

5 CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

For the purposes of this section, unavoidable significant adverse impacts are those effects of the project that would significantly affect either natural systems or other community resources, and cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. The following significant unavoidable impacts were identified.

- Loss of non-renewable mineral resources
- Reduced level of service on state highways and county roads
- Reduced level of service at intersections
- Unmet demand for additional school capacity
- Greater air quality emissions than listed significance thresholds

5.2 IRREVERSIBLE IMPACTS

For adoption of a planning document, CEQA requires a discussion of potential significant, irreversible environmental changes that could result. Examples include projects that generally commit future generations to similar uses, irreversible damage that may result from accidents associated with a project, or irretrievable commitments of resources.

The Proposed Project, including build-out of General Plan land uses, will convert some of the existing open space land in the County to a variety of urban, suburban, and rural uses. Loss of open space is considered to be a significant and irreversible effect. As existing open space land will be committed to developed uses, it is unlikely that such lands would be returned to their natural state in the future. Likewise, development of uses identified above generally commit future generations to similar uses. Additionally, uses of nonrenewable resources during all phases of plan build-out may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely.

5.3 SHORT-TERM USES VERSUS LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

CEQA requires a discussion of cumulative and long-term environmental effects that could result from adoption of a plan. Special attention should be given to impacts that narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment or pose long-term risks to health or safety.

As the proposed General Plan designates substantial areas of land for development, the Plan thereby commits the environment to uses that may limit the long-term productivity, particularly with respect to agricultural production. The proposed Plan, however, does provide a framework for establishing a balance between competing values and interests. For example, the proposed General Plan land use diagram and goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures provide for growth to occur in the County. However, they also provide for protection of natural resources in conjunction with that growth. Additionally, development allowed under the proposed General Plan would result in a long-term commitment of energy resources to build, operate, and maintain structures.

5.4 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

CEQA requires that any growth-inducing aspect of a project be discussed in an EIR. This discussion should include consideration of ways in which the project could directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth in a surrounding area. Projects which could remove obstacles to population growth (such as a major public service expansion) must also be considered in this discussion. According to CEQA, it must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental or of little significance to the environment.

Any General Plan that designates undeveloped land for future development can be defined as “growth inducing.” One of the County’s clear objectives in updating its General Plan is the promotion of economic development and accommodation of demand for residential growth. However, in promoting such development, the General Plan addresses the potentially adverse implications through policies, programs, and implementation measures, which would seek to provide adequate public services and infrastructure, promote a balance between jobs and housing, minimize conflicts between various types of land uses, and protect environmentally sensitive resources.

Likewise, expansion of existing sewer and water systems to provide for proposed General Plan build-out could also be growth inducing if they were sized to serve more than the projected population. Sizing such facilities to serve only the planned population would also serve to limit potential growth inducing aspects of the proposed General Plan.

5.5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

An EIR on a comprehensive general plan constitutes an assessment of the cumulative impacts of development within the area covered by the plan, particularly in the case of a county general plan. This EIR evaluates the implications of build-out under proposed General Plan land uses.

CEQA (Statute Section 1065) defines a project as “an activity which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and which is any of the following:

- An activity directly undertaken by any public agency.
- An activity undertaken by a person which is supported, in whole or in part, through contracts, grants, subsidies, loans or other forms of assistance from one or more public agencies.
- An activity that involves the issuance to a person of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use by one or more public agencies. “

Throughout this EIR, the impacts are identified and evaluated on a topic-by-topic basis. The results of these impacts, taken together, may be a perceived change in the rural characteristics of the County. This change may be related to: loss of open space, changes in visual characteristics and/or views, traffic increases, and an awareness of greater numbers of people and associated demand for public and social services.

The goals, objectives, policies, implementation measures, and the land use diagram of the proposed General Plan are written to protect the rural quality of the County to the extent possible.

5.6 PLAN ALTERNATIVES

5.6.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

The California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) require that an EIR “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)). If a project alternative would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of a proposed project, the decision maker should not approve the proposed project unless it determines that specific technological, economic, social, or other considerations make the project alternatives infeasible (PRC Section 21002, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a)(3)). The EIR must also identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and should briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c)).

One of the alternatives analyzed must be the “No Project” alternative. The “No Project” analysis must discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved and development continued to occur in accordance with existing plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)).

A description of the proposed Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 is provided in Chapter 2. This Chapter provides a description and analysis of general plan alternatives. The alternatives are:

- *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 80,000 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 - General Plan 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 Draft General Plan 2005 policies have 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 Draft General Plan 2005 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 in the Catheys Valley and Hornitos areas 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 approximately up to 100,000 persons.

- *Alternative 5: Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection.* This alternative was developed for consideration by the Board of Supervisors at their October 2006 hearings. The alternative incorporated the mitigation measures recommended by the October 2006 Final EIR and incorporated goals, policies and implementation measures suggested during the comment period. The Board of Supervisors conducted public hearings on the General Plan. Working with the public, the Board of Supervisors incorporated (with modifications) the goals, policies and implementation measures from Alternative 5 October 2006 into the Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection, the Project.

Table 5-1 provides a comparison of the impacts associated with the alternatives to the Mariposa County General Plan according to the Evaluation Criteria (Impacts) defined in Chapter 4.

The alternatives analysis is intended to focus on eliminating or reducing in significance, those impacts identified as significant in the EIR. Significant unavoidable long-term impacts (Section 2.5.1) associated with this project include: loss of non-renewable mineral resources, reductions in level of service on state highways and County arterials, reductions in level of service at County intersections, impacts from unmet needs at County public schools, and greater air quality emissions than listed significant thresholds permit.

