

MARIN COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
PLANNING DIVISION

REVISED INITIAL STUDY
(July 2005)

Marin Countywide Plan Update 2005

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

- A. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Marin County Community Development Agency -
Planning Division
3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 308
San Rafael, CA 94903-4157
- B. Property Owners** N/A
- C. Lead Agency Name and Address:** Marin County Community Development Agency -
Planning Division
(see address above)
- D. Decision-Maker for Applications:** Marin County Planning Commission/Board of
Supervisors
- E. Other Agencies Which Require
Approval:** None

II. PROJECT INFORMATION

- A. Project Title and Applications:** Draft Marin Countywide Plan Update 2005
- B. Project Address:** N/A
- C. Countywide Plan
Land Use Designation:** N/A
- D. Zoning:** N/A
- E. Project Location:**

The Countywide Plan update encompasses the unincorporated territory of Marin County. Marin's total land and water area is approximately 606 square miles, of which about 87 percent (527 square miles) is unincorporated.

F. Project Description:

In 2004 Marin County completed a draft update of the 1994 Marin Countywide Plan, (Marin CWP), entitled the Draft 2004 CWP Update. In February 2004 an Initial Study was prepared and circulated for the Draft 2004 CWP Update. The Marin County Planning Commission subsequently initiated a preliminary review of the Draft CWP Update 2004 and proposed revisions and clarifications to the Plan. The Commission's proposed revisions to the Draft 2004 CWP Update were then confirmed in a joint meeting of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Based on that preliminary review a revised and reorganized comprehensive update of the 1994 Marin Countywide Plan, the **Draft 2005 CWP Update** has been prepared. This revised Initial Study addresses the Draft 2005 Countywide Plan Update.

The proposed project is therefore the 2005 comprehensive update of the 1994 Marin CWP. California State law requires that all cities and counties prepare and adopt general plans. These plans must be comprehensive, long-range and internally consistent. Every plan must address seven specific topics, or “elements”.

The purpose of the Plan Update is to set policy guidelines for future conservation and development in the county and to address changed conditions since the last revision of the CWP. The CWP establishes an overall framework and set of goals for countywide development in the unincorporated area of the County. The Draft 2005 CWP Update also includes implementing program concepts for updating the 2003 Development Code.

The overarching theme presented in the Draft 2005 CWP Update is sustainability. To address this theme, the CWP has been substantially reformatted into three main elements: Natural Systems and Agriculture Element, Built Environment Element, and Socioeconomic Element. The seven mandatory General Plan Elements required by the State Planning and Zoning Laws (Conservation, Open Space, Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Noise, and Safety) and the five optional elements in the 1994 CWP (Agriculture, Community Facilities, Parks and Recreation, Trails, and Economic), have been updated and incorporated into the reformatted three main elements of the Draft 2005 CWP Update. Recent updates of the Economic and Housing Elements ¹ of the CWP were adopted prior to this Draft 2005 CWP Update. These adopted elements are summarized and included in the CWP update. (Refer to the list below for the location of the State mandated elements in the Draft 2005 CWP).

The Draft 2005 CWP Update retains the “corridor” concept of the 1994 CWP, dividing the County into designated regional units based on specific geographic and environmental characteristics and natural boundaries formed by north/south trending geomorphic ridges. In addition to the Coastal Recreation Corridor, Inland Rural Corridor and City Centered Corridor retained from the 1994 CWP; the Plan Update now designates a fourth environmental corridor, the Baylands Corridor. This corridor encompasses tidelands, marshes and diked lands and adjacent, largely undeveloped uplands along the Bay shoreline designated to provide for increased protection of environmental characteristics of the historic bay margins.

The principal components of the three main elements of the Draft 2005 CWP Update and implementing programs are summarized as follows:

NATURAL SYSTEMS AND AGRICULTURE ELEMENT

The Natural Systems and Agriculture Element focuses on “Nature” and life support systems and includes the following main topics:

- Biological resources, including special status species and sensitive natural communities, wetlands, riparian habitat, and the Baylands Corridor (required Conservation Element);
- Water resources, including watersheds, hydrology, flooding, septic alternative waste options and water conservation (portion of required Safety Element);
- Environmental hazards (portion of required Safety Element),
- Atmosphere and climate;
- Open space resources and preservation (required Open Space Element);
- Trails;

¹ The Housing Element was certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development on July 24, 2003 and is not the subject of this CWP update.

- Agriculture and the production of food.

BUILT ENVIRONMENT ELEMENT

The Built Environment Element principally addresses the County's unincorporated villages and towns including:

- Community development (required Land Use Element);
- Community design;
- Energy conservation and green building;
- Mineral resources;
- Housing Overlay Zone to implement the Housing Element adopted by the County. (The required Housing Element is summarized and included in the 2005 CWP update);
- Transportation (required Circulation Element);
- Noise (required Noise Element);
- Public facilities and services, including water supply, sanitary waste disposal, solid waste disposal, and disposal of hazardous waste and materials.
- Planning Areas and land use maps and diagrams

SOCIOECONOMIC ELEMENT

The Socioeconomic Element focuses on people and what they do for each other including:

- Economy;
- Childcare;
- Public safety;
- Community participation;
- Diversity;
- Education;
- Environmental justice;
- Public health;
- Arts and culture;
- Historic and archaeological resources;
- Parks and recreation.

REVISIONS INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT 2005 CWP UPDATE.

As discussed above, the Marin County Planning Commission initiated a preliminary review of the Draft 2004 CWP Update. Based on that review a revised and reorganized comprehensive update of the 1994 Marin Countywide Plan (Draft 2005 CWP Update) has been prepared. The changes between the 2004 Draft Plan and the 2005 Draft plan are listed below in order for readers to identify and understand the changes incorporated into the Draft 2005 CWP update from the Draft 2004 CWP update that was addressed in the previously circulated 2004 Initial Study.

Beginning in Section V., this Initial Study considers and evaluates all of the provisions, (including Plan “Options” added in 2005) of the Draft 2005 CWP Update in comparison to the adopted 1994 CWP and in relation to the current environment in Marin at the time this Initial Study was prepared. Differences between the proposed 2005 CWP and the adopted 1994 CWP are summarized in section V., and the potential impacts on the current environment of the 2005 CWP are discussed.

