

2.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

2.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This chapter summarizes the findings of this Draft EIR. It highlights the project's effects, identifies the alternatives studied, and presents the impact overview discussions required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

2.1 PROPOSED PROJECT

Sonoma County's existing *General Plan* was adopted in 1989 after three and a half years of work and over two years of public hearings. The plan established nine major planning goals as the basic framework of its goals, objectives, and policies. These nine major goals are contained in the Land Use Element of the existing *General Plan* and relate to the following subjects:

- Growth projections and growth policy;
- City and community centered growth;
- Compact city and community boundaries;
- Phasing of rural and urban growth with availability of adequate services;
- Open space separation between cities / communities;
- Opportunities for diverse rural and urban residential environments;
- Use of environmental suitability criteria to locate urban and rural growth;
- Protection of agricultural lands; and
- Preservation of scenic features and biotic resource areas.

The overall objective of the *GP 2020* is to review and consider policy changes only on selected topics or issues. These policies and issues were established by the Board of Supervisors following extensive public input and recommendations of the Citizen's Advisory Committee, appointed by the Board. The community at large, and the Citizen's Advisory Committee, felt strongly that the existing *General Plan* was functioning well as the County's land use guide. As a result, the *Draft GP 2020* continues to follow the existing *General Plan* land use maps and its major goals so that the policies that are reviewed and revised are in keeping with these goals.

The *Draft GP 2020* is organized into ten elements as follows:

- Land Use
- Housing
- Agricultural Resources
- Open Space and Resource Conservation
- Water Resources
- Public Safety
- Circulation and Transit
- Air Transportation
- Public Facilities and Services
- Noise

This EIR evaluates policies and programs of the *Draft GP 2020* that would lead to alterations in the physical environment. The evaluation includes changes in population, housing, and land use patterns that would occur in Sonoma County as the *GP 2020* is implemented. The project encompasses all of the future land uses and development that are projected to occur, including residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and other land uses and development, as well as the entire foreseeable public infrastructure that is necessary to serve the projected uses. The *Draft GP 2020* is based upon a projected amount of growth, and does not assume that all properties would be fully developed.

The *Draft GP 2020* projects that the population in Sonoma County would increase from 458,614 in 2000 to 546,030 residents in 2020; an increase of 87,416 residents. This would place 73 percent of Sonoma County's total population in the nine cities. In the unincorporated area of Sonoma County, population would increase from 128,596 in 2000 to 147,660 residents in 2020; an increase of 19,064 residents. Population in the unincorporated area would account for 27 percent of the total county population.

The *Draft GP 2020* projects the number of housing units in Sonoma County would increase from 183,153 in 2000 to 221,640 in 2020; an increase of 38,487 housing units. Of this growth, the *Draft GP 2020* projects a housing unit increase in the nine cities of 31,143 to 157,851 between 2000 and 2020. Such growth would place 71 percent of Sonoma County's housing units within the cities. Growth in the unincorporated area between 2000 and 2020 is projected to reach 63,789 housing units; an addition of 7,344 housing units. Housing units in the unincorporated area would account for 29 percent of the total number of county housing units.

Adoption of the *GP 2020* would also affect the County's Zoning Code and zoning applied to selected properties. Code changes are proposed concurrent with the *GP 2020* that would apply to the following:

- **Air Transportation Element** – An Overlay Zoning District is proposed to be created and applied to properties surrounding the public use airports in the county for the purpose of increased protection of the airport environs from incompatible uses.
- **Affordable Housing Sites** – An Overlay Zoning District is proposed to be created and applied to selected properties in Urban Service Areas in order to implement a program in the adopted Housing Element.
- **Land Use Changes** – Zoning is proposed to be changed on certain properties to conform to any land use map amendments that are approved as part of the *GP 2020*.
- **Zoning Code and Map Changes** would also be required following the adoption of the *GP 2020* in order for the Code to be consistent with the updated General Plan. Designation of Community Separators, Scenic Landscape Units, Biotic Resource Areas, and text amendments to implement policies regarding energy resources, rural and urban development guidelines, siting of churches and schools, etc. are examples.

A more detailed description of the proposed project and background information are contained in *Chapter 3.0 Project Description*.

2.2 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Sonoma County prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) in January 2003 and sent it to governmental agencies, special service districts, organizations, and individuals with an interest in or jurisdiction over the project in order to provide early consultation on the scope of the EIR. Several letters were received in response to the NOP. After reviewing comments relevant to the *Draft GP 2020*, the County identified the following areas of controversy that are further evaluated in this Draft EIR:

Land Use, Population, and Housing – Impact of projected growth and development on the existing land use patterns in the county.

Transportation – Impact of the proposed land use on the county’s transportation system. Of particular concern is the change in existing levels of service on the county’s roadway system with projected growth of the *GP 2020*.

Air Quality – Consistency with the population / employment assumptions used in the development of the Clean Air Plans and consistency with the regional Transportation Control Measures.

Noise – Concern with increased noise due to increased traffic and impacts to noise sensitive development.

Hydrology and Water Resources – Impact on surface water and groundwater quality, bank erosion and sedimentation, flooding, and the management of water supplies.

Biological Resources – Impact on county’s biological and wetland resources – especially sensitive natural communities, special-status species, and riparian corridors.

Geology / Soils – Assess potential geologic, seismic, and soil impacts of the *Draft GP 2020*.

Agriculture – Potential conversion of agricultural land uses to non-agricultural uses, including the conversion of timberland to other uses.

