

**ADDENDUM (No. 4)
TO SAN RAFAEL GENERAL PLAN 2020
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(SCH#2003052031)**

**FOR AMENDMENT TO
San Rafael General Plan 2020 Proposing:
General Plan Update (10-year review)
Project File No. GPA15-001**

Prepared By:

Metropolitan Planning Group
1303 Jefferson Street Ste. 100-B
Napa, CA 94559

Lead Agency:

City of San Rafael
Community Development Department
1400 Fifth Avenue (P.O. Box 151560)
San Rafael, CA 94915-1560

Contact: Paul A. Jensen, Community Development Director

July 8, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. INTRODUCTION	3
B. BACKGROUND	3
C. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	5
D. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	14
E. INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST	26
I. AESTHETICS	28
II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.....	29
III. AIR QUALITY.....	30
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	32
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	34
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	35
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....	37
VIII. HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	38
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	39
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING	42
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES.....	43
XII. NOISE	43
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:	45
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:	46
XV. RECREATION	46
XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION.....	47
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	49
XVIII.MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE (CAL. PUB. RES. CODE §15065).....	50
F. SOURCE REFERENCES	51
G. PUBLIC REVIEW	52

A. INTRODUCTION

The City of San Rafael is amending the City's General Plan 2020 document to ensure that the policies and programs continue to be applicable and relevant to the vision of the General Plan. The targeted amendments focus on maintaining the established goals and policy directions of the existing General Plan while making adjustments that respond to changes in the ten years since the Plan was adopted. The majority of policies and programs would not require revisions, most notably those with long-term timeframes. Programs with short-term timeframes and those that have been affected by changing circumstances are updated through this General Plan Amendment. In keeping with the approach to maintain the framework established in the current General Plan, most changes consist of minor text and timeframe updates while new programs and revisions were integrated into the structure of General Plan.

Pursuant to Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Addendum is considered the appropriate document when "only minor technical changes or additions are necessary" and which would not affect or otherwise contribute to significant environmental effects. An Addendum is the most appropriate document pursuant to CEQA Guidelines because the General Plan Amendment does not introduce any new impacts or more severe impacts relative to what was previously analyzed and none of the conditions described in Section 15162 have occurred.

This Addendum has been prepared in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines and analyzes the potential impacts of the General Plan Amendment relative to those impacts previously identified in the San Rafael General Plan 2020 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH# 203052031), which was certified on November 15, 2004 through City Council Resolution No. 11664. While the General Plan Amendment does include minor changes such as those outlined below, it is consistent with what was identified in the EIR and would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant impacts from those previously identified in the certified General Plan EIR.

The General Plan Amendment has been reviewed against the impacts and mitigation measures presented in the certified General Plan EIR. As set forth below, this Addendum finds that there would be no change to the impacts evaluated for housing, population and growth, circulation/transportation, air quality, noise, biological resources, or other environmental categories.

B. BACKGROUND

On November 15, 2004, the City Council of the City of San Rafael adopted the San Rafael General Plan 2020 (General Plan). The General Plan has subsequently been amended with an update to the Housing Element, the introduction of a Sustainability Element, changes to various policies, and the redesignation of several land uses.

The City of San Rafael prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to assess the physical environmental impacts of the General Plan, its policies and implementing programs (SCH

#2003052031) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The Final EIR (FEIR) was certified by the City Council on November 15, 2004 (City Council Resolution No. 11664.). The certified EIR consists of the following volumes:

- San Rafael General Plan 2020 Background Report; April 12, 2001/reprinted December 19, 2003;
- San Rafael General Plan 2020 Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR); February 2004; and
- San Rafael General Plan 2020 FEIR/Response to Comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Report; August 2004

The certified EIR (including the DEIR, FEIR and subsequent amendments) assesses environmental impacts of the General Plan development projections through 2020 (cumulative). These impacts include, among others, transportation, air quality and noise. The certified EIR serves as a program-level environmental document for subsequent City actions that are deemed consistent with the General Plan. Further, the certified EIR was prepared and deemed legally sufficient to serve as a project-level environmental document for subsequent actions such as re-zonings, pre-zonings, annexations and revisions to the San Rafael Municipal Code and regulations, as deemed necessary or recommended to implement the provisions of the General Plan.

As noted, since 2004 the San Rafael General Plan 2020 has been amended numerous times. In processing and adopting many of these subsequent amendments, the City has relied on use of the Plan's certified EIR for environmental review and clearance. In 2009, the City prepared and adopted an Addendum to the certified EIR (Addendum No. 1), which assessed a General Plan amendment to change the Plan-adopted traffic level of service (LOS) standard at the intersection of 3rd Street and Union Street. In 2011, the City prepared and adopted an Addendum to the certified EIR (Addendum No. 2), which assessed a General Plan Amendment for the Housing Element (2009-2014), a New Sustainability Element and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy, an amendment to Conservation Element Policy CON-3, as well as the elimination of the Project Selection Process (PSP). In 2015, the City prepared and adopted an Addendum to the certified EIR (Addendum No. 3), which assessed a General Plan Amendment for the Housing Element (2015-2023).

