

2 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

2.1 GENERAL PLAN OVERVIEW

The project under consideration is the General Plan update for Mariposa County. The General Plan provides a basis to guide future development and decision-making via land use designations, goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures. The General Plan addresses build-out of the County as a whole. Build-out would occur at some unspecified time in the future, depending upon the rate at which growth proceeds.

Based on a series of central and supporting themes used to develop the proposed General Plan, the Plan is divided into two parts: the countywide General Plan (Volume I) and the area plans (Volume II). The countywide General Plan contains countywide goals, policies, and implementation measures. The area plans contain plans for each of the communities and regions in the County including town plans, community plans, special plans, and the Yosemite National Park General Management Plan. Volume II also contains interim land use diagrams for those areas for which a plan has not yet been prepared and adopted, Planning Study Areas. The countywide goals, policies, and implementation measures apply to the Planning Study Areas. As stated above, this EIR assesses the impacts of the countywide General Plan. Adopted area plans, including their associated environmental impact analyses are incorporated into the General Plan without change and thus are not analyzed in this document. Likewise, Yosemite National Park and those planning areas jointly managed with the National Park Service are not included as part of this EIR. Impacts associated with the adopted area plans however are presented here for informational purposes.

2.1.1 ADOPTED AREA PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

A jurisdiction's general plan identifies the expected future population, housing, and employment within its planning area, and provides a plan of where, when, and how services should be developed to support the projected future demands. Each general plan has an associated environmental impact report (EIR) that identifies and analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with adopting the general plan and the projected growth the general plan accommodates. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, the following town planning area specific plans have been incorporated into this document by reference. A summary table of growth related impacts identified in the adopted town planning area specific plan and certified EIRs for Mariposa, Coulterville, Fish Camp, and Wawona are provided in Appendix B of this EIR. These documents may also be reviewed in their entirety at the Mariposa County Planning Department.

2.1.1.1 MARIPOSA TOWN PLANNING AREA SPECIFIC PLAN

The Mariposa Town Planning Area Specific Plan EIR was certified by Mariposa County Board of Supervisors in 1992 in accordance with CEQA. This EIR identifies significant impacts to geology and soils, hydrology and drainage, wildlife resources, land use, state highways, County streets and roads, pedestrian circulation, parking, Mariposa Public Utilities District (MPUD), non-MPUD public services and utilities, and cultural resources resulting from the development allowed in the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan EIR offers mitigation measures that reduce those significant impacts to a less than significant level. However, four significant unavoidable impacts are identified with short term and full implementation of the Specific Plan.

- Increase in Traffic Safety Hazards at Highway 140/Smith Road and Highway 49/Smith Road
- Increase in Traffic and Safety Hazards on Smith Road
- Increase in Traffic, Pedestrian Activity, and Safety Hazards Along Smith Road
- Inadequate Water Supply for Residential Development

2.1.1.2 COULTERVILLE TOWN PLANNING AREA SPECIFIC PLAN

The Coulterville Town Planning Area Specific Plan EIR was certified by Mariposa County Board of Supervisors in 1980 in accordance with CEQA. This EIR identifies significant impacts to flood hazards, septic tank and disposal facility limitations, erosion, historic character, and underground water quality resulting from the development allowed in the Specific Plan and offers mitigation measures that reduce those significant impacts to a less than significant level. However, two significant unavoidable impacts are identified with full implementation of the Specific Plan.

- Impacts to Maxwell Creek
- Impacts to the Small Town Atmosphere

2.1.1.3 FISH CAMP TOWN PLANNING AREA SPECIFIC PLAN

The Fish Camp Town Planning Area Specific Plan EIR was certified by Mariposa County Board of Supervisors in 1983 in accordance with CEQA. This EIR identifies significant impacts to wildlife, flood hazards, circulation and traffic, ground water quality and quantity, erosion and drainage, and rare and endangered plants resulting from the development allowed in the Specific Plan and offers mitigation measures that reduce those significant impacts to a less than significant level. However, one significant unavoidable impact is identified with full implementation of the Specific Plan.

- Impacts to Big Creek

2.1.1.4 WAWONA TOWN PLANNING AREA SPECIFIC PLAN

The Wawona Town Planning Area Specific Plan EIR was certified by Mariposa County Board of Supervisors in 1987 in accordance with CEQA. This EIR identifies significant impacts to drainage and topography; hydrology and flood hazards; vegetation and wildlife; circulation and traffic; health; County services; and archaeology, history, and aesthetics resulting from the development allowed in the Specific Plan and offers mitigation measures that reduce all significant impacts to a less than significant level. No significant unavoidable impacts are identified.

2.2 MARIPOSA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN BUILD-OUT

When creating its General Plan, Mariposa County developed a population build-out projection for the Plan based on a methodology and set of assumptions.

The General Plan uses two population forecast methods to identify short-term and long-term issues and actions, a growth projection and a build-out projection. The growth projection is utilized to identify programs that need to occur in a short period of time, generally within a 15-year time frame. The build-out projection is utilized to anticipate programs and actions that will occur beyond a 15-year time frame but that need to be considered in any actions in the short-term period.

The growth projection is based on historic and project growth rates to forecast the pace of growth within the County. The most recent growth forecast was issued by the State of California for a period through 2050. This forecast projects a population of approximately 25,500 in Mariposa County in the next 40+ years.

The population projection reflects the implementation of the policies in the General Plan assuming the continuation of existing trends in development investment. Build-out of the General Plan would result in a population of 28,000 persons.

The projections were derived in several steps. The County first evaluated vacant land under two categories: 1) lands within the designated planning areas, and 2) lands outside of the designated planning areas. Mariposa County has approximately 50,100 acres of vacant land, of which, approximately 37,000 acres are within the County but outside of the planning areas, and 13,100 acres are within designated planning areas (Table 2-1).

**Table 2-1
Residential Land Evaluation**

	Residential Land Use Designation (acres, rounded)	Vacant Land in the Residential Land Use Designation (acres, rounded)
Countywide, Outside Planning Areas	86,700	37,000
Within Designated Planning Areas	25,000	13,100
Total	111,700	50,100

Source: Mariposa County, 2006.

In addition to the vacant Residential land within the County, there are 1,173 vacant private parcels outside the Plan Areas within the Natural Resource and Agriculture/Working Landscape designations and 6,800 acres of vacant land within the Plan Areas designated Natural Resource, Agricultural/Working Landscape, Interim Community Center and Town Plan Area.

To determine the potential residential build-out one residential unit was allocated to each vacant parcel of private land outside the Plan Areas designated Natural Resource and Agriculture/Working Landscape. For vacant Residential land of the planning areas, the County implemented a building density methodology that considers both slope and density in determining feasible developable acreage. Due to the varied sloping topography in Mariposa County, which creates constraints for development, it is unrealistic for the County to calculate residential build-out densities at 100 percent of a parcel’s development potential. Further, there are undeveloped areas of the County without infrastructure improvements, suitable soils, and/or access to a County maintained road or an improved road within 2,500 feet of the parcel.

Within designated planning areas, building densities were determined based on methodology within the adopted General Plan Housing Element, which evaluates development potential as a reasonable buildable percentage per land use designation. Table 2-2 presents the feasible building density percentages based on slope for countywide land outside of the designated planning areas, classified as Class A, B1, and B2, and the uniform percentages used for each land use. Within planning areas, the following land use designations were analyzed that allow for residential development: Residential, Agricultural/Working Landscape, and Natural Resources.

Residential uses are also allowed within the Rural Economic/Commercial subclassification at one dwelling unit supporting each retail or commercial use; however, the Rural Economic designation was not analyzed because it is not a primary residential zone, and as such, the unit density per acre is not defined.

**Table 2-2
Feasible Building Density Percentages**

	Slope	Vacant Land Feasible Onsite Building Density
Countywide, Outside Planning Areas		
Class A	0-15%	30%
	15-30%	10%
	30+%	3%
Class B1	n/a	35%
Class B2	0-15%	30%
	15-30%	5%
	30+%	2%
Within Designated Planning Areas		
Residential	n/a	30%
Agricultural/Working Landscape		20%
Natural Resources		25%
Interim Community Center	n/a	40%

Source: Mariposa County, 2006.

- **Class A** (parcels over 10 acres and over \$15,000 in existing improvements). The following building densities are used for the established methodology: 30 percent for parcels with an average slope of under 15 percent, 10 percent for parcels with an average slope of 15-30 percent, and 3 percent for parcels with an average slope of 30+ percent. Because these parcels already have some development, including residential development based upon the assessed value of improvements, it is assumed that basic requirements such as road access and suitable soils are present. However, as slope increases, road access and septic capabilities are adversely impacted; therefore, building densities that reflect the effects of slope is appropriate. There are 3,900 acres of residential buildable vacant land in Class A.
- **Class B1** (parcels under 10 acres with under \$15,000 in existing improvements). A building density of 35 percent of the total acres in this class is used for the established methodology regardless of slope. This figure is appropriate because development is a right; no discretionary permit is required for full residential development of parcels of this size. However, a building density of 100 percent of the General Plan is not likely

because of the decisions of some property owners to hold a parcel. There are 1,800 acres of residential buildable vacant land in Class B1.

- **Class B2** (parcels over 10 acres with under \$15,000 in existing improvements). The following building densities are used for the established methodology: 30 percent for parcels with average slope of under 15 percent, 5 percent of parcels with average slope of 15 to 30 percent, 2 percent for parcels with average slope of 30+ percent. A more conservative building density figure was implemented for this class compared to Class A because there is no residential development likely to exist on the parcels in this class based upon assessed value of improvements. Therefore, basic requirements for development such as roadway access and suitable soils are not guaranteed. It is likely that the majority of these parcels are not within 2,500 feet of a County maintained road or improved road. The maximum building densities were based on slope and the previously stated predictable existing site conditions. There are 3,800 acres of residential buildable vacant land in Class B2.
- **Planning Areas.** The following flat rate percentage building densities were used to determine buildable vacant land acreage in the planning areas. The methodology is based on development potential per land use designation within the adopted General Plan Housing Element: Residential, 30 percent; Agriculture/Working Landscape, 20 percent; and Natural Resources, 25 percent. It is assumed that 40 percent of the acreage designated in the Residential land use will be developed, based on topography, ability to construct an approved onsite sewage disposal system, and ability to find an adequate supply of potable water. Because of the extremely low density of the Agricultural/Working Landscape and Natural Resources designations, it is assumed that 35 percent of the acreage designated in this land use will be developed. Slope was not used as a factor in the methodology for determining building density for land within designated planning areas because the planning areas are generally the historic communities within the county, which were built out of necessity in areas of less slope constraints than found in the rural parts of the county. There are 10,800 acres of buildable vacant land for residential dwelling units within designated Plan Areas.

With the total buildable vacant land/parcels for residential dwelling units calculated (Table 2-3), the County then determined the allowable dwelling units per acre in the following three ways:

1. By the appropriate land use designation density within the planning areas.
2. By the County's General Plan rural density policy of 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres for lands countywide outside of designated planning areas.
3. By allocating one dwelling unit to each private parcel outside the Plan Area within the Natural Resource and Agriculture/Working Landscape designations.

**Table 2-3
Residential Buildable Vacant Land**

	Acres/Parcels		
Countywide, Outside Planning Areas	9,500/1,200		
Within Designated Planning Areas	10,800		

Source: Mariposa County, 2006.

After the densities were determined, the total dwelling unit count was calculated. Within the designated planning areas, 1,200 dwelling units are projected, while outside of planning areas countywide, 3,100 dwelling units are projected. This equates to a net increase of 4,300 dwelling units. The County then applied the dwelling unit net increase to the Mariposa County 2000 U.S. Census average persons per household size (2.37) and then added that number to the existing population total to calculate population at build-out.

Table 2-4 summarizes the build-out projections for the 2005 General Plan resulting in a population of 28,000 persons.

**Table 2-4
Summary of Build-Out
Mariposa County 2005 General Plan**

General Plan	Dwelling Units	Population
Existing Total	8,991 ¹	17,803 ²
Net Increase	4,300	10,200
Build-out Total	13,300	28,000
Persons Per Household⁴	2.37	

Source: U.S. Census and Mariposa County, 2006.

¹U.S. Census, 2002.

²U.S. Census Estimate, 2003.

³Rounded.

⁴U.S. Census, 2000.

The California Department of Finance (DOF) Demographic Research Unit prepares population projections for the State and is designated as the single official source of demographic data for the State of California planning and budgeting. The most recent population projections released by DOF (May 2004) for California and its counties, from years 2010 through 2050, estimates the following populations for Mariposa County.

2010	2020	2030	2040	2050
18,608	20,607	22,435	23,979	25,456

These DOF estimates project a growth rate for Mariposa County at or below 10 percent per decade. This estimate of growth mirrors the conditions that have occurred between 2000 and 2005 where on an annual basis Mariposa County averaged a 1 percent growth rate, which is less than other rural counties such as Calaveras (1.8 percent), El Dorado (1.7 percent), and Tuolumne (2.9 percent) or surrounding counties such as Fresno (2.0 percent), Madera (3.0 percent), and Merced (2.6 percent). Since the 2000 Census was released, the DOF reports that Mariposa’s population has increased by 861 persons, estimating a January 1, 2005 population of 17,991. On a statewide comparison, Mariposa County is projected to have a slower growth scenario than California, which has a projected annual growth rate of 1.5 percent.

