

## ***7.0 IMPACT OVERVIEW***

## 7.0 IMPACT OVERVIEW

### 7.1 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126(g) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires EIRs to discuss how a project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing (either directly or indirectly) in the surrounding environment.

There are several ways in which growth-inducing effects can result from new development projects. For example, a project can have a growth-inducing impact if development of that project removes obstacles to future development. Physical growth-inducing impacts create and make available infrastructure that fosters future development. These physical improvements can include the construction of roads, water lines, sewer service, and other kinds of urban infrastructure and services into previously non-urban areas.

A second type of impact can be the setting of precedents that could allow similar development to occur in the future. Examples include a development that allows growth in an area previously closed to development such as an agricultural area or outside an urban service area. A precedent setting project can have growth-inducing impacts by increasing the expectations of adjoining property owners who expect the "highest and best use" of their lands.

The proposed project would be consistent with goals, objectives, and policies of the *Sonoma County 1989 General Plan* to accommodate growth in a compact manner within existing Urban Service Areas in order to achieve goals such as maintaining agriculture, preserving open space, and protecting biotic resources. The project site lies within the Sonoma Valley Urban Service Area and therefore, would not result in the extension of urban services into surrounding areas previously constrained or closed to development.

The *Wolf House Inn* project would, essentially, “buildout” the Jack London Village commercial center. While the proposed project may give rise to a limited amount of new commercial development at the Jack London Village (e.g., cafés), the lack of additional parking would be a limiting factor. As described in *Chapter 3.0 Description of the Proposed Project*, the *Wolf House Inn* would employ approximately 19 total persons: 13 in the “inn” portion of the project and six persons in the “spa”. It is assumed that these employees would live in Glen Ellen or a neighboring community.

The proposed project would involve an amendment to the County’s zoning ordinance. It is proposed to add hotels as a permitted use in the PC - Planned Community zoning district and add a definition of *condominium hotels* to the zoning ordinance. In addition to the three Jack London Village parcels (see **Exhibit 3.0-3**) approximately an additional 19 acres have a PC zoning designation and either a LC (Limited Commercial) or GC (General Commercial) General Plan designation.<sup>1</sup> As shown in **Exhibit 7.0-1** these parcels are generally small in size. This does not include lands within the Coastal Zone as they are unaffected by changes made to the Zoning Ordinance for the rest of the County.

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a significant amount of PC zoned land in the Coastal area but these are all residential general plan designation. Also the coastal zoning code is separate, and unaffected by, changes made to the zoning code for the rest of the County. Nichols • Berman communication with Melinda Grosch, Planner Sonoma County PRMD, September 2008.

**Exhibit 7.0-1**  
**Parcels Zoned PC with a LC or GC General Plan Designation**

<i>Parcel No.</i>	<i>General Plan Designation</i>	<i>Size of Lot in Acres</i>	<i>Other Information</i>
054-070-029	LC	2.6	Across the street from the proposed Wolf house Inn
074-130-010	LC	0.13	Graton
074-130-012	UR 4/LC	0.11	
074-130-015	PQP/LC/UR 4	3.0	
074-130-031	LC	0.27	
125-111-045	GC	1.12	
125-111-046	GC	1.17	
125-111-047	GC	1.18	
125-111-048	GC	0.31	
125-111-037	GC	6.96	
Total Acreage		16.85	

Source: Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, September 2008.

Although the proposed project would set a precedent to allow hotel development in certain PC zoned properties, **Exhibit 7.0-1** illustrates that there are few parcels in Sonoma County where similar development could occur. It should also be noted that the environmental effects of hotels and condominium hotels would likely be similar in nature to those of currently permitted land uses within the either the LC or GC General Plan designation.

In conclusion, for the reasons stated above, the proposed project is not expected to induce growth on adjacent lands and, therefore, would not result in a significant growth inducing impact.