The General Plan and EIR are available for review at the following location:

City of San Rafael Community Development Department
1400 5th Avenue, 3rd floor,
San Rafael, California 94915

The General Plan is also available on the City's website, which can be accessed at:

http://www.cityofsanrafael.org/Government/Community_Development/General_Plan_2020.htm

C. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of San Rafael has proposed the amendment of the General Plan 2020 (General Plan Amendment No. GPA15-001, initiated 1.13.2016) to update applicable policies and programs in each of the General Plan Elements. The goal is to bring the text and format of the General Plan up-to-date, to clarify policies and to remove inaccurate information. The amendments do not substantially change the established policy framework and direction. The General Plan Amendment does not propose development nor does it require construction of specific projects. The purpose of the General Plan Amendment is to reinforce local goals, policies, and programs to implement the vision of the community.

Prior to the preparation of the General Plan Amendment, the City of San Rafael assembled a 10-Year Status Report to review the progress of policy and program implementation of the General Plan, laying a roadmap to streamline and update applicable components of the General Plan.

The 10-year review was completed with input from members of a Working Group consisting of representatives from several city departments. A comprehensive review of short-term and annual programs was conducted for each of the 16 elements in the General Plan. Additionally, select long-term and ongoing programs were also included in the review. Through this 10-year review, the City of San Rafael has evaluated which programs can be removed due to completion, what strategies and programs will need to be continued, and where revisions are needed to reflect changes over the past decade. Recommendations contained within the report provide guidance to update the policies and programs in the General Plan.

A majority of policies and programs in the General Plan will not require changes and have not been listed in the table below. Rather, the table below provides a summary of the proposed changes to the General plan policies and programs. Where policies and programs require changes as shown in the table, most require minor text updates. Policies and programs that have been completed or are no longer applicable comprise a portion of the programs that need to be changed; the changes in these cases are the deletion of the policies and programs. Revised text and new programs have been included as needed to adequately address changes since the adoption of the 2004 General Plan. Overall, the General Plan Amendment does not propose significant change to the vision and direction of the current General Plan.

The table below identifies the changes made in the General Plan Amendment. The actions of the General Plan Amendment are classified into five general categories: No Change/ Minor Update, Completed, Deleted, Revised, and New.

- No Change/Minor Update - Many policies and programs will be carried forward into the Amended General Plan unchanged. The general success or lack of significant action during the planning period calls for many programs to be continued. Some programs require minor updates that do not cause any major change to the original text; this includes reference number updates, changes in responsible parties, or extending timeframes.

- Completed – Policies and programs that have been completed are proposed for deletion.
- Deleted – Policies and programs that are no longer relevant are proposed for deletion.
- Revised – Some policies and programs require a text update to respond to changes that have occurred since the adoption of the General Plan. Revisions may be required due to completion of planning documents, implementation of new projects, collection of updated information, and other changes. Policies and programs are characterized as revised if they have been moved to another Element or consolidated with programs in another Element. A number of programs in the Conservation Element were moved to and/or consolidated with programs in the Sustainability Element, which merged similar or redundant programs and relocated programs to Elements where they have a close logical association.
- New – Policies and programs added through this General Plan Amendment are considered new.

Table of Changes to General Plan Policies and Programs

Element	Program/ Policy	Modification
Land Use	LU-8	No Change/ Minor Update. Crossed out page number reference, numbers were not necessary and may change so it avoids inconsistency.
	LU-8b	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
	LU-20a	Revised. Update program and timeframe to maintain zoning standards adopted to implement the policy.
	LU-21a	Revised. Update program and timeframe to maintain zoning standards adopted to implement the policy.
	LU-23c	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	Exhibit 11	Revised. Water land use category added.
Housing	H-11b	Revised. Update program and timeframe to maintain zoning standards adopted to implement the policy.
	H-12	Revised. Reference Homeless Action Plan.
	H-12a	Revised. Reference Homeless Action Plan.
	H-15	No Change/ Minor Update. Change Responsibility from Community Development to Parking Services
	H-19a	No Change/ Minor Update. Specify sustainability program reference numbers.
Neighborhood	Intro	Deleted “current” from policy reference.
	NH-2a	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
	NH-3	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
	NH-15a	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated resource.
	NH-16a	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated resource.
	NH-18a	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated responsibility/ resource.
	NH-21	No Change/ Minor Update. Update program reference.
	NH-22	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
	Intro	Revised. Downtown District. Delete “which is now partially vacant”
	NH-34a	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated resource.
	NH-36	No Change/ Minor Update. Acknowledge initiation of SMART rail service.
	NH-36b	Revised. Add SMART and Downtown Station Area Plan reference.
	NH-54a	Revised. Text revised to maintain zoning and revise Timeframe.
	NH-74a	Revised. Text revised to reflect completion of Canalfront Conceptual Design Plan. Added “Public Works” to responsibility and “State and Federal Grants” as resources
	NH-75	Revised. Amend policy to implement adopted plan, revise Responsibility and Resources.
	NH-75a	Revise. Update program and Timeframe change to Ongoing.
	NH-76a	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	NH-86	Revised. Added Civic Center station area plan reference.
	NH-86a	Revised. Added Civic Center station area plan reference.