Public Services – Assess whether projected land uses and development consistent with the *Draft GP 2020* would result in the demand for public services such that new facilities would need to be constructed and identify associated environmental impacts.

Cultural Resources – Impact to historical and cultural resources in Sonoma County.

Visual Resources – Impacts to visual resources and aesthetic character of Sonoma County, including potential development on the county’s scenic resources and rural character.

Hazardous Materials – Potential use of hazardous materials and the treatment and disposal of hazardous waste in the county.

2.3 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

This Draft EIR considers the projected development related to the *GP 2020* and assesses the effects of implementing the project alone and combined with other cumulative development expected in the vicinity. **Exhibit 2.0-1** summarizes the environmental impacts identified in **Chapter 4.0 Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures** where the impacts are discussed in detail.

The following levels of significance were used to identify impacts in **Exhibit 2.0-1** and elsewhere in this Draft EIR.

- **Significant Impact (S)** – an adverse change in the environment, where the change exceeds a specific significance threshold. These thresholds are described under the "Significance Criteria" in sections 4.1 through 4.13.
- **Significant Unavoidable Impact (SU)** – A significant impact which cannot be avoided with mitigation. These include impacts which could be partly mitigated but could not be reduced to a less-than-significant level.
- **Less-than-Significant Impact (LTS)** – a change in the environment that does not exceed specific significance thresholds, or no change at all.

Topical sections in *Chapter 4.0 Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures* list the thresholds and criteria used to determine significance for the respective environmental subject.

Exhibit 2.0-1
Summary of Findings

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Land Use, Population and Housing			
<p><i>4.1-1 Growth and Concentration of Population</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would induce growth of population within the unincorporated portion of Sonoma County by accommodating new housing and businesses and by providing services and infrastructure capacity.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.1-2 Land Use Conflicts between Agricultural and Residential / Urban Uses</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in the intrusion of residential uses into agricultural areas thereby exposing residents to noise, odors, dust, and similar nuisances associated with agricultural operations. Such residential development may be incompatible with agricultural operations. Urban uses at the fringe of cities and the unincorporated communities may also encounter these agricultural operations. Both residential intrusion and urban uses at the fringe may result in land use conflicts and land use incompatibility. While the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> and the Sonoma County Code contain policies and ordinances to reduce this impact, this would be a significant impact.</p>	S	No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU
<p><i>4.1-3 Incompatible Land Uses in the Rural Area</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in changes in land use type, density, and scale within rural areas and generate land use incompatibilities. While policies and programs contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce such incompatibilities, this would be a significant impact.</p>	S	No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.1-4 Affordable Housing</i></p> <p>Development of affordable housing projects consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> may be incompatible with established land uses adjacent to the proposed locations.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
Transportation			
<p><i>4.2-1 Congestion on Local County and City Roadway Segments</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i>, the cities, and implementation of proposed transportation improvements would result in unacceptable LOS along several local city and county roadways.</p>	S	<p><i>Adobe Road, west of Corona Road and east of Frates Road</i></p> <p>4.2-1(a) Revise Policy CT-6l of the Circulation and Transit Element (Rohnert Park / Cotati Planning Area) as follows:</p> <p>Policy CT-6l: Utilize the County traffic model as a foundation to prepare a detailed operational analysis of roads and streets in the Penngrove community, to identify specific traffic calming improvements within the community, and to route traffic to the Highway 101 and rail corridor. As part of this study, consider expanding the area designated for traffic calming to include the remainder of Adobe Road from Sonoma Mountain Road to Frates Road. <u>Also consider improvements to the intersections of Adobe / Corona Roads and Adobe / Frates Roads that would reduce congestion along Adobe Road where consistent with the designated road classifications.</u> Develop a phasing mechanism for these improvements that provides for completion of traffic calming improvements on designated roadways in the community prior to improvement of other roads that accommodate through traffic.</p> <p><i>Arnold Drive north of Watmaugh Road and north of Verano Avenue</i></p> <p>4.2-1(b) Add a new policy to the Circulation and Transit Element (Sonoma Valley Planning Area) as follows:</p> <p>Policy CT-6xx: Consider intersection improvements such as signalization and left turn lanes at various intersections along Arnold Drive to reduce congestion, provided that the improvements are consistent with the designated road classifications.</p>	<p>SU</p> <p>SU</p>

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.2-1 Congestion on Local County and City Roadway Segments (cont.)</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i>, the cities, and implementation of proposed transportation improvements would result in unacceptable LOS along several local city and county roadways.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><i>Guerneville Road, east of Frei Road</i></p> <p>4.2-1(c) Add a new policy to the Circulation and Transit Element (Russian River Planning Area) as follows:</p> <p>Policy CT-6yy: Consider increased access management along Guerneville Road between Highway 116 and the Santa Rosa city limits to preserve through-traffic carrying capacity, provided that the improvements are consistent with the designated road classifications.</p>	<p>SU</p>
		<p><i>Main Street between Old Redwood Highway and Adobe Road, through the community of Penngrove</i></p> <p>4.2-1(d) No Mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies discussed in the impact analysis.</p>	<p>SU</p>
		<p><i>Petaluma Boulevard north of Skillman Lane</i></p> <p>4.2-1(e) Recommended mitigation would include signalization and turning lane intersection improvements, lengthening turning pockets, access management, and signal modifications.</p>	<p>SU</p>
		<p><i>Petaluma Hill Road from Adobe Road to the Santa Rosa City Limits</i></p> <p>4.2-1(f) Add a new policy to the Circulation and Transit Element (Rohnert Park/Cotati Planning Area) as follows:</p> <p>Policy CT-6zz: Consider intersection improvements and restrictions, turning lanes, and signalization along Petaluma Hill Road to reduce congestion, provided that the improvements are consistent with the designated road classifications.</p>	<p>SU</p>
		<p><i>Rohnert Park Expressway from Stony Point Road to the Rohnert Park City Limits</i></p> <p>4.2-1(g) Add a new policy to the Circulation and Transit Element (Rohnert Park/Cotati Planning Area) as follows:</p> <p>Policy CT-6aaa: Consider additional turning lanes at the intersection of Rohnert Park Expressway and Stony Point Road to reduce congestion on the Rohnert Park Expressway.</p>	<p>SU</p>
		<p><i>Traffic in the Cities</i></p> <p>4.2-1(h) No additional mitigation is available.</p>	<p>SU</p>