Significant project impacts (Section 2.5.2) that can be reduced to a less-than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures recommended in this EIR include: land use. The Draft General Plan November 2006 incorporates goals, policies and implementation measures that mitigate the biological resources, hydrology and water quality, air quality, historic and cultural resources, noise, public health and safety, and visual resources impacts identified in the Draft EIR 2005.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
LAND USE					
LU-1. Will the project physically divide an established community?	<i>Less than Significant impact.</i> The General Plan maintains the amount of developed land. The policies of the General Plan require that growth be directed to existing Plan Areas in a concentric manner that would reinforce existing community development patterns.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Growth under the current General Plan would be guided by General Plan and Town Planning Area policies. These policies do not directly address the issues of future growth patterns. Therefore, there is a potential for growth to occur in a manner that could physically divide an existing community.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development under this alternative, and therefore there would be no potential for division of existing communities.	<i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative would accommodate additional development but to a lesser degree than the proposed General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, requiring development to take place in a manner that reinforces the viability of existing communities, but without land use designations in the expanded Mariposa Town Planning Area.	<i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative would include increased development, but this development would take place in rural areas in the southwestern and southern areas of the county. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, requiring development to take place in a manner that reinforces the viability of existing communities, but without land use designations in the expanded Mariposa Town Planning Area.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
LU-2. Will the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project, including but not limited to the general plan, area plans, specific plans, airport master plan, zoning, or environmental impact mitigation measures?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> There are no incorporated cities in the County. The County’s area plans are incorporated into the updated General Plan. Planning Study Areas retain their existing land uses. The General Plan specifies that no development incompatible with the airport land use plan shall be permitted.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> All town and community plans would be consistent with the General Plan policies and compatible with existing and future land use.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Development will be limited to currently approved projects and thus there would be no potential for future planning conflicts.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative,. However, the reduced nature of this alternative would result in a lowered potential for future planning conflicts.	<i>Potentially significant impact.</i> This alternative would increase urbanization in the rural southern and southwestern parts of the County. This alternative may conflict with the policies of area plans.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
LU-3. Will the project convert or induce the conversion of Agricultural/Working lands or Prime, Unique or Farmland of Statewide Significance to non-agricultural use?	<i>Significant impact.</i> The County has 215 acres of designated Prime, Unique, or Farmlands of Statewide significance. The updated General Plan, with specific finding adopted by the Board of Supervisors, allows for the conversion of agriculture/working landscape lands to non-agricultural uses. This Plan enhances the protection of agricultural lands from the existing General Plan but does not implement a no-net-loss policy.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Under the current General Plan, planned or cluster development is prohibited in all rural land use classifications except RR and MH. However, the General Plan allows such development in any land use district provided minimum density requirements are met. This may allow the conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses by planned or cluster developments.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be no conversion of agricultural/working landscape lands.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The policies of the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, guiding growth away from agricultural/working landscape, and there would be less pressure for the conversion of agricultural lands.	<i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply requiring guiding growth away from agricultural/working landscape lands, but implementation of these policies would be more difficult.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
<p>LU-4. Will the Project increase the potential for cancellation or non-renewal of any existing Land Conservation Act (Williamson Act) contracts or interfere with existing zoning for agricultural use?</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The General Plan would continue existing Williamson Act contracts. As there are - acres of Williamson Act land within the proposed Residential use classification, the impact would be significant.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> Under the current General Plan, lands under Williamson Act contracts may be preserved, but the policies of the Plan would not be sufficient to ensure that existing contracts would not be cancelled or not renewed.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be no increases in demand for land under Williamson Act contracts or zoned for agricultural use.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative. However, the reduced nature of this alternative would result in a lowered demand for conversion of lands zoned for agriculture or under Williamson Act contract.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply requiring guiding growth away from agricultural lands and land under Williamson Act contract, but implementation of these policies would be more difficult.</p>
<p>LU-5. Will the Project induce the conversion of any private timberlands subject to the California Forest Practice Rules under the Z’Berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act (Title 14 CCR Chapters 4, 4.5 and 10) to nontimber growing uses?</p>	<p><i>Less than Significant impact.</i> The General Plan includes policies that protect timberlands from conversion to non-timber uses.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> Under the current General Plan timberlands would be preserved, but the policies of the Plan would not be sufficient to ensure that existing timberlands would not be converted to non-timber uses.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be no increases in demand for conversion of timberlands to non-timber uses.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, however the reduced nature of this alternative would result in a lowered demand for conversion of timberlands to non-timber uses.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative in the protection of timberlands from non-timber uses.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
LU-6. Will the Project induce the conversion of any private mineral-producing lands into non-mineral production use?	<i>Significant impact.</i> Existing residential development exists within the State classified MR-1 gravel resource area, and the proposed Residential land use classification in the General Plan allows residential development that is not compatible with gravel resource production, and therefore, the mineral resources would not necessarily be protected in these areas. The General Plan enhances the protection of mineral resources but retains the ability to develop residential uses on these lands	<i>Significant impact.</i> Under the current General Plan mineral resources would be preserved, but the policies of the Plan would not be sufficient to ensure protection of private mineral-producing lands from conversion to non-mineral uses..	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be no increases in demand for conversion of private mineral-producing lands from conversion to non-mineral uses.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative. However, the reduced nature of this alternative would result in a lowered demand for conversion of private mineral-producing lands to non-mineral uses.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative protecting private mineral-producing lands from conversion to non-mineral uses.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
POPULATION AND HOUSING					
PH-1. Will the Project result in a net loss, through conversion or demolition, of homes occupied by low- or moderate-income households?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan would increase demand for low- and moderate-income housing. The policies of the General Plan facilitate the preservation of existing and provision of new low- and moderate-income housing.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The current General Plan would also increase demand for low- and moderate-income housing. The policies of the current Plan would facilitate the preservation of existing and provision of new low- and moderate-income housing.	<i>Significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be no increases in the stock of low- and moderate-income housing. This alternative would not meet the current demand for such housing.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative. However, the reduced nature of this alternative would result in a lowered demand for low- and moderate-income housing.	<i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply regarding the provision of low- and moderate-income housing, but implementation of these policies would be more difficult.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
PH-2. Will the project result in a net loss, through conversion or demolition, of multifamily rental housing?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan would increase demand for multifamily rental housing. The policies of the General Plan facilitate the preservation of existing and provision of new multifamily rental housing.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The current General Plan would also increase demand for multifamily rental housing. The policies of the current Plan would facilitate the preservation of existing and provision of new multifamily rental housing.	<i>Significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be no increases in the stock of multifamily rental housing. This alternative would not meet the current demand for such housing.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative. However, the reduced nature of this alternative would result in a lowered demand for multifamily rental housing.	<i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply regarding the provision of multifamily rental housing, but implementation of these policies would be more difficult.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
PH-3. Will the project result in the displacement of substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The County has sufficient land available for residential development; thus, there would be little need to displace substantial numbers of people to accommodate future growth. In addition, under the General Plan low- and moderate-income housing and multifamily rental housing would be preserved and rehabilitated.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The County has sufficient land available for residential development; thus, there would be little need to displace substantial numbers of people to accommodate future growth. In addition, under the current General Plan low- and moderate-income housing and multifamily rental housing would be preserved and rehabilitated.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative. Therefore there would be reduced pressure to displace substantial numbers of people to accommodate development.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative. However, the reduced nature of this alternative would result in a lowered pressures to displace people to accommodate development.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply regarding the preservation of low- and moderate-income and multifamily rental housing. While there appears to be sufficient land in these areas to accommodate development without the need to displace people, the implementation of these policies would be more difficult.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION					
TT-1. Will the Project create adverse vehicular impacts on state highways or county arterial roads?	<i>Significant impact.</i> Build-out under the General Plan, would result in deterioration in Level of Service below LOS “D” on state highways. The County does not have control over and cannot commit State funding for highway projects.	<i>Significant Impact.</i> Build-out under the existing General Plan would result in population levels as high or higher than in the General Plan update, and therefore as under the General Plan update, would result in deterioration in Level of Service below LOS “D” on state highways.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> All state highways and county arterial roads are currently operating at LOS “D” or better, and with no additional development, would continue to operate at those levels	<i>Significant impact.</i> While this alternative would reduce the overall population in the County and therefore would also reduce the number of vehicular trips, they would not be reduced to the extent necessary to avoid deterioration in Level of Service on state highways below LOS “D.” However, the extent of deterioration could be reduced in comparison with the project or Alternatives 1 or 4.	<i>Significant impact.</i> In addition to impacts from development in the central part of the County, development of “tract” housing in the western part of the County would generate additional vehicle trips, which could result in deterioration in LOS on state highways, and would also potentially degrade Level of Service on county routes that would carry commuter traffic to Madera County.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
TT-2. Will the Project create adverse vehicular impacts for intersections in Mariposa County town or community planning areas?	<i>Significant impact.</i> Build-out under the General Plan, would result in deterioration in Level of Service below LOS “D” at state highway intersections in the Mariposa Town Planning Area. The County does not have control over and cannot commit State funding for highway projects.	<i>Significant Impact.</i> Build-out under the existing General Plan would result in population levels as high or higher than in the General Plan update, and therefore as under the General Plan update, would result in deterioration in Level of Service below LOS “D” at state highway intersections in the Mariposa Town Planning Area.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> With no additional development, intersections would continue to operate at current levels	<i>Significant impact.</i> While this alternative would reduce the overall population in the County and therefore would also reduce the number of vehicular trips, they would not be reduced to the extent necessary to avoid deterioration in Level of Service at state highway intersections in the Mariposa Town Planning Area. However, the extent of deterioration could be reduced in comparison with the project or Alternatives 1 or 4.	<i>Significant impact.</i> In addition to impacts on intersections in the Mariposa Town Planning Area from development in the central part of the County, development of “tract” housing in the western part of the County would generate additional vehicle trips, which could result in deterioration in Level of Service at intersections on county and state routes that would carry commuter traffic to Madera County.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
TT-3. Will the Project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>While the General Plan would generate additional air traffic at the Mariposa County Airport, conformance with the regulations under the Airport Land Use Plan would prevent development that would create substantial safety risks.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>Build-out under the current General Plan also would generate additional air traffic at the Mariposa County Airport, but conformance with the regulations under the current Airport Land Use Plan would prevent development that would create substantial safety risks.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>Although no new development would occur under this alternative, there could be additional traffic generated from existing development. However, any increase would likely be small and unlikely to create significant safety risks.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>Uses that would generate additional air traffic at the Mariposa County Airport would not be reduced under this alternative, but conformance with the regulations under the Airport Land Use Plan would prevent development that would create substantial safety risks.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>Uses that would generate additional air traffic at the Mariposa County Airport would not be increased under this alternative, and conformance with the regulations under the Airport Land Use Plan would prevent development that would create substantial safety risks.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
TT-4. Will the project substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> All road improvements would be required to conform to new County road standards and specifications. This would result in new roads constructed to contemporary design standards and existing roads being brought up to contemporary design standards, and over time, could decrease hazards as existing roads are improved.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Continued development under the current General Plan could result in new roads being constructed without all weather surfaces and/or adequate width. This would potentially increase hazards to users if the roads carried substantial amounts of local traffic. Also, existing roads would not be subject to requirements for upgrading as new development occurs.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur and while existing roads would not be improved, existing hazards would not be substantially increased.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> All road improvements would also be required to conform to new County road standards and specifications under this alternative. This would result in new roads constructed to contemporary design standards and existing roads being brought up to contemporary design standards, and over time, could decrease hazards as existing roads are improved.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> All road improvements would also be required to conform to new County road standards and specifications under this alternative. This would result in new roads constructed to contemporary design standards and existing roads being brought up to contemporary design standards, and over time, could decrease hazards as existing roads are improved.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
TT-5. Will the Project result in inadequate emergency access?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan would improve emergency access within the County by interconnecting existing roads, and requiring that all roads serving road systems have an all-weather surface. The provision of needed services on-site would allow development to grow with population, rather than “leap-frogging” development.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> Build-out under the existing General Plan would not require that roads be interconnected or have an all-weather surface. This would further degrade the emergency access in rural areas of the County. The current General Plan has no controls on “leap-frogging” development, which would make provision of services more difficult.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur and while existing inadequate access would not be improved, the level of inadequacy would not be increased.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative also would improve emergency access within the County by interconnecting existing roads, and requiring that roadway improvements have an all-weather surface.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative also would improve emergency access within the County by interconnecting existing roads, and requiring that roadway improvements have an all-weather surface.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
TT-6. Will the Project create adverse impacts to existing parking or access to existing parking?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Off-street parking requirements are established by the Mariposa County Zoning Ordinance. All new development under the General Plan would have to conform to the Ordinance, and off-street parking would be provided for all new development.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Off-street parking requirements are established by the Mariposa County Zoning Ordinance. All new development under the updated General Plan would have to conform to the Ordinance, and off-street parking would be provided for all new development.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur and while existing inadequate parking or access would not be improved, the level of inadequacy would not be increased.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Off-street parking requirements are established by the Mariposa County Zoning Ordinance. All new development under the updated General Plan would have to conform to the Ordinance, and off-street parking would be provided for all new development.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Off-street parking requirements are established by the Mariposa County Zoning Ordinance. All new development under the updated General Plan would have to conform to the Ordinance, and off-street parking would be provided for all new development.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
TT-7. Will the Project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (transit, bicycle and pedestrian paths)?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan supports implementation of the County’s Transit Plan and Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Equestrian Facilities Plan.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The current General Plan would not conflict with implementation of the County’s Transit Plan and Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Equestrian Facilities Plan. However, it does not specifically support implementation of these plans.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Because no new development would occur, there would likely be no conflicts with implementation of the County’s Transit Plan and Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Equestrian Facilities Plan.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative also would provide support for implementation of the County’s Transit Plan and Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Equestrian Facilities Plan.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative also would provide support for implementation of the County’s Transit Plan and Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Equestrian Facilities Plan.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES					
PS-1. Will the Project increase demand for law enforcement, ambulance, fire protection, water supply, sewage treatment and disposal, solid waste removal, or recreation to such a degree that accepted service standards are not maintained?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan would increase demand for public services and utilities that, with the exception of solid waste facilities, would not have adequate capacity to meet the demand. However, the policies of the General Plan require that provision of services be coordinated with future development. By requiring concentric development, the provision of needed services would be allowed to grow with population.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Growth under the current General Plan would also increase demand for public services and utilities beyond available capacity to a greater degree than under the updated General Plan, and the policies of the current Plan would not be sufficient to ensure that provision of adequate services is coordinated with future development. The current General Plan has no controls on “leap-frogging” development, which would make provision of services more difficult.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore there would be no increases in demand for services and utilities.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for public services and utilities that, with the exception of solid waste facilities, would not have adequate capacity to meet the demand. The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, requiring that provision of services be coordinated with future development. However, under this alternative, the increase in demand would be less than the project or alternatives 1 or 4, and therefore, provision of needed services would be easier.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for public services and utilities that, with the exception of solid waste facilities, would not have adequate capacity to meet the demand. The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, requiring that provision of services be coordinated with future development. However, under this alternative, the increase in demand would be greater than the project or alternatives 1 or 3, and therefore, provision of needed services would be more difficult.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
<p>PS-2. Will the project create a demand for additional school capacity that cannot be met by existing or planned capacity?</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The General Plan would increase demand for school capacity that cannot be met due to limitations on local and state funding sources. . The County does not have control over and cannot commit funding for school projects.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The current General Plan also would increase demand for school capacity that cannot be met due to limitations on local and state funding sources. The increase in demand would be greater than the project or alternative 3 and therefore, provision of needed facilities would be more difficult</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore there would be no increases in demand for school capacity.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative also would increase demand for school capacity that cannot be met due to limitations on local and state funding sources. However, under this alternative, the increase in demand would be less than the project or alternatives 1 or 4, and therefore, provision of needed facilities would be easier.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative also would increase demand for school capacity that cannot be met due to limitations on local and state funding sources. However, under this alternative, the increase in demand would be greater than the project or alternatives 1 or 3, and therefore, provision of needed facilities would be more difficult.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
BR-1. Will the Project cause a net loss of individuals, occupied habitat, or restrict the reproductive capacity of endangered, threatened, or rare wildlife or plant species?	<i>Less than Significant impact.</i> Mariposa County contains potentially suitable habitat for a number of endangered, threatened and rare species. The General Plan includes policies that specifically address the protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Mariposa County contains potentially suitable habitat for a number of endangered, threatened and rare species. The current General Plan does not include policies that specifically address the protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species, and build-out under the current General Plan would be more likely to affect habitat of these species because of the higher density of development in the western part of the County.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would not include any additional development. Therefore, no new impacts to endangered, threatened, or rare species would be expected.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Mariposa County contains potentially suitable habitat for a number of endangered, threatened and rare species. The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the loss of individuals or habitat of rare, threatened, and endangered species. However, under this alternative, it would likely have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Mariposa County contains potentially suitable habitat for a number of endangered, threatened and rare species. The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the loss of individuals or habitat of rare, threatened, and endangered species. In addition, under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact than the project or alternative 3.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
BR-2. Will the Project cause a net loss of individuals of CNPS List 2, 3, or 4 plant species?	<i>Less than Significant impact.</i> Mariposa County contains potentially suitable habitat for a number of category 2, 3, or 4 listed plant species. The General Plan includes policies that specifically address the protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Mariposa County contains potentially suitable habitat for a number of category 2, 3, or 4 listed plant species. The current General Plan does not include policies that specifically address the protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species, and build-out under the current General Plan would be more likely to affect habitat of these species because of the higher density of development in the western part of the County.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would not include any additional development. Therefore, no new impacts to listed plant species would be expected.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Mariposa County contains potentially suitable habitat for a number of listed plant species. The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the loss of individuals or habitat these species. However, under this alternative, it would likely have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Mariposa County contains potentially suitable habitat for a number of listed plant species. The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the loss of individuals or habitat of these species. In addition, under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact than the project or alternative 3.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