Local Coastal Plan

The Local Coastal Plan was going to be simultaneously updated with the CWP. The County has decided to forego an update of the Local Coastal Plan at this time. Therefore the Local Coastal Plan update is no longer a part of the project description and will not be analyzed in the EIR.

Plan Options

There are four areas of concern in the Draft 2005 CWP Update for which “options” will be presented. These are discussed below.

Baylands Corridor

The Draft 2004 CWP Update proposed to establish a Baylands Corridor along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay and Pablo Bay. The Baylands Corridor would extend along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay and San Pablo Bay and generally would consist of most of the currently designated lands in the County’s Bayfront Conservation Zone (both south and north of Point San Pedro) plus portions of largely undeveloped parcels (typically more than two acres in size) where future reuse is considered likely. The Draft 2005 CWP Update describes three options for designating this extent of the corridor.

Option 1 would include large undeveloped parcels (typically more than two acres in size) generally consisting of the area from 300 feet landward of the historic bay marshlands based on maps prepared by the San Francisco Estuary Institute.

Option 2 would extend the Baylands Corridor to Highway 101 in the Las Gallinas Planning Area.

Option 3 would extend the Baylands Corridor to the Northwestern Pacific Railroad in the Las Gallinas Planning Area; however Gness Field and surrounding lands would be excluded.

Residential Building Size in Agricultural Areas

The Draft 2005 CWP Update proposes to limit the size of residential buildings in agricultural areas based on certain criteria. There are four options regarding the criteria to establish maximum dwelling unit sizes.

St. Vincent’s / Silveira Land Use

The Draft 2005 CWP Update establishes criteria for development of the St. Vincent’s / Silveira properties and provides for four development designation options.

Option 1 provides for 120 dwelling units plus up to a total of 100 additional affordable dwelling units.

Option 2 provides for the same number of dwelling units but changes some of the Ridge and Upland greenbelt designations. Nonresidential uses may be permitted in lieu of dwelling units not to exceed an equivalent level of traffic generation for the allowed residential uses.

Option 3 provides for a maximum of 350 dwelling units, such as 120 dwelling units, 100 affordable dwelling units, and a senior housing facility. Nonresidential uses may be permitted in lieu of dwelling units not to exceed an equivalent level of traffic generation for the allowed residential uses.

Option 4 provides for a maximum of 500 dwelling units through a combination of market rate housing, affordable housing and senior housing. Nonresidential uses may be permitted in lieu of dwelling units not to exceed an equivalent level of traffic generation for the allowed residential uses.

San Quentin State Prison

The Draft 2005 CWP Update discusses the San Quentin State Prison, which is covered by CWP Policies and Land use designation, but the Current State Prison use is not subject to County zoning regulations. The Draft 2005 CWP provides two visions for the site, should the State discontinue some or all of its prison operations.

Option 1 provides a vision if the prison ceases operations.

Option 2 provides a vision should the State of California agrees to a shared use of the site.

Housing Overlay Zone

The Draft 2005 Draft CWP Update establishes a Housing Overlay Zone that identifies locations where additional affordable, workforce, and special needs housing can be constructed. The Housing Overlay Zone policies will provide for up to 1,834 additional housing units. There are two maps (3-1a and 3-1b) showing locations within the City Centered Corridor where the Housing Overlay Zone would be applied.

DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE

The Draft 2005 CWP Update Implementing programs including amendments to the Development Code to be enacted after the CWP Update is adopted so that the Development Code will be consistent with policies in the CWP Update.

- Code amendments are proposed to strengthen wetland and bayland protection; to increase protection from stormwater runoff and from hazards caused by seismic and geologic activity and by flooding and wildland fires; and to protect open space lands.
- Zoning changes are proposed to protect agricultural lands by increasing controls on residential and non-agricultural development.
- Sites that the CWP designates for mixed use and higher densities near employment centers and transit nodes will need to be rezoned to allow mixed residential and commercial use and a housing overlay zone at higher densities than current zoning permits.
- Other proposed modifications to the Development Code will facilitate the use of renewable energy, mitigate the impacts of mining operations, provide increased protection from noise, and require use of drought-tolerant landscaping.

- Additional amendments to zoning designations and regulations will be needed for consistency with CWP policies dealing with density, permitted uses, protection of views in ridge and upland greenbelt areas, home occupations, parking standards, traffic reduction, and bicycle and pedestrian access.
- CWP policies requiring archeological surveys and protection of historic structures will also need Development Code amendments.

III. DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

A complete listing of all technical reports and plans submitted by the project sponsor, as well as maps and documents on file in the Planning Division, that have been used in evaluating the proposed project and incorporated by reference in accordance with Section 15150 of the *California Environmental Quality Act Statutes and Guidelines* are contained in Attachment 1 of this Initial Study. Please be advised that all reports, documents, and maps, **including the Draft 2005 CWP Update**, are matters of public record and are available for public review in the Community Development Agency - Planning Division, Room 308, Marin Civic Center, and San Rafael and is also available on the County's website at <http://www.co.marin.ca.us>.

IV. CIRCULATION AND REVIEW

This Initial Study is being circulated to all agencies which have jurisdiction over the planning area or natural resources affected by the Plan and to consultants, community groups, and interested parties to attest to the completeness and adequacy of the information contained in the Initial Study as it relates to the concerns which are germane to the agency's or organization's jurisdictional authority or to the interested parties' issues.