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.2-2 Congestion on State Highways</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> and implementation of proposed transportation improvements would result in unacceptable LOS along several locations on State Highways.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><i>Highway 12 in Several Locations Primarily in the Sonoma Valley</i></p> <p>4.2-2 (a) Add a new policy to the Circulation and Transit Element (Russian River, Santa Rosa, and Sonoma Valley Planning Areas) as follows:</p> <p>Policy CT-6bbb: Work with Caltrans in considering signalization, turning lanes, passing lanes, and other traffic management improvements along Highway 12 to reduce congestion, provided that the improvements are consistent with the designated road classifications.</p> <p><i>Highway 37 in Several Locations</i></p> <p>4.2-2(b) Add a new policy to the Circulation and Transit Element (Petaluma and Sonoma Valley Planning Areas) as follows:</p> <p>Policy CT-6ccc: Work with Caltrans in considering turning lanes, access controls, and other traffic management improvements along Highway 37 to reduce congestion, provided that the improvements are consistent with the designated road classifications.</p> <p><i>Highway 116 East of Adobe Road (Petaluma Planning Areas) and west of Stony Point Road (Rohnert Park – Cotati Planning Area)</i></p> <p>4.2-2(c) Add a new policy to the Circulation and Transit Element (Sebastopol, Russian River, Santa Rosa, Petaluma and Sonoma Valley Planning Areas) as follows:</p> <p>Policy CT-6ddd: Work with Caltrans in considering passing and turning lanes along Highway 116 to reduce congestion, provided that the improvements are consistent with the designated road classifications.</p> <p><i>Highway 121 South of Highway 116 in the Southern Sonoma Valley</i></p> <p>4.2-2(d) Add a new policy to the Circulation and Transit Element (Sonoma Valley Planning Area) as follows:</p> <p>Policy CT-6eee: Work with Caltrans in considering intersection improvements at Highways 116 and 121 and passing lanes, and access management along Highway 121 to reduce congestion, provided that the improvements are consistent with the designated road classifications.</p>	<p>SU</p> <p>SU</p> <p>SU</p> <p>SU</p>