BR-3. Will the Project cause a net loss of active raptor nests, migratory bird nests, or native wildlife nursery sites?	<p><i>Less than Significant impact.</i> If active nest sites occur within a development area, disturbance associated with construction activities during the nesting season may lead to nest abandonment and nest failure, and could also destroy active nest sites. The General Plan includes policies that protect active raptor and migratory nest sites.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> If active nest sites occur within a development area, disturbance associated with construction activities during the nesting season may lead to nest abandonment and nest failure, and could also destroy active nest sites. Build-out under the current General Plan would be more likely to affect nest sites because of the higher density of development in the western part of the County.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would not include any additional development. Therefore, no additional disturbance to nest sites would be expected.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> If active nest sites occur within a development area, disturbance associated with construction activities during the nesting season may lead to nest abandonment and nest failure, and could also destroy active nest sites. However, under this alternative, it would likely have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> If active nest sites occur within a development area, disturbance associated with construction activities during the nesting season may lead to nest abandonment and nest failure, and could also destroy active nest sites. Under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact than the project or alternative 3.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
BR-4. Will the Project cause a permanent net loss of habitat for sensitive wildlife species?	<i>Less than Significant impact.</i> Mariposa County has habitats that provide high suitability for foraging and breeding for protected species and species of special concern as well as important resting, foraging, and breeding habitat for migratory birds and other native wildlife. The General Plan includes policies that prevent the loss of significant portions of these habitats.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The current General Plan does not include policies that would prevent the loss of significant portions of habitat for sensitive species, and build-out under the current General Plan would be more likely to affect habitat of these species than the project or alternative 3 because of the higher density of development in the western part of the County under the current General Plan.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would not include any additional development. Therefore, no additional loss of habitat would be expected.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the loss of habitat. However, under this alternative, it would likely have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the loss of habitat. In addition, under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact than the project or alternative 3.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
BR-5. Will the Project cause a permanent loss of sensitive native plant communities?	<p><i>Less than Significant impact.</i> Mariposa County has riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. The General Plan includes policies that prevent the loss of significant portions of the riparian habitat or other native plant communities.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The current General Plan does not include policies that would prevent the loss of significant portions of riparian habitat or sensitive native plant communities, and build-out under the current General Plan would be more likely to affect habitat of these species than the project or alternative 3 because of the higher density of development in the western part of the County under the current General Plan.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would not include any additional development. Therefore, no additional loss of riparian habitat or sensitive native plant communities would be expected.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the loss of riparian habitat or sensitive native plant communities. However, under this alternative, it would likely have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the loss of riparian habitat or sensitive native plant communities. In addition, under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact than the project or alternative 3.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
BR-6. Will the Project substantially block or disrupt wildlife migration or travel corridors?	<p><i>Less than Significant impact.</i> Mariposa County is known to have deer migration corridors and is likely to have migration corridors for other wildlife. The General Plan includes policies that address the disruption or blocking of pre-existing wildlife migration or travel corridors (e.g., east-west migration corridor).</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The current General Plan does not include policies that would prevent the blockage of wildlife migration corridors, and build-out under the current General Plan would be more likely to affect such corridors in the western part of the County than the project or alternative 3 because of the higher density of development in the western part of the County under the current General Plan.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would not include any additional development. Therefore, no additional blockage of wildlife migration corridors would be expected.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the blockage of wildlife migration corridors. However, under this alternative, it would likely have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the blockage of wildlife migration corridors. In addition, under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact on such corridors in the western part of the County than the project or alternative 3.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
BR-7. Will the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, state or federal habitat conservation plan?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>The General Plan would not conflict with the provisions in the Mariposa County Environmental Conservation Program. The Program review by the County would occur after the adoption of the General Plan.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>The General Plan would not conflict with the provisions in the Mariposa County Environmental Conservation Program. The Program review by the County would occur after the adoption of the General Plan.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>The General Plan would not conflict with the provisions in the Mariposa County Environmental Conservation Program. The Program review by the County would occur after the adoption of the General Plan.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>The General Plan would not conflict with the provisions in the Mariposa County Environmental Conservation Program. The Program review by the County would occur after the adoption of the General Plan.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>The General Plan would not conflict with the provisions in the Mariposa County Environmental Conservation Program. The Program review by the County would occur after the adoption of the General Plan.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
BR-8. Will the project result in a net loss of wetlands, vernal pools, or other waters of the U.S. or State of California?	<p><i>Less than Significant impact.</i> Any development project will be subject to the federal Section 404 permit process, requiring no net loss of wetlands. The General Plan contains policies requiring compliance with Federal and State regulation of wetlands or other waters of the U.S. or California.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The current General Plan does not include policies that would require no net loss of wetlands, and build-out under the current General Plan would be more likely to affect wetlands in the western part of the County than the project or alternative 3 because of the higher density of development in the western part of the County under the current General Plan.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would not include any additional development. Therefore, no additional loss of wetlands would be expected.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the loss of wetlands. However, under this alternative, it would likely have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would not necessarily prevent the loss of wetlands. In addition, under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact any wetlands in the western part of the County than the project or alternative 3.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY					
GS-1. Will project facilities be damaged by ground surface rupture?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The updated General Plan has policies that would protect project facilities from risks of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The current General Plan has policies that protect facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be reduced probability of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
GS-2. Will earthquake-induced strong ground shaking damage Project facilities?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The updated General Plan has policies that would protect project facilities from risks of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The current General Plan has policies that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be reduced probability of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.
GS-3. Will project facilities be damaged by co-seismic ground deformation?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan has policies that would protect project facilities from risks of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The current General Plan has policies that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be reduced probability of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
GS-4. Will project facilities be damaged by liquefaction or settlement during an earthquake?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan has policies that would protect project facilities from risks of injury or property damage from seismic events.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The current General Plan has policies that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be reduced probability of injury or property damage from seismic events.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from seismic events.</p>
GS-5. Will project facilities be damaged by unstable slope conditions?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan has policies that would protect project facilities from risks of injury or property damage from unstable slope conditions.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The current General Plan has policies that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from unstable slope conditions.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be reduced probability of injury or property damage from unstable slope conditions.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from unstable slope conditions.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage from unstable slope conditions.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
<p>GS-6. Will Project facilities be exposed to damage due to expansive soils or soils with moderate to high erosion potential?</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan has policies that would protect project facilities from risks of injury or property damage due to expansive soils or soils with moderate to high erosion potential.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The current General Plan has policies that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage due to expansive soils or soils with moderate to high erosion potential.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be reduced probability of injury or property damage due to expansive soils or soils with moderate to high erosion potential</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage due to expansive soils or soils with moderate to high erosion potential.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply that protect project facilities from risk of injury or property damage due to expansive soils or soils with moderate to high erosion potential.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY					
HW-1. Will the Project cause increased off-site runoff?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Build-out of the General Plan would increase off-site runoff due to increased surface coverage by pavements and structures. However, proposed plan policies would minimize this impact through building intensity limitations and by requiring on-site detention for all storm water flows to ensure that pre-development off- and on-site surface flows are maintained with no net increase.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> Build-out of the current General Plan would also increase off-site runoff due to increased surface coverage by pavements and structures, and the plan policies would not be sufficient to reduce or eliminate this impact. The current General Plan has no building intensity limitations.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore there would be no new sources of surface runoff.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase off-site runoff due to increased surface coverage by pavements and structures, although the increase would be less than under the project or alternatives 1 or 4 due to the less population projection and resulting development. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, requiring that increased storm water flows be retained on-site.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase off-site runoff due to increased surface coverage by pavements and structures, although the increase would be greater than under the project or alternatives 1 or 3 due to the higher potential population and greater degree of urbanization. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, requiring that increased storm water flows be retained on-site.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
HW-2. Will the Project result in a degradation of surface runoff quality?	<p><i>Less than Significant impact.</i> Build-out of the General Plan could result in the degradation of surface runoff quality due to increased levels of pollutants from additional paved surfaces; landscaping fertilization and irrigation; and grading, construction, and inadequate revegetation. The General Plan policies reduce the impact to less than significant</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> Build-out of the current General Plan also could result in the degradation of surface runoff quality due to increased levels of pollutants from additional paved surfaces, landscaping fertilization and irrigation, and grading, construction, and inadequate revegetation. The current General Plan has no building intensity limitations.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore there would be no new sources of surface runoff.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative also could result in the degradation of surface runoff quality due to increased levels of pollutants from additional paved surfaces, landscaping fertilization and irrigation, and grading, construction, and inadequate revegetation. However, the increase would be less than under the project or alternatives 1 or 4 due to less population density and reduced development.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative also could result in the degradation of surface runoff quality due to increased levels of pollutants from additional paved surfaces, landscaping fertilization and irrigation, and grading, construction, and inadequate revegetation. However, the increase would be greater than under the project or alternatives 1 or 3 due to higher potential population and greater degree of urbanization.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
HW-3. Will the Project reduce groundwater quantity?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> The variability in yield from place to place, particularly at a feasible economic cost, rather than any limits on overall quantity of the groundwater resource is the controlling factor in providing adequate water supply for new development. The policies in the General Plan would protect the water sources and recharge areas and would require proven water yields for all new developments.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> Development under the current General Plan would also be subject to the variability in groundwater yield, but the plan policies would not be able to ensure a proven yield for new development.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore there would be no increase in users of groundwater.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Development under this alternative would also be subject to the variability in groundwater yield, although the demand would be less than under the project or alternatives 1 or 4, due to less population and reduced development. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative and would protect the water sources and recharge areas as well as require proven water yields for all new developments.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> Development under this alternative would also be subject to the variability in groundwater yield, and the demand would be greater than under the project or alternatives 1 or 3, due to the suburban character of development. Although the same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative for protection of water sources and recharge areas as well as requiring proven water yields for all new developments, the amount of new development in the western part of the County could result in significant “draw-down” of the groundwater resource in that area..</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
HW-4. Will the Project degrade groundwater quality?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Development with on-site sewage disposal systems under the General Plan rather than central sewage systems creates potential groundwater quality impacts if not properly installed, particularly where soils are not conducive to septic systems. Plan policies would minimize improperly located or designed on-site sewage disposal systems.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> Build-out under the current General Plan would also have the potential for development with on-site sewage disposal systems. However, the current General Plan policies would not necessarily minimize the impacts of improperly located or designed systems.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore there would be no increase in the use of on-site disposal systems.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Development with on-site disposal systems would also occur under this alternative, although the use of such systems would be less than under the project or alternatives 1 or 4, due to less population and reduced development. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative and would minimize improperly located or designed on-site sewage disposal systems.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Development with on-site disposal systems would also occur under this alternative, and the use of such systems would be greater than under the project or alternatives 1 or 4, due to the greater population in the western part of the County. However, the same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative and would minimize improperly located or designed on-site sewage disposal systems.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
<p>HW-5. Will the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, place structures in the 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding?</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> A flood plain encompasses the 100-year flood hazard area. Under the General Plan retention of a flood plain within project design would 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.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The current General Plan would not prevent residential structures from being constructed within the 100-year floodplain.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore there would be no new residential structures located in the 100-year floodplain.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Under this alternative, as under the updated General Plan, “flood-proofed” residential structures could be constructed within the 100-year floodplain. Under the updated General Plan, retention of a flood plain within project design would be done in such a way as to ensure that no net change in flow occurs upstream or downstream.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Under this alternative, as under the updated General Plan, “flood-proofed” residential structures could be constructed within the 100-year floodplain. Under the updated General Plan, retention of a flood plain within project design would be done in such a way as to ensure that no net change in flow occurs upstream or downstream.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
HW-6. Will the project expose people or structures to significant risk from flooding, including flooding from failure of a levee or dam, or due to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>In California, dams are subject to review and approval by the Division of Safety of Dams, which controls the construction and alteration of dams as well as approving the impoundment of water behind a dam. This review and approval process would significantly reduce the potential for dam failures and seiches.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>As within the Project, dams are subject to review and approval by the Division of Safety of Dams, which controls the construction and alteration of dams as well as approving the impoundment of water behind a dam. This review and approval process would significantly reduce the potential for dam failures and seiches.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore there would be no additional people or structures exposed to risk.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>As within the Project, dams are subject to review and approval by the Division of Safety of Dams, which controls the construction and alteration of dams as well as approving the impoundment of water behind a dam. This review and approval process would significantly reduce the potential for dam failures and seiches.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>As within the Project, dams are subject to review and approval by the Division of Safety of Dams, which controls the construction and alteration of dams as well as approving the impoundment of water behind a dam. This review and approval process would significantly reduce the potential for dam failures and seiches.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
AIR QUALITY					
AQ-1. Will there be adequate mitigation for potential construction-period emissions?	<i>Less than Significant impact.</i> Construction-period emissions and mitigation measures are addressed in the General Plan.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Construction activities under the updated General Plan would result in significant unmitigated air pollutant emissions. Construction-period emissions and mitigation measures are not addressed in the current General Plan.	<i>Significant impact.</i> While no new development would be permitted under this alternative, there may be significant unmitigated air pollutant emissions from construction of projects already permitted but not constructed. Construction activities under the current General Plan could result in significant air pollutant emissions.	<i>Significant impact.</i> While there would be a lower overall level of development with this alternative, there may be significant unmitigated air pollutant emissions from construction of new projects. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative. Construction-period emissions and mitigation measures are not addressed in the updated General Plan.	<i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase construction activity. Thus, there may be significant unmitigated air pollutant emissions from construction of new projects. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative. Construction-period emissions and mitigation measures are not addressed in the updated General Plan.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
AQ-2. Is the Project inconsistent with emission growth factors contained in any air quality plans or will the project result in emissions greater than the listed significance thresholds?	<i>Significant impact.</i> Emissions resulting from build-out under the General Plan would result in significant unmitigated air pollutant emissions. The General Plan contains policies that reduce future emissions, but given the unknown future parameters, the effectiveness of the General Plan policies cannot be quantified with certainty.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Emissions resulting from build-out under the current General Plan would result in significant unmitigated air pollutant emissions. The current General Plan contains policies that would reduce future emissions, but emissions and mitigation measures are not addressed in the current General Plan.	<i>Significant impact.</i> While no new development would be permitted under this alternative, there may be significant unmitigated air pollutant emissions increases from build-out of projects already permitted but not constructed. Emissions and mitigation measures are not addressed in the current General Plan.	<i>Significant impact.</i> While there would be a lower overall level of development with this alternative, there may be significant unmitigated air pollutant emissions from build-out under this alternative. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative. Emissions and mitigation measures are not addressed in the updated General Plan.	<i>Significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase construction activity. Thus, there may be significant unmitigated air pollutant emissions from build-out under this alternative. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative. Emissions and mitigation measures are not addressed in the updated General Plan.
AQ-3. Will the Project create objectionable odors?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Continued enforcement of Mariposa County APCD rules would reduce any potential impacts to a level of less than significant.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> As stated for the Project, continued enforcement of Mariposa County APCD rules would reduce any potential impacts to a level of less than significant.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> As stated for the Project, continued enforcement of Mariposa County APCD rules would reduce any potential impacts to a level of less than significant.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> As stated for the Project, continued enforcement of Mariposa County APCD rules would reduce any potential impacts to a level of less than significant.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> As stated for the Project, continued enforcement of Mariposa County APCD rules would reduce any potential impacts to a level of less than significant.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
AQ-4. Will the Project significantly alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or change in climate, either locally or regionally?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No projects capable of impacting air movement or temperature are anticipated under the proposed Project. New projects that would emit significant amounts of greenhouse gases affecting climate would be subject to national and international regulations and agreements.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No projects capable of impacting air movement or temperature are anticipated under this alternative. New projects that would emit significant amounts of greenhouse gases affecting climate would be subject to national and international regulations and agreements.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> There are no existing projects within the County that are capable of impacting air movement or temperature, and there would be no new projects with this alternative.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No projects capable of impacting air movement or temperature are anticipated under this alternative. New projects that would emit significant amounts of greenhouse gases affecting climate would be subject to national and international regulations and agreements.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No projects capable of impacting air movement or temperature are anticipated under this alternative. New projects that would emit significant amounts of greenhouse gases affecting climate would be subject to national and international regulations and agreements.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
AQ-5. Will the Project expose sensitive receptors or the general public to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Air toxics from stationary sources are under the authority of the Mariposa County APCD. Continued enforcement of APCD rules and regulations under this alternative would mitigate air toxics emissions or concentrations to a less than significant level.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Air toxics from stationary sources are under the authority of the Mariposa County APCD. Continued enforcement of APCD rules and regulations under this alternative would mitigate air toxics emissions or concentrations to a less than significant level.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Air toxics from stationary sources are under the authority of the Mariposa County APCD. Continued enforcement of APCD rules and regulations under this alternative would mitigate air toxics emissions or concentrations to a less than significant level.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Air toxics from stationary sources are under the authority of the Mariposa County APCD. Continued enforcement of APCD rules and regulations under this alternative would mitigate air toxics emissions or concentrations to a less than significant level.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> Air toxics from stationary sources are under the authority of the Mariposa County APCD. Continued enforcement of APCD rules and regulations under this alternative would mitigate air toxics emissions or concentrations to a less than significant level.</p>