## **7.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

This Draft EIR assesses the effects of implementing the proposed project under existing environmental conditions and under anticipated future conditions. Section 15064(i) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* states that significance determination for cumulative effects be analyzed in two steps: 1) determine if the whole cumulative effect is significant and 2) determine if the project's contribution is

“cumulatively considerable”. Recent Court guidance<sup>2</sup> has been interpreted to imply that the “relevant question is not how the effect of the project compares to preexisting cumulative effect, but whether any additional amount is significant in context of the existing cumulative effect...does not mean any addition in nonattainment area is significant.”<sup>3</sup>

When evaluating cumulative impacts, CEQA envisions the use of either a list of past, present, and probable future projects, including projects outside the control of the lead agency, or summary of projections in an adopted planning document, or some reasonable combination of the two approaches. This cumulative analysis uses the development assumptions listed in **Section 3.3 Cumulative Development Assumptions**.

## **LAND USE**

The cumulative development assumptions prepared for this EIR include 31 projects that are approved, under review, under construction or are reasonably expected to be proposed in the vicinity of the project site.<sup>4</sup> Of these 31 projects, nine would involve new construction of or increased capacity of an existing winery and / or increased attendance or event capacity. Operation of these uses and increased attendance at special events could lead to compatibility issues with adjacent agricultural uses. This would be a significant cumulative impact.

However, consistent with the *Sonoma County 1989 General Plan*, the proposed project would occur within an Urban Service Area and is not adjacent to agricultural lands. Furthermore, no land use compatibility impacts between the proposed project and adjacent land uses have been identified. Therefore, while cumulative development could result in cumulative land use compatibility impacts, the proposed project would make a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to this impact.

## **TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION**

As discussed in **Section 5.2 Traffic and Circulation**, traffic impacts have been determined for peak traffic hours for the weekday morning and evening commute for “Near-Term Base Case” conditions (i.e., under development assumptions for 2010) and the “Long-Term Base Case” conditions (i.e., under buildout conditions of the *Sonoma County General Plan 2020*).

**Exhibits 5.2-21** and **5.2-22** show the results of Near-Term Base Case for the four studied intersections: Arnold Drive / SR 12; Arnold Drive / London Ranch Road; Arnold Drive / Jack London Village North Driveway Arnold Drive / Jack London Village South Driveway. All analyzed intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service during the AM and PM peak traffic hours.

**Exhibits 5.2-23** and **5.2-24** show the results of Long-Term Base Case for the four studied intersections: Arnold Drive / SR 12; Arnold Drive / London Ranch Road; Arnold Drive / Jack London Village North Driveway Arnold Drive / Jack London Village South Driveway. Three of the analyzed

---

<sup>2</sup> Citizens for a Better Environment v. State of California Resources Agency.

<sup>3</sup> 2003 Spring CEQA Workshop Series, Association of Environmental Professionals.

<sup>4</sup> See **Section 3.3 Cumulative Development Assumptions** for further discussion of the cumulative projects.

intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service during the AM and PM peak traffic hours. At the Arnold Drive / London Ranch Road intersection, where PM peak hour operation would be an unacceptable LOS E, project traffic would result in less than five seconds increase in delay. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant cumulative traffic impact.

## **NOISE**

Implementation of cumulative projects would increase noise levels in Sonoma County and surrounding areas due to construction-period activity and increased traffic on county roadways. Predicted traffic noise levels for the year 2020 would increase by approximately two decibels on Arnold Drive near the project site. This increase in noise would occur with or without the project. As traffic noise increases of three dBA or less in the  $L_{dn}$  are considered less-than-significant regardless of the noise level at the receiving land use, this would be a less-than-significant cumulative noise impact.

## **AIR QUALITY**

With respect to air pollution, the development of the proposed project would not result in any long-term air quality impacts. Short-term impacts were identified along with appropriate measures to mitigate those impacts. Under the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, significant cumulative impacts to air quality do not result from projects that have less-than-significant impacts and do not conflict with regional clean air planning efforts. Since the proposed project would not conflict with regional clean air planning efforts, the cumulative impact to air quality would be less-than-significant.