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.2-3 Congestion on Portions of US 101 in Several Areas between Cotati to north of Windsor</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> and implementation of proposed transportation improvements would result in unacceptable LOS along portions of US 101.</p>	S	<p>4.2-3(a) Revise Policy CT-3f of the Circulation and Transit Element as follows:</p> <p>Policy CT-3f: In conjunction with SCTA and Caltrans, designate and design freeways as limited access highways that carry large volumes of interurban, regional, and interstate traffic, and carry local traffic in urban areas. The following policies apply to designated freeways:</p> <p>Sub-policy items 1-4 do not change</p> <p>(5) <u>Consider additional traffic management actions such as ramp metering, auxiliary lanes, the Bay Area Traffic Operations System, and the Freeway Service Patrol.</u></p>	SU
<p><i>4.2-4 Congestion at Key Intersections throughout the County</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> and implementation of proposed transportation improvements would result in unacceptable LOS at several key intersections.</p>	S	<p>4.2-4(a) Mitigation measures may include changing the timing of the signal controller; adding or modifying signal phases; and / or re-striping, lengthening, or constructing new lanes. In some areas, right of way is constrained, or intersections are in environmentally sensitive areas, limiting the ability to construct new lanes. Specific mitigation measures would be selected as individual projects are planned.</p>	SU
<p><i>4.2-5 Increased Demand for Transit Services</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in increased demand for transit services. Implementation of policies included in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in improvements in transit services.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.2-6 Air Traffic Safety</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could be subject to safety risks from air traffic at the county's six airports. However, existing regulations and policies contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce this to a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.2-7 Conflict with Alternative Transportation</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could conflict with adopted plans, policies, and programs supporting alternative transportation modes, such as bicycle, pedestrian, rail, and other modes of travel. However, proposed policies in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce this to a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.2-8 Lack of Parking Capacity or Emergency Access</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in safety hazards or lack of emergency services due to inadequate parking and / or insufficient access for emergency vehicles. However, existing regulations and proposed policies in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce this to a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.2-9 Safety Risk from Transportation System Design</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in an increase in safety hazards associated with transportation design features or with incompatible uses of the road system. However, existing regulations and proposed policies in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce this to a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
Air Quality			
<p><i>4.3-1 Increased Emissions of Ozone Precursors</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in increased emissions of ozone precursors resulting primarily from vehicles. The increase of emissions within the NSCAPCD would be a less-than-significant impact. However, within the jurisdiction of the BAAQMD, the increased emissions would exceed the District's Clean Air Plan (CAP) thresholds.</p>	S	<p>4.3-1 Add a new policy to the Open Space and Resource Conservation Element as follows:</p> <p>Policy OSRC-16h: Require that development within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District that generates high numbers of vehicle trips, such as shopping centers and business parks, to incorporate air quality mitigations in their designs.</p>	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.3-2 Increased Particulate Emissions</i></p> <p>Residential construction consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in increased wood-burning. Construction activities consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in emissions of dust and other air pollutants.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.3-3 Exposure to Odors / Toxic Air Contaminants</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could emit odors and toxic contaminants that could affect nearby land uses. In addition, occupants of certain land uses proposed near major transportation corridors could be exposed to toxic air contaminants.</p>	S	<p>4.3-3(a) Add a new policy to the Open Space and Resource Conservation Element as follows:</p> <p>Policy OSRC-16k: Ensure that any proposed new sources of toxic air contaminants or odors would provide adequate buffers to protect sensitive receptors and comply with existing health standards. Require consideration of odor impacts when evaluating discretionary land uses and development projects near wastewater treatment plants, or treatment plant expansion projects. Promote land use compatibility for new development by using buffering techniques such as landscaping, setbacks, and screening in areas where such land uses abut one another.</p> <p>4.3-3(b) Add a new policy to the Open Space and Resource Conservation Element as follows:</p> <p>Policy OSRC-16l: Require that discretionary projects involving sensitive receptors (facilities or land uses that include members of the population sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly and people with illnesses) proposed near the US 101 corridor should include an analysis of mobile source toxic air contaminant health risks. Project review should include an evaluation of the adequacy of the setback from the highway and, if necessary, identify design mitigation measures to reduce health risks to acceptable levels.</p>	LTS
<p><i>4.3-4 Exposure to Industrial Diesel Truck Emissions</i></p> <p>Industrial, mineral-extraction, and other land uses and development that generate diesel truck trips could result in exposures of people to diesel particulate (a Toxic Air Contaminant).</p>	S	<p>4.3-4 Add a new policy to the Open Space and Resources Conservation Element as follows:</p> <p>Policy OSRC-16m: Work with the BAAQMD and NSCAPCD to adopt a diesel particulate ordinance regulating land uses that generate diesel vehicle trips. The ordinance should establish trip-based thresholds that trigger mitigation requirements either through source reduction or payment of a mitigation fee to off-set a project's impact in the same geographical area, and provide for periodic review to account for long-term changes in emission rates from diesel trucks.</p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.3-5 Aircraft Emissions</i></p> <p>Air operations at Sonoma County airports consistent with levels projected by the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> Air Transportation Element, could result in increased emissions in the region. These emissions are already included in the emission inventory that is the basis for regional air quality plans and thus are not expected to impede attainment or maintenance of ambient air quality standards.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
Noise			
<p><i>4.4-1 Increased Traffic Noise</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in increased traffic which in turn would result in a substantial increase in noise along certain roadway segments.</p>	S	<p>4.4-1 Revise Policy NE-2b to encourage sound barriers along roadways in areas where significant noise sensitive land uses, such as hospitals and schools, exist. Revise Policy NE-2b as follows:</p> <p>Policy NE-2b: Encourage installation of sound barriers along roadways in non-industrial urban areas where an exterior noise level of 65 dB Ldn or more is attained and residences or other noise sensitive uses exist. <u>Encourage installation of sound barriers adjacent to roadways in other areas where significant noise sensitive land uses exist.</u></p>	SU
<p><i>4.4-2 Impact to Noise Sensitive Development from Roadway Noise</i></p> <p>Future noise sensitive development could expose new sensitive receptors to roadway noise levels greater than those considered normally acceptable.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.4-3 Increased Rail Noise</i></p> <p>Existing noise sensitive land uses could be exposed to substantially increased noise levels from rail activity.</p>	S	4.4-3 No mitigation would be available to the County beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies. Mitigation of noise impacts resulting from the implementation of the SMART rail project would be the responsibility of the SMART District.	SU
<p><i>4.4-4 Impact to Noise Sensitive Development from Stationary Noise Sources</i></p> <p>Existing and future noise sensitive development could be exposed to increased noise levels from new noise generating development greater than those considered normally acceptable.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.4-5 Airport Noise</i></p> <p>Air operations at Sonoma County airports consistent with levels projected by the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> Air Transportation Element could result in increased noise levels to surrounding areas including residential land uses. However, policies and programs contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> Noise and Air Transportation Elements would reduce this to a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
Hydrology and Water Resources			
<p><i>4.5-1 Water Quality – Residential, Commercial, Industrial, and Public Uses</i></p> <p>Residential, commercial, industrial, and public uses consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could introduce additional non-point source pollutants to downstream surface waters. However, existing regulations and water quality policies and programs contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce this to a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.5-2 Water Quality – Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Related to Construction</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in increased soil erosion and sedimentation during construction activities, thereby degrading water quality in downstream waterways. However, existing regulations and water quality policies and programs contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce this to a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.5-3 Water Quality – Agricultural and Resource Uses</i></p> <p>Agricultural and resource development (i.e., timber harvesting and mineral resources extraction) land uses consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in an increase in sediment and nutrients in downstream waterways.</p>	S	<p>4.5-3(a) Revise Policy WR-1i as follows to expand the scope of the educational and technical assistance programs to include BMPs for reducing erosion and sedimentation and runoff rates from cultivated slopes. Revise Policy WR-1i as follows:</p> <p>Policy WR-1i: Implement erosion and sediment control requirements for vineyards and row crops. Develop and implement educational and technical assistance programs for agricultural activities including vineyard and crop production, <u>development of BMPs which focus on reduction of peak runoff rates on all cultivated slopes, and erosion and sedimentation on slopes greater than 35 percent.</u></p> <p>4.5-3(b) Revise Water Resources Program 1: Education and Technical Assistance, as follows:</p> <p>Program Description: Develop a public education and technical assistance program that provides property owners, applicants, and the general public with information regarding stormwater pollution, efficient water use, public water supplies, water conservation and re-use, and groundwater. <u>Include the preparation of BMPs for agricultural cultivation that addresses reduction of peak runoff from cultivated slopes and erosion and sedimentation on slopes greater than 35 percent.</u></p>	SU