2.3 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The areas of controversy identified during development of the General Plan include:

- requirements for new subdivisions to be approved only if located on a fully-improved road, has an approved area for on-site sewage disposal systems, and has an approved water supply. Parcels to be served by wells also require a disclaimer as part of the sales documents;
- environmental protection policies regarded by some as being overly aggressive;

- policies that may require private property improvements/actions in excess of state-required minimums; and
- lack of environmental focus and the appearance of lack of environmental protection measures.
- Status of historic parcels
- Plan Area size
- Interim land use designations within Plan Areas
- Parcel size outside Plan Areas, 5 acres vs. 2.5 acres
- Agriculture protection
- Environmentally superior alternative
- Split parcel design
- Native American consultation

2.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126) require that an EIR describe and evaluate alternatives to the project or to the location of the project, which could eliminate significant adverse impacts of the project or reduce them to a level of insignificance. In addition to the project, the proposed General Plan, the following alternatives are evaluated in the CEQA Considerations Section of this EIR (see Section 5.6).

- *Alternative 1: No Project.* This “No Project” alternative would result in the continued implementation of the existing County’s General Plan to build-out. Build-out under this alternative would result in a population of approximately 87,000 persons.
- *Alternative 2: Existing Conditions.* This alternative would result in no new development in the County except for those projects in which permits have already been issued. This would result in a population of approximately 20,000 persons.
- *Alternative 3: Draft General Plan October 2006, the Enhanced Alternative.* In recognition of the ability of the County to implement the proposed General Plan policies within the planning period based on the limitations of existing and forecasted County resources (i.e., staff availability and County funding), the proposed General Plan has both mandatory and discretionary policies. Mandatory policies use the words “shall, must, or will,” which means that the directives or requirements are mandatory and may not be waived or modified. Discretionary policies use the words “should, may, or can,” which means that the directives or requirements are permissive or selective and are imposed at the option of the decision-maker. Alternative 3 converts the discretionary September 2005 Draft General Plan policies into mandatory policies resulting in enhanced environmental protection. This alternative would result in a population of approximately 39,000 persons.
- *Alternative 4: “Suburbanization” Alternative.* This alternative would provide for the conversion of agricultural land to expand the Catheys Valley Plan Area and Hornitos Plan Area to enable the construction of tract housing to serve population growth taking place primarily in Merced County, commuting to destinations outside Mariposa County. This alternative would result in a population of up to approximately 100,000 persons.

- *Environmentally Superior Alternative.* CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified. In general, the environmentally superior alternative as defined by CEQA is supposed to minimize adverse impacts that could result from the project. The alternatives discussed above may be considered environmentally superior in some respects, but generally involve other trade-offs. Of the alternatives considered, the existing conditions alternative does not create any new impacts. Therefore, it is environmentally superior to a project that proposes to change existing conditions.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, if the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives that meets the project objectives; this would be the Project *Draft General Plan November 2006 Rural Character Protection*.

Table 2-5 provides a comparison of the goals, policies and implementation measures of the Draft General Plan October 2006 Alternative, Alternative 4 Suburbanization, and the project, Draft General Plan November 2006 - Rural Character Protection.

**Table 2-5
General Plan Alternatives**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Land Use Designations		
Ag/Working Landscape: 426,200 ac	Ag/Working Landscape: 370,000 ac	Ag/Working Landscape: 426,200 ac
Natural Resources: 116,700 ac	Natural Resources: 131,200 ac	Natural Resources: 116,700 ac
Residential: 86,700 ac	Residential: 93,700 ac	Residential: 86,700 ac
Rural Economic: 180 ac	Rural Economic: 60 ac	Rural Economic: 180 ac
Plan Areas: 62,200 ac	Plan Areas: 97,000 ac	Plan Areas: 62,200 ac
Population Forecast		
Same as Project	Same as Project	2006 by CA Dept of Finance: 18,216
Same as Project	Same as Project	2050 by CA Dept of Finance: 25,456
Same as Project	Same as Project	CA DOF Annual Growth Rate: 0.9 %
Build-out at undetermined date: 39,000	100,000	Build-out at undetermined date: 28,000
General Plan Administration		
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 4-1: The General Plan is to be the prevailing document defining the Board of Supervisors Planning policy for the County of Mariposa.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 4-1a: Interpreting Board of Supervisors' policy in the General Plan shall follow the direction of the guiding principles.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation 4-1a(1): Conformance with guiding principles is to be used as the foundation for interpreting General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation 4-1a(2): When a conflict exists between the General Plan and an enacted ordinance, regulation, or a policy of the Board of Supervisors, the General Plan shall be the prevailing language. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 4-1b: Interpretation of the Plan is the responsibility of the Planning Agency of the County of Mariposa.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 4-1b(1): The Planning Agency of Mariposa County is authorized to utilize appropriate judgment in determining the meaning of the General Plan policy. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 4-1b(2): The Director of Public Works shall be the County official empowered to define road systems consistent with the current and future transportation patterns as needed for implementation of the General Plan. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 4-2: The General Plan is to be reviewed and updated on a regularly scheduled basis.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 4-2a: Maintaining a regularly updated Plan ensures its ongoing use in the decision-making process.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 4-2a(1): Mariposa Planning shall review and recommend changes to the General Plan as a part of its annual report on Planning in the County of Mariposa. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 4-2a(2): Mariposa County’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) shall be consistent with the General Plan. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 4-3: General Plan amendments are to be regularly scheduled to better serve constituents.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 4-3a: General Plan amendments shall be scheduled on a regular basis every year.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 4-3a(1): The Mariposa County Planning Department will report to the Board of Supervisors on the need for General Plan amendments at the beginning of each year. The Board of Supervisors will schedule a meeting to consider, as appropriate, General Plan amendments hearing dates for the public and general use. Per state law, the Board of Supervisors can amend the General Plan no more than four times per year. Timing: Short-term

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 4-3a(2): The fourth General Plan amendment hearing shall be held for the use of the Board of Supervisors to adopt updates and modifications to the General Plan as generated by the Annual Review. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 4-4: Mariposa County should not enforce, unless required to do so by law, third party land use conditions and regulations.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 4-4a: In implementing General Plan land use requirements the County may deem the failure to respond by any state or federal agency as “no comment,” unless otherwise required by law or as necessary to protect public health and safety.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 4-4a(1): The Board of Supervisors will develop a resolution to implement the policy regarding third party agency responses. Timing: Short-term
Land Use	Land Use	Land Use
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 5-1: Maintain the rural character of Mariposa County.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-1a: New development shall be in keeping with the County’s rural character.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-1a(1): Rural character for each of the planning areas is to be defined by Area Plans. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-1a(2): Land development regulations should respect the diversity of rural lifestyles allowing the right to use one's property. Timing: Short-term
Implementation Measure 5-1a(3): Land development regulations should define thresholds within which uses are complementary to the concept of rural character as defined by the General Plan and in regulations associated with the Area Plans.	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-1a(3): Land development regulations shall define thresholds within which uses are complementary to the concept of rural character as defined by the General Plan and in regulations associated with the Area Plans. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Goal 5-2: Create land use density and development patterns.	Goal 5-2: Create land use density and development patterns to manage growth in patterns avoiding sprawl.
Same as Project	Policy 5-2a: Encourage that development occur first where services are located.	Policy 5-2a: Ensure that development shall occur first where services are located.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-2a(1): Development shall grow outward from Planning Areas and Residential Areas with available services. Timing: Review standard

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-2a(2): Establish land development regulations defining permitted uses and establishing standards for close-to-services development. Timing: Short-term
		Implementation Measure 5-2a(3) The County shall prevent premature urbanization of the planning study area of the Mariposa Town Planning Area until the Mariposa Town Plan is updated. Timing: Review standard
		Implementation Measure 5-2a(4) No urban expansion shall occur within the Mariposa Town Plan Study Area unless water and sewage disposal are available from a centrally coordinated and managed system. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 5-3: Integrate transportation and land use decisions to achieve the County’s managed growth objectives.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-3a: New subdivisions and lands created for commercial and industrial purposes shall have direct access to maintained roads.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Implementation Measure 5-3a(1): Prior to the consideration of an application to change a land use classification into a non-residential land use classification, the subject property shall front on or shall have direct access to a maintained road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a prerequisite of the application and shall not replace any project-specific conditions that may be required. • A paved maintained road requirement shall not be imposed when the requested land use classification is “Agriculture/Working Landscape” or “Natural Resources” <p>Timing: Review standard</p>
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Implementation Measure 5-3a(2): Prior to consideration of a change of zoning district from residential into a commercial or industrial zoning district, the subject property shall be found to be located on a maintained road.</p> <p>Timing: Review standard</p>
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Implementation Measure 5-3a(3): No subdivision shall be approved unless it is found that there is adequate road capacity to serve the new traffic.</p> <p>Timing: Review standard</p>

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-3b: All subdivision roads shall be maintained roads.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-3b(1): No subdivision shall be approved unless a mandatory contribution road maintenance mechanism is created for roads within the subdivision that are not within the County-maintained road system. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 5-4: Designate land areas and establish siting criteria to enhance economic opportunities.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-4a: Cluster commercial and service development in Planning Areas and Rural Economic land use classifications.
Implementation Measure 5-4a(1): Commercial, healthcare, financial, and other service businesses intended to serve the greater County population, a regional or greater customer base, should be encouraged only within Town Planning Areas.	Same as Draft General Plan October 2006.	Implementation Measure 5-4a(1): Commercial, healthcare, financial, and other service businesses intended to serve the greater County population, a regional or greater customer base, shall be located only within Town Planning Areas. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-4a(2): Commercial, healthcare, financial, and other service businesses intended to serve the neighborhood needs may be located in Planning Areas and in the Rural Economic land use classification. Timing: Review standard

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-4a(3): All community plans shall include land area to accommodate local rural home industries that out-grow their home-based location. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-4b: Businesses, services, and industries need properly classified site on which to grow.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-4b(1): Zoning shall include provisions to include zoning districts with flexible standards for defining business and industry uses in a changing economy. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-4b(2): Establish provisions to accommodate businesses in the home consistent with the purpose of the land use classifications. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-4c: Establish siting criteria to provide areas for visitor recreation opportunities.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-4c(1): Accommodate appropriate siting and development standards for recreation and resort uses within the County. Timing: Short-term

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
		<p>Implementation Measure 5-4c(2): Standards shall be included that protect visual character related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • viewsheds; • structure design, landscaping and scenic environment; • landform grading; • site development; and • lighting. <p>Timing: Short-term</p>
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 5-5: Designate land areas to maintain the County’s agricultural/working landscape.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-5a: Maintenance of the agricultural/working landscape shall recognize the economic use of these lands, as well as their scenic and open space functions.
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Implementation Measure 5-5a(1): The Land Use element shall identify lands within which the economic uses for the production, extraction, or harvesting of food, fiber, timber, and minerals shall be the primary purpose.</p> <p>Timing: Short-term</p>
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 5-6: Designate land areas and establish siting criteria for the management of natural resources.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-6a: Managing natural resources shall allow a balance of uses.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-6a(1): The Land Use element shall identify lands within which the management of natural resources shall be the primary purpose. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 5-7: Designate land areas and establish siting criteria for public facilities to support current and future populations.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-7a: Public facilities and services may be sited in all General Plan land use classifications with due consideration for area-specific issues.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-7a(1): Establish siting and development criteria for public facilities and sites. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 5-8: Create collaborative planning efforts.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-8a: Establish ongoing collaborative and cooperative planning relationships.
Implementation Measure 5-8a(1): The Board of Supervisors should initiate discussions with representatives from public agencies to establish a formal collaborative cooperation and planning process.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 5-8a(1): The Board of Supervisors shall initiate discussions with representatives from public agencies to establish a formal collaborative cooperation and planning process. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 5-9: Maintain rural densities for residential development outside planning areas.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-9a: One house per five acres is the County’s rural density.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-9a(1): Outside Planning Areas, the maximum allowable density for residential development shall be one dwelling unit per five acres. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 5-10: Require new subdivisions to be “Ready to Build.”
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-10a: New subdivisions (minor and major) shall be required to have necessary infrastructure to enable all parcels to be “Ready to Build.”
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 5-10a(1): Require that infrastructure for new subdivisions meet the General Plan’s requirements for ready to build parcels. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 5-11: Permit legally existing nonconformities to continue use and operation.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 5-11a: Legally existing nonconformities may continue.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Implementation Measures 5-11a(1): No implementation of the General Plan shall be enacted to force the amortization, closure, and relocation of any legally existing nonconformity-except signs and/or billboards.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measures 5-11a(1): No implementation of the General Plan shall be enacted to force the amortization, closure, and relocation of any legally existing nonconformity-except signs and/or billboards and major transient rental management activities in the rural portions of Yosemite West. Timing: Short-term
		Goal 5-12: Protect significant timberlands and provide for sustainable management and harvesting of timber resources.
		Policy 5-12a: Protect significant timberland from conversion to non-timber related uses.
		Implementation Measure 5-12a(1): Use the Timber Preserve zoning district within the Agricultural/Working Landscape and Natural Resource land use classifications to limit development in areas of identified potential timber resources. Timing: Short-term
Economic Development	Economic Development	Economic Development
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 6-1: Pursue sustainable economic growth.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 6-1a: Create and maintain an economic development function as a part of County Government.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 6-1a(1): The County Administrative Officer will hire an Economic Development Coordinator within the County Government. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 6-1b: Adopt a long-term strategic plan for diversifying and strengthening the economy with an active public-private partnership.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 6-1b(1): The Board of Supervisors should adopt an ongoing Economic Development Strategic Plan, including an assessment of assets, definition of target markets, specific implementation activities, assigned responsibilities, measurable objectives, and metrics to measure progress. The plan should contain provisions for destination resorts and hotel facility development. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 6-1b(2): On an annual basis, the Board of Supervisors shall review accomplishments of Economic Development Strategic Plan. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 6-2: Position the County to capture economic development opportunities through brand identification.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 6-2a: Establish a Mariposa County brand based upon the County’s strategic characteristics and unique assets.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 6-2a(1): The County should develop a clearly defined Mariposa County brand and supporting marketing program. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 6-2a(2): The County shall implement the marketing program, successfully establishing the brand within target economic markets. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 6-3: Expand job opportunities, increase personal income, and strengthen the Mariposa County economy through economic diversification.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 6-3a: Promote programs strengthening and retaining existing County businesses, creating new businesses, and providing an attractive environment for relocating appropriate businesses.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 6-3a(1): The County Economic Development Strategic Plan should include a proactive business retention and growth program to be implemented during the short-term planning period. Timing: Intermediate-term