	NH-88	Revised. Delete “If rail service is initiated.”
	NH-94b	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	NH-95	Completed. Delete policy.
	NH-95a	Completed. Delete program.
	NH-98	Revised. Add “maintain” to indicate continuing landscaping.
	NH-118a	Revised. Add “Village at Loch Lomond project approval” reference.
	NH-118b	Revised. Maintain program implementation.
	NH-118c	Revised. Facilitate program implementation.
	NH-119	Revised. Maintain policy.
	NH-119a	Completed. Delete program.
	NH-126a	Revised. Encourage ongoing implementation of program.
	NH-150a	Revised. Added accomplishments. Timeframe changed to long term.
	NH-156a	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
Community Design	CD-1b	Completed. Delete program.
	CD-3b	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	CD-3c	No Change/ Minor Update. Change reference to related program.
	CD-4a	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	CD-4b	Revised. Added partially implemented accomplishments. Timeframe changed to long term.
	CD-4c	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	CD-4d	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	CD-5a	Revised. Acknowledge completed Canalfront Conceptual Design Plan.
	CD-8a	No Change/ Minor Update. Redevelopment replaced with Economic Redevelopment as a resource.
	CD-10b	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	CD-10c	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	CD-11a	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	CD-12a	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	CD-13	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
	CD-15b	Revised. Mentioned thresholds adjusted. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
Economic Vitality	Intro	Revised. Revised outdated numbers
	EV-2e	Revised. Revised text, timeframe changed to ongoing.
	EV-7a	Revised. Examples added, timeframe changed to ongoing.
	EV-8b	Deleted.
	EV-12b	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
	EV-13a	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to ongoing. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
	EV-14	No Change/ Minor Update. H-54a reference removed (program completed)
	EV-15b	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
	EV-17a	Revised. Expanded on pre-application actions. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
Circulation	Intro	Revised. Revise “Background” and Update Exhibit 19 to add mode split with 2013 data.

	Intro	Revised. Revised “Transportation Successes” to reflect updates, add Station Area Plan references and Complete Streets Directive policy adoption.
	Intro	Revised. Update to “Transit Services” and remove outdated text.
	Intro	Revised. Update to “Paratransit Services” estimated needs.
	Intro	Revised. Update to “Bicycling and Pedestrian Facilities” to reference Complete Streets Policy.
	Intro	Revised. Update to “Paratransit Services” estimated needs.
	Intro	No Change / Minor Update. Revise “Parking Facilities” sentence structure.
	Intro	Revised. Update to “Funding Needs” to reflect new funding sources.
	Goal 12	Revised. Clarified reference to TAM
	C-1a	Revised. Clarified reference to TAM
	C-2a	Completed. Delete program.
	(New) C-5.1	New. New policy on VMT for Environmental Review.
	(New) C-5.1a	New. New program on VMT for Environmental Review.
	Exhibit 21	Revised. Project list updated.
	C-7	Revised. Removed redevelopment as a source.
	Intro	Revised. Removed outdated text from “Expanding Alternatives to the Single Occupant Automobile for Local and Regional Mobility”.
	C-11a	Revised. Removed outdated text.
	C-11e	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
	Intro	Revised. Removed outdated text from “Improving Transit and Related Services”.
	C-14a	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
	C-17a	Revised. Updated SMART text reference.
	C-17b	Revised. Updated SMART text reference.
	C-20	Revised. Updated SMART text reference.
	C-20a	Revised. Updated SMART text reference.
	C-29e	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
Infrastructure	Intro	Revised. Removed outdated text
	I-4b	No Change/ Minor Update. Removed redevelopment as a source.
	I-8b	Revised. Added text on continuing actions
	Intro	Revised. Updated “Water and Wastewater Infrastructure” water supply text, and removed outdated text relevant to LGVSD
	I-12	Deleted. Policy no longer considered necessary.
	I-12a	Deleted.
	I-13	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated program number reference.
	Intro	Revised. Revised “Telecommunications” introduction to remove outdated text.
	I-15b	Completed. Delete program.
Governance	G-2	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated Housing Element program number reference.
	G-3	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated Housing Element program number reference.