<p><i>4.5-4 Water Quality – Wastewater Disposal</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in sewer- and septic-related water quality problems, including the reuse of treated water. However, policies provided in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would adequately reduce such impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.5-5 Groundwater Level Decline</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would increase demand on groundwater supplies and could therefore result in the decline of groundwater levels.</p>	S	<p>4.5-5 Revise Policy WR-2f to include the following:</p> <p>Policy WR-2f: Require that discretionary projects, to the maximum extent practicable, maintain or increase the site’s pre-development absorption of runoff to recharge groundwater. Implementation would include standards which could regulate impervious surfaces; vary by project type, land use, soils and area characteristics; and provide for water impoundments, protecting and planting vegetation, cisterns, and other measures to increase runoff retention and groundwater recharge. <u>Develop voluntary guidelines for rural development that would accomplish the same purposes.</u></p>	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.5-6 Saltwater Intrusion</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would increase demand on groundwater supplies in areas susceptible to saltwater intrusion. Increased groundwater pumping in certain areas of the lower Petaluma River, Sonoma Creek, and Bodega Bay could result in saltwater intrusion.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.5-7 Well Competition and Adverse Well Interference</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in an increase in the number of private wells in unincorporated areas of the County. Approval of wells in Class I or Class II areas could result in well interference impacts.</p>	S	<p>4.5-7 Revise Policy WR-2c to require that pump tests be conducted for all new high capacity wells where there is reason to believe that there may be potential adverse effects on existing adjacent wells. Revise the end of Policy WR-2c to include the following:</p> <p>Policy WR-2c: Revise ordinance requirements for permits to drill, replace, deepen or repair all wells as follows:</p> <p>(Policy items 1-6 remain the same.)</p> <p>(7) <u>Require pump tests for new high capacity wells to avoid well interference between proposed.</u></p>	SU
<p><i>4.5-8 Changes to Drainage Patterns Leading to Streambank Erosion</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in alterations to existing drainage patterns. Such changes would increase erosion, both in overland flow paths and in drainage swales and creeks.</p>	S	<p>4.5-8 Add a new policy to Section 3.1 of the Water Resource Element addressing the effects of changes in drainage patterns leading to increased erosion in drainage swales and streams. Add a new policy WR-1w as follows:</p> <p>Policy WR-1w: Revise the County’s flood control design criteria to include a section on stream geomorphic analysis and to update information on bank protection and erosion control to incorporate biotechnical bank stabilization methods for the purpose of preventing erosion and siltation in drainage swales and streams.</p>	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.5-9 Increased Flood Risk from Drainage System Alteration</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in increases in stormwater runoff and peak discharge. Existing storm drain systems, including urban creeks and rivers, may be incapable of accommodating increased flows, potentially resulting in on- or off-site flooding. However, policies and programs contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce such impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.5-10 Place Housing or Structures in 100-Year Flood Hazard Areas</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would allow continued development in 100-Year Flood Hazard Areas. However, policies and programs contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce such impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.5-11 Impede or Redirect Flows in Flood Hazard Areas</i></p> <p>The placement of land uses and development, particularly structures within 100-year flood hazard areas, could impede or redirect flood flows, resulting in secondary flood damage including bank instability and erosion.</p>	S	Same as Mitigation Measure 4.5-8	SU
<p><i>4.5-12 Failure of Levee or Dam</i></p> <p>Potential failure of levees or dams could expose people and structures to inundation and result in loss of property, increased risk, injury or death.</p>	S	<p>4.5-12 Revise Policy PS-2u to include a provision for review and rehabilitation of dams and levees that pose a significant threat of inundation to adjacent or downstream development. Revise the end of Policy PS-2u to include the following text:</p> <p>Policy PS-2u: Encourage the timely completion and filing of inundation maps for all dams whose failure could cause loss of life or personal injury within Sonoma County. <u>Where inundation maps indicate dam or levee failure could cause loss of life or property or personal injury, coordinate with the corresponding responsible party to investigate levee or dam stability and management and identify rehabilitation and maintenance needs as appropriate.</u></p>	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources			
<p><i>4.6-1 Special Status Species</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in loss of populations or essential habitat for special-status species.</p>	S	<p>4.6-1 Add a new policy to Section 3.1 of the Open Space and Resource Conservation Element to encourage continued participation in the FishNet4C program:</p> <p>Policy OSRC-7v: Continue to actively participate in the FishNet4C program and work cooperatively with participating agencies to implement recommendations to improve and restore aquatic habitat for listed anadromous fish species and other fishery resources.</p>	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.6-2 Sensitive Natural Communities</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in loss of sensitive natural communities.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>4.6-2 Policies pertaining to sensitive natural communities in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could be revised to include new language encouraging protection of the remaining old growth forests in Sonoma County, and to improve protection of riparian corridors. This consists of the following amendments to the Open Space and Resource Conservation Element:</p> <p>4.6-2(a) Add a new policy to Section 3.1 of the Open Space and Resource Conservation Element as follows:</p> <p>Policy OSRC-7v: Identify and consider designation of old growth redwood and Douglas fir forest as sensitive natural communities. Encourage preservation and public acquisition of any remaining old growth redwood and Douglas fir forests in private ownership in the County. Because of their rarity and biological importance, these sensitive natural community types should be made priorities for protection through conservation easements, fee title, or other mechanisms.</p> <p>4.6-2(b) Revise Policy OSRC-8c(10)(a) to ensure restrictions do not result in additional adverse impacts on biological resources as follows:</p> <p>Policy OSRC-8c: Rezone to the Biotic Resources combining zoning district all lands within the streamside conservation areas. Adopt an ordinance which provides for their protection in conformance with the following principles. Until the ordinance is adopted, require that land use and development comply with these principles:</p> <p>(Policy items 1-9 do not change)</p> <p>(10) Allow stream crossings for roads and utility lines subject to the following design requirements:</p> <p>(a) Be at 75 to 90 degrees to the channel, <u>except when biological impacts to accommodate this approach would be greater.</u></p> <p>(Policy items (b) through (e) do not change.)</p> <p>(Policy items 11 through 13 do not change.)</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p><i>4.6-3 Wetlands</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in direct or indirect impacts on jurisdictional wetlands and unvegetated other waters.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.6-4 Wildlife Habitat and Movement Opportunities</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in a reduction of existing wildlife or fish habitat, contribute to habitat fragmentation, and result in obstruction of movement opportunities. Aspects of the applicable policies contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would serve to partially address these impacts, but the conversion, fragmentation, and obstruction would be a significant impact.</p>	S	4.6-4 No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies	SU
<p><i>4.6-5 Conflict with Local Policies or Ordinances</i></p> <p>Proposed policies in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> that affect biological resources may differ from local policies and ordinances currently in effect. However, potential conflicts would be addressed by the revisions of the implementing ordinances to ensure that they conform to the proposed policies.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.6-6 Conflict With Adopted Habitat or Natural Community Conservation Plans</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would not conflict with any adopted Habitat or Natural Community Conservation Plans.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
Geology / Soils			
<p><i>4.7-1 Seismic Ground Shaking</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would expose people or structures to substantial adverse seismic effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic groundshaking.</p>	S	<p>4.7-1 Revise Policy PS-1o to specifically include all multiple family residential URM structures.</p> <p>Policy PS-1o: Adopt an ordinance requiring strengthening and / or reinforcement of Unreinforced Masonry Buildings, <u>including multi-family</u>, but not single family residential structures.</p>	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.7-2 Seismic Related Ground Failure</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse seismic effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death from seismic-related ground failures such as surface fault rupture, lateral spreading, lurching, differential settlement, and flow failures. While the policies included in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce most impacts to an acceptable level, seismic related ground failure impacts related to roads, public facilities, and other County projects would remain significant.</p>	S	4.7-2 No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU
<p><i>4.7-3 Landsliding</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would expose people and structures to substantial damaging effects of landsliding, including the risk of loss, injury, or death from down slope earth movement that may be slow or rapidly occurring. This kind of geologic hazard can be caused by earthquake, seasonal saturation of the soils and rock materials, erosion, or grading activities.</p>	S	4.7-3 No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU
<p><i>4.7-4 Subsidence and Settlement</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could expose property and structures to the damaging effects of ground subsidence hazards. This kind of geologic hazard can be seismically triggered (e.g., liquefaction), caused by seasonal saturation of the soils and rock materials, or caused by grading activities.</p>	S	4.7-4 No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.7-5 Tsunamis and Seiches</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could expose people and structures in limited areas of the county to potential, substantial adverse seismically caused flooding and strong tidal effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death. While the policies included in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce impacts to an acceptable level, tsunami and seiche impacts related to roads, public facilities, and other County projects would be significant.</p>	S	4.7-5 No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU
<p><i>4.7-6 Soil Erosion</i></p> <p>Erosion can result in the loss of agricultural soil resources, as well as expose improvements to erosion-related damage such as undermining and settlement, and in severe cases can progress to landsliding.</p>	S	4.7-6 No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU
<p><i>4.7-7 Expansive Soils</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could expose property improvements to potential adverse effects from expansive soils. Expansive soils can cause damage to improvements, especially structures such as residential buildings, small commercial buildings and pavements.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.7-8 Septic Suitability of Soils</i></p> <p>The construction of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems on soils incapable of adequately supporting such systems can cause damage to improvements and can adversely impact surface and ground water resources. Policies and programs contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would reduce such impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.7-9 Mineral Resources</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in the loss of the availability of a known mineral resource.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Agricultural and Timber Resources</i>			
