic light has passed, the westbound traffic from Main Street or Jewell rounds the curve at the Pine Trees HOA. At present, there is often very little time in which there is a break to cross over to Robinson from Bears Meadow in order to head south. The same is true for turning left onto Bodega. One must turn right and go west in order to go either south or east.

Regarding Bullet Point #3 under Existing Traffic Counts: Is the "north leg of Bodega Avenue/Robinson Road" referring to the Bears Meadow driveway? This bullet point says that "it is unusual that the southbound approach incudes 5 right-turn vehicles and 0 left-turn vehicles." You rightly point out that "No left-turn movements will be a red flag." Not only is it a red-flag, it is not accurate. Currently, residents of Bears Meadow frequently exit to the right, going one block westbound in order to go eastbound, turning right on Nelson Way and right again on Washington Ave., because it is often impossible to turn left on Bodega, especially on spring/summer weekends and other seasonal weekends due to beach traffic from both directions. And, as I stated at the beginning of this letter, it is gridlocked in the midafternoon on a Sunday in February. All "ring streets" will become further clogged than they are currently.

Analysis

Bullet Point #2: Queueing up will occur and it will be a mess. It will, as you say, be "nonsensical." I would submit that the traffic analysis upon which the Planning Department is relying, is in and of itself nonsensical.

In addition to the queueing referenced in exiting the shared-use driveway by Bears Meadow/Woodmark, please note the queueing on Bodega Ave. that will occur when vehicles going eastbound attempt to turn left into Bears Meadow/Woodmark, thereby exacerbating the gridlock continuing eastbound.

Bullet Point #3: I propose that **there be no left turns onto Bodega** *if* the Woodmark Project goes forward. They propose having two left-only turn lanes. Because I am limiting my comments to the impact on traffic, I will not address the *many* other reasons why I believe this development project should not be approved.

Bullet Point #6: Again, to hammer home the point, there should be *no* outbound left turns onto Bodega at all from Woodmark. It will result in further queueing leaving Bears Meadow and Woodmark, and increased gridlock for all.

Request for Updates

Item 2: In a word, NO. See my comments above under Completeness Items Planning Department, Item #23(4) and Analysis, Bullet Points #3 and #6.

Item 3: Do a *post-pandemic* traffic study including the summer and the weekend: see #24 under Completeness, (which, as suggested, could also be put as #29 under Traffic Consultation).

Item 4: Exactly what is "Intersection #3"? Again, if you are advising a "majority of left-turn movements" of vehicles leaving Woodmark, in addition to those already exiting Bears Meadow, as I have stated above, it will be a disaster.

Item 10: Repetitively but nonetheless importantly, NO, as said above.

In summary, I emphasize again:

- That the City initiate and select a new independent post-pandemic traffic study to be done, "at the applicant's expense, at the appropriate time," requiring the use of the same tables as in the previous study(studies) included here going from Main Street and/or Jewell to Robinson Road, both eastbound and westbound, as well as Robinson Road both northbound and southbound.
- That the new, City initiated independent post-pandemic traffic study include in the "ring road" traffic that was completely ignored in the previous traffic study(studies), including Nelson Way, Washington Street, Leland Street. etc.
- That the new, City initiated independent post-pandemic traffic study include *traffic light timing* for traffic coming eastbound from the Pleasant Hill Ave traffic light with the timing of traffic coming westbound from the lights at Main Street/Jewell Ave.
- That the new, City initiated independent post-pandemic traffic study include a Monday, Friday and a *Saturday in the summer* as well as in fall when school starts.

Lastly, I am clearly not a traffic analysist but one should be one in "defense of the City" to dispute, in depth, the Transportation Impact Analysis Report of October 2, 2020.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Janis Dolnick

Sebastopol, California