State Clearinghouse	California Coastal Conservancy
ABAG Clearinghouse	CA Dept. of Conservation Div of Mines & Geology
Marin County Community Development Agency	California Dept. of Fish and Game
Marin County Dept of Public Works	CA Office of Historic Preservation
Marin Co. Parks, Open Space & Cultural Services	CA Dept. of Parks and Recreation
Marin Co. Dept of Health & Human Services	Reclamation Board
Marin County Airport	SF Bay Conservation & Development Commission
Marin County Farm Advisor	Division of Aeronautics
Marin County Farm Bureau	California Highway Patrol
Marin County Office of Education	CA Dept. Housing & Community Development
Marin County Resource Conservation District	CA Dept. of Food & Agriculture
Marin County Transit District	California Dept. of Health Services
Marin County Environmental Health Services	CA Environmental Protection Agency
Marin County Open Space District	California Integrated Waste Management Board
Marin County Housing Authority	Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 2
Marin County Counsel	Youth & Adult Correctional Agency
Marin County Sheriff's Department	CA Energy Commission
Marin County Fire Department	CA Native American Heritage Commission
Marin County Libraries	CA Public Utilities Commission
Marin County School Districts	CA State Lands Commission
Marin County Fire Districts	US Army Corps of Engineers
Marin County Water & Sewer Districts	US Fish & Wildlife
Marin County Cities and Departments	Office of Housing & Urban Development
Adjacent Counties and Departments	Golden Gate National Recreation Area
Local, State & Federal Elected Officials	Pt. Reyes National Seashore
Resources Agency	National Marine Fisheries Service

California Coastal Commission	Interested Parties
Local Agency Formation Commission	

V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Pursuant to Section 15063 of the *California Environmental Quality Act Statutes and Guidelines* (CEQA) Guidelines, and the *County Environmental Impact Report Guidelines* (EIR), Marin County will prepare an “Initial Study” for all projects not categorically exempt from the requirements of CEQA. The “Initial Study” evaluation is a preliminary analysis of a project that provides the County with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an EIR or Negative Declaration. The points enumerated below describe the primary procedural steps undertaken by the County in completing an “Initial Study” checklist evaluation and, in particular, the manner in which significant environmental effects of the project are made and recorded.

- A. The determination of significant environmental effect is to be based on substantial evidence contained in the administrative record and the County's environmental database consisting of factual information regarding environmental resources and environmental goals and policies relevant to Marin County. As a procedural device for reducing the size of the Initial Study document, relevant information sources cited and discussed in topical sections of the checklist evaluation are incorporated by reference into the checklist (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Each of these information sources has been assigned a number which is shown in parenthesis following each topical question and which corresponds to a number on the data base source list provided herein as Attachment 1. See the sample question below. Other sources used or individuals contacted may also be cited in the discussion of topical issues where appropriate.
- B. In general, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when either the Initial Study demonstrates that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have one or more significant effects on the environment. A Negative Declaration shall also be prepared if the Initial Study identifies potentially significant effects, but revisions to the project made by or agreed to by the applicant prior to release of the Negative Declaration for public review would avoid or reduce such effects to a level of less than significance, and there is no substantial evidence before the Lead County Department that the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment. A signature block is provided in Section VII of this Initial Study to verify that the project sponsor has agreed to incorporate mitigation measures into the project in conformance with this requirement.
- C. All answers to the topical questions must take into account the whole of the action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. Significant unavoidable cumulative impacts shall be identified in Section VI of this Initial Study (Mandatory Findings of Significance).
- D. A brief explanation shall be given for all answers except "Not Applicable" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead County Department cites in the parenthesis following each question. A "Not Applicable" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "Not Applicable" answer shall be discussed where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- E. "Less Than Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is found to be less than significant based on the project as proposed and without the incorporation of mitigation measures recommended in the Initial Study. Items identified as less than significant will not be evaluated in the EIR
- F. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated" applies where the incorporation of recommended mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The Lead County Department must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how

they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section V, "Earlier Analyses", may be cross-referenced). The EIR will discuss the efficacy of the proposed policies to mitigate those effects that will be evaluated. Based on the analysis in the EIR additional mitigation measures may be required.

- G. "Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the Lead County Department lacks information to make a finding that the effect is less than significant. If there are one or more effects that have been determined to be significant and unavoidable, an EIR shall be required for the project.
- H. The answers in this checklist have considered the current California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines and the Initial Study checklist contained in the Guidelines.

VI. ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

1. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the proposal:*

a) Conflict with applicable Countywide Plan designation or zoning standards? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

The "project" is the adoption of the updated Countywide Plan. The Draft 2005 CWP Update is internally consistent among the policies and programs within each of its' elements. This Draft 2005 CWP Update is also consistent with Community Plans, but may have some inconsistencies with City Plans. The EIR will evaluate the impacts of the projected growth and development under the Draft 2005 CWP Update policies on the existing land use patterns in the county. Also, the consistency of Draft 2005 CWP Update with City Plans and the County Zoning Ordinance will be addressed. As part of the Countywide Plan implementation program, the Draft 2005 CWP Update policies call for some revisions to county zoning.

b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by Marin County? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

As stated above, the Draft 2005 CWP Update is internally consistent. The EIR will evaluate the impacts of the projected growth and development under Draft 2005 CWP Update policies on all applicable Marin County environmental plans and policies and applicable State and Regional Plans and Policies such as the Regional Air Basin Plan, ABAG Plan, BCDC plan, etc.

c) Affect agricultural resources, operations, or contracts (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, impacts from incompatible land uses, or conflicts with Williamson Act contracts)? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

One of the goals of the Draft 2005 CWP Update is to preserve agricultural lands and resources. The policies and implementing programs in the Natural Systems and Agriculture Element section 2.1 Agriculture and Food are expected to have a beneficial effect on lands preserved under agricultural contract. The EIR will evaluate the impacts of the projected growth and development under Draft

2005 CWP Update policies on agricultural resources, operation and contracts and the efficacy of the proposed policies to protect agricultural lands.

d) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

In addition to the four environmental corridors the CWP includes seven planning areas. Land use policy maps for each of the planning areas are included in the Build Environment Element, section 3.12 Planning Areas. Based on a review of the land use policy maps, the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not make any major land use plan changes; no existing unincorporated communities would be divided.

e) Result in substantial alteration of the character or functioning of the community, or present or planned use of an area? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

The Draft 2005 CWP Update would retain established community patterns. Further, the plan was developed with considerable public participation and adoption of the plan incorporates public input and acceptance through the public review process. Therefore, adoption of this plan would not result in substantial alteration or conflict with the functioning of the community.

f) Substantially increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities, or affect existing recreational opportunities? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