<p><i>4.8-1 Conversion of Agricultural Lands to Non-Agricultural Uses</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in conversions of both County and State designated farmlands to non-agricultural uses.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.8-2 Agricultural Processing and Support Uses</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in the development of agricultural support uses including processing services and storage on agricultural lands and would therefore remove a portion of the county’s agricultural lands from agricultural production. However, due to the limited acreage that would be removed as well as policies and programs contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> regulating such development, this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.8-3 Agricultural Tourism</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in the development of visitor-serving uses on agricultural lands and would therefore convert a portion of the county’s agricultural lands to these uses. However, due to the limited acreage that would be lost as well as policies and programs contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> regulating such development, this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.8-4 Timberland Conversion</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in the conversion of timberland to non-timber uses. However, the acreage of timberland converted to non-timber uses would be relatively small and would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Public Services			
<p><i>4.9-1 Insufficient Water Supplies to Meet the Future Water Demand of the Urban Service Areas</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would increase the demand for water. As a result, insufficient water supplies would be available to serve some of the unincorporated USAs from existing entitlements. New or expanded entitlements would be required.</p>	S	No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU
<p><i>4.9-2 Insufficient Water Supplies to Meet the Future Water Demand of Rural Private Domestic, Small Municipal, and Agricultural Wells</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in an increased demand on groundwater supplies for rural uses. Due to the lack of comprehensive information regarding the county's groundwater resources, it is uncertain if groundwater supplies would be sufficient to meet the future demand of rural private domestic, small municipal, and agricultural wells. This uncertainty combined with the current regulatory approach could result in insufficient groundwater supplies in rural areas of the county.</p>	S	Same as Mitigation Measure 4.5-5.	SU
<p><i>4.9-3 New or Expanded Water Supply Facilities</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in the need for increased water supply facilities, either through the construction of new facilities or through the expansion or retrofitting of existing facilities. Construction of new or expanded water supply facilities could result in site-specific impacts, especially on aquatic organisms and fisheries.</p>	S	No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.9-4 Increased Wastewater Treatment Demand</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would generate wastewater flows that exceed treatment capacity of wastewater treatment services and would require both construction of new facilities and improvements to existing facilities.</p>	S	No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU
<p><i>4.9-5 New or Expanded Wastewater Facilities</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in the need for increased wastewater facilities, either through the construction of new facilities or through the expansion or retrofitting of existing facilities. Construction of these facilities could result in site-specific impacts.</p>	S	No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU
<p><i>4.9-6 Increased Solid Waste Disposal Demand</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would generate solid waste streams that would exceed the disposal capacity of the Sonoma County Central Landfill. After this date, the transport of solid waste to landfills outside of Sonoma County with sufficient permitted capacity would commence. Due to the lack of certainty regarding the county's future landfill capacity, this would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>4.9-6 Add a policy to the Public Facilities and Services Element that would provide guidance to the County Integrated Waste Management Plan to provide for future landfill capacity needed to meet the county's future demands for waste disposal.</p> <p>Policy PF-2bb: Amend the County Integrated Waste Management Plan as necessary to continue to address potential shortfalls in future landfill capacity.</p>	SU
<p><i>4.9-7 Increased Demand for Parks and Recreation Services and Facilities</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would require new or expanded Community and Neighborhood Parks, Regional Recreation Areas, and Regional Open Space Parks in order to achieve recognized park planning standards. The construction of these facilities could result in adverse physical effects on the environment.</p>	S	<p>4.9-7 Add a new policy to the Public Facilities and Services Element as follows:</p> <p>Policy PF-2cc Adopt and implement an Outdoor Recreation Plan with parks and recreation facilities necessary to meet the needs of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i>.</p>	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.9-8 Demand for Public Education Services</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would not generate a substantial demand for school services beyond the existing public school capacity and would not result in the need for additional facilities.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.9-9 Increased Demand for Fire Protection and Emergency Services Facilities</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would increase the demand for fire protection and emergency services and require the construction of new or expanded fire protection and emergency services facilities.</p>	S	No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU
<p><i>4.9-10 Wildland Fire Hazards</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.</p>	S	<p>4.9-10 Revise Policy PS-3m as follows:</p> <p>Policy PS-3m: <u>Require</u> automatic fire sprinkler systems in all new residential and commercial structures, with exceptions for detached utility buildings, garages, and agricultural-exempt buildings. <u>Require automatic fire sprinkler systems at the time of expansion of existing residential and commercial buildings except as provided for in the Sonoma County Code.</u></p>	SU
<p><i>4.9-11 Demand for Additional Criminal Justice Facilities</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would increase the demand for new or expanded Sheriff's Department substations and detention facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.</p>	S	No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU
<p><i>4.9-12 Increased Demand for Library Facilities</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would result in the demand for new or expanded County Library facilities in order to maintain acceptable service levels.</p>	S	No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
<p><i>4.9-13 Increased Demand for Human Services Facilities</i></p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could exceed the ability of the County’s Human Services Department to maintain an acceptable level of service within its present level of funding and facilities and therefore could result in the expansion or construction of new Human Services facilities.</p>	S	No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU
Cultural Resources			
<p><i>4.10-1 Historic Resources</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in the disturbance of historic resources.</p>	S	<p>4.10-1 Add a new policy in the Open Space and Resources Conservation Element as follows:</p> <p>Policy OSRC-19j Develop a Historic Resources Protection Program that provides for an ongoing process of updating the inventory of historic resources. Such a program should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Periodic historic building surveys; (2) Formalized recognition of the inventory of historic resources as recommended by the State Office of Historic Preservation, including, rezoning to the Historic Combining District (HD); and (3) Procedures for the protection of recognized historic resources for both ministerial and discretionary permits. 	LTS
<p><i>4.10-2 Archeological and Paleontological Resources and Human Remains</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in the disturbance of subsurface archeological and paleontological resources as well as human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</p>	S	<p>4.10-2 Add new policy to the Open Space and Resource Conservation Element in order to develop and adopt a countywide procedure for protection of archeological and paleontological resources. This program would provide guidelines for land uses on parcels identified by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) as likely to contain human remains or archeological and paleontological resources.</p> <p>Policy OSRC-19k: Develop an archeological and paleontological resource protection program that provides:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Guidelines for land uses and development on parcels identified as containing such resources; (2) Standard project review procedures for protection of such resources when discovered during excavation and site disturbance; and (3) Educational materials for the general public on the identification and protection of such resources. 	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Visual Resources			
<p><i>4.11-1 Community Separators, Scenic Landscape Units, Scenic Corridors, and Scenic Highways</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could impact the visual quality of Community Separators, Scenic Landscape Units, Scenic Corridors, and Scenic Highways. However, policies contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> and the Sonoma County Code would continue to strictly limit the intensity, density, and location of development within these areas and reduce the visual impact on such lands to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.11-2 Visual Impacts in Other Urban and Rural Areas</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could impact the visual quality of urban and rural areas that are not designated as scenic resource areas. However, policies contained in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> and existing regulations would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.11-3 Light Pollution and Nighttime Sky</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would create additional sources of lighting which could result in sky glow, light trespass, and glare.</p>	S	4.11-3 No mitigation available beyond the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Energy			
<p><i>4.12-1 Energy Consumption from Land Use Locations and Patterns</i></p> <p>The <i>Draft GP 2020</i> land use plan could affect energy usage by creating a land use pattern that could increase the dependence on single occupancy vehicles. The proposed land use pattern would be compact and focus future development within or adjacent to existing developed areas. Agricultural production and related uses would continue to be located in agricultural areas. This land use pattern would reduce the future reliance upon single occupancy vehicles, a major user of energy.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.12-2 Energy Consumption from Building Construction and Retrofit</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in inefficient and excessive use of energy resources. However, the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> includes goals, objectives, and policies that would support energy efficiency in new construction and retrofit.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.12-3 Increased Energy Demand and Need for Additional Energy Resources</i></p> <p>Future land uses and transportation systems could substantially increase the demand for energy resources and the need for additional energy resources to meet this demand.</p>	S	4.12-3 No mitigation available beyond <i>Draft GP 2020</i> policies.	SU