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
HC-1. Will the project disturb known or potentially eligible National or California Register properties, including archaeological, historical, architectural, and Native American/traditional heritage resources?	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>The General Plan has policies to protect cultural resources including policies for funding mechanisms and procedures to add sites and structures to the County Register of Historic Places; implementing guidelines for historic design review; and providing for the identification and establishment of historic districts in the County.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i></p> <p>Build-out under the current General Plan policies would not necessarily avoid disturbance of known historic and cultural resources. In addition, the higher density of development allowed in the western part of the County would increase the likelihood for disturbance of such resources.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore there would likely be no additional disturbance of known historic and cultural resources.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i></p> <p>The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would protect known historic and cultural resources. Also, under this alternative, the lower population would likely have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i></p> <p>The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, and implementation of these policies would protect known historic and cultural resources. However, under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact on historic and cultural resources than the project or alternative 3.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
HC-2. Will the project disturb unknown archaeological resources?	<p><i>Less than Significant Impact.</i> There is a strong likelihood that build-out of the updated General Plan will disturb or otherwise adversely impact unknown archaeological resources. The General Plan, Federal and State policies deal directly with unknown archaeological resources.</p>	<p><i>Significant Impact.</i> There are no current General Plan policies that deal directly with unknown archaeological resources. In addition, the higher density of development allowed in the western part of the County would increase the likelihood for disturbance of such resources.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore it is unlikely that there would be any additional disturbance of unknown archaeological resources.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, and no proposed Plan policies would deal directly with unknown archaeological resources. However, under this alternative, the lower population would be less likely to have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, and no proposed Plan policies would deal directly with unknown archaeological resources. In addition, under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact on unknown archaeological resources than the project or alternative 3.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
HC-3. Will the project disturb unknown important paleontologic resources?	<i>Less than Significant impact.</i> Most of Mariposa County is undeveloped, and may have a high sensitivity for paleontological resources. The policies in the General Plan, Federal and State policies address paleontological resources.	<i>Significant Impact.</i> There are no current General Plan policies that address paleontological resources. In addition, the higher density of development allowed in the western part of the County would increase the likelihood for disturbance of such resources.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore it is unlikely that there would be any additional disturbance of paleontological resources.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, and no Plan policies address paleontological resources. However, under this alternative, the lower population would likely have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, and no Plan policies address paleontological resources. In addition, under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact on paleontological resources than the project or alternative 3.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
<p>HC-4. Will the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</p>	<p><i>Less than Significant impact.</i> It is likely that there are a number of unknown burial sites throughout the County that may be disturbed by the development allowed under the General Plan. The Plan, Federal and State policies address the matter of human remains.</p>	<p><i>Significant Impact.</i> There are no current General Plan policies that specifically address the matter of human remains. In addition, the higher density of development allowed in the western part of the County would increase the likelihood for disturbance of such remains.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore it is unlikely that there would be any additional disturbance human remains.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, and no Plan policies specifically address the matter of human remains. However, under this alternative, the lower population would likely have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, and no Plan policies specifically address the matter of human remains. In addition, under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact than the project or alternative 3.</p>