	Goal 21	Revised. Added text to highlight efforts to support community participation.
	G-5	Revised. Included reference to Community Engagement Action Plan.
	G-6	Revised. Included reference to Community Engagement Action Plan.
	G-7	Revised. Included reference to Community Engagement Action Plan. Update Housing Element program reference.
	G-8	Revised. Included reference to Community Engagement Action Plan.
	G-9b	Revised. Text on exit interviews.
	G-11a	Revised. Replaced DART with CERT.
	G-12b	Revised. Removed outdated text.
	Goal 22	Revised. Revised outdated numbers.
	G-18c	Revised. Added reference to SB 2.
Sustainability	SU-3a	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
	SU-3b	Completed. Delete program.
	SU-3c	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
	SU-4	Revised. Integrated with CON-8
	SU-4a	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
	SU-4b	No Change/ Minor Update. Program continues in some form but responsibility changed to city manager
	SU-4c	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
	SU-4d	Revised. Revised due to completion. References recent actions.
	(New) SU-4e	Revised. Moved from CON-17a.
	(New) SU-4f	Revised. Moved from CON-18b.
	(New) SU-4g	Revised. Moved from CON-18d Incentives for Solar and Clean Energy and combined with CON-19a Energy Production.
	SU-5a	Deleted.
	(New) SU-5b	Revised. Moved from CON-18c.
	SU-5b	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-5c. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
	SU-5c	Revised. Renumbered to SU-5d. Timeframe changed to ongoing. Integrated CON-20a.
	(New) SU-5e	Revised. Moved from CON-20b
	SU-5d	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-5f. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
	(New) SU-6	Revised. Moved from CON-22.
	(New) SU-6a	Revised. Moved from CON-22a.
	SU-6	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-7
	SU-6a to 6b	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-7a and SU-7b.
	SU-6c	Completed. Delete program.
	SU-6d	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-7c.
	SU-7	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-8.
	SU-7a	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-8a. Resource changed to Economic Development.
	SU-7b	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-8b.
	SU-8	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-9.
	SU-8a	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-9a. Removed

	redevelopment as a resource. Updated Housing Element program reference.
SU-8c	Revised. Moved and modified from PR-16a.
SU-9	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-10.
SU-9a	Revised. Renumbered to SU-10a. Updated program status.
SU-9b	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-10b. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
SU-9c	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-10c. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
SU-9d	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-10d.
(New) SU-10e	Revised. Moved from CON-21a.
(New) SU-10f	Revised. Moved from CON-21b.
(New) SU-10g	Revised. Moved from CON-21c.
(New) SU-10h	Revised. Moved from CON-21d.
(new) SU-10i	Revised. Moved from CON-21e.
SU-9e	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-10j. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
SU-9f	Completed. Delete program.
SU-9g	No Change/ Minor Update. No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-10k.
SU-9h	Completed. Delete program.
SU-9i	Completed. Delete program.
SU-10	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-11.
SU-10a	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-11a. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
SU-10b	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-11b. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
SU-10c	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-11c. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
SU-10d	No Change/ Minor Update. to SU-11d. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
SU-10f	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-11e.
SU-11	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-12.
SU-11a	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-12a. Resource changed to Economic Development.
SU-11b	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-12b. Timeframe changed to ongoing. Incorporated CON-17b.
SU-11c	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-12c. Resource changed to Economic Development.
SU-12	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-13.
SU-12a to SU-12c	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-13a to SU-13c.
SU-12d	Completed. Delete program.
SU-12e	Revised. Renumbered to SU-13d. Include reference to CCAP.
SU-13	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-14.
SU-13a	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-14a. Incorporated

		CON-23a.
	SU-13b	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-14b. Incorporated CON-24c.
	SU-13c	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-14c.
	SU-13d	Completed. Delete program.
	SU-13e	Completed. Delete program.
	SU-13f	Revised. Renumbered to SU-14d. Incorporated CON-24d.
	SU-13g to SU-13j	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-14e to SU-14h.
	(New) SU-14i	Revised. Moved from CON-18f. LEED changed to CalGreen
	(New) SU-14j	Revised. Moved from CON-24a.
	(New) SU-14k	Revised. Moved from CON-24b.
	(New) SU-14l	Revised. Moved from CON-25a.
	SU-14	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-15.
	SU-14a to SU-14d	No Change/ Minor Update. Renumbered to SU-15a to SU-15d.
Culture and Arts	CA-1a	Completed. Delete program.
	CA-1b	Completed. Delete program.
	CA-2	Revised. Revised text on the Arts Plan
	CA-6c	Completed. Delete program.
	CA-8	Completed. Delete policy.
	CA-8a	Completed. Delete program.
	CA-9a	Completed. Delete program.
	CA-13a	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to long term.
	CA-14a	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
	CA-14c	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
Parks and Recreation	Intro	Revised. Removed outdated text
	PR-7b	Deleted.
	PR-11a	Completed. Delete program.
	PR-16a	Deleted. Modified and moved to SU-8c. Originally recommended for deletion because of completion, but there may be opportunities to look into standards and permitting processes.
	PR-24a	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
Safety	Intro	Revised. Updated to reflect CUPA oversight
	S-12	Revised. Updated to reflect CUPA oversight
	S-12a	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated to reflect CUPA oversight
	S-12b	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated to reflect CUPA oversight
	S-13a	Revised. Updated to reflect CUPA oversight
	S-13b	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated to reflect CUPA oversight
	S-13c	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated to reflect CUPA oversight
	S-14a	No Change/ Minor Update. Responsibility updated
	S-16a	No Change/ Minor Update. Updated to reflect CUPA oversight
	S-21	Revised. Text updated, refers to sea level rise white paper
	S-21a	New. Changed to local hazard mitigation plan
	(New) S-21b	New. New program
	Intro	Revised. Replaced DART with CERT
	S-26a	No Change/ Minor Update. Replaced DART with CERT
	S-30b	Revised. Updated WUI reference