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Hazardous Materials			
<p><i>4.13-1 Release of Hazardous Materials</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in the transport, use, and / or disposal of hazardous materials, which could result in exposure of such materials to the public either through routine use or due to accidental release. The <i>Draft GP 2020</i> includes policies that would address the hazards associated with new land uses and development.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS
<p><i>4.13-2 Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste near School Sites</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> could result in the increased exposure to hazardous materials in the vicinity of schools.</p>	S	<p>4.13-2(a) Add a new policy to the Public Safety Element as follows:</p> <p>Policy PS-4p: Avoid siting of hazardous waste repositories, incinerators, facilities that use a substantial quantity of hazardous materials, or other similar facilities intended primarily for hazardous waste disposal within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school facility.</p> <p>4.13-2(b) Add a new policy to the Public Safety Element as follows:</p> <p>Policy PS-4q: Work with School Districts to avoid siting of schools within one-quarter mile of hazardous waste repositories, incinerators, facilities that use a substantial quantity of hazardous materials, or other similar facilities intended primarily for hazardous waste disposal.</p>	LTS
<p><i>4.13-3 Hazardous Materials near Airports</i></p> <p>Land uses and development consistent with the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> in the vicinity of public use airports or private airstrips could expose people to accidents involving hazardous materials. Current policies and plans, carried forward in the <i>Draft GP 2020</i> would address these hazards.</p>	LTS	No mitigation would be required.	LTS