## **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

The cumulative development assumptions prepared for this EIR includes 31 projects that are approved, under review, under construction or are reasonably expected to be built in the vicinity of the project site.<sup>5</sup> Twenty-seven of these projects are within the Sonoma Creek Watershed. These include all projects south of Hood House Drive at State Route 12. Of the projects listed, the already constructed Hotel Chauvet is the only project located in close proximity to Sonoma Creek or one of its tributaries.

Of the 27 projects within the Sonoma Creek Watershed, 22 would involve new construction, 13 would result in an increased transient and / or permanent residential population within the watershed, and nine would result in new or expanded wineries with wine tasting and special events. Projects involving new construction or remodeling would include the creation of impervious surface. The loss of infiltrative area would contribute to a cumulative increase in runoff volume and peak runoff in Sonoma Creek and its developed subwatersheds.

The intensity and duration of flooding along Sonoma Creek would be affected by cumulative increases in peak flow and runoff volume. Flooding resulting from increased peak runoff from cumulative development would represent a potentially significant cumulative impact. However, the project's contribution to cumulative flooding impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable, after incorporation of mitigation measures included in this EIR.

---

<sup>5</sup> See *Section 3.3 Cumulative Development Assumptions* for further discussion of the cumulative projects.

The cumulative increase in storm water runoff would also contribute to more hillside and stream erosion, leading to increased sedimentation in Sonoma Creek and its developed subwatersheds. Although there are many influencing factors in the geomorphology of a stream system, increased sediment and pollutant loads from the development/urbanization of watersheds can accelerate geomorphologic change, such as changes in stream course, meander patterns, and channel geometry. These changes can contribute to bank instability and affect the streams' ability to support aquatic systems (i.e., from the siltation of spawning gravels and habitat). With implementation of Mitigation Measures in *Section 5.5 Hydrology and Water Quality*, the proposed project would make a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to this potential cumulative hydrology and water quality impact.

The Sonoma Creek Watershed is currently considered an impaired watershed under the Clean Water Act 303(d) list for pathogens, nutrients, and sediment.<sup>6</sup> Cumulative development within the watershed would further degrade water quality. Increased erosion would also contribute to water quality problems as eroded soil contains nitrogen, phosphorus, and other nutrients. When these nutrients enter receiving waters, they can trigger algal blooms that reduce water clarity, deplete oxygen, and create odors. Cumulative development could also result in greater concentrations of nonpoint source pollutants including suspended solids and floating debris, litter, nutrients associated with landscape fertilizers, heavy metals (e.g., copper, lead, and zinc) from automobiles, hydrocarbons associated with fuels and crankcase oil, pesticides, and trace organics from solvents. The beneficial uses of Sonoma Creek would be adversely affected by sedimentation and nonpoint source pollutants.

Existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting requirements, such as a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, as well as the building code regulations of Sonoma County and the incorporated cities, would reduce or minimize adverse effects associated with short-term construction or long-term project operation. Implementation of existing permitting requirements and building codes for each individual project would serve to reduce cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts. In addition, with implementation of Mitigation Measures in *Section 5.5 Hydrology and Water Quality*, the proposed project would make a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to this potential cumulative water quality impact.

## **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Cumulative development could result in adverse effects to special-status species, loss of sensitive natural communities, and loss of potential wetlands. The overall cumulative effect of development is dependent on the degree to which significant vegetation and wildlife resources are protected or mitigated. This includes preservation of areas of sensitive natural communities such as valley oak woodland, riparian woodland, and native grasslands, protection of essential habitat for special-status plant species, and avoidance of wetlands. Further environmental review of the listed cumulative projects should serve to ensure that important biological and wetland resources are protected and properly managed, and to prevent any significant adverse development-related impacts.