	S-33e	No Change/ Minor Update. Replaced DART with CERT
	S-40c	No Change/ Minor Update. Replaced DART with CERT
Noise	N-6b	Completed. Delete program.
	N-6f	No Change/ Minor Update. Timeframe changed to ongoing.
	N-10b	No Change/ Minor Update. Change to N-9b. Wrong numbering/ typo
	N-10c	No Change/ Minor Update. Change to N-9c. Wrong numbering/ typo
	N-10d	No Change/ Minor Update. Change to N-9d. Wrong numbering/ typo
Open Space	OS-2d	No Change/ Minor Update. Deleted reference that could not be located
Conservation	Goal 32	Deleted. Goal is deleted because policies and programs were moved to the Sustainability Element
	CON-17 to CON-25	Revised. Policies and programs moved to the Sustainability Element. See SU-4e (Regional Energy Office), SU-4f (Zoning and Building Code Review), SU-4g (Clean Energy Production), SU-5b (Use of Alternative Building Materials), SU-5d (Water Efficiency Programs), SU-5e (Water Recycling), SU-6a (Site Design), SU-10e (Recycling), SU-10f (Recyclable Waste Receptacles), SU-10g (Recycling for Apartments and Nonresidential Buildings), SU-10h (Demolition Waste), SU-10i (Recycling Education), SU-12b (Marin County Green business Program), SU-14a (Alternative Transportation Options), SU-14b (Alternative Fuel for City Fleet), SU-14d (City Electricity), SU-14i (Civic Buildings), SU-14j (Green Business Certification), SU-14k (Regional Collaboration), SU-14l (Backup Energy Provision)
	CON-18a	Completed. Program not moved to Sustainability Element
	CON-18e	Completed. Program not moved to Sustainability Element
Air Quality	AW-4b	Completed. Delete program.
	AW-6c	No Change/ Minor Update. Deleted completed reference

D. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The required environmental review for the proposed General Plan Amendments commenced with a review of the 2004 certified San Rafael General Plan 2020 EIR. An Initial Study checklist was prepared to determine if the proposed General Plan Amendments would result in any new significant impacts, an increase in the severity of impacts, or new or expanded mitigation measures from those analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The following section of this document provides the rationale for the preparation of an addendum and a summary of analysis and findings of the addendum for each environmental category reviewed.

Rationale for Preparation of EIR Addendum

Since the General Plan EIR has been certified, the environmental impacts of all subsequent activities must be examined in light of the impact analysis in the certified EIR to determine if additional CEQA documentation must be prepared. One of the standards that apply is whether, under Public Resources Code Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163, there are new significant effects, changes in circumstance or other information that require preparation of a subsequent EIR or supplemental EIR. CEQA Section 15164 states that, “the lead or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for a subsequent EIR have occurred.”

In determining whether an addendum is the appropriate document to analyze the modifications to the project and its approval, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration) states:

(a) The lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

(b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.

(c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.

(d) The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.

(e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency’s required findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.

New significant effects or other grounds require preparation of a subsequent EIR or supplemental EIR in support of further agency action on a project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163. Under these guidelines, a subsequent or supplemental EIR shall be prepared if any of the following criteria are met.

(a) When an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

This document serves as the Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) prepared for the City of San Rafael General Plan. The Addendum has been drafted pursuant to Section 15164 of CEQA and provides evidence demonstrating that the proposed General Plan Amendment is consistent with the certified General Plan EIR.

As demonstrated herein, the proposed changes set forth in the General Plan Amendment do not meet the criteria for requiring preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR, CEQA Section 15162 and 15163 respectively. The General Plan Amendment will not result in one or more significant effects not previously discussed in the General Plan EIR, nor does the Amendment

create substantially more severe significant effects than previously examined. Additionally, none of the conditions analyzed under the certified General Plan EIR have substantially changed.

The City of San Rafael, as the lead agency, supports and recommends an Addendum rather than the preparation of a Subsequent EIR or Supplemental EIR. Therefore, the General Plan Amendment may be approved as an activity covered within the scope of the 2004 certified General Plan EIR. The purpose of this review is to determine if the project would result in: new significant impacts; an increase in the severity of impacts; or new or expanded mitigation measures from those analyzed and determined in the General Plan EIR. The following presents those General Plan EIR impacts and mitigation measures that are pertinent to the project, and compares the proposed project activities to these impacts and measures. The discussion is organized by the chronological order of topic areas presented in the Initial Study:

Impacts Summary Table

GENERAL PLAN EIR IMPACT	GENERAL PLAN EIR ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURE	RELATIONSHIP TO PROPOSED PROJECT (GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 2016)
AESTHETICS		
<p>Impact IV. 7-4 Light and Glare</p> <p>GP EIR determined that development facilitated by GP could produce new sources of light and glare. Considered significant before mitigation/ Less than significant after mitigation</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure IV.7-4: new projects proposing parking lot improvements to prepare lighting plan that incorporate measures as set forth in CD-19b "Lighting Plan"</p>	<p>No change. The General Plan Amendment would result in no change that would result in impacts different from those analyzed in the GP EIR.</p>
AIR QUALITY		
<p>Impact IV.3-1. Consistency with Clean Air Plan. General Plan EIR determined that there would be a less-than-significant to the Clean Air Plan.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>No change. The General Plan Amendment would result in no change that would result in impacts different from those analyzed in the GP EIR. Therefore, this action would have no impact on General Plan consistency with the Bay Area Air Plan.</p>
<p>Impact IV.3-2. Consistency with Clean Air Plan transportation control measures. General Plan EIR determined that there would be to be less-than-significant impacts to Clean Air transportation control measures.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>No change. The proposed update to the General Plan Amendment would result in no changes to the adopted Sustainability Element and GHG Emissions Reduction Strategy, which ensure consistency with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines for promoting transportation control measures.</p>
<p>Impact IV.3-3. Odor/toxics buffer zones. The GP EIR determined that in the</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure IV.3-3. Adopted Program AW-2a (Sensitive Receptors)</p>	<p>No Change. The General Plan Amendment does not propose a change in development policy from those analyzed in the GP EIR that would</p>

<p>absence of buffer zones from major mobile sources of toxic contaminants impacts would be potentially significant before mitigation.</p>	<p>required that all projects considered “sensitive receptors” (e.g., housing, schools, child care) proposed within 500 feet of the closest lane of US 101 or I-580 be subject to review of health risks.</p>	<p>expose “sensitive receptors” to health risks at significant levels.</p>
<p>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p>		
<p>Impact IV.8-1. Special-Status Plant and Animal Species. The GP EIR determined that the 2020 GP could directly and/or indirectly affect special status plants and animals before mitigation.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure IV.8-1 introduced CON-14a requiring survey of vacant lots prior to development approval and CON-14b requiring minimization of impacts to special status species where impacts found to be unavoidable. After mitigation Impacts are Less than significant</p>	<p>No Change. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected and all impacts would remain at levels below significant.</p>
<p>Impact IV.8-2. Sensitive Natural Communities. The GP EIR determined that implementation of the 2020 GP may directly or indirectly impact undeveloped areas.</p>	<p>Mitigation measure IV.8-2 requires the adoption of Conservation Policy CON-10a, which requires the protection of oak savanna and oak woodland habitat when assessing development in these areas.</p>	<p>No Change. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected and all impacts would remain at levels below significant.</p>
<p>Impact IV.8-3. Federally Protected Wetlands. The General Plan determined that there would be less-than-significant</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>No change. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected.</p>

<p>impacts to protected wetlands, provided that Conservation Element policies and programs were included in the adoption of the Plan.</p>		
<p>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</p>		
<p>Impact IV.9-1 Seismic Ground Shaking. The GP EIR determined that new development would likely be subject to some level of seismic ground shaking and found this impact to be significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Impact IV. 9-2 Seismic related ground failure. The GP EIR determined that exposure to adverse seismic effects would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure IV. 9-1: Required post-earthquake inspections of critical facilities. With mitigation, impacts would be less than significant. (applicable to both impact categories)</p>	<p>No Change. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected and all impacts would remain at levels below significant.</p>
<p>Impact IV. 9-3 Land sliding. GP EIR found that development consistent with 2020 GP could expose people to effects of landslides and this would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure IV.9-3 requires that the City develop and adopt a City landslide policy. With mitigation impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>There would be no change or increase in the severity of the significant and unavoidable impact. The General Plan Amendment does not change the policies on land sliding and proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected.</p>
<p>Impact IV.9-4 Subsidence. The GP EIR found that development consistent with 2020 GP could expose people to effects of subsidence and this would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures IV.9-4 (a) and 4 (b) requires that the City amend policy S-21 Rise in Sea Level and that the City adopt a program for S-20 Levee Upgrading, respectively.</p>	<p>The General Plan Amendment revises Policy S-21. Rise in Sea Level to expand upon the current policy through monitoring, sea level rise vulnerability assessments, and coordination for long-term adaptation. Program S-21a. calls for the preparation of a local hazard mitigation plan and Program S-21b. calls for a vulnerability assessment. Policy S-20 remains unchanged.</p>