Table 5-1
Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
NOISE					
NO-1. Will the Project expose the public to high noise levels?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Build-out under the General Plan would increase the number of noise sources. However, the General Plan would require that noise sources be controlled and noise impacts otherwise mitigated to meet specific threshold requirements.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Build-out under the current General Plan would increase the number of noise sources. However, the current Plan would require that noise sources be controlled and noise impacts otherwise mitigated to meet specific threshold requirements.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> While no new development would occur under this alternative, construction of currently approved projects would marginally increase noise sources. However, the new noise sources would be controlled and noise impacts otherwise mitigated to meet specific threshold requirements.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Build-out under this alternative would also increase the number of noise sources. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, requiring that new noise sources be controlled and noise impacts otherwise mitigated to meet specific threshold requirements.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Build-out under this alternative would also increase the number of noise sources, particularly in the relatively rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative, requiring that new noise sources be controlled and noise impacts otherwise mitigated to meet specific threshold requirements.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
NO-2. Will vibration cause any disturbance?	<i>Less than Significant impact.</i> Build-out under the General Plan would increase the number of vibration sources, particularly during construction. The General Plan contains policies that address vibration.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Build-out under the current General Plan would increase the number of vibration sources, particularly during construction. The current General Plan does not contain policies that address vibration.	<i>Significant impact.</i> While no new development would be allowed, construction of already-permitted projects could cause vibration impacts. General Plan policies do not contain policies address that vibration.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Build-out under this alternative would also increase the number of vibration sources, particularly during construction. The updated General Plan would apply, but it does not contain policies that address vibration.	<i>Significant impact.</i> Build-out under this alternative would also increase the number of vibration sources, particularly during construction. The updated General Plan would apply, but it does not contain policies that address vibration.
PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY					
PHS-1. Will the Project comply with federal, State and local laws, regulations, ordinances and policies intended to protect the public from exposure to hazardous materials at concentrations detrimental to human health?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan has policies that would protect humans from risk of injury from exposure to hazardous material or concentrations.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The current General Plan does not have policies that directly address protection to humans from risk of injury from exposure to hazardous material or concentrations.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be reduced probability from risk of injury from exposure to hazardous material or concentrations.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative that protect humans from risk of injury from exposure to hazardous material or concentrations.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply that protect humans from risk of injury from exposure to hazardous material or concentrations