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 6-3b: Increase the total funding available for economic diversification by improving access to capital.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 6-3b(1): The County should support programs to assist in the acquisition and administration of grants as part of its economic development function. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 6-3b(2): As part of the business retention and attraction program, the County should establish working relationships with local and regional financial institutions to serve as potential sources of financing for establishing and expanding businesses in the County. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 6-4: Strengthen and diversify the Mariposa County economy by connecting and capitalizing on economic opportunities in the region.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 6-4a: Improve the ability to connect business in Mariposa with business in the region.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 6-4a(1): Meet with leaders from telecommunication companies serving the County to bring high-speed telecommunications to Mariposa County Timing: Intermediate-term

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 6-4b: Utilize the development of the University of California at Merced campus as a stimulus for economic development in the County.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 6-4b(1): Incorporate an assessment of potential businesses created by the University of California at Merced in the County’s Economic Development Strategic Plan. Timing: Intermediate-term
Arts and Culture	Arts and Culture	Arts and Culture
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 7-1: Position the County to act as a catalyst for the arts in the community.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 7-1a: Diverse community members represent the Board on issues associated with the arts in the County.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 7-1a(1): Support the Mariposa County Arts Council in advising the Board on the arts. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 7-2: Broaden support for and recognition of the arts as an important aspect of County character and economy through the development of programs and partnerships.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 7-2a: Increase public awareness of and support for the arts as an integral part of life in the County.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 7-2a(1): The County should support community-based programs that increase awareness of the arts. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 7-2b: To enhance economic return to the community, the County participates in arts and culture programs.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 7-2b(1): The County should include the arts in its ongoing marketing and promotion programs. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 7-2c: The arts are part of the County’s economic development strategic planning.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 7-2c(1): Integrate the arts as part of the County’s Economic Development Strategic Plan. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 7-2d: Non-commercial public displays of art are used to enhance community character.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 7-2d(1): The Planning Commission and the Mariposa County Arts Council may collaborate to prepare an ordinance addressing the review process, standards, and guidelines for public displays of art in County facilities. Timing: Intermediate-term

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Circulation, Infrastructure, Services	Circulation, Infrastructure, Services	Circulation, Infrastructure, Services
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 9-1: All development shall have safe and adequate access.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-1a: Level of Service (LOS) shall be used as a measure of capacity for major collector and arterial roads.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-1a(1): A publicly-maintained road with an LOS of “A” through “D” shall be deemed to have adequate capacity to serve the needs of the road systems. Timing: Review standard

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
		<p>Implementation Measure 9-1a(2): In order to facilitate provision of needed long-range (2015-2025) improvements to state highways serving Mariposa County, and particularly to those state routes where projected capacity would be less than LOS “D,” the County shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare and implement a program to evaluate Development Impact Fees for state highway intersection facilities needed to adequately service new growth. Such local funding would ensure the improvements are accomplished in the needed timeframe and would substantially benefit the economic development of the County. • Maintain a close working partnership with the State to solve state highway capacity deficiencies and funding limitations. • Monitor State activities in responding to the long-term transportation needs in the County and provide input to the state concerning the priorities for state highway improvements based on capacity below LOS standards, including timing of long-term Project Study Reports (PSR) for priority projects and their inclusion in the STIP in the needed timeframe. <p>Timing: Short-term</p>

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-1b: Road capacity shall be the basis for determining the adequacy of access for all new development within the County. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-1b(1): The County should define the capacity of all roads. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-1c: Roads shall have adequate capacity to serve respective road needs.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-1c(1): The density of land for development purposes within an area shall be based on the capacity of the road divided by the average daily traffic of the permitted uses. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-1c(2): A traffic study prepared by a professional appropriately licensed in the State of California shall be required if traffic calculations show that the proposed project will significantly increase traffic volumes. Timing: Review standard
		Implementation Measure 9-1c(3): The capacity of a county road must be assessed for its capability to meet existing and new uses when the aggregate potential development will increase the utilization of the road by more than 25%. Timing: Review standard

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-1d: Road Improvement requirements shall be based on road capacity.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-1d(1): No subdivision or discretionary project shall be approved if the traffic generated by the proposed project will exceed the capacity of the road systems which provide access from the nearest County major collector or State highway unless mitigation is required. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-1e: Adopt comprehensive standards for all County roadways.

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
<p>Implementation Measure 9-1e(1): The County should incorporate standards and specifications applicable to roads under County jurisdiction, which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requirement that all roads serving road systems shall have an all-weather surface, • all new roads shall be constructed to fire safe standards, • all new non-County maintained roads shall be contained within mandatory road maintenance associations or zones of benefit: • all road construction shall be inspected and approved by the Public Works Department, and • - road circulation within a system shall be designed to be interconnecting and cul-de-sac or dead-end roads shall be designed to be safe. 	<p>Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan</p>	<p>Implementation Measure 9-1e(1): The County shall incorporate standards and specifications applicable to roads under County jurisdiction, which will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requirement that all roads serving road systems shall have an all-weather surface, • all new roads shall be constructed to fire safe standards, • all new non-County maintained roads shall be contained within mandatory road maintenance associations or zones of benefit, • all road construction shall be inspected and approved by the Public Works Department, and • road circulation within a system shall be designed to be interconnecting and cul-de-sac or dead-end roads shall be designed to be safe. <p>Timing: Short-term</p>
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 9-2: Maintain an effective transit system.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-2a: Implement the County’s transit plan.
<p>Implementation Measure 9-2a(1): The County should implement the Transit Plan.</p>	<p>Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan</p>	<p>Implementation Measure 9-2a(1): The County shall implement the Transit Plan.</p> <p>Timing: Short-term</p>

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-2a(2): Annually report on implementation of the Transit Plan. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-2a(3): Update the transit plan concurrently with the next scheduled update of the Regional Transportation Plan. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 9-3: Create a bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian system for recreation and transportation use.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-3a: Adopt and implement the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Equestrian Facilities Plan.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-3a(1): The County should adopt and implement the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Equestrian Facilities Plan. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-3a(2): The County shall update the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Equestrian Plan to create a comprehensive system of transportation and recreation trails. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 9-4: Maximize the Yosemite-Mariposa Airport as an economic asset.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-4a: Improve and expand the airport.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Implementation Measure 9-4a(1): The County should continue systematic implementation of the Airport Master Plan.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 9-4a(1): The County shall continue systematic implementation of the Airport Master Plan. Timing: Ongoing
Policy 9-4b: Coordinate development permit decisions with the Airport Land Use Plan.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Policy 9-4b: Shall coordinate development permit decisions with the Airport Land Use Plan.
Implementation Measure 9-4b(1): No projects should be approved within the Airport Land Use Planning Area unless consistent with the Plan.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 9-4b(1): No projects shall be approved within the Airport Land Use Planning Area unless consistent with the Plan. Timing: Review standard
Goal 9-5: Provide adequate water and wastewater services to properties in the County.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Goal 9-5: Adequate water and wastewater services shall be provided to properties in the County.
Policy 9-5a: New projects and subdivisions should be served by basic water and wastewater infrastructure.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Policy 9-5a: New projects and subdivisions shall be served by basic water and wastewater infrastructure.
Implementation Measure 9-5a(1): No project should be approved unless it is shown to have access to an approved source for wastewater treatment and disposal and a potable water supply meeting health department requirements.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 9-5a(1): No project shall be approved unless it is shown to have access to an approved source for wastewater treatment and disposal and a potable water supply meeting Health Department requirements. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 9-6: Provide adequate solid waste disposal.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-6a: Increase waste disposal facility life.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-6a(1): Design, permit, and construct a co-composting facility. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 9-7: Collaborate with the Mariposa County Unified School District for facilities.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-7a: Work with the school district on siting facilities.
Implementation Measure 9-7a(1): The Board of Supervisors should meet periodically with the Board of Trustees for the school district to coordinate capital facility planning.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 9-7a(1): The Board of Supervisors shall meet periodically with the Board of Trustees for the school district to coordinate capital facility planning. Timing: Ongoing
Implementation Measure 9-7a(2): County Staff should work with school district administration to share information and assist in facilities development.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 9-7a(2): County Staff shall work with school district administration to share information and assist in facilities development. Timing: Ongoing

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
		Implementation Measure 9-7a(3): The County will cooperate with the MUSD, to the extent feasible and permitted by state law, to explore methods for securing adequate funding of new school facilities, which may include the development of local funding mechanisms as well as the utilization of state funds when available. For any project or subdivision where the MUSD determines that adequate school facilities are not available to serve the proposed development, the County will work with the MUSD in securing project-sponsored mitigation to the extent permitted by state law. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 9-8: Coordinate private utility services to meet County economic needs.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-8a: The County should share information and plans with private utilities to coordinate service delivery.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-8a(1): County Staff should maintain technical and planning liaison with private utilities to ensure appropriate infrastructure accomplishing economic development goals. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 9-9: Maintain quality emergency service delivery.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 9-9a: Define acceptable service standards and create a comprehensive plan to attain and maintain service delivery.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-9a(1): Prepare an emergency services plan. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 9-9a(2): Implement the emergency services plan. Timing: Ongoing
Agriculture	Agriculture	Agriculture
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 10-1: Create a support staff for agriculture providing assistance and innovation for agricultural activities.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 10-1a: Support the agriculture industry through the Agriculture Commissioner's office.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 10-1a(1): The Board of Supervisors should maintain a full-time agriculture commissioner and provide support within budgetary and staff constraints. Timing: Intermediate-term
Policy 10-1b: Collaborate with landowners, federal agencies, state agencies, universities, stakeholders and community-based organizations for continued agricultural preservation.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Policy 10-1b: The County shall collaborate with landowners, federal agencies, state agencies, universities, stakeholders and community-based organizations for continued agricultural preservation.

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Implementation Measure 10-1b(1): The Agricultural Advisory Committee should expand its role to provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on all agriculturally-related issues and resources.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 10-1b(1): The Agricultural Advisory Committee shall expand its role to provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on all agriculturally-related issues and resources. Timing: Ongoing
Implementation Measure 10-1b(2): Coordinate with the Mariposa Unified School District to enhance the District’s agricultural educational programs, including its Rural Challenge, Future Farmers of America (FFA), or other similar programs.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 10-1b(2): The County shall coordinate with the Mariposa Unified School District to enhance the District’s agricultural educational programs, including its Rural Challenge, Future Farmers of America (FFA), or other similar programs. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 10-1c: Maintain uses compatible with agriculture in the Agriculture/Working Landscape land use classification.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 10-1c(1): Clearly define uses compatible with agriculture Timing: Short-term.
Same as Project		Goal 10-2: Avoid loss of agriculture lands in the Agriculture/Working Landscape land use classification to maintain rural character.
Same as Project		Policy 10-2a: Agriculture lands should be retained.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project		<p>Implementation Measure 10-2a(1): Areas of the General Plan classified as Agriculture/Working Landscape and proposed for reclassification to a Residential, Planning Area, or Natural Resource land use classification will be reviewed against the following criteria. No land within the Agriculture/Working Landscape land use classification shall be changed to a Residential, Planning Area, or Natural Resource land use classification unless the Board of Supervisors adopts all of the following findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject property is not within an area in which the majority of the surrounding parcels are currently being used or historically have been used for agriculture, timber, or mineral purposes. • The soils, water rights, topography, terrain, and location are not suitable as an economic production unit of sufficient quality for commercial agricultural production. • There are no other lands within the proposed land use classification available for the proposed or similar project. • The characteristics and size of the subject properties make it unsuitable for open space, conservation easements, or other preservation opportunities which further implement the goals and policies of the General Plan.
		<p>Page 2-39</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject property has not been