With regard to developed recreational facilities, such as softball fields, certain planning areas in the county currently fall short of the State’s Quimby standard of three-to-five acres per 1,000 residents, but the County as a whole is within about 300 acres of an overall five-acre standard. If the large quantity of federal, State and regional open space areas are included, Marin County has approximately 440 acres of open space land per 1,000 residents, much of this being open to low impact recreational use.² The Draft 2005 CWP Update is expected to have a beneficial impact on existing and potential county recreational amenities. Policies are designed to facilitate a parks inventory and update of the County Parks Master Plan, encourage coordinating use of schools and cities to meet county needs, replacement of closed facilities, and exploration of different types of recreational amenities such as community gardens and camping areas. Other open space policies for programs regarding lands managed primarily for habitat and scenic values and lower-impact, passive recreation are found in the Open Space Section in the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element. Policies are designed to conserve and develop parks and to increase acquisition of open space, so it is anticipated that the adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update will not have an adverse effect on existing or potential community recreation areas.

2. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the proposal:*

² Based on the year 2000 population of 247,289 residents and 109,824 acres of open space.

a) Increase density that would exceed official population projections for the planning area within which the project site is located as set forth in the Countywide Plan and/or community plan? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

Population growth declined over the past decade and this trend is expected to continue. The Draft 2005 CWP Update recommends no net change in the number of allowable housing units at buildout. Due to the application of environmental restrictions such as wetlands, ridge and upland greenbelt areas, and streamside setbacks, combined with the public acquisition of developable land, Draft 2005 CWP Update has, based on consideration of the current environment, reduced development potential compared to the 1994 CWP. For this reason, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to exceed official population projections. The plan horizon is based on ABAG growth projections.

b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

As discussed above, growth resulting from Draft 2005 CWP Update implementation is expected to be consistent with official growth expectations. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth in Marin County. The proposed Housing Overlay Zone, however, would result in the shift of approximately 1,800 housing units from the Coastal Corridor and Inland Rural Corridor to the City-Centered Corridor. The EIR will identify the potential for growth inducing impacts of the proposed Housing Overlay Zone.

c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

The project would allow for the redevelopment of presently developed sites, which potentially could result in some displacement of existing residents. Such displacement would be minor if at all, and the adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not lead to a substantial amount of displacement of housing. Moreover, the Housing Element was recently updated and adopted and is incorporated into the Draft 2005 CWP Update. The Housing Element contains detailed policies and programs to increase the supply of affordable housing. Therefore, the plan would have a beneficial effect by creating additional housing and would not result in the displacement of existing housing stock.

3. GEOPHYSICAL. *Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:*

a) Location in an area of geologic hazards, including but not necessarily limited to: 1) active or potentially active fault zones; 2) landslides or mudslides; 3) slope instability or ground failure; 4) subsidence; 5) expansive soils; 6) liquefaction; 7) tsunami ; or 8) similar hazards? (source #(s): 1, 2)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not directly result in the exposure of people to geologic hazards, however this may occur with future development. Preparation of site-specific geologic and/or soils investigations overseen by a state-certified engineering geologist and/or geotechnical engineer would be necessary to provide appropriate construction design and address the requirements of the Alquist-Priolo Act and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act. Policies in the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element, section 2.6 Environmental Hazards, ensure that future development projects will be thoroughly evaluated and potential geologic hazards addressed. The EIR will identify the potential for geologic hazards impacts with Draft 2005 CWP Update implementation and the efficacy of the proposed policies to mitigate those effects will be evaluated.

b)	Substantial erosion of soils due to wind or water forces and attendant siltation from excavation, grading, or fill? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
		[]	[X]	[]	[]

Future development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update could result in significant soil erosion due to exposed soils during construction activities and increased runoff rates and thus erosive forces in drainageways. Plan adoption would not directly lead to such impacts, and the plan contains policies design to address such environmental effects in the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element, section 2.5 Water Resources. The potential for erosion and sedimentation impacts and the efficacy of proposed Draft 2005 CWP Update policies to mitigate those effects will be addressed in the EIR.

c)	Substantial changes in topography from excavation, grading or fill, including but not necessarily limited to: 1) ground surface relief features; 2) geologic substructures or unstable soil conditions; and 3) unique geologic or physical features? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
		[]	[X]	[]	[]

Adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not directly lead to substantial changes in topography from excavation, grading or filling, however this may occur when development occurs. The EIR will address the potential for changes in topography resulting from mass grading or use of large amounts of fill and evaluate policies to mitigate those effects.

4. WATER. *Would the proposal result in:*

a)	Substantial changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
		[]	[X]	[]	[]

By increasing the amount of impervious surfaces or altering surface drainage patterns, future development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update could affect absorption rates, drainage patterns and runoff rates, however, adoption of the plan would not directly lead to such impacts. Policies in the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element, section 2.5 Water Resources are designed to assure future development will not adversely affect runoff and infiltration. The potential for such impacts and the efficacy of these policies to mitigate will be addressed in the EIR.

b)	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards, including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) flooding; 2) debris deposition; or 3) similar hazards? (source #(s): 1, 3, 4)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
		[]	[X]	[]	[]

Adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not directly result in the exposure of people to flooding hazards, however this may occur when development occurs. Future development has the potential to increase runoff volumes and peak flows, which can lead to channel instability, bank erosion, sediment accumulation, and ultimately flooding. Policies in the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element, section 2.6 Environmental Hazards, and enforcement of Title 23 (Floodplain Management) ensure that potential flooding hazards associated with future development projects will be addressed. Policies expand flood zone district overlays and restrict development within flood prone areas, require hydrologic studies to address the potential for increased sedimentation or the alteration of drainage patterns and promote the retention of natural conditions including stream channels and flood plains. The potential for water related hazards and the efficacy of the proposed policies to mitigate will be evaluated in the EIR.

c)	Discharge of pollutants into surface or ground waters or other alteration of surface or ground water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (source #(s): 1, 3)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
		[]	[X]	[]	[]