Most of the cumulative projects identified in the upper Sonoma Valley are proposed along the State Route 12 corridor or involve changes in activities at existing facilities, limiting concern about effects to sensitive biological and wetland resources. However, several are proposed along the fringe of

---

<sup>6</sup> *Sonoma Creek Pathogens TMDL*, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Sonoma Ecology Center, 2007. Available online at <http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb2/TMDL/sonomacrkrpathogenstmdl.htm>

existing development and agricultural use and would result in loss of habitat. Cumulative development contributes to an incremental reduction in the amount and connectivity of existing wildlife habitat. While the proposed project impacts on riparian woodland habitat would be relatively insignificant, they would contribute to further reduction in existing habitat values. With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures in *Section 5.6 Biological Resources*, the proposed project would not make cumulatively considerable contribution to potential cumulative biological resources impacts.

## **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Impacts associated with geological hazards from project development would be typical of similar sites in the San Francisco Bay Area. Implementation of the proposed project would result in impacts associated with seismic ground shaking, seismically induced ground failure, including liquefaction and densification, and soil erosion. These impacts would be confined to the project site and would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and adherence to the construction standards in the applicable Uniform Building Code. The geologic impacts of other projects in Sonoma County would also be reduced with similar mitigation measures and adherence to the Uniform Building Code. Therefore, cumulative geology and soils impacts would be less-than-significant.

## **VISUAL AND AESTHETIC QUALITY**

As visual impacts are typically limited to the proximity of development, cumulative growth typically does not compound or increase the severity of impacts from implementation of an individual project. In this instance; however, cumulative development would occur largely along or within sight of State Route 12, a designated Scenic Corridor, and therefore could adversely affect its overall visual and aesthetic quality. The project site is not, however, located on State Route 12, nor is it visible from State Route 12. The proposed project, therefore, would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to potential cumulative visual and aesthetic quality impacts.

## **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

While no known cultural resources exist at the project site, subsurface archeological deposits could be discovered during project grading and construction activities. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce such impacts to a less-than-significant level. Historical resources at Jack London Village would not be adversely affected by project development. Impacts to cultural and historical resources are typically limited to the proximity of development, thus cumulative development outside of the project site would not compound or increase the severity of impacts to cultural resources from implementation of the *Wolf House Inn*. County guidelines and environmental review of cumulative development would require project sponsors to take appropriate measures to protect or preserve cultural resources affected by individual projects. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant cumulative impact.

## **PUBLIC SERVICES**

### **Water Supply Services**

Project and cumulative development would increase water demand on Valley of the Moon Water District (VOMWD). While VOMWD has existing capacity and infrastructure to serve the project, it may not have sufficient capacity to meet demand under buildout conditions of the Sonoma County General Plan 2020.<sup>7</sup> The ability of VOMWD to meet the increased water demand resulting from implementation of the cumulative and other projects in the Sonoma County General Plan 2020 would be dependent on the construction of additional collection and transmission facilities and the confirmation of additional Russian River diversions from Lake Sonoma. These efforts are referred to as the “Water Project.”<sup>8</sup> In a County report evaluating water supply and sewer capacity for unincorporated Sonoma County, the adequacy of VOMWD facilities to serve growth allowed by General Plan Land Use Map (1998) raised “Significant Concerns”, which is defined as “the provider lacks capacity to serve projected growth and is likely to experience significant difficulties in expanding the system to meet projected demand.”<sup>9</sup>

It should be noted that the VOMWD’s *2005 Urban Water Management Plan*<sup>10</sup> (released in February 2007) states that VOMWD would have adequate water supply through 2030, except, starting in 2020, for single-dry drought years.<sup>11</sup> In single-dry drought years, starting in 2020, VOMWD would need to reduce water demands as described in its Water Storage Contingency Plan.<sup>12</sup>

Given uncertainty regarding the approval of the Water Project, which could affect the VOMWD’s ability to acquire additional water, it is uncertain whether the VOMWD would have sufficient supply to meet projected cumulative water demand. Therefore, this would be a significant cumulative impact to which the proposed project would make a cumulatively significant contribution.

**Mitigation Measure** Within the unincorporated portions of the VOMWD, new development shall only occur when adequate infrastructure is available consistent with Sonoma County making the following finding:

---

<sup>7</sup> While the project is being evaluated under conditions established by the *Sonoma County 1989 General Plan*, the most recent analysis of the ability of service providers to supply water to cumulative development is contained in the *Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Draft and Final EIR*.