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project		Implementation Measure 10-2a(2): Lot line adjustments in the Agriculture/Working Landscape land use classification, including Williamson Act contracted parcels, shall result in parcels which are in compliance with the underlying land use designation, including minimum parcel size. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 10-2a(3): Standards shall be developed for issuance of development permits for substandard size parcels under Williamson Act contract. Timing: Short-term
		Implementation Measure 10-2a(4): Develop criteria for transfers of lands within the Agriculture/Working Landscape land use designation for lands within other land use designations which results in no net loss of like kind of agricultural lands (type and quality) and that demonstrates a benefit to agricultural lands. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 10-3: Preserve agricultural economic viability to the greatest extent possible.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 10-3a: Collaborate with the Mariposa County Farm Bureau, agricultural interests, institutions, agencies, and groups to devise strategies defining resource stewardship.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 10-3a(1): The Agriculture Commissioner and Agricultural Advisory Committee should create a document identifying successful practices used in the County. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 10-3a(2): The County shall maintain a commitment to programs for invasive species eradication. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project		Policy 10-3b: Maintain our agricultural resources to diversify the local economy.
Same as Project		Implementation Measure 10-3b(1): Develop and implement a program cataloguing sources of funding and resources providing technical and economic assistance for agriculture stewardship. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 10-4: Preserve heritage crop varieties.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 10-4a: Establish preservation strategy for local heritage crop varieties.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure: 10-4a(1): The agricultural resources program should include support for identifying a market for heritage crop varieties. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 10-5: Encourage the expansion of the agricultural economy.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Policy 10-5a: Identify adaptive uses of agricultural properties with a discretionary review.	Policy 10-5a: Identify adaptive uses of agricultural properties.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 10-5a(1): Accommodate agritourism uses through changes in Agriculture zones. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 10-5b: Develop and implement strategies to enhance the agricultural economy.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 10-5b(1): The Economic Development Strategic Plan should include strategies for agritourism. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 10-5b(2): Coordinate with the private sector to implement an economic development strategy for agriculture. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project		Goal 10-6: Preserve agriculture lands to maintain County character.
Same as Project		Policy 10-6a: Maintain viability of agriculture lands when historic parcels are discovered.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project		Implementation Measure 10-6a(1): Prohibit the construction of residences on parcels that are subject to a Williamson Act contract unless they comply with the terms of a Williamson Act contract. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 10-6a(2): Review enforcement of Williamson Act provisions requiring onsite residents to be actively performing qualifying agricultural activities on all contracted property, including historic parcels, and require one Williamson Act contract for each parcel or for each group of contiguous parcels that are owned and managed as one unit. Timing: Short-term
Conservation and Open Space	Conservation and Open Space	Conservation and Open Space
Same as Project		Goal 11-1: Conserve the natural and scenic resources, and open space lands to protect and enhance the County’s quality of life and character ensuring a viable economy.
Same as Project		Policy 11-1a: Conserve natural and scenic resources through County programs and development standards.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Implementation Measure 11-1a(1): Establish guidelines to ensure development complementary to the scenic aspects of the County’s rural character.		Implementation Measure 11-1a(1): The County shall establish guidelines to ensure development complementary to the scenic aspects of the County’s rural character. Timing: Short-term
Implementation Measure 11-1a(2): Develop subdivision design standards for placement of structures on ridgelines and open hillsides.		Implementation Measure 11-1a(2): The County shall develop subdivision design standards for placement of structures on ridgelines and open hillsides. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-1a(3): Develop flexible site development and clustering to conserve designated scenic routes, views, and viewsheds. Timing: Short-term
		Implementation Measure 11-1a(4): The County shall develop guidelines for non-single family development within County highway corridors to preserve scenic resources. The guidelines will be developed into a scenic views plan for the preservation of visual quality along the County’s highways. The plan will identify resources, views, and programs, while protecting the rights of property owners. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 11-1b: Collaborate with other public and private agencies for conservation management plans and programs.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-1b(1): The County should participate in conservation management planning with Federal and State and other public and private agencies. Timing: Ongoing
		Policy 11-1c: Implement standards that minimize impacts on and/or improve air quality.
		Implementation Measure 11-1c(1): The County will implement Federal and State air quality regulations to minimize air quality impacts and improve air quality. Timing: Review standard
		Implementation Measure 11-1c(2): Establish land use patterns that minimize impacts to air quality. Timing: Short-term

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
		<p>Implementation Measure 11-1c(3): Implement a program that minimizes impacts on and/or improves air quality that include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage maximized solar access where feasible and consistent with the maintenance of scenic values, in new subdivision designs to optimize energy efficiency; and • Road improvement projects such as paving unpaved roads which improve air quality. <p>Timing: Intermediate-term</p>

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
		<p>Implementation Measure 11-1c(4): The County shall cooperate with the Air Pollution Control District (APCD), or successor agency, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with local public utility providers, and the private sector to encourage the development and implementation of educational and incentive programs to encourage energy conservation, house weatherization, and solar energy use; • Work with the Mariposa County Department of Public Works and homeowner associations to encourage the development and implementation of educational and incentive programs for composting, mulching, grinding, cogeneration, feedstocks, and chipping in lieu of outdoor burning; • Work with appropriate agencies to develop programs to maximize the participation of employers in employer-operated van pool and/or ride sharing for employees and mass transit service for both employers and customers/visitors; and • Work with the school districts to replace existing buses with less polluting models. <p>Timing: Ongoing</p>

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
		Policy 11-1d: Ensure that light sources in new development are compatible with rural character and that the light sources do not produce glare that interferes with vision.
		Implementation Measure 11-1d(1): Include as part of the comprehensive development standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lighting standards established by the International Dark Sky Association; and • require that building materials have a low reflective index. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 11-2: Protect and manage the use of Mariposa County’s limited water resources.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 11-2a: Conserve water to accommodate County growth and sustainable agriculture.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-2a(1): Implement standards for water conservation that are consistent with State guidelines, including requirements for the installation and use of low-flow plumbing fixtures in all new construction, and for the use of drip irrigation systems and drought-tolerant or low water using landscaping (including retention of existing native plant material) in all multi-family, commercial, resort, industrial and public developments. Timing: Short-term

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-2a(2): Cooperate with the Mariposa Public Utility District and other wastewater generators in implementing programs for reuse of treated wastewater. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-2a(3): Cooperate with the domestic water system operators and public water purveyors in implementing programs to eliminate water loss due to leakage in pipes, ditches or other conveyance facilities. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 11-2b: Preserve surface and sub-surface water quality.
Implementation Measure 11-2b(1): Review development designs to ensure developments do not discharge contaminated water.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan.	Implementation Measure 11-2b(1): Review development designs to ensure compliance with Federal and State water quality regulations and to ensure that the project does not discharge contaminated water. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 11-2c: Preserve the existing or potential sources of a sustainable water supply.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-2c(1): Outside Town Planning Areas and Rural Centers, maintain low intensities of development in order to protect the capacity of watersheds. Timing: Review standard

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-2c(2): Designate watershed areas of surface water systems where such systems and their proposed watershed areas serve or are capable of serving as a potable water source. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 11-2d: Conserve water sources for water-dependent species and the continuity of riparian communities.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-2d(1): Implement requirements for minimum building and grading setback lines from waters of the State (i.e., perennial streams and environmentally significant wetlands), that are adequate to protect stream, riparian, and wetland resource values. Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-2d(2): Provide for clustering of development that protects and avoid impacts to significant water resources. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 11-3: Provide for the reasonable development of mineral resources.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 11-3a: Mining occurs in balance with adjoining uses and resources compatibility.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-3a(1): Require a conditional use permit for mining activity except where a land use designation permits such use. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-3a(2): Incorporate standards for the exploration, development, and reclamation activities associated with mineral resource projects. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 11-4: Conserve and enhance the ecosystems, plant communities, wildlife habitats, and the inherent diversity of both plant and animal species for the recreational, commercial, aesthetic, and basic ecosystems needs.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 11-4a: Conserve the diversity of native ecosystems, plant communities, wildlife habitat, and plant and animal species in the County.

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
<p>Implementation Measure 11-4a(1): During the intermediate-term planning period, the County will review preparation of a Mariposa County Environmental Conservation Program. The program should include development standards and programs conserving, protecting, and mitigating the impacts on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • significant and sensitive habitat including wildlife migration corridors, • breeding and nesting areas (as seasonally appropriate); • known occurrences of special status animal species; • riparian habitat around bodies of water and along watercourses and seasonal drainages; • known occurrences of special status plant species, and • significant and sensitive plant communities. 	<p style="background-color: #cccccc;">Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan</p>	<p>Implementation Measure 11-4a(1): The County will implement a Mariposa County Environmental Conservation Program. The Program shall include development standards and programs conserving, protecting, and mitigating the impacts on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • significant and sensitive habitat including wildlife migration corridors, • breeding and nesting areas (as seasonally appropriate); • known occurrences of special status animal species; • riparian habitat around bodies of water and along watercourses and seasonal drainages; • known occurrences of special status plant species, and • significant and sensitive plant communities including oak woodlands and heritage trees. <p>Timing: Intermediate-term</p>
<p>Same as Project</p>	<p>Same as Project</p>	<p>Implementation Measure 11-4a(2): Site development and grading review should minimize the removal of native trees and groves of trees.</p> <p>Timing: Review standard</p>

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
		<p>Implementation Measure 11-4a(3): The County shall develop and enforce standards that reduce or eradicate invasive species affecting the agricultural and natural ecosystems.</p> <p>Timing: Short-term</p>
		<p>Implementation Measure 11-4a(4): The County shall publish landscaping guidelines for the use of site-appropriate native plant species.</p> <p>Timing: Intermediate-term</p>
		<p>Implementation Measure 11-4a(5): The County shall utilize collaborative planning efforts to coordinate local efforts to eradicate invasive plant species.</p> <p>Timing: Ongoing</p>

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
		<p>Implementation Measure 11-4a(6): The County shall require site surveys in compliance with Federal and State regulations as part of environmental review to determine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presence or absence of endangered species and their habitat; • The presence or absence of threatened or rare wildlife and plant species and their habitat; • The presence or absence of breeding raptors and migratory birds; • The presence or absence of sensitive native plant communities; • The presence or absence of native wildlife migration or travel corridors; and • The presence or absence of jurisdictional wetland or other waters of the U.S. <p>Timing: Review standard</p>
		<p>Implementation Measure 11-4a(7): The County shall record the data collected from the required site surveys to create a comprehensive map of environmental resources in Mariposa County. The map shall include but not be limited to vegetation communities with associated habitats for sensitive wildlife species.</p> <p>Timing: Ongoing</p>

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
		<p>Implementation Measure 11-4a(8): During project review and environmental analysis, the County shall comply with Federal and State regulations to require measures that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect endangered species and their habitat; • Protect threatened or rare wildlife and plant species and their habitats • Protect breeding raptors and migratory birds; • Protect and avoid to the extent feasible sensitive native plant communities; • Protect and avoid to the extent feasible native wildlife migration or travel corridors; and • Protect and avoid to the extent feasible jurisdictional wetland or other waters of the U.S. <p>Timing: Review standard</p>
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 11-5: Avoid erosion and loss of soils due to development activities.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 11-5a: Minimize impacts of grading activities.

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-5a(1): Review and amend the County Grading Ordinance provisions for erosion control on all development projects. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 11-5a(2): Review and update the provisions of the County Grading Ordinance as needed. Timing: Short-term
Local Recreation	Local Recreation	Local Recreation
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 12-1: Define and achieve local recreation service levels throughout the County to enhance the quality of life.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 12-1a: Define developed-park service levels for neighborhood, regional, and community populations.
Implementation Measure 12-1a(1): The County should ensure parks and recreation facilities are distributed in reasonable proximity to the neighborhood, community, or regional populations they are intended to serve.		Implementation Measure 12-1a(1): The County shall ensure parks and recreation facilities are distributed in reasonable proximity to the neighborhood, community, or regional populations they are intended to serve. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 12-1b: Park and recreation facilities shall be designed for the greatest return on community investment.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 12-1b(1): Parks shall be designed and developed in a manner to reduce long-term operations and maintenance cost. Timing: Review standard
Implementation Measure 12-1b(2): The County should adopt performance standards for maintenance of parks and recreation facilities preventing premature deterioration.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 12-1b(2): The County shall adopt performance standards for maintenance of parks and recreation facilities preventing premature deterioration. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 12-2: Create a parks and recreation strategic plan to respond to citizen needs.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 12-2a: The Public Works Department/Parks and Recreation Division should respond to the diverse needs of neighborhood, community, and regional residents.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 12-2a(1): The Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee shall report annually on the implementation of the Parks and Recreation programs. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 12-3: Create programs to provide a range of recreation opportunities and facilities to meet diverse needs of the County’s population.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 12-3a: The Public Works Department/Parks and Recreation Division should address programs intended to meet special recreation needs. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 12-3a(1): The Parks and Recreation Department should implement youth programs for both “after school” and times of the year when school is not in session.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 12-3a(2): The Public Works Department/Parks and Recreation Division should identify a broad range of recreation opportunities and facilities needed to serve the County’s diverse population. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 12-4: Cooperate with regional agencies to develop a range of recreation opportunities for the County.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 12-4a: Collaborate with local and regional agencies in facility development and programs serving local recreation needs.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 12-4a(1): When other agencies propose to develop park or recreation facilities, the County should participate when a local recreation need can also be served. Timing: Ongoing

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 12-4a(2): The Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee should meet with the School District at least once each fiscal year to learn of school capital facility proposals that may benefit from County participation or partnership. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 12-4a(3): The County should explore with Federal land management agencies issues of mutual concern regarding the effects of agency and County policies on their respective users and resources. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 12-5: Continue funding to maintain Parks and Recreation programs.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 12-5a: Identify funding for financing park and recreation capital improvements, maintenance, and programs
Implementation Measure 12-5a(1): The Parks and Recreation programs should identify short-, intermediate-, and long-term revenue sources.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 12-5a(1): The Parks and Recreation programs shall identify short-, intermediate-, and long-term revenue sources. Timing: Ongoing
Regional Tourism	Regional Tourism	Regional Tourism
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 13-1: Preserve, protect, and enhance regional tourism opportunities and resources.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 13-1a(1): Plan collaboratively with the public land managers for a broad spectrum of regional tourism opportunities.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 13-1a(1): The County shall collaborate with Federal agencies creating multiple use and public education policies supporting regional tourism and protecting public lands. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 13-1a(2): The County shall collaborate with the American Indian Council of Mariposa County creating facilities and opportunities to promote public education of Native American cultural traditions and places. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 13-1b: Maximize public access to public lands consistent with the protection of sensitive natural resources and habitats.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 13-1b(1): The Board of Supervisors should support programs to maintain and increase multiple- use on public land to increase regional tourism opportunities. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 13-2: Increase appreciation of environmental values and lengths of visitor stays through education programs.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 13-2a: Provide easily accessible information about the County’s natural, historic, and scenic attractions.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 13-2a(1): The County should provide ongoing regional tourism programs for residents and visitors defining opportunities for extended side-trips within the County. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 13-3: Increase public access to trails and off-road areas to provide greater opportunities for “in-County” visitor experience.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 13-3a: Work with other land management agencies to establish access routes and trailheads while protecting environmentally sensitive areas. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measures 13-3a(1): The County should collaborate with Federal and State agencies to develop trail-head facilities and other public access points to public lands. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 13-4: Create visitor access to communities and points of interest.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 13-4a: Assist visitors in finding points of interest in the County.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 13-4a(1): Create a coordinated County information program to identify points and routes of interest for regional tourists. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 13-4b: Enhance visitor center facilities and information for distribution.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 13-4b(1): Maintain a visitor center in the Mariposa Town Area designed to provide information about all County visitor assets. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 13-5: Provide job growth and sustain County revenues by enhancing and expanding the visitor-serving sectors of the economy.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 13-5a: Implement active programs designed to increase opportunities for a diverse tourism experience.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Implementation Measure 13-5a(1): In cooperation with the County’s tourism industry, implement a tourism marketing and advertising program using the Mariposa County brand designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase the length of visitor stay within the County, • expand the tourist season into shoulder seasons, and • incorporate special targeted activities for cultural tourism and agri-nature tourism. <p>Timing: Short-term</p>
Historic and Cultural Resources	Historic and Cultural Resources	Historic and Cultural Resources
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 14-1: Determine appropriateness of Certified Local Government Status or alternate program for the County of Mariposa to better serve owners of historic properties.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 14-1a: Evaluate services and funds for owners of historic properties through the Certified Local Government program or alternate program.