Future development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update could result in adverse water quality impacts, however adoption of the plan would not directly lead to such impacts. Such impacts could result from increased automobile use and contaminated runoff, increased use of pesticides, and agricultural land uses. Policies in the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element, section 2.5 Water Resources, are designed to assure future development would not adversely impact Marin County water quality. The policies encourage Marin County to work with the Regional Water Quality Control Board to develop of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for impaired water bodies and pollutants of concern, develop a septic system monitoring program, and educate homeowners about toxicity issues related to the use of pesticides and other household items. The potential for water quality impacts resulting from CWP implementation and the efficacy of Draft 2005 CWP Update policies to mitigate will be addressed in the EIR.

d)	Substantial change in the amount of surface water in any water body or ground water either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through intersection of an aquifer by cuts or excavations? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
		[]	[X]	[]	[]

Future development would increase impervious surfaces and thus surface runoff into receiving waterways and water bodies. Additionally, development will increase the demand for water, a portion of which is provided by county reservoirs. The EIR will determine the significance of these effects in relation to the adequacy of the Draft 2005 CWP Update policies to mitigate such effects. Policies in the plan would not be expected to result in direct additions to any water body or intersection of an aquifer.

e) Substantial changes in the flow of surface or ground waters, including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) currents; 2) rate of flow; or 3) the course or direction of water movements? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

It is unlikely the adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would cause a significant adverse change in the flow (current, rate, course, etc.) of surface or ground waters. As discussed in item 4a) above policies in the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element, section 2.5 Water Resources are designed to assure future development will not adversely affect runoff and infiltration. The potential for such impacts and the efficacy of these policies to mitigate will be addressed in the EIR.

f) Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies? (source #(s): 1, 2)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Future development consistent with Draft 2005 CWP Update would increase the demand for water, however adoption of the plan would not directly lead to such increases. The plan includes policies in the Built Environment Element, section 3.11 Public Facilities and Services, design to address adequate water supply. Policies are intended to encourage use of rainwater and treated wastewater for irrigation, promote water conservation and seek additional groundwater sources. The adequacy of the anticipated Marin County water supply and the Draft 2005 CWP Update policies will be addressed in the EIR.

5. AIR QUALITY. *Would the proposal:*

a) Generate substantial air emissions that could violate official air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (source #(s): 1, 5)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

The San Francisco Bay region is considered nonattainment for ground-level ozone at both the State and federal level, and nonattainment for PM₁₀ at the State level only. The San Francisco Bay region currently complies with State and federal standards for all other air pollutants (e.g., carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and lead). Sources of air pollution from Marin County contribute to these air quality problems, and will continue to do so with adoption and implementation of the Draft 2005 CWP Update. Increased vehicular traffic will produce emissions leading to greater ozone concentrations, while construction activities, wood burning, off-road travel, and agricultural activities will cause greater particulate matter levels.

Additionally, sheltered valleys in Marin County are susceptible to localized build up of PM₁₀ and carbon monoxide emissions during winter. Poor dispersion characteristics of these valleys during cold periods in winter along with wood burning and vehicle use could lead to localized exceedances of air quality standards. The BAAQMD does not measure pollutant concentrations in these more-rural locations, however new development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update will likely contribute to this trend. While adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not directly lead to these impacts, such impacts would occur when future development takes place.

Policies within the Draft 2005 CWP Update are designed to address these air quality impacts. Section 2.7, Atmosphere and Climate, in the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element contains policies

designed to reduce particulate matter through use of Best Management Practices during grading, construction and agricultural tilling, and continued enforcement of limits on wood burning stoves. In the Built Environment Element, section 3.4 Community Development, contains policies which encourage reduced vehicle trips through mixed use development, ride sharing and telecommuting and satellite work stations, while section 3.9, Transportation, includes policies which would reduce traffic-generated air pollutants by maintaining service levels, reducing congestions, increasing bicycle and pedestrian activities, and increasing use of public transportation. The EIR will address local air quality impacts resulting from development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update as well as the plan's consistency with the Bay Area 2000 Clean Air Plan, including the appropriate implementation of Transportation Control Measures.

b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, such as noxious fumes or fugitive dust? (source #(s): 1, 5)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Toxic air contaminants present a health risk to persons in urban areas of Marin County and the Bay Area. This risk has decreased considerably in recent years. About 70 percent of the current risk is attributable to diesel particulate matter. Development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update could increase toxic air contaminants. The significance of this effect and adequacy of the Draft 2005 CWP Update to address it will be discussed in the EIR.

c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? (source #(s): 1, 5)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

Implementation of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not cause any alteration in air movement, moisture, temperature, or climate.

d) Create objectionable odors? (source #(s): 1, 5)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Adoption and implementation of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not create objectionable odors, however future development consistent with the plan may do so. Policies contained in section 2.7, Atmosphere and Climate, of the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element require enforcement of BAAQMD screening distance guidelines to assure point sources do not impact receptors. Evaluation of potential odor impacts and mitigations in the Draft 2005 CWP Update will be included in the EIR.

6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. *Would the proposal result in:*

a) Substantial increase in vehicle trips or traffic congestion such that existing levels of service on affected roadways will deteriorate below acceptable County standards? (source #(s): 1, 6)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Adoption and implementation of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not cause a substantial increase in traffic levels, however future development consistent with the plan may do so. The effect of future development on traffic congestion and intersection levels of service and plan policies to mitigate such effects will be discussed in the EIR.

b) Traffic hazards related to: 1) safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections); 2) barriers to pedestrians or bicyclists; or 3) incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? (source #(s): 1, 6)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Future development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update may cause changes in transit operations or increased traffic volumes, which could result in traffic hazards. Further, the plan includes polices aimed at enhancing the pedestrian and bicycle network. The effect of plan implementation on traffic hazards and pedestrians and bicyclists will be addressed in the EIR and mitigation evaluated.

c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

Policies contained within the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not directly affect countywide emergency access or procedures. Inadequate emergency access may occur with specific project proposals. Such impacts would be site-specific and thus are unknown at this time and will be addressed at the time the projects are proposed. Adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not lead to foreseeable impacts on emergency access.

d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

Future development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update may cause increased demand for parking, particularly in the City Centered Corridor. It is impossible to predict where impacts could occur. Development within the unincorporated areas will continue to be required to fulfill the parking obligations set forth in the County's Development Code, while development within the cities will be required to meet city requirements. Inadequate parking resulting from individual projects will be addressed by the appropriate agency at the time the project is proposed. Adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not lead to insufficient parking.

e) Substantial impacts upon existing transportation systems, including rail, waterborne or air traffic systems? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

The Draft 2005 CWP Update includes polices that encourage and enhance public transportation services. The effects of these policies as well as the effect of future development consistent with the plan on transportation systems will be addressed in the EIR.