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
PHS-2. Will the Project comply with Federal, State and local laws, regulations, ordinances and policies intended to protect the public from exposure to hazardous waste at concentrations detrimental to human health?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan has policies that would protect humans from risk of injury from exposure to hazardous waste at unsafe concentrations.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The current General Plan does not have policies that directly address protection to humans from risk of injury from exposure to hazardous waste at unsafe concentrations.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative and therefore there would be reduced probability from risk of injury from exposure to hazardous waste at unsafe concentrations.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative that protect humans from risk of injury from exposure to hazardous waste at unsafe concentrations.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply that protect humans from risk of injury from exposure to hazardous waste at unsafe concentrations
PHS-3. Will the project interfere with implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evaluation plan?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The General Plan has policies that would implement emergency response and emergency evacuation planning. The General Plan requires development take place where services are located.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The current General Plan does not have policies that directly address emergency response and emergency evacuation planning. The current General Plan has no controls on “leap-frogging” development, which would make provision of services more difficult.	<i>Significant impact</i> No new development would occur under this alternative. However, there would be development of currently permitted projects. The General Plan does not directly address emergency response and emergency evacuation planning.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative regarding emergency response and emergency evacuation planning.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply regarding emergency response and emergency evacuation planning.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
PHS-4. Will the project expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<i>Less than Significant impact.</i> The General Plan has policies that require actions to reduce risks due to wildland fires to a level of less than significant.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> The current General Plan has policies that would require actions to reduce risks due to wildland fires of a less than significant level.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would be permitted under this alternative. Construction of currently permitted projects would occur. The General Plan has policies that would require actions to reduce risks due to wildland fires of a less than significant level.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would also increase demand for future urban growth, but to a lesser degree than the updated General Plan. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply under this alternative regarding protection from wildland fires.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> This alternative would provide for growth in the rural southern and southwestern areas of the County. The same policies as the updated General Plan would apply regarding protection from wildland fires.
PHS-5. Will the project provide breeding grounds for vectors?	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Continued implementation of the County’s vector control efforts by the County Environmental Health Department will mitigate impacts to a less than significant level.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Continued implementation of the County’s vector control efforts by the County Environmental Health Department will mitigate impacts to a less than significant level.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Continued implementation of the County’s vector control efforts by the County Environmental Health Department will mitigate impacts to a less than significant level.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Continued implementation of the County’s vector control efforts by the County Environmental Health Department will mitigate impacts to a less than significant level.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> Continued implementation of the County’s vector control efforts by the County Environmental Health Department will mitigate impacts to a less than significant level.
VISUAL RESOURCES					