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 14-1a(1): The Historic Sites and Records Preservation Committee should be reorganized to meet the requirements for a local Historic Preservation Commission recognized by the Department of Interior. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 14-1a(2): The Planning Director shall be designated the County’s Cultural Resources Coordinator/Historic Preservation Officer. Timing: Ongoing
Implementation Measure 14-1a(3): Retention of historic records should be within the purview of the Historic Sites and Records Preservation Commission.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 14-1a(3): Retention of historic records shall be within the purview of the Historic Sites and Records Preservation Commission. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 14-2: Identify historical resources within the County of historical significance.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 14-2a: Identify historic resources to determine marketing opportunities.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 14-2a(1): Update the County historic sites inventory. Timing: Intermediate-term

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Implementation Measure 14-2a(2): The Board of Supervisors should include qualifying sites and structures on the list of Mariposa County Historic sites.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 14-2a(2): The Board of Supervisors shall include qualifying sites and structures on the list of Mariposa County Historic sites. Timing: Intermediate-term
Implementation Measure 14-2a(3): Analysis of qualifying historic sites and structures should be undertaken in conformance with appropriate standards of the California State Historic Preservation Office and the standards of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 14-2a(3): Analysis of qualifying historic sites and structures shall be undertaken in conformance with appropriate standards of the California State Historic Preservation Office and the standards of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 14-3: Use financial incentives and partnership opportunities to preserve historic and cultural resources.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 14-3a: Attempt to increase the number of historic resources in Mariposa County that are preserved, protected, and/or rehabilitated.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 14-3a(1): Seek options through partnerships with private organizations, local financial institutions, and by the use of Federal and State grants and tax incentives. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 14-4: Utilize the County’s historic sites to increase tourism opportunities.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 14-4a: Development within historic districts shall enhance and improve historic scenery.

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Implementation Measure 14-4a(1): The County should prepare and adopt Historic Design Review Guidelines for use within Districts.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 14-4a(1): The County shall prepare and adopt Historic Design Review Guidelines for use within Districts. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 14-4a(2): Within County-identified historic districts, all exterior construction, renovation, rehabilitation, or restoration shall be subject to design review approval. Timing: Review standard
Implementation Measure 14-4a(3): Demolition of County-identified historic structures should require review from the Historic Sites and Records Preservation Commission.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 14-4a(3): Demolition of County-identified historic structures shall require review from the Historic Sites and Records Preservation Commission. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 14-5: Create historic districts to preserve the County’s historic character and promote tourism.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 14-5a: Identify areas of the County that qualify as historic districts.

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Implementation Measure 14-5a(1): The County, in cooperation with the Historic Sites and Records Preservation Commission and local Planning Advisory Committees, should identify new or expanded historic districts for nomination to the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places. This may include, but not be limited to cemeteries.	Same as October 2006 Draft General Plan	Implementation Measure 14-5a(1): The County, in cooperation with the Historic Sites and Records Preservation Commission and local Planning Advisory Committees, shall identify new or expanded historic districts for nomination to the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places. This may include, but not be limited to, cemeteries. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 14-6: Avoid demolition or destruction of historic and cultural resources.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 14-6a: Seek alternatives to demolition or destruction of historic resources.
Same as Project	Implementation Measure 14-6a(1): Prior to the approval of a demolition permit for any historic site, or structure, the Historic Committee shall review the application pursuant to CEQA and determine whether alternatives to the proposed demolition or destruction shall be required.	Implementation Measure 14-6a(1): Prior to the approval of a demolition permit for any historic site, structure, or cultural place, the Historic Sites and Records Preservation Commission shall review the application pursuant to CEQA and determine whether alternatives to the proposed demolition or destruction shall be required. Timing: Review standard

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 14-6a(2): Prior to the approval of a demolition permit or grading permit for a cultural place the Southern Sierra Miwuk Nation Consultation Committee shall review the application pursuant to CEQA and determine whether alternatives to the proposed demolition or destruction shall be require. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 14-7: Include Native American representatives in discretionary project review.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 14-7a: Encourage cooperation and communication between County officials and the Native American population of Mariposa County.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 14-7a(1): Mariposa County shall invite the participation of representatives of the Native American community in the review of discretionary projects for which there is a likelihood of potential archaeological artifacts and cultural places. Timing: Ongoing
Noise	Noise	Noise
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 15-1: Preserve the quality of life in Mariposa County by controlling noise at its source.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 15-1a: Control noise at its source.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 15.1a(1): A noise ordinance should be considered to define the standards for the County. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 15.1a(2): County development standards shall require means of controlling noise at its source as opposed to imposing mitigation as the means of offsetting noise impacts. Timing: Intermediate-term
		Implementation Measure 15.1a(3): The County shall develop and implement standards that will reduce vibration from construction activities to a level that is less than perceptible at adjacent property lines. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 15-2: Protect County residents from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 15-2a: Siting and construction of facilities intended for noise sensitive uses shall comply with the noise reduction standards of applicable State building codes.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 15-2a(1): The State building standards for the proper insulation of new dwellings for noise reduction shall be enforced. Timing: Review standard

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 15-2b: New projects with extensive noise potential shall incorporate mitigation measures.
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Implementation Measure 15-2b(1): Where proposed non-residential land uses are likely to produce excessive noise levels at existing or planned noise-sensitive uses, an acoustical analysis shall be required as part of the project review process. An acoustical analysis should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be prepared by a person qualified in environmental noise assessment and architectural acoustics, • include representative noise level measurements to adequately describe local conditions, • recommend appropriate mitigation to achieve compliance with the adopted policies and standards, • estimate noise exposure after the prescribed mitigation measures have been implemented, and describe a post-project mitigation measure effectiveness assessment program. <p>Timing: Review standard</p>
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Implementation Measure 15-2b(2): Noise created by new transportation noise sources shall be mitigated.</p> <p>Timing: Review Standard</p>

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Implementation Measure 15-2b(3): The County shall require appropriate noise reduction measures for outdoor public events. Such measures may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preparation of a noise impact analysis by an appropriate licensed professional; • identification of best sound management practices for avoiding impacts; • restrictions on the level of amplification of sound systems; • conditions on the start, finish, and duration of the event; limitations on the number of participants; and a requirement to install temporary noise reduction devices or barriers. <p>Timing: Review standard</p>
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Policy 15-2c: Ensure that new development does not produce noise levels that create an unacceptable noise environment in those existing areas of the County where the noise environment is deemed acceptable, and also in those locations deemed noise sensitive.</p>

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 15-2c(1): The County shall assess development activities and determine whether the Noise Element shall be updated or whether to undertake studies to create noise contours and noise exposure indices. Timing: Intermediate-term
Safety	Safety	Safety
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-1: Enforce development standards lessening fire hazard danger.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-1a: Non-residential development activity shall be within acceptable fire department response time limits and coverage areas; or a development project shall provide its own on-site fire protection facilities and firefighters as approved by the County Fire Department.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-1a(1): Establish appropriate standards for development projects wishing to provide alternative, on-site fire protection services. Timing: Intermediate-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-1b: Establish attainable standards for new subdivisions and development for fire safety.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Implementation Measure 16-1b(1): Enact amendments to the Mariposa County Code to implement fire safe standards. The ordinance(s) shall include the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum construction standards or template (width, grade, and surfacing) for public roads, private roads, and private driveways sufficient for emergency vehicles access. • Requirements for a connecting circulation system within a road system using roads connecting through other parcels or developed secondary routes dedicated for emergency access. • Minimum standards for emergency water supply standards for firefighting purposes. • Standards for siting of flammables. • Signage and address standards providing easy identification of roads, driveways and buildings. • Site design specifications for buildings in locations of extremely high fire danger. <p>Timing: Short-term</p>

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
		<p>Implementation Measure 16-1b(2): Implement the countywide Wildfire Hazard Safety Plan, which includes standards for fire prevention, fuel management, and fire suppression, including but not limited to the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for development in areas with high and very high fuel hazards, including adequate emergency access and water supply; “defensible space” standards; and encourage the use of fire-resistant exterior construction materials, such as fire safe roofing and fire-resistant plants. • Wildland fire management activities such as controlled burning, fuel removal, vegetation management, and firebreaks. • Specific fire protection and prevention requirements for hillside, open space, and rural area development. • Public wildfire safety education through the Mariposa County Fire Safe Council (MFSC) or other appropriate agency or group. • Standards specific to geographic areas in the County based on fire hazard potential. <p>Timing: Intermediate-term</p>

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-1c: All subdivisions and development projects shall conform to adopted fire code and other fire prevention regulations.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-1c(1): Amend, if necessary, the County Subdivision code to ensure formal review of subdivisions by the Fire Agencies. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-2: Utilize the most efficient multi-level fire prevention and protection system.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-2a: Develop and maintain cooperative arrangements with CDF to maximize the efficient deployment of fire prevention and protection resources.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-2a(1): Cooperate with the CDF in providing advice to landowners on vegetation management programs keeping forest fuel values at acceptable levels. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-2b: Support programs to involve and educate County residents in fire prevention.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-2b(1): Continue to work with the Mariposa County Fire Safe Council or other appropriate agency or group as a major avenue for educating residents and coordinating citizen efforts in fire prevention. Timing: Ongoing
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-3: Sustain adequate fire protection service levels.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-3a: Adopt a strategic plan for fire safety.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-3a(1): Adopt a strategic plan for fire safety incorporating the Standards of Cover for the Mariposa County Fire Department identifying current and future fire service areas and standards. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-3a(2): The strategic plan shall identify the long term capital improvements, rolling stock, equipment and supplies, and other major purchase items needed to maintain and improve fire safety. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-3a(3): The strategic plan shall identify thresholds and capital facility needs for each of the existing and future service areas. Timing: Short-term

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-3a(4): Revise and update the “Standards of Cover” and its service area maps. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-3b: Increase emergency response personnel training opportunities.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-3b(1): Enable facilities for “heavy” fire suppression helicopter operations at the Mariposa Yosemite Airport. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-4: Reduce the risk of flood loss to preserve property and save lives.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-4a: Control development in flood hazard areas.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-4b: All new construction in a flood hazard area shall be flood proofed.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Implementation Measure 16-4a and b(1): Adopt a comprehensive County Flood Protection Ordinance that includes at a minimum the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All structures in flood hazard areas are constructed with materials and equipment resistant to flood damage. • All mobile homes shall be anchored by providing over-the-top and frame ties to ground anchors. • All new and replacement water systems shall be designed to prevent infiltration of floodwaters into the system. • On-site sewage disposal systems shall be located to avoid impairment to them or contamination from them during flooding. <p>Timing: Short-term</p>
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-4c: Control development in dam inundation areas.
Same as Project	Same as Project	<p>Implementation Measure 16-4c(1): The update to Title 17, Mariposa County Code, Zoning shall include a dam inundation overlay district.</p> <p>Timing: Intermediate-term</p>
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-5: Minimize the impact of floods on the people and businesses of Mariposa County.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-5a: Ensure adequate capacity is maintained in flood plains and drainage channels to handle flood flows.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-5a(1): Enact an ordinance to require a hydrologic evaluation for subdivisions and development projects located within flood plains and drainage channels to ensure potential flood hazard is minimized. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-5a(2): Subdivision parcel and final maps and building permit site plans shall provide for on-site detention for normal storm water flows in excess of the capacity of natural drainage courses receiving runoff from the development. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-5b: Minimize the loss of access across floodways and in flood hazard areas.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-5b(1): Amend Title 16 of the Mariposa County Code, Subdivisions, to require subdivision parcels and development projects to provide at least one means of vehicular access not crossing a flood hazard area, or be constructed above the maximum flood elevation. Timing: Short-term

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-5c: Water retention facilities shall be constructed to prevent flooding and to ensure that pre-development off- and on-site surface flows are maintained with no net increase.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-5c(1): Enact an ordinance requiring ponds and facilities for retaining water to be designed to prevent downstream flooding. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-6: Preserve the values of floodplains as natural features.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-6a: Retain flood plains within project design in such a way as to ensure that no net change occurs upstream or downstream.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-6a(1): Amend Title 17 of the Mariposa County Code, Zoning, to require flood and drainage channels to be designed into landscaping plans. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-6a(2): Land use maps shall maintain low intensity zoning in floodplain areas. Timing: Short-term
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-7: Protect life and property endangered by landslides and rockfalls.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-7a: Reduce risk of injury or property damage by landslides and rockfalls.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-7b: Avoid development in geologic hazard areas.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-7a and b(1): Site inspections and maps (topographic, soils and geologic) will be used to identify geologic hazard areas (e.g., landslide-prone areas) in the County. The maps will be retained and available in the County Planning Department. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-7a and b(2): The County Building Official will review plans for new construction in geologic hazard areas and will determine whether engineering studies, including structural and soils analyses, are required prior to issuing permits for construction in these areas. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-8: Protect life and property endangered by seismic activity.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-8a: Develop and enforce standards to reduce risk of injury or property damage by seismic activity.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-8a(1): New development projects in or near a seismic risk area (fault zone) or geologic hazard area shall be discouraged or designed to such standards as to minimize or eliminate such risk. Timing: Review standard