7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal result in:*

<p>a) Reduction in the number of endangered, threatened or rare species, or substantial alteration of their habitats including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) plants; 2) fish; 3) insects; 4) animals; and 5) birds listed as special-status species by State or Federal Resource Agencies? (sources #(s): 1, 7)</p>	<p>Significant Impact</p> <p>[]</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</p> <p>[X]</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> <p>[]</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p> <p>[]</p>
--	---	---	---	---

Development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update could cause a reduction in the number of special status species or their habitat due to development encroachment and greater use of open spaces areas for recreational activities. In particular, baylands and riparian corridors are sensitive to impacts resulting from further development. Policies contained in the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element, 2.4 Biological Resources section, are intended to mitigate the effect of existing and future development on the county’s sensitive resources by protecting riparian areas, tidelands, and wetlands with development restrictions and greater consultation with State and federal trustee agencies. The EIR will identify the level of impact to sensitive biological resources and will evaluate the efficacy of the Draft 2005 CWP Update policies to mitigate.

<p>b) Substantial change in the diversity, number, or habitat of any species of plants or animals currently present or likely to occur at any time throughout the year? (source #(s) 1, 7)</p>	<p>Significant Impact</p> <p>[]</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</p> <p>[X]</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> <p>[]</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p> <p>[]</p>
---	---	---	---	---

Please see 7(a), immediately above.

<p>c) Introduction of new species of plants or animals into an area, or improvements or alterations that would result in a barrier to the migration, dispersal or movement of animals? (source #(s): 1, 7)</p>	<p>Significant Impact</p> <p>[]</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</p> <p>[X]</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> <p>[]</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p> <p>[]</p>
---	---	---	---	---

Landscaping associated with new development and the development itself often impairs the habitat value and movement corridors of native species. Future development consistent with Draft 2005 CWP Update would continue to have this effect. Policies contained in the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element, 2.4 Biological Resources section, are designed to mitigate such effects by prohibiting certain exotic plant species, encouraging native landscaping pallets, and protecting ecotones and wildlife corridors with habitat connectivity assessments. The EIR will address the adequacy of the Draft 2005 CWP Update policies to protect native animal migration and dispersal patterns.

8. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal result in:*

<p>a) Substantial increase in demand for existing energy sources, or conflict with adopted policies or standards for energy use? (source #(s): 1)</p>	<p>Significant Impact</p> <p>[]</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</p> <p>[X]</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> <p>[]</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p> <p>[]</p>
--	---	---	---	---

While adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not directly lead to increased demand for energy, future development consistent with the plan would result in increased energy needs in the county. Draft 2005 CWP Update polices in the Built Environment Element, section 3.6 Energy and Green Building, are designed to mitigate energy consumption and increase use of and local production of renewable and alternative energy sources. New residential development and remodels would be encouraged to utilize the Marin Green Home Rating System while non-residential development would be encouraged to utilize the U.S Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system. Further, future development would be required to conform with Marin County's Building Energy Efficient Structures Today (BEST) program, which would ensure construction of energy efficient structures. As discussed above under 2(a), the population growth rate in Marin County declined over the past decade and this trend is expected to continue. The Draft 2005 CWP Update recommends no net change in the number of allowable housing units at buildout, and in fact would reduce development potential on many parcels by over 1,800 potential dwelling units. For these reasons, implementation of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not be expected to substantially increase the demand for existing energy sources. However, overall energy supply and demand generally expected to result from the plan will be evaluated in the EIR and efficacy of mitigation addressed.

b) Use of non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

While adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not directly lead to increased use of non-renewable resources, such as materials used for construction and energy production, future development consistent with the plan would result in increased use of such resources in the county. Policies contained within the plan would not lead to such use taking place in a wasteful or inefficient manner, thus no impact would result from adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update.

c) Loss of significant mineral resource sites designated in the Countywide Plan from premature development or other land uses which are incompatible with mineral extraction? (source #(s): 1, 2)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

Eight sites in Marin County have been identified as Mineral Resource Zone Class 2 or MRZ-2. Two no longer meet the minimum threshold requirements and are exempt from application of mineral resource policies. Of the remaining six sites, four are located within incorporated areas. The Built Environment Element, section 3.7 Mineral Resources, includes policies that would continue to protect these mineral resources through development restriction within the Development Code. As such, adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not lead to the loss of significant mineral resources sites. Implementation measures would apply a new overlay zone "Designated Mineral Resource" to the identified sites in unincorporated Marin County. The overlay zone would prohibit any temporary or permanent land uses, which would preclude eventual extraction of the mineral resource and would require the creation of buffer land uses between the potential extraction areas and surrounding areas.

9. HAZARDS. *Would the proposal involve:*

a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) oil, pesticides; 2) chemicals; or 3) radiation)? (source #(s): 1, 2)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

No policies proposed in the Draft 2005 CWP Update would involve the accidental explosion or release of hazardous materials. Adoption and implementation of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not lead to such impacts. As discussed below under 9(d), the potential for exposure of people and the environment to hazardous substances, including through accidental release, will be addressed in the EIR.

b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

The Office of Emergency Services has adopted an *Emergency Operations Plan* (EOP) that provides procedures to be followed in response to emergency situations. Policies contained within the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not directly affect countywide emergency response procedures. Interference with an emergency response plan may occur with specific project proposals. Such impacts would be site-specific and thus are unknown at this time and will be addressed by the county's Office of Emergency Services at the time the projects are proposed. Adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not lead to foreseeable impacts on emergency response.

c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? (source #(s): 1, 2)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