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
VR-1. Will the Project adversely affect designated scenic routes or scenic vistas?	<i>Less than Significant impact.</i> Policies in the updated General Plan would protect scenic vistas from incompatible development, and scenic routes, particularly the important State routes in the County.	<i>Significant Impact.</i> Current General Plan policies would not necessarily protect scenic routes or scenic vistas from incompatible development. In addition, the higher density of development allowed in the western part of the County would increase the likelihood for adverse effects on scenic routes and vistas in that area.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore it is unlikely that scenic routes or vistas would be adversely affected.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and scenic routes would not necessarily be protected. However, under this alternative, the lower population would likely have a lesser impact than the project or alternatives 1 or 4.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and scenic routes would not necessarily be protected. In addition, under this alternative, the suburbanization of the western part of the County would likely have a greater impact than the project or alternative 3.

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
VR-2. Will the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of Mariposa County?	<p><i>Less than Significant impact.</i> The General Plan has policies that protect the visual character of the county. Policies address recreation and resort development or public facilities.</p>	<p><i>Significant Impact.</i> Current General Plan policies would not necessarily protect the scenic character of the County from incompatible development. In addition, the higher density of development allowed in the western part of the County would increase the likelihood for adverse effects on the scenic working landscape character in that area.</p>	<p><i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore it is unlikely that the scenic character would be adversely affected.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative. The policies do not specifically address recreation and resort development or public facilities.</p>	<p><i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative. The policies do not specifically address recreation and resort development or public facilities.</p>