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-8b: Avoid seismic dangers for public facility construction.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-8b(1): Public facilities shall be sited to avoid known seismic dangers and shall be constructed to meet seismic safety requirements of the Uniform Building Code. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-9: Engineer and locate development in areas not endangered by secondary seismic effect to protect life and property.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-9a: Develop and enforce standards to reduce risk of injury or property damage by secondary effects of seismic activity.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-9a(1): Review development and subdivision proposals to avoid building sites in areas subject to secondary seismic effects. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-10: Provide a safe airport environment to ensure its success and expansion.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-10a: Implement the Mariposa-Yosemite Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-10a(1): No land development incompatible with the airport land use plan shall be permitted in the airport’s area of influence. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-11: Manage hazardous materials and hazardous waste to prevent unnecessary exposure and risk.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-11a: Maintain the effectiveness of the Comprehensive Hazardous Waste Management Plan.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-11a(1): Enforce the requirements of the County’s Comprehensive Hazardous Waste Management Plan. Timing: Review standard
Same as Project	Same as Project	Goal 16-12: Minimize risks to people and property during emergencies through pre-planning.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Policy 16-12a: Coordinate local and State emergency response efforts.
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-12a(1): Review and update the Mariposa County Emergency Management Plan every five years. Timing: Ongoing

**COUNTY OF MARIPOSA GENERAL PLAN – VOLUME IV
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Draft General Plan October 2006	Alternative 4 Suburbanization	Project Draft General Plan November 2006 (Rural Character Protection)
Same as Project	Same as Project	Implementation Measure 16-12a(2): Undertake full operation emergency situation drills and training periodically. Timing: Ongoing

2.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts identified during the course of this environmental analysis on the proposed General Plan are summarized in this section. This summary groups impacts of similar ranking together, beginning with significant unavoidable impacts, followed by significant impacts that can be mitigated, followed by impacts found to be not significant. This summary is intended as an overview and is to be used in conjunction with a thorough reading of the EIR. A summary of impacts that would occur with build-out under plan alternatives is contained at the end of this section.

While implementation of the General Plan update would have a number of significant impacts, many of the impacts resulting from build-out would be less than significant due to the implementation of proposed policies in the Project, which were designed to address important environmental resources in Mariposa County and to avoid or minimize impacts to these resources.

2.5.1 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The following impacts have been identified as significant and unavoidable. Although mitigation measures are recommended where feasible to help reduce impacts, the following impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level.

2.5.1.1 LAND USE

Impact LU-6. Build-out of the proposed General Plan might impact the County's mineral production industry. This would result in a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Land Use Policy 5-5a and accompanying Implementation Measure 5-5a(1) states the General Plan Land Use Element will identify lands within the Agriculture/Working Landscape land use classification for the primary purpose of production, extraction, or harvesting of food, fiber, timber, and minerals.

Agriculture General Plan Implementation Measure 10-2a(1) establishes findings the Board of Supervisors must adopt in order to convert land in the Agriculture/Working Landscape designation to a Residential, Planning Area, or Natural Resource land use classification.

Conservation and Open Space General Plan Policy 11-3a and Implementation Measures 11-3a(1) and 11-3a(2) provide for reasonable development of mineral resources with standards of use where sitings are compatible with adjoining uses.

Existing residential development exists within the State classified MR-1 gravel resource area, and the proposed Residential land use classification in the draft General Plan would allow residential development that would not be compatible with gravel resource production. The policies provided in the draft General Plan would not necessarily protect the known gravel resources in the County. Therefore, the impact would be significant.

Other Mitigation Measures

No other feasible mitigation measures have been identified. Once committed to non-mineral producing uses, land containing mineral resources cannot be replaced.

2.5.1.2 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

Impact TT-1. Build-out of the proposed General Plan would create adverse vehicular impacts on state highways and county arterial roads. Specifically, levels of service (LOS) would be reduced to level “E” on state highways in the County beyond 2010 with the addition of planned growth. Implementation of highway improvement programs would improve the situation, but the County cannot guarantee implementation of the necessary improvements. This would result in a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Implementation Measure 9-1a(2) requires the preparation and implementation to evaluate Development Impact Fees for state highway facilities, requires a working partnership with the State to solve capacity deficiencies and funding limitations, and requires the monitoring of State activities to respond to long-term transportation needs. The Board of Supervisors has engaged an engineering consulting firm to prepare a long-term Countywide Capital Improvements Program and Impact Fee analysis. The resulting Development Impact Fee program will focus on transportation improvements related to new population growth, and it will also identify needed fire, sheriff, library, parks and administrative facilities.

Implementation Measure 9-1c(3) requires a project to assess the capability to meet existing and new uses when the aggregate potential development increases the utilization of the road by more than 25%.

While the policies increase the likelihood that the needed long-range highway improvements would be accomplished, the County has no control over and cannot commit State funding and thus the potential for significant and unavoidable impacts on state highway system would remain.

Impact TT-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan would create adverse impacts at intersections in the County. Future LOS at the County’s intersections would likely follow the pattern of route segments identified under Impact TT-1 above. Anticipated state highway improvements would provide service at LOS “D” or better, but without the improvements, there could be significant impacts at intersections in the County.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Implementation Measure 9-1a(2) requires the preparation and implementation to evaluate Development Impact Fees for state highway facilities, requires a working partnership with the State to solve capacity deficiencies and funding limitations, and requires the monitoring of State activities to respond to long-term transportation needs. The Board of Supervisors has engaged an engineering consulting firm to prepare a long-term Countywide Capital Improvements Program and Impact Fee analysis. The resulting Development Impact Fee program will focus on transportation improvements related to new population growth, and it will also identify needed fire, sheriff, library, parks and administrative facilities.

Implementation Measure 9-1c(3) requires a project to assess the capability to meet existing and new uses when the aggregate potential development increases the utilization of the road by more than 25%.

With the implementation of Implementation Measure 9-1a(2) Development Impact Fee monies would be available to finance state highway intersection improvements associated with new population growth throughout the County.

These implementation measures increase the likelihood that the needed improvements would be implemented; however, the County does not have jurisdiction over the commitment of state funding for the County's state highways. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

2.5.1.3 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Impact PS-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could create a demand for additional school capacity that cannot be met by existing or planned capacity, which would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Policy 9-7a and its implementation measures provide that the County work with the school districts on siting facilities and assist in development. However, application of this policy would not assure that adequate school facilities would be available to serve future growth. Therefore, the impact would be significant.

Implementation Measure 9-7a(3) requires the County to cooperate with the school districts to secure adequate funding for new school facilities and require project-sponsor mitigation.

The state-mandated impact fees for schools are inadequate to fully mitigate the impacts of new development, and the typical residential development in the County is too small to be able to provide land for school facilities in lieu of fees. Because school funds from all sources are limited and the proposed policy could not assure funds for new facilities and the statutory limits on local governments imposing development fees for education, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

2.5.1.4 AIR QUALITY

Impact AQ-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could create significant impacts to air quality from emissions greater than the listed significance thresholds would remain.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Air quality in the County is managed by the Mariposa County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). Draft General Plan Policies 5-2a, 5-4a, and 5-4b guide growth in a manner that minimizes sprawl and reduces motor vehicle and area source emissions. Policies 5-3a, 5-3b, and 6-4a encourage actions that reduce vehicle miles traveled and associated emissions. Policies 9-1b, 9-1c, 9-1d, 9-2a, and 9-3a encourage more efficient transportation systems and the use of transit, again reducing overall vehicle miles traveled. Policy 11-1c requires the implementation of standards that minimize impacts and/or improve air quality. Implementation Measures 11-1c (1 through 4) acknowledge the County will implement Federal and State air quality regulations, establish land use patterns that minimize air quality impacts, implement programs such as solar access and paving of unpaved roads, and cooperate with the Air Pollution Control District in programs to improve air quality.

These measures would reduce emissions; however, implementation of these policies would not reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

Other Mitigation Measures

Given the unknown future parameters of detailed growth data, specified locations of future urban land uses, detailed mobile and area source emission characteristics, and the specifics of future mitigation measures, the effectiveness of the recommended mitigation measures cannot be quantified with certainty. The potential for significant impacts to air quality from emissions greater than the listed significance thresholds remains.

2.5.2 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The following impacts have been identified as being significant; however, these impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

2.5.2.1 LAND USE

Impact LU-3. The General Plan allows the conversion of Agriculture/Working Landscape lands or prime, unique, or farmland of statewide significance to non-agricultural use. The conversion of these lands to non-agricultural uses would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Land Use Policies 5-1a; 5-2a; and 5-5a, and Agriculture Policies 10-1b; 10-1c; and 10-2a serve to guide growth away from Agriculture/Working Landscape lands to town, community, and special planning areas. Implementation Measure 10-2a(4) requires the County to evaluate a system that allows the conversion of agriculture lands to non-agriculture lands if there is no net loss of like kind of agricultural lands. Goal 10-3, 10-4, and 10-5 with their policies and implementation measures provide for preserving the agricultural economic viability of the region which reduce the pressure to convert agricultural lands to non-agricultural land uses.

Implementation Measure 10-2a(1) allows for the conversion of Agriculture/Working Landscape land to other land use classifications if findings (see implementation measure) are adopted by the Mariposa County Board of Supervisors. The policies and implementation measures do not prohibit conversion of agricultural land and agricultural production. Implementation of the draft General Plan would be a significant impact with the conversion or inducement of prime, unique, or farmland of statewide significance to non-agricultural use.

Other Mitigation Measures

Proposed Mitigation Measure LU-3 should be added to the Agriculture Element of the General Plan to include an implementation measure under Policy 10-2a that prohibits the loss of prime, unique, or farmland of statewide significance.

Impact LU-4. Build-out of the General Plan could result in pressures leading to cancellation or non-renewal of Williamson Act Contracts. This would result in a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Policy 10-6a and Implementation Measure 10-6a(1) prohibits the construction of residences on parcels subject to a Williamson Act contract unless they comply with the terms of the contract.. Implementation Measure 10-6a(2) requires the County to review enforcement of Williamson Act provisions regarding onsite residences.

Williamson Act Land Use Compatibility provisions shall be referenced prior to amending any local Williamson Act policies.

2.5.3 IMPACTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The EIR identified the following impacts, which are considered to have a less than significant impact on the environment. Plan policies in the draft General Plan serve as mitigation. No additional mitigation measures are required.

2.5.3.1 LAND USE

Impact LU-1. Build-out of the proposed General Plan land uses may result in the physical division of an established community. There is a less than significant impact because the General Plan Land Use Map does not indicate any potential for division of established communities.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Implementation of General Plan Land Use Policies and the related implementation measures 5-1a, 5-2a, 5-3a, 5-4a, 5-7a, 5-9a, and 5-10a reduce potential impacts by reinforcing development in established communities. These measures reduce the impact to less than significant.

Impact LU-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could possibly result in conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations of agencies with jurisdiction over the project. Since there are no incorporated cities in the County, there is no consistency issue with city plans, resulting in a less than significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

The General Plan incorporates adopted area plans and the Yosemite National Park General Management Area Plan. In addition, General Plan Policy 16-10a and Implementation Measure 16-10a(1) specifies that no land development incompatible with the Airport Land Use Plan will be permitted within the airport's area of influence. Therefore, less than significant impact is anticipated.

Impact LU-5. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may induce the conversion of private timberlands subject to the California Forest Practice Rules to non-timber growing uses. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Goal 5-12, policy 5-12a and implementation Measure 5-12a(1) protect significant timberlands and provide for sustainable management and harvesting of timber resources. These policies reduce the impact to less than significant.

2.5.3.2 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Impact PH-1. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in a loss of homes occupied by low- or moderate-income households. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Implementation of General Plan Policies 2.1 and 2.2 continues the County's support of the HDCA and provide support services for the provision of low- and moderate-income housing. Other General Plan policies that would improve low- and moderate-income housing situation in the County include Policies 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 4.1, which provide various measures to stimulate the provision of low- and moderate-income housing through density bonuses, uses of mobile and manufactured housing on single family dwelling parcels, and removal of restrictive covenants. Implementation of these policies will reduce impacts to less than significant.

Impact PH-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may result in the net loss of multifamily rental housing through conversion or demolition. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Implementation of General Plan Policies 4.1, 5.2, and 5.3 serve to preserve and increase multifamily housing stock in the County, resulting in an impact that is less than significant.

Impact PH-3. Build-out of the proposed General Plan would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of people that would require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The County has a ready availability of sufficient land for future growth, resulting in a less than significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Additionally, implementation of the housing policies listed under Impacts PH-1 and PH-2 above will assist in ensuring that no displacement of current housing is necessary.

2.5.3.3 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

Impact TT-3. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in increased traffic levels at the Mariposa County airport. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Policy 9-4b and Implementation Measure 9-4b(1) require that no projects inconsistent with the Airport Land Use Plan shall be approved within the Mariposa County Airport Land Use Planning Area. Implementation of this policy will result in a less than significant impact.

Impact TT-4. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

All road improvements under the draft General Plan would be required to conform to the new County road policy that would incorporate the standards and specifications for new roads contained in Policy 9-1e and Implementation Measure 9-1e(1). Additionally, Policy 9-1d would require improvements on all roads lacking appropriate capacity. These policies would result in impacts that are less than significant.