<sup>8</sup> *Sonoma County General Plan 2020, General Plan Update, Draft Environmental Impact Report*, Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, State Clearinghouse No. 2003012020, January 2006. Additional information regarding the Sonoma County Water Agency’s water project is provided in Master Response Q SCWA Water Project in *Sonoma County General Plan 2020 General Plan Update, Final Environmental Impact Report Volume 2*, Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, State Clearinghouse N. 2003012020, June 12, 2007.

<sup>9</sup> *Water and Sewer Capacities, Final Report*, CAC memo, Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, October 16, 2003.

<sup>10</sup> *2005 Urban Water Management Plan*, Valley of the Moon Water District, February 2007.

<sup>11</sup> Urban water management plans evaluate the adequacy of water supply under several conditions including normal conditions plus single and multiyear droughts.

<sup>12</sup> *2005 Urban Water Management Plan*, Valley of the Moon Water District, February 2007, page 7-1.

- Water (including for adequate fireflow), wastewater, and other infrastructure improvements will be available to serve new development by the time the development is constructed.

**Significance After Mitigation** Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the cumulative water supply impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Responsibility and Monitoring** Prior to issuance of Building / Occupancy permits, Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department would need to verify through consultation with VOMWD that adequate water supply would be available.

### **Wastewater Management**

Cumulative development could generate wastewater flows that exceed the treatment capacity of Sonoma Valley Sanitation District.<sup>13 14</sup> This demand may require the need for new or expanded facilities, the construction of which could result in site-specific environmental impacts. The *Wolf House Inn* would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact associated with increased demand for wastewater services and the need for new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities.

**Mitigation Measure** Within the unincorporated portions of the Sonoma Valley Sanitation District new development shall only occur when adequate infrastructure is available consistent with Sonoma County making the following finding:

- Water (including for adequate fireflow), wastewater, and other infrastructure improvements will be available to serve new development by the time the development is constructed.

**Significance After Mitigation** Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the cumulative wastewater management impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Responsibility and Monitoring** Prior to issuance of Building / Occupancy permits, Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department would need to verify through consultation with the Sonoma Valley Sanitation District that adequate wastewater management facilities will be available.

### **Fire and Emergency Services**

Cumulative development projects would contribute to an increased demand for fire and emergency services. However, as these projects are located in the jurisdiction of different emergency service providers and because multiple agencies often respond to calls in Sonoma County outside the City of Santa Rosa, it is difficult to assess the actual impact to any given agency. While such demand may require new facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative fire and emergency services impact.

---

<sup>13</sup> *County of Sonoma Water and Sewer Providers Municipal Service Review, Final Draft Report*, Economic & Planning Systems, Inc., August 2004.

<sup>14</sup> *Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Draft Environmental Impact Report*, Sonoma County PRMD.

### **Police Services**

Cumulative development projects would contribute to an increased demand for police protection services. Recent construction of a new Sonoma Valley Substation for the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department should provide adequate facilities until approximately 2020.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant cumulative impact.

### **Solid Waste Services**

As described in *Section 5.10 Public Services*, no solid waste is currently being buried in Sonoma County, as landfilling operations have been suspended at the Central Landfill. Contracts with four out-of-county landfills have been established to ensure sufficient disposal capacity: Redwood Landfill (Marin County), Potrero Hills Landfill (Solano County), Vasco Road Landfill (Alameda County), and Keller Canyon Landfill (Contra Costa County).

Future landfill capacity remains uncertain as a result of delayed landfill expansion projects, and the potential infeasibility of recommended projects contained in the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CoIWMP). As a result, cumulative projects as well as future land uses and development consistent with the *Sonoma County 1989 General Plan* would generate solid waste streams that would require that either additional capacity be located and permitted within the county, or that solid waste be transported to an undetermined permitted-site outside of the county. This lack of sufficient and permitted solid waste disposal capacity would represent a significant cumulative impact. However, with incorporation of mitigation presented in this EIR, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to this cumulative solid waste disposal impact.