Adoption and implementation of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not lead to the creation of new health hazards. No policies in the Draft 2005 CWP Update would involve the creation of new hazards. In Marin County, the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) and Waste Management within the Department of Public Works and Environmental Health in the Community Development Agency regulate hazardous materials. These agencies, as well as State and federal regulatory agencies, would be responsible to addressing potential health hazards associated with future development. As discussed below under 9(d), the EIR will address potential for exposure to hazardous materials.

d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (source #(s): 1, 2)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

The City Centered Corridor is considered most susceptible to public health concerns and environmental degradation caused by long-term conditions and by secondary disasters. This corridor has the greatest concentration of people and industry in the county. In the Inland Rural Corridor, hazardous material releases from transportation of hazardous materials could be particularly severe because response times would be great, sensitive environmental receptors are abundant, and many roads are narrow and twisting. More than 500 Marin County businesses are regulated hazardous

material businesses. Existing sources of hazardous materials within the county are also associated with waste treatment and disposal sites, storage tanks, and agricultural activities. Future development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update could result in the exposure of existing or future residents to known health hazards in such ways as discovery of underground hazardous materials, encroachment on closed sold waste sites, or accidental release caused by disaster or equipment malfunction. The EIR will discuss existing sources of hazardous materials in the county and the potential for exposure of people to these hazards and will provide possible measures to mitigate potential impacts.

e) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

While adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not lead to increased fire hazards, future development consistent with the plan and located adjacent to open space areas would be subject to wildland fire risk. Development within the county would continue to be subject to the regulations and standards of the County Fire Department and local fire districts as well as the Uniform Fire Code. Further, policies contained within the Natural Systems and Agricultural Element, section 2.6 Environmental Hazards, would assure a reduction of wildland fire risk by requiring sprinklers, fire-resistant building materials and vegetation clearing around structures for all new development. The EIR will evaluate the efficacy of plan policies to mitigate increased fire hazard.

10. NOISE. *Would the proposal result in:*

a) Substantial increases in existing ambient noise levels? (source #(s): 1, 8)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not lead to increased ambient noise levels in the county, however development consistent with the plan would contribute to increased noise. Increased automobile traffic and transit operations could be expected to increase noise levels in the county. Policies in the Built Environment, section 3.10 Noise, are designed to assure people would not be exposed to noise levels in excess of adopted standards through adherence to State-adopted acceptable noise levels, establishment of noise limit standards, and regulation of temporary and construction noise sources. The EIR will assess future noise levels resulting from increased traffic and will evaluate the efficacy of the Draft 2005 CWP Update noise policies to mitigate.

b) Exposure of people to significant noise levels, or conflicts with adopted noise policies or standards? (source #(s): 1, 8)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Please refer to Section 10(a) of this Initial Study.

11. PUBLIC SERVICES. *Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government service in any of the following areas:*

a) Fire protection? (source #(s): 1, 9)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Within the county there are 16 fire protection districts, including the Marin County Fire Department. All new development is required to meet the standards of the County Fire Code, and those projects with discretionary review often include more restrictive requirements. Adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not directly lead to impacts on fire protection services, however future development consistent with the plan could increase demand for fire protection. The EIR will discuss existing fire protection services within the county and will discuss in general what affect anticipated development could have on the county's service providers.

b) Police protection? (source #(s): 1, 9)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Some police protection is provided by city police departments in the various county planning areas, but the majority of this service is provided by the County Sheriff's Department. Adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not directly lead to impacts on police protection services, however future development consistent with the plan may increase demand for police protection services. The EIR will discuss existing police protection services within the county and will discuss in general what affect anticipated development will have on those service providers.

c) Schools? (source #(s): 1, 9)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Future development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update would likely increase student enrollment in the county's school districts. The EIR will discuss enrollment projections utilized by the various school districts and the capacity of their facilities.

d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not directly lead to impacts, however with increased development and automobile traffic, roadway wear would accelerate. The roadway impact fee assessed by the county of one percent of assessed value for building permits for structures valued at greater than \$10,000 may not be adequate to offset the increased costs incurred to maintain these facilities. An economic analysis of the Draft 2005 CWP Update will not be prepared as a part of the EIR. The EIR will discuss existing road and facilities' maintenance within the County and will discuss in general what effect anticipated development may have on maintenance of facilities. The purpose of the analysis will be to determine if there is a chain of cause and effect from the potential impact on maintenance of facilities to physical impacts.

e) Other governmental services? (source #(s): 1, 9)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

Other government services, such as libraries and solid waste collection, could be affected by the increased number of residents anticipated with Draft 2005 CWP Update implementation. Funding for the Marin County Free Library (MCFL) district is mostly provided by property tax revenues. Additional property tax revenue generated by additional residential development will offset the increased demand resulting from the development. However, due to existing budgetary limitations, it is expected that funding could fall short of the MCFL budgetary needs in some years. Garbage collection and disposal is governed by public agencies, but is conducted by private haulers. The costs are paid directly by consumers, and thus the increased demand for this service is expected to be funded by the residents receiving the service. As these effects are economic or social and not expected to result in physical impacts on the environment, they will not be evaluated in the EIR, (see section 15 below). Impacts on solid waste disposal are discussed in item 12(f) below.

12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:*

a) Power or natural gas? (source #(s): 1, 9)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

According to the Community Facilities Element Technical Background Report, Pacific Gas and Electric Company has adequate facilities in the county to provide service to development associated with the Draft 2005 CWP Update. Plan implementation may result in the need for expansion of existing services and new connections, however adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not be expected to necessitate entirely new systems or substantial alteration of the existing system. PG&E will be consulted to determine the effect Draft 2005 CWP Update implementation could have on its service to Marin County, and this topic will be addressed in the EIR. See discussion under Energy in item 8(a) above.

b) Communications systems? (source #(s): 1, 9)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

Telecommunications facilities provided by private companies in Marin County including Comcast, West Marin Cablevision, SBC and Verizon. Plan implementation may result in the need for expansion of existing services and new connections, however adoption of the Draft 2005 CWP Update would not necessitate entirely new systems or substantial alteration of the existing system, a less-than-significant impact. The Telecommunication Facilities Policy Plan provides information and policies about potential impacts of these facilities.