Impact TT-5. Build-out under the proposed General Plan has the potential to create inadequate emergency access impacts. This is considered to be a less than significant impact because all new development under the draft General Plan would have to conform to the minimum requirements of the Mariposa County Zoning Ordinance.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

All road improvements under the draft General Plan would be required to conform to a new County road policy that would incorporate standards and specifications for new roads (Policy 9-1e and Implementation Measure 9-1e(1)). Where new development exceeds the capacity of the existing road system, Policy 9-1d and its implementation measure would require improvements of all roads lacking capacity from the project site to the nearest major collector or arterial. In addition, Policy 9-1b and 9-1c would ensure that roads have adequate capacity to serve respective road needs and that road capacity would be the basis for determining the adequacy of access for all new development. These policies and implementation measures would improve emergency access within the County by interconnecting existing roads and requiring that all roads serving road systems shall have an all-weather surface, which would result in a less than significant impact.

Impact TT-6. Build-out under the proposed General Plan has the potential to create parking impacts. This is considered to be a less than significant impact because all new development under the draft General Plan would have to conform to the minimum requirements of the Mariposa County Zoning Ordinance.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Off-street parking requirements are established by the Mariposa County Zoning Ordinance. All new development under the draft General Plan would have to conform to the minimum requirements of the Ordinance. Because off-street parking would be provided for all new development, the impact on existing parking would be less than significant.

Impact TT-7. Build-out under the proposed General Plan has the potential to result in conflicts with adopted plans and policies supporting alternative transportation. This is

considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policy 9-2a requires maintenance of an effective transit system under the County's Transit Plan. Policy 9-3a and Implementation Measures 9-3a(1) and 9-3a(2) require that the County update the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Equestrian Facilities Plan. These policies would result in plans and policies that would eliminate conflicts resulting in a less than significant impact.

2.5.3.4 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Impact PS-1. Build-out of the proposed General Plan would increase demands for public services and utilities. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policies that serve as mitigation include: Policy 5-2a and its implementation measures; Policy 9-5a and Implementation Measure 9-5a(1); Policy 9-6a and Implementation Measure 9-6a(1); Policies 12-1a, 12-1b, and 12-5a; and Policy 16-1a, 16-3a, 9-9a and Implementation Measures 9-9a(1) and 9-9a(2). These policies would result in plans and policies that would eliminate conflicts resulting in a less than significant impact.

2.5.3.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact BR-1. Build-out under the proposed General Plan could cause significant adverse impacts to special status species. If these species occur in development areas there could be loss of individuals and habitat, which would result in a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate the loss of special status species. Draft General Plan Policies 11-2d and 11-4a call for the conservation of a diverse and sensitive range of species and habitats from incompatible uses. Implementation Measure 11-4a(1) requires the implementation of a County Environmental Conservation Program that includes standards and programs to protect sensitive habitat, breeding and nesting areas, special status species, riparian habitat, and sensitive plant communities. Implementation Measure 11-4a(6) requires site surveys in compliance with Federal and State regulations as part of the environmental review. Implementation Measure 11-4a(7) requires the County to record the data collected from the site surveys, a comprehensive map of environmental resources in Mariposa County.

Other Mitigation Measures

The County will work with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to include appropriate mitigation measures during project approval to prevent the loss of individuals and occupied or designated habitat.

Implementation of proposed policies identified above reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact BR-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan has the potential to cause loss of plant species contained on CNPS Lists 2, 3 and 4, resulting in a significant adverse impact. A significant impact would occur if development would result in the loss of more than 15 percent of the known occurrences of the populations in the County.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate the loss of special status species. Draft General Plan Policies 11-2d and 11-4a call for the preservation of a diverse range of species and vegetation types from the intrusion of incompatible uses. Implementation Measure 11-4a(1) requires the implementation of a County Environmental Conservation Program that includes standards and programs to protect sensitive habitat, breeding and nesting areas, special status species, riparian habitat, and sensitive plant communities. Implementation Measure 11-4a(6) requires site surveys in compliance with Federal and State regulations as part of the environmental review. Implementation Measure 11-4a(7) requires the County to record the data collected from the site surveys, a comprehensive map of environmental resources in Mariposa County.

Implementation of the policies identified above reduce the potential impacts to CNPS species to a level less than significant.

Impact BR-3. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could cause a significant impact to nesting raptors and migratory birds if active nests occur within a development area. This impact would be significant.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate the loss of special status species. Implementation Measure 11-4a(1) requires the implementation of a County Environmental Conservation Program that includes standards and programs to protect sensitive habitat, breeding and nesting areas, special status species, riparian habitat, and sensitive plant communities. Implementation Measure 11-4a(6) requires site surveys in compliance with Federal and State regulations as part of the environmental review. Implementation Measure 11-4a(7) requires the County to record the data collected from the site surveys, a comprehensive map of environmental resources in Mariposa County. Implementation of the policies above reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

Impact BR-4. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could cause the permanent loss of habitat for sensitive wildlife species, which would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate the loss of special status species. Draft General Plan Implementation Measure 11-4a(1) would minimize the loss of habitat for sensitive species. Implementation Measure 11-4a(1) requires the implementation of a County Environmental Conservation Program that includes standards and programs to protect sensitive habitat, breeding and nesting areas, special status species, riparian habitat, and sensitive plant communities. Implementation Measure 11-4a(6) requires site surveys in compliance with Federal

and State regulations as part of the environmental review. Implementation Measure 11-4a(7) requires the County to record the data collected from the site surveys, a comprehensive map of environmental resources in Mariposa County. Implementation Measure 11-4a(8) requires compliance with regulations and requires measures that protect endangered species, rare wildlife and plant species, breeding raptors, migratory birds, sensitive native plant communities, wildlife migration or travel corridors and jurisdictional wetlands or other waters of the U.S.

Implementation of the policies above reduces the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact BR-5. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in a loss of sensitive native plant communities from development activities. This would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate the loss of special status species. Draft General Plan Implementation Measure 11-4a(1) calls for the preservation of a diverse range of species and habitats, and the protection of significant and sensitive habitats from incompatible uses. Implementation Measure 11-4a(1) requires the implementation of a County Environmental Conservation Program that includes standards and programs to protect sensitive habitat, breeding and nesting areas, special status species, riparian habitat, and sensitive plant communities. Implementation Measure 11-4a(6) requires site surveys in compliance with Federal and State regulations as part of the environmental review. Implementation Measure 11-4a(7) requires the County to record the data collected from the site surveys, a comprehensive map of environmental resources in Mariposa County. Implementation Measure 11-4a(8) requires compliance with regulations and requires measures that protect endangered species, rare wildlife and plant species, breeding raptors, migratory birds, sensitive native plant communities, wildlife migration or travel corridors and jurisdictional wetlands or other waters of the U.S.

Implementation of the policies above reduces the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact BR-6. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could cause a significant impact from blocking or disrupting wildlife migration or travel corridors. This would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate the loss of special status species. Draft General Plan Policy 11-2d calls for the conservation of water sources for water-dependent species and riparian habitats. Implementation Measure 11-4a(1) requires the implementation of a County Environmental Conservation Program that includes standards and programs to protect sensitive habitat, breeding and nesting areas, special status species, riparian habitat, and sensitive plant communities. Implementation Measure 11-4a(6) requires site surveys in compliance with Federal and State regulations as part of the environmental review. Implementation Measure 11-4a(7) requires the County to record the data collected from the site surveys, a comprehensive map of environmental resources in Mariposa County. Implementation Measure 11-4a(8) requires compliance with regulations and requires measures that protect endangered species, rare wildlife and plant species, breeding raptors, migratory birds, sensitive native plant communities, wildlife migration or travel corridors and jurisdictional wetlands or other waters of the U.S.

Implementation of the above policies reduces the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact BR-7. Build-out of the proposed General Plan would not conflict with any habitat conservation plans.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Implementation Measure 11-4a(1) states the Mariposa County Planning Department would review the preparation of a Mariposa County Environmental Conservation Program during the intermediate-term planning period. This Program would include development standards, conservation programs, and mitigation measures for impacts on sensitive biological resources. The draft General Plan would not conflict with the provisions in the Mariposa County Environmental Conservation Program because the Program would be developed and subsequently reviewed by the County after the adoption of the General Plan. This would result in a less than significant impact.

Impact BR-8. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in the net loss of wetlands, vernal pools, or other waters of the U.S. from development activities. This loss would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate the loss of special status species. Draft General Plan Policies 11-2d, 11-4a, and 16-6a conserve water sources for water-dependent species and riparian habitats; conserve the diversity of native ecosystems, plant communities, wildlife habitat, and plant and animal species; and retain flood plains within project design in such a way as to ensure that no net change occurs upstream or downstream. Implementation Measure 11-4a(1) requires the implementation of a County Environmental Conservation Program that includes standards and programs to protect sensitive habitat, breeding and nesting areas, special status species, riparian habitat, and sensitive plant communities. Implementation Measure 11-4a(6) requires site surveys in compliance with Federal and State regulations as part of the environmental review. Implementation Measure 11-4a(7) requires the County to record the data collected from the site surveys, a comprehensive map of environmental resources in Mariposa County. Implementation Measure 11-4a(8) requires compliance with regulations and requires measures that protect endangered species, rare wildlife and plant species, breeding raptors, migratory birds, sensitive native plant communities, wildlife migration or travel corridors and jurisdictional wetlands or other waters of the U.S.

If there is a significant impact potential to jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S., the project proponent would work with the Army Corps of Engineers and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board to develop appropriate actions. Implementation of the above policies serve to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

2.5.3.6 GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY

Impact GS-1. Build-out of the proposed General Plan would include structures that could be damaged by ground surface rupture. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policies that serve as mitigation include Policy 16-8a and Implementation Measures 16-8b(1) and 16-9a(1), which require that new development near fault zones be

discouraged or designed to minimize or eliminate risks, that public facilities be sited and constructed to meet state and UBC guidelines, and that development in geologic hazard areas be reviewed to avoid building sites in areas subject to secondary seismic effects. Implementation of these policies would result in a less than significant impact.

Impact GS-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in damage from earthquake-induced ground shaking. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policies that serve as mitigation include Policy 16-8a and Implementation Measures 16-8b(1) and 16-9a(1), which are described under Impact GS-1 above. Implementation of these policies will mitigate impacts from ground shaking to a level of less than significant.

Impact GS-3. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in damage from co-seismic ground deformation. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policies that serve as mitigation include Policy 16-8a and Implementation Measures 16-8b(1) and 16-9a(1), which are described under Impact GS-1 above. Implementation of these policies will mitigate impacts from co-seismic ground deformation to a level of less than significant.

Impact GS-4. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in damage from liquefaction or settlement during an earthquake. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policies that serve as mitigation include Policy 16-8a and Implementation Measures 16-8b(1) and 16-9a(1), which are described under Impact GS-1 above. Implementation of these policies will mitigate impacts from liquefaction and settlement to a level of less than significant.

Impact GS-5. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in damage to facilities from unstable slope conditions including landslides and rockfalls. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policies that serve as mitigation include Policy 16-7a, which enforces the County grading code, Policy 16-7b and its implementation measures, which requires additional inspections and engineering studies in geologic hazard areas, and Policy 16-8a and Implementation Measure 16-8a(1), which discourages development in geologic hazard areas or requires additional mitigation design. Implementation of these policies will mitigate impacts from unstable slope conditions to a level of less than significant.

Impact GS-6. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in damage to facilities due to expansive soils or soils with moderate to high erosion potential. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policies that serve as mitigation include Policies 16-7a, 16-7b, and 16-8a, which are described under Impact GS-5 above. Implementation of these policies will mitigate impacts from liquefaction and settlement to a level of less than significant.

2.5.3.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Impact HW-1. Build-out of the proposed General Plan would potentially increase off-site runoff. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policy 11-5a and Implementation Measure 11-5a(1) would minimize the effects of grading activities on all development projects for erosion control. Additionally, Implementation Measure 16-5a(2) requires retention of all storm water flows in excess of the capacity of natural drainage sources. Further, Policy 16-5c requires the construction of water retention facilities that would prevent flooding and would ensure that pre-development on- and off-site surface flows are maintained with no net increase flow. These policies would result in impacts that are less than significant.

Impact HW-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in the net degradation of surface runoff quality from additional paved surfaces, landscaping, fertilization, and irrigation, and grading, construction, and inadequate revegetation. This loss would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate surface runoff water quality. Draft General Plan Policies 11-2b, 11-5a, 11-3c, and 11-2d mitigate impacts by controlling sources of grading runoff, providing for low-density development, and for building setbacks from streams and water of the State. Implementation Measure 11-2b(1) requires development review to ensure compliance with Federal and State water quality regulations and to ensure that the project does not discharge contaminated water. Implementation Measure 11-2d(1) requires minimum building and grading setbacks from waters of the State.

Implementation of the above policies serve to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact HW-3. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could reduce groundwater quantity by taking more water, particularly from crystalline rocks, than is recharged. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policy 11-2c provides for the preservation of existing or potential sources of a sustainable water supply through maintaining low intensities of development in order to protect the capacity of watersheds. This Policy would designate watershed areas of surface water systems where such systems and their proposed watershed area serve or are capable of serving as a potable water source. Policy 9-5a requires that all new projects have access to basic water and wastewater infrastructure including potable water supply meeting health department requirements and access to an approved source for wastewater treatment and disposal. These policies would result in impacts that are less than significant.

Impact HW-4. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in degradation of groundwater quality from development that relies upon on-site sewage disposal rather than central systems. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policy 5-4a and its implementation measures provide for clustering commercial and service development which would facilitate the use of community disposal systems. New parcels must have approved areas for on-site sewage disposal if sewer connections are not available and would be required to obtain an approval from the County Health Department. This policy, along with the application of the General Plan land use and other growth management policies, would reduce the impacts from improper on-site disposal systems, resulting in impacts that are less than significant.

Impact HW-5. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in placing housing within flood hazard areas. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Implementation Measure 16-4a and b(1) provides for adoption of a County Flood Protection Ordinance. Other policies that mitigate flood hazards include Policy 16-4a, 16-4b, and 16-5a, which provide for additional flood protection actions. A flood plain encompasses the 100-year flood hazard area. Policy 16-6a states retention of a flood plain within project design will be done in such a way as to ensure that no net change in flow occurs upstream or downstream. With no net change in upstream or downstream flow, development within a 100-year flood hazard area would not impede or redirect flood flows or expose people or structures to a significant risk. Implementation of these policies would result in impacts that are less than significant.