2.4 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

This EIR examines three alternatives to the *Draft GP 2020* as presently proposed:

- Alternative 1 – the No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2 – the Buildout Alternative
- Alternative 3 – The Mitigated Alternative

Since the primary objective of the *GP 2020* is a policy review, the alternatives that are considered focus on policy alternatives. The No Project Alternative assumes that the existing *General Plan* policies remain unchanged. The other two alternatives, the Buildout Alternative and the Mitigated Alternative, have been formulated to provide environmental impact analyses of a range of policy choices.

A complete description of the three alternatives is contained in *Chapter 5.0 Alternatives*.

On the basis of the discussion of the proposed project and the three alternatives, this Draft EIR finds that the No Project Alternative and the Buildout Alternatives would result in more severe impacts than the *Draft GP 2020*. The No Project Alternative does not have the benefit of the goals, policies, and programs contained in the *Draft GP 2020*. The increased level of development under the Buildout Alternative would result in more significant impacts compared to the *Draft GP 2020*. The Mitigated Alternative would include additional policies and programs that would result in less significant impacts than the *Draft GP 2020*. Therefore, the Mitigated Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. The Mitigated Alternative would have substantially more highway improvements than would the *Draft GP 2020*, resulting in less congestion than the other alternatives. However, these improvements may result in additional secondary impacts. The Mitigated Alternative would also result in less agricultural cultivation and associated facilities such as agricultural processing and support and agricultural tourism uses than would the *Draft GP 2020*. The reduced agricultural cultivation would result in fewer significant impacts compared to the *Draft GP 2020*. However, reduced agricultural production may, over time, result in a gradual decline in agricultural and related support uses that could adversely affect the viability of the county's agriculture based economy.