Table 5-1

Alternatives Impact Comparison

Impact	Mariposa County Draft General Plan November 2006 – Rural Character Protection (Project)	Alternative 1 – No Project (1981 General Plan)	Alternative 2 - Existing Conditions	Alternative 3 – General Plan Enhanced	Alternative 4 – “Suburbanization”
VR-3. Will the Project create new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views?	<i>Less than Significant impact.</i> The General Plan policies address impacts on nighttime views and daytime glare.	<i>Significant Impact.</i> Current General Plan policies would not minimize impacts on nighttime or daytime views. In addition, the higher density of development allowed in the western part of the County would increase the likelihood for adverse nighttime effects on adjacent rural areas.	<i>Less than significant impact.</i> No new development would occur under this alternative, and therefore it is unlikely that there would be any substantial light or glare created.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and while they would minimize impacts on nighttime views, they do not address daytime glare.	<i>Significant impact.</i> The same policies as the updated Plan would apply under this alternative, and while they would minimize impacts on nighttime views, they do not address daytime glare.

5.6.2 ALTERNATIVES IMPACT SUMMARY

Five alternatives were evaluated in addition to the Project. 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 “General Plan Enhanced” alternative, would convert the discretionary Proposed Project General Plan policies into mandatory policies resulting in enhanced environmental protection and allow growth in the County to grow at a slower rate with a lower population at build-out than either the Proposed Project or Alternative 1, and would incorporate the same policy set as in the proposed General Plan update; Alternative 4, the “Suburbanization” alternative, would accommodate the highest growth rate and 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, the Draft General Plan November 2006 Rural Character Protection, the Project, that incorporates mitigation measures suggested by the October 2006 EIR and comments received on the Draft EIR and Draft General Plan October 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 horizon year population than that of the General Plan update 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 update 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 horizon year population growth, all impacts under Alternative 2 would be less intense than under the Proposed Project.

Alternative 3 assumes a horizon year population total of approximately 30 percent less than the Draft General Plan 2005, the previously proposed Project. As compared to the Draft General Plan 2005, Alternative 3 converts the discretionary Project General Plan 2005 policies into mandatory policies resulting in enhanced environmental protection.

Alternative 4 has the largest overall growth potential of the alternatives; approximately 100 percent greater than the Draft General Plan 2005 and 20 percent greater than that contemplated under the current General Plan. Alternative 4 has 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, Alternative 3, Alternative 2 and Alternative 1 due to the greater degree of population and urbanization growth.

Alternative 5, now the Project, reduces most of the impacts identified the Draft EIR 2005 to a less than significant level. The impacts that remain significant include: mineral resource production due to the potential for building residences in the vicinity, traffic impacts to highways because the County does not have control of State funding, school capacity because the County does not have control of school funding, air quality from emissions because the future impacts cannot be quantified, and agriculture because the General Plan may allow conversion of agriculture land to non-agriculture uses.

5.6.3 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The existing conditions alternative has the fewest impacts because it represents the environmental conditions at this time. 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 Alternative 5, the Draft General Plan November 2006 Rural Character Protection.

5.6.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

During the initiation or “scoping” period for General Plan development between January and April, 2001, many members of the public raised issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Over 1,000 comments were received creating more than 500 distinct issues. The Board of Supervisors interpreted, debated, and discussed each of the issues, and consolidated the list to over 300 points. Reviewing each of these, the Board directed 176 to be included in the General Plan. Those issues which were not incorporated into the General Plan are included in the Guiding Principles Matrix of August 7, 2001, with the reasons for non-inclusion. This document is available at the Mariposa County Planning Department.

The five alternatives considered in the alternatives analysis represent a broad range of alternative development scenarios for Mariposa County, including an alternative that converts the discretionary Draft General Plan 2005 policies into mandatory policies, an alternative incorporating significant development in the western part of the County that could be generated by regional growth patterns, and the Project alternative which incorporates the recommended mitigation measures of the Draft EIR 2005. The selected alternatives provide a reasonable range of alternatives for analysis.