Impact IV.9-5 Erosion	Mitigation Measure IV.9-5 requires that the City shall amend Policy NH-68 Shoreline Embankments With mitigation impacts were found to be less than significant.	No Change. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected and all impacts would remain at levels below significant.
IV. 9-7 Septic Suitability of Soils. The GP EIR Determined that the installation of septic systems on inadequate soils would be a potentially significant impact.	Mitigation Measure IV.9-7 requires the City adopt a GP Policy discouraging the use of septic systems in the planning area. If no other alternatives exist than a soil test is required. With mitigation impacts are less than significant.	No Change. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected and all impacts would remain at levels below significant.
LAND USE, POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING		
Impact IV.1-1. Conflict with applicable land use or other plans. The GP EIR determined that there would be less-than-significant impacts.	No mitigation required.	The General Plan Amendment proposes introduction of a “Water” land use designation for parcels covered by the bay to more accurately reflect parcels that are not expected to develop because of their location in the water. As development would not be expected on parcels under water, the applied “Water” land use designation would not cause a significant change. No new impacts are expected.
Impact IV.1-2. Incompatible land uses and changes to neighborhood character. The	No mitigation required.	No change. The General Plan Amendment would not increase the severity of this impact or result in a new impact. Programs have been

General Plan EIR determined that there would be less-than-significant impacts.		carried through to completion: zoning updates have been completed in policies NH-54, NH-75, NH-95, and NH-119. Programs in policy NH-118 have been updated to reflect progress in planning and development. The Project would not result in incompatible land uses or a change in the character of a neighborhood.
Impact IV.1-3. Growth and concentration to population. The General Plan EIR determined that there would be less-than-significant impacts.	No mitigation required.	No change. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected and all impacts would remain at levels below significant.
Impact IV.1-4. Employment growth rate. The General Plan EIR determined that there would be less-than-significant impacts.	No mitigation required.	No change. None of the components of the project would result in a substantial increase in the employment projected under the San Rafael General Plan 2020.
Impact IV.1-5. Jobs-to-housing ratio. The General Plan EIR determined that there would be less-than-significant impacts.	No mitigation required.	No change. None of the components of the project would result in a substantial change in the jobs-to-housing ratio that is projected under the San Rafael General Plan 2020.
NOISE		
IV.4-2. Increased Rail Noise.	Mitigation Measure IV.4-2. This measure requires that a detailed noise assessment be conducted to assess noise and vibration impacts associated with	No Change. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected and all impacts would remain at levels below significant.

	the SMART rail service.	
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
Impact IV.5-3 Release of Hazardous Materials. GP EIR indicates that development consistent with the 2020 GP could cause a release of hazardous materials that would be a significant impact.	Mitigation Measure IV. 5-3 requires that policy S-13 be introduced requiring remediation and cleanup for any sites having had past contamination.	Marin County CUPA replaces the San Rafael Fire Department as the oversight body for hazardous materials. Policy and program changes involve replacing text noting the responsible party for implementation.
Impact IV.5-4 Hazardous Materials, substances or wastes near schools. The GP EIR indicated that because the 2020 GP would allow for the transportation, storage, use and or disposal of hazardous materials within ¼ mile of a school the associated impacts are potentially significant.	Mitigation Measure IV.5-4 introduces GP policy S-11 requiring survey of existing industrial facilities located adjacent to schools and restricting the siting of hazardous waste-related facilities near schools.	No Change. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected beyond those previously analyzed.
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES		
Impact IV.5-6 Police Services. The GP EIR found that development consistent with the 2020 GP would generate demand for police services beyond the available capacity. This was found to be a potentially significant impact.	Mitigation Measure IV.5-6(a) and (b) introduces S-39a, Public Safety Facilities, to encourage the Police Dept. to identify needs and construct or renovate facilities. However, impacts remain significant	No change or increase in the severity of the significant and unavoidable impact. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected beyond those previously analyzed.

	and unavoidable.	
Impact IV.5-8 Parks, The GP EIR determined that development consistent with the 2020 GP may further exacerbate the existing deficiency in park facilities and this would be a potentially significant impact.	Mitigation Measure IV.5-8 recognizes that impacts would be minimized through adherence to GP policies, however, impacts remain significant and unavoidable.	No change or increase in the severity of the significant and unavoidable impact. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected beyond those previously analyzed.
Impact IV.5-9 Library Services. The GP EIR found that development consistent with 2020 GP could increase the demand for library services beyond the current capacity which would be a potentially significant impact.	Mitigation Measure IV.5-9 recognizes that impacts would be minimized through adherence to GP policies, however, impacts remain significant and unavoidable.	No change or increase in the severity of the significant and unavoidable impact. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected beyond those previously analyzed.
Impact IV.5-11 Wastewater treatment capacity – South of Puerto Suello Hill. The GP EIR found that development consistent with the 2020 GP could generate wastewater flows that exceed the capacity of the Central Marin Sanitation Agency.	Mitigation Measure IV.5-11(a) and (b) require that that the CMSA perform a Capacity Management Alternative Study.	No change or increase in the severity of the significant and unavoidable impact. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected beyond those previously analyzed.
Impact.5-12 Water Supply. The GP EIR found that development consistent with the 2020 GP could increase the demand for water in the planning area which would constitute a project specific and cumulative impact.	Mitigation Measure IV.5-12(a) and (b) requires that the MMWD research and implement water conservation facilities and identify new water supply sources. However, this impact remains significant and unavoidable	No change or increase in the severity of the significant and unavoidable impact. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected beyond those previously analyzed.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC		
Impact IV.2-1. Level of Service at intersections approved to acceptable levels of service with General Plan 2020. The General Plan determined that there would be less-than-significant impacts to intersections adopted with specific, acceptable LOS standards.	No mitigation required.	The General Plan Amendment presents updates to the list of traffic improvements in terms of description, funding amount for consolidated projects, and timing of proposed roadway improvements. The total funding remains consistent with the current General Plan No new impacts are expected beyond those previously analyzed.
Impacts IV.2-2, IV.2-3, IV.2-4, IV.2-5. Impacts to levels of service at specific intersections. The GP EIR determined that there would be significant and unavoidable impacts at specific intersections.	No mitigation measures available or adopted to reduce impacts to acceptable level. Found to be significant and unavoidable	No change or increase in the severity of the significant and unavoidable impact. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected beyond those previously analyzed.
Impact IV.2-6. Unacceptable City roadway segment level of service resulting from San Rafael General Plan 2020. The General Plan EIR determined that there would be significant and unavoidable impacts along specific roadway segments.	Impact determined to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures available or adopted to reduce impacts to acceptable level.	No change or increase in the severity of the significant and unavoidable impact. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected beyond those previously analyzed.
Impact IV.2-7. City roadway segment level of service resulting from San Rafael General Plan 2020. The General Plan determined that there would be less-than-significant impacts to selective City roadway segments.	No mitigation required.	No change. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected beyond those previously analyzed.
Impact IV.2-9 LOS along US 101 and I-580 Mainlines resulting from 2020 GP. Implementation of the GP would cause	GP EIR determined impact to be significant and unavoidable. No	No change or increase in the severity of the significant and unavoidable impact. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected beyond those