Impact HW-6. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in the exposure of people and structures to flooding hazards from dam or levee failures, or inundation by seiche or mudflow. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

There are numerous dams in Mariposa County that are subject to state review and approval. Draft General Plan Policy 16-4c and Implementation Measure 16-4c(1) would control development in dam inundation areas and would amend the County Zoning Ordinance to include

a dam inundation overlay district. Policies 16-7a and 16-7b provide for the reduction of risk of injury or property damage from landslides and rockfalls and for avoiding development in high-risk geologic areas, and Policy 16-12a provides for updating of the County’s Emergency Management Plan. Implementation of these policies would result in impacts that are less than significant.

2.5.3.8 AIR QUALITY

Impact AQ-1. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may result in significant construction-period air pollutant emissions.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate air quality impacts. Air quality in the County is managed by the Mariposa County APCD. Draft General Plan Policy 11-5a requires proper grading practices for erosion control. Policy 11-1c requires the implementation of standards that minimize impacts on and/or improve air quality. Implementation Measure 11-c(1) acknowledges the County implements Federal and State air quality regulations. Implementation Measure 11-1c(2) requires the establishment of land use patterns that minimize impacts to air quality. Implementation Measure 11-1c(3) requires the implementation of a program that minimizes impacts and/or improves air quality. Implementation Measure 11-1c(4) requires the County to cooperate with the Air Pollution Control District to encourage development of educational and incentive programs, work with homeowner associations to develop education and incentive programs to reduce burning, work with agencies to increase ride sharing for employees and visitors, and work with the school districts to replace existing buses.

Implementation of the above policies reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact AQ-3. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may result in the creation of objectionable odors. Mariposa County APCD Rule 205 regulates nuisance impacts, including odors. Continued operation of this rule would reduce any impacts to a level of less than significant.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Mariposa County APCD Rule 205 is sufficient in regulating nuisance impacts. Policies serving as mitigation are not required for inclusion in the General Plan.

Impact AQ-4. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may result in changes in air movements, moisture, temperature, or climate. However, no projects of the magnitude that would cause such impacts are anticipated in the County. Major projects that would produce large amounts of greenhouse gases are likewise not anticipated. In the event that such projects are proposed, the projects would be subject to national and international regulations, and thus would result in impacts that are at a level of less than significant.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

If, in the unlikely event, a major project is proposed that would potentially emit large quantities of CO₂ or methane, the project would be subject to national and international regulations, and thus beyond the control of local government. This would result in impacts that are at a level of less than significant. Policies serving as mitigation are not required for inclusion in the General Plan.

Impact AQ-5. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may result in the emission of air toxics from non-motor vehicle sources. Mariposa County APCD Regulation IX regulates air toxics emissions and concentrations from stationary sources. Continued operation of this regulation would reduce any impacts to a level of less than significant.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Mariposa County APCD Regulation IX regulates is sufficient in regulating air toxics emissions and concentrations from stationary sources. Policies serving as mitigation are not required for inclusion in the General Plan.

2.5.3.9 HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact HC-1. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in the disturbance of known or potentially eligible National or California Register properties, including Native American heritage resources. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

The draft General Plan has a number of policies, which guide a wide variety of actions to protect cultural resources. These include Policies 14-1a, 14-2a, 14-3a, 14-4a, 14-5a, 14-6a, and 14-7a. Taken together, implementation of these policies would result in impacts that are less than significant.

Impact HC-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in the disturbance of unknown archaeological resources. This would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate the impacts on unknown archaeological resources. There are no General Plan policies that directly address unknown archaeological resources.

State law requires a project builder or contractor to suspend or redirect work when a discovery is made during the course of construction. Work would be suspended or redirected until the County’s historic preservation officer is contacted and a qualified archaeologist assesses the discovery and it is appropriately recorded, preserved, and/or removed or curated. Implementation of to the reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact HC-3. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in the disturbance of unknown paleontologic resources. This would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate the impacts on unknown paleontologic resources.

State law requires a project builder or contractor to suspend or redirect work when fossils are uncovered during the course of construction until the fossils are examined by a qualified paleontologist, who will assess their significance and offer recommendations for further

investigation or mitigation measures. Implementation of the above policies reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact HC-4. Build-out of the proposed General Plan could result in the disturbance of human remains, including those outside formal cemeteries. This would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Compliance with Federal and State regulations serve to mitigate the impacts on unknown human burials.

Other Mitigation Measures

State law requires a project builder or contractor contact the Mariposa County Coroner when a discovery of human remains is made during the course of construction. In the event that the remains are of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission will be contacted to determine the necessary procedures for protection or preservation of the remains. Implementation of the above policies reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

2.5.3.10 NOISE

Impact NO-1. Build-out of the proposed General Plan will result in the generation of noise, perhaps exposing the public to high noise levels. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

The draft General Plan has a number of policies that would reduce noise impacts. Land Use Policies 5-1a and 5-7a govern land use actions to preserve the County’s rural character and thus minimize urban noise levels. Circulation Policy 9-4b requires that decisions on development permits be coordinated with the Airport Land Use Plan. Noise Policies 15-2a, 15-2b, and 15-2c require: (a) the siting of noise sensitive uses to comply with noise reduction standards; (b) mitigation of stationary, mobile, and temporary noise sources; and (c) implementation of noise standards and updating of the County Noise Element, if necessary. Taken together, implementation of these policies would result in impacts that are less than significant.

Impact NO-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may result in the generation of ground vibration that may disturb people or damage structures. This would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Implementation Measure 15.1a(3) requires the implementation of vibration standards for construction activities.

Implementation of the above policy reduces the impact to a less than significant level.

2.5.3.11 PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Impact PHS-1. Build-out of the proposed General Plan will result in the generation of hazardous materials that may impact human health. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Mariposa County currently operates under the County’s Comprehensive Hazardous Waste Management Plan and the Hazardous Material Business Plan. Draft General Plan Policy 16-11a and Implementation Measure 16-11a(1) maintain the effectiveness and require continued enforcement of the County’s Comprehensive Hazardous Waste Management Program. This continued activity will result in an impact that is less than significant.

Impact PHS-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may result in the exposure of people to hazardous or low-level radioactive wastes. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

The generation of hazardous waste would fall under the controls discussed under Impact PHS-1 above. Draft Policy 16-11a would reduce impacts from hazardous and radioactive waste to a level of less than significant.

Impact PHS-3. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may affect implementation of an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policy 16-11a requires that the County coordinate state and local emergency response efforts, the regular updating of the Mariposa County Emergency Management Plan, and periodic drilling and training. Policies 5-1a and 5-2a set requirements that public and private development take place where emergency services are located. Policies 9-1c and 16-1b require that all new developments have safe and maintained access roads and are developed in areas with appropriate fire safety standards. Taken together, implementation of these policies would result in impacts that are less than significant.

Impact PHS-4. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may expose people to death or injury and structures to destruction from wildland fire. This is considered a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Wildland fires are a natural part of Mariposa County’s ecosystem. The southwestern and southern parts of the County have the greatest fire risk. The draft General Plan has a number of policies dealing with fire protection including Policies 5-1a, 5-2a, 9-1c, 16-1b, and 16-12a, which would reduce fire hazards through development requirements. To further reduce fire risk, draft General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures 16-1a, 16-1b, 16-1b(1), 16-1c, 16-2a, 16-2b, 16-3a, and 16-3b require a variety of County actions to develop, maintain, and administer fire safety regulations, standards, programs, and agreements. Implementation of these policies would minimize impacts to people and structures from wildland fire. Implementation Measure 16-1b(2)

requires the implementation of a countywide Wildfire Hazard Safety Plan that includes requirements for development, wildland fire management activities, specific requirements for hillside, open space, and rural area development, education, and standards specific to geographic areas based on fire potential.

Implementation of the above policies reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact PHS-5. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may result in the creation of breeding grounds for vectors. This is considered to be a less than significant impact as proposed plan policies would minimize impact potential.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Continued implementation of the County’s vector control efforts, grading ordinance, flood control and drainage design requirements, and waste collection and disposal programs will mitigate any increases in vectors brought about by development under the General Plan. These activities will result in impacts that are less than significant.

2.5.2.8 VISUAL RESOURCES

Impact VR-1. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may result in significant visual impacts to State Highways 41 and 49. This would be a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policy 11-1a requires the conservation of natural and scenic resources through programs and development standards. Within Mariposa County there is one designated State Scenic Highway (Route 140 from Mariposa to Yosemite National Park). Two state highway segments (portions of Highways 41 and 49) are eligible for designation as State Scenic Highways; however, these highways have not been officially designated. In addition, other scenic views occur along other routes in the County. General Plan Implementation Measures 11-1a(1), (2), and (3) protect views through establishing guidelines to ensure complementary development, provide for development standards for the placement of structures on ridgelines and hillsides, and set site standards for clustering of new development. Implementation Measure 11-1a(4) requires the County to develop guidelines for non-single family development within the highway corridors. These guidelines will be developed into a scenic views plan for the County’s highways. Implementation of these measures would minimize impacts to scenic routes, vistas, and viewsheds.

Implementation of the above policies reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact VR-2. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may cause substantial degradation of the visual character and quality of Mariposa County, resulting in a significant impact.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policy 5-1a provides that new development maintain Mariposa County’s rural qualities. Policy 5-2a further protects and enhances rural qualities by encouraging development to occur first where services are located. Other Policies that provide for the preservation of the Agriculture/Working Landscape land use classification of the County include Policies 5-5a, 10-1b, 10-1c, and 10-2a; while Policies 11-2d and 11-4a preserve riparian areas. Implementation of

Policy 5-4c provides siting and development criteria for recreation and resort development. Implementation Measure 5-4c(2) requires development standards to protect visual character including viewsheds, design, landform, site development and lighting.

Implementation of these policies reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Impact VR-3. Build-out of the proposed General Plan may result in significant impacts from the creation of substantial light and glare.

Plan Policies that Serve as Mitigation

Draft General Plan Policy 5-1a requires that land development be compatible with the County's rural character. Policy 11-ad requires that light sources in new development are compatible with rural character. Implementation Measure 11-1d(1) requires development standards that meet the International Dark Sky Association guidelines.

Implementation of these policies reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

2.6 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

The project and 5 alternatives were evaluated. These were: the "No Project" alternative which considered build-out under the existing General Plan (Alternative 1); Alternative 2, the "Existing Conditions" alternative, considered no additional development within the County beyond that which is already permitted; Alternative 3, the "October 2006 Draft General Plan Enhanced" alternative, would allow growth in the County with a lower population at build-out than either the 2005 Draft General Plan or Alternative 1; Alternative 4, the "Suburbanization" alternative, would accommodate the highest population of all the alternatives, concentrating growth in suburban tract-type housing in the southern and southwestern areas of the County; and Alternative 5 - Rural Character Protection that incorporates the Draft EIR mitigation measures and recommendations from the DEIR comments. The Board of Supervisors incorporated directly or modified the goals, policies, and implementation measures of Alternative 5 into the project, the Draft General Plan November 2006.

Alternative 1 would have the greatest total number of significant impacts of all the alternatives, including the Proposed Project. Alternative 1 assumes a larger population than that of the 2005 Draft General Plan and includes the current General Plan policies, which are less complete than those in the Proposed Project. Under Alternative 1, impacts would be greater than identified for the proposed General Plan in the following areas (primarily due to the greater amount of growth allowed and the lack of mitigating policies as part of the plan): land use (the possible division of existing communities, conversion of agricultural lands and timberlands), traffic (new road construction to inadequate standards), public services and utilities (increased demand for services beyond capacities), hydrology and water quality (increased runoff, reductions in groundwater quantity, degradation of groundwater quality), cultural resources (disturbance of resources), and public health and safety (exposure to hazardous waste). Since Alternative 1 assumes a greater total population than the Proposed Project, all impacts would be more intense than under the proposed General Plan update.

Alternative 2 assumes the lowest population increase of the alternatives and has the fewest overall significant impacts. This alternative would have greater impacts than identified in the Proposed Project only in the area of population and housing (no increases in the stock of low- and

moderate-income housing or multifamily rental housing). Because of its lower total population at build-out, all impacts under alternative 2 would be less intense than under the Proposed Project.

Alternative 3 assumes a population total of approximately 30 percent less than the the 2005 Draft General Plan and 39 percent more than the project. As compared to the 2005 Draft General Plan, Alternative 3 converts the discretionary 2005 Draft General Plan policies into mandatory policies resulting in enhanced environmental protection. Due to its lower density and total population growth, the overall impact potential of Alternative 3 would be less than that of the 2005 Draft General Plan and more than the project.

Alternative 4 has the largest overall growth potential of the alternatives; approximately 260 percent greater than the Project and 20 percent greater than that contemplated under the current General Plan. As compared to the Project, Alternative 4 has greater impacts in land use (increased urbanization of rural parts of the County, greater conversion of agricultural and timberlands), population and housing (reduced opportunities for low-and moderate income housing and multifamily rental housing, displacement of people and housing), hydrology and water quality (reduced groundwater quantity), and cultural resources (impacts on resources). The impacts of Alternative 4 would be more intense than those of the Project due to the greater degree of population and urbanization growth.

Of the alternatives evaluated, the Existing Conditions alternative (Alternative 2) has the fewest impacts. Therefore, it can be considered environmentally superior to an alternative that proposes to change existing conditions. Alternative 2 is essentially a type of “No Project” alternative and CEQA requires that if the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, then the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative from those that meet project objectives. This is the project, November 2006 Draft General Plan – Rural Character Protection.