### **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Implementation of the proposed project could result in the release of hazardous materials during site construction and operation of the *Wolf House Inn*. Cumulative projects development could also release hazardous materials associated with construction activities and operation. Hazardous materials impacts associated with the proposed project and cumulative project, however, would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through adherence to federal, State, and local hazardous materials regulations, and through the implementation of standard mitigation measures such as those presented in *Section 5.11 Hazardous Materials*. Therefore, cumulative hazardous materials impacts, would be less-than-significant.

## **7.3 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

With the implementation of the mitigation measures described in this Draft EIR all of the identified significant impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the proposed *Wolf House Inn* with the incorporation of all of the mitigation measures, therefore, would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts.

---

<sup>15</sup> *Sonoma County General Plan 2020 Draft EIR*, Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, January 2006.

## 7.4 EFFECTS OF NO SIGNIFICANCE

As discussed in *Chapter 1.0 Introduction*, the scope of the EIR was determined through a process that included the preparation of an Initial Study in September 2004 and revised in February 2005. The Initial Study concluded that an EIR would be required for the project and identified a number of topics for analysis. Responses to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) further refined the focus of the EIR, as did comments made at the November 16, 2004 public scoping meeting at the Glen Ellen Fire Station. Based on this scoping process and additional analyses prepared as part of this EIR, it has been determined that a number of potential impacts of the *Wolf House Inn* project would not be significant.

The following topics are dismissed from further analysis by the Initial Study which determined that the project's effects would be less-than-significant with respect to:<sup>16</sup>

### 1. *Aesthetics*

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

### 2. *Agricultural Resources*

- a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- c. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

### 3. *Air Quality*

- a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

---

<sup>16</sup> Numbers and letters refer to items on the County's Initial Study prepared for this project (see *Appendix A*). The County's Initial Study identifies impacts as "Potentially Significant Impact", "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation", "Less than Significant Impact" and "No Impact". The Initial Study describes the reasons for each determination including the mitigation measures required to be incorporated into the project for "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation". *Wolf House Inn Environmental Checklist Form*, County of Sonoma, September 23, 2004, revised February 24, 2005.

- e. Create objectionable odors and / or airborne dust affecting a substantial number of people?

**4. Biological Resources**

- c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or their approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan?

**5. Cultural Resources**

- c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

**6. Geology and Soils <sup>17</sup>**

- a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
  - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
  - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
  - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
  - iv) Landslides?
- e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

**7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials <sup>18</sup>**

- a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

---

<sup>17</sup> Subsequent to the preparation of the Initial Study, it was decided to conduct further analyses of geology and soils issues in the EIR (see *Section 5.7 Geology and Soils*).

<sup>18</sup> Subsequent to the preparation of the Initial Study, it was decided to conduct further analyses of hazardous materials issues in the EIR (see *Section 5.11 Hazardous Materials*).

- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- g. Impair implementation of or physically interfering with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

#### **8. Hydrology and Water Quality <sup>19</sup>**

- b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
- f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.
- g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
- i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

#### **9. Land Use and Planning**

- a. Physically divide an established community?
- c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

#### **10. Mineral Resources**

- a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

#### **11. Noise**

- b. Expose persons to, or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?
- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

---

<sup>19</sup> Subsequent to the preparation of the Initial Study, it was decided to conduct further analyses of hydrology and water quality issues in the EIR (see *Section 5.5 Hydrology and Water Quality*).

- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**12. Population and Housing**

- a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?<sup>20</sup>
- b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing stock, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**13. Public Services**

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for:

- b. Police protection
- c. Schools
- d. Parks
- e. Other public facilities

**14. Recreation**

- a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
- b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

**15. Transportation / Traffic**

- c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

**16. Utilities and Service Systems**

No significance criteria were dismissed for Utilities and Service Systems.

---

<sup>20</sup> While the project would not induce substantial population growth, the development potential of allowing hotels as a permitted use in the PC - Planned Community zoning district is addressed in *Section 7.1 Growth Inducing Impacts*.