c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? (source #(s): 1, 9)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Water is supplied by two main water districts in the City Centered Corridor: the MMWD and the NMWD, while West Marin is served by four different districts. Future development would increase the demand for treated water and would require expanded or improved distribution facilities. The MMWD has noted that it has an annual shortfall of water supply for its service area which will continue to increase without a new supply source.³ The EIR will address the increased demand expected with buildout of the Draft 2005 CWP Update and the adequacy of Marin County water services.

d) Sewer or septic tanks? (source #(s): 1, 9)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Existing sewage treatment and conveyance facilities will likely be impacted by future development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update. The effect of development on these facilities and efficacy of plan policies to mitigate will be addressed in the EIR.

e) Storm water drainage? (source #(s): 1, 4, 9)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Increased impervious surfaces associated with future development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update may impact storm water drainage facilities. Improved or new facilities may be required by individual projects, but as a whole, additional development will likely lead to increased peak flows and will affect existing facilities within the county. The EIR will address the impact Draft 2005 CWP Update implementation would have on county storm drainage facilities and the efficacy of plan policies to address those impacts.

f) Solid waste disposal? (source #(s): 1, 9)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Future development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update could have an effect on the Redwood Landfill, which serves Marin County. Based on information in the *Redwood Landfill Solid Waste Facilities Permit Revision EIR* the effect of future development on the landfill and plan policies to mitigate such effects will be discussed in the EIR.

13. AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal:*

³ Letter to Michele Rodriguez, Marin CDA from Eric McGuire, Environmental Services Coordinator, Marin Municipal Water District, June 29, 2004.

a) Substantially reduce, obstruct, or degrade a scenic vista open to the public or scenic highway, or conflict with adopted aesthetic or visual policies or standards? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update would likely take place in areas that could include those areas that would affect scenic highways and vistas. An analysis of impacts on the visual resources and aesthetic character of Marin County will be included in the EIR, including impacts of potential development on the county's scenic resources and rural character. The effectiveness of the policies in section 3.5 Design of the Built Environment Element will be assessed with regard to potential impacts on the quality of scenic views and vistas, the preservation of community character, and compatibility of development. The EIR will also address effects associated with an increase of light sources within the county, including light pollution, light trespass, and glare.

b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect by causing a substantial alteration of the existing visual resources including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) an abrupt transition in land use; 2) disharmony with adjacent uses because of height, bulk or massing of structures; or 3) cast of a substantial amount of light, glare, or shadow? (source #(s): 1)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Please see 13(a), above.

14. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal:*

a) Disturb paleontological, archaeological, or historical sites, objects, or structures? (source #(s): 1, 10)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Several kinds of archaeological deposits are found in Marin County including settlements and villages, hunting camps, quarries, rock art sites, and trails associated with Native American settlement of the area. Spanish, Mexican and American era deposits are also present. The more recent historic era deposits frequently overlie the earlier Native American ones. The distribution of known archaeological sites in Marin County is concentrated near the urban areas and the Point Reyes Peninsula.

Development consistent with the Draft 2005 CWP Update has the potential to disturb unique cultural resources. The Socioeconomic Element, section 4.13 Historical and Archeological Resources, contains policies intended to protect the county's cultural resources by preparing a sensitivity map, requiring surveys in sensitive areas, promoting restoration, and adopting preservation guidelines. These policies will be evaluated in the EIR.

b) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would adversely affect unique ethnic cultural values, or religious or sacred uses within the project area? (source #(s): 1, 10)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Please refer to Item 14(a) above.

15. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS. *Would the proposal result in:*

Any physical changes which can be traced through a chain of cause and effect to social or economic impacts. (source #(s): 1-16)	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
	[]	[]	[X]	[]

Economic and social effects are not considered environmental effects under CEQA. These effects need to be considered in EIRs only if they would lead to an environmental effect. Policies within the Draft 2005 CWP Update are not expected to result in social or economic impacts leading to physical changes that would result in environmental effects. See sections 11 and 12 above regarding evaluation in the EIR of services and utilities. Social and economic effects will not be evaluated in the EIR.

VII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Pursuant to Section 15065 of the *California Environmental Quality Act Statutes and Guidelines*, a project shall be found to have a significant effect on the environment if any of the following are true:

(Please explain your answer after each question)

) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	Yes [X]	No []	Maybe []
--	---------------------	------------------	---------------------

As described in Section VI of this Initial Study, potential environmental impacts from the proposed project related to biological and cultural resources would be significant.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?	Yes []	No [X]	??? []
--	-------------------	--------------------	-------------------

The proposed project is a long-term planning document with long-term environmental goals and policies.

Yes	No	???
------------	-----------	------------

- c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects). [X] [] []

Potential environmental impacts from the proposed project, such as air quality, water quality, and increased traffic, could be cumulatively considerable.

- d) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Yes [X] No [] ??? []

As described in Section VI of this Initial Study, potential environmental impacts from the proposed project could adversely affect human beings.

XIII. DETERMINATION

(Completed by the Marin County Environmental Coordinator). Pursuant to Sections 15081 and 15070 of the *California Environmental Quality Act Statutes and Guidelines*, the forgoing Initial Study evaluation, and the entire administrative record for the project:

- I find that the proposed project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures incorporated into the Initial Study have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Tim Haddad, Marin County Environmental Coordinator

Date

Attachment I
Documents Incorporated by Reference

1. *Planning Commission Draft Marin Countywide Plan 2005.*
2. Geology, Mineral Resources and Hazardous Materials Technical Background Report, March 2002
3. Hydrology Background Report, March 2002
4. Flooding Background Report, March 2002
5. Air Quality Background Report, March 2002
6. Transportation Background Report, March 2002
7. Biology Background Report, March 2002
8. Noise Background Report, March 2002
9. Community Facilities Background Report, March 2002
10. Archeology Background Report, March 2002
11. Agriculture Background Report, December 2003
12. Historic Resources Background Report, February 2004
13. Land Use Modeling and Buildout Projections Technical Report, June 2005
14. Parks and Recreation Technical Background Report, January 2005
15. Trails Element Technical Background Report, January 2004.
16. Energy Technical Report, undated.