<p>some freeway segments to deteriorate to below significant levels and this is considered a potentially significant impact</p>	<p>mitigation measures available to further reduce this impact</p>	<p>previously analyzed.</p>
<p>Impact IV. 2-13 Removal of on-street parking spaces along Lincoln Avenue. The GP EIR determined that the removal of on-street parking spaces required to improve traffic flow would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>GP EIR determined impact to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures available to further reduce this impact</p>	<p>No change or increase in the severity of the significant and unavoidable impact. The General Plan Amendment proposes no new changes to the analysis in the GP EIR. No new impacts are expected beyond those previously analyzed.</p>

E. INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Initial Study Checklist

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Project Title | General Plan Amendment |
| 2. Lead Agency Name & Address | City of San Rafael
Community Development Department
Planning Division
1400 Fifth Avenue (P.O. Box 151560)
San Rafael, California 94915-1560 |
| 3. Contact Person & Phone Number | Paul A. Jensen, Community Development Director
Phone number: (415) 485-5064
Email: paul.jensen@cityofsanrafael.org |
| 4. Project Location | The proposed project is not site-specific, but addresses policies, programs and strategies that are applicable citywide. |
| 5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address | City of San Rafael
1400 5 th Avenue
P.O. Box 151560
San Rafael, CA 94915-1560 |
| Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required | None |

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

None of the following environmental categories would be potentially affected, as indicated by the following evaluation of environmental impacts.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Finding of Significance |

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that, in preparing the attached Initial Study, the proposed project would not result in any new significant information, new significant impacts or new mitigation measures that had not been previously considered, analyzed or disclosed in the San Rafael General Plan 2020 certified EIR (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT). Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, an ADDENDUM to the certified ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT will be prepared.

Prepared By: Olivia Ervin, Environmental Planner, Metropolitan Planning Group

Paul A. Jensen

August 8, 2016

Approved By: Paul A. Jensen, Community Development Director, City of San Rafael

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources: 1, 2, 3, and 7

Aesthetics Impact Discussion:

- a) **No Impact.** Adoption of the proposed General Plan Amendment will not have a substantial direct or indirect impact on scenic vistas. Any future development project will be subject to individual, site-specific environmental review, as required by CEQA as well as all development standards and building code regulations required by State law and City policy.
- b) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment provides policies and programs that are broadly applied citywide and are not site-specific. Potential environmental impacts to scenic resources may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The General Plan contains several policies regarding the preservation of scenic roads and highways. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. No impacts beyond those identified in the General Plan EIR are anticipated. Thus, the General Plan Amendment will have no impacts to scenic resources.
- c) **No Impact.** Potential environmental impacts to the visual character or quality of a specific site and its surroundings may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of future development to the visual character and quality of the site will be assessed at the time of specific project review. Impacts from future growth and infill development associated with residential land uses have been previously identified in the General Plan EIR and would be required to be consistent with existing adopted General Plan policies that preserve the visual character and ensure compatibility. No impacts beyond those identified in the General Plan EIR are anticipated, and thus the General Plan Amendment would

result in no impacts to the environment due to a degradation of the visual character and quality.

- d) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment provides policies and programs that are broadly applied citywide and are not site-specific. Potential environmental impacts associated with new sources of light or glare may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. No impacts beyond those identified in the General Plan EIR are anticipated, and thus the General Plan Amendment would result in no impacts to the environment due to introduction of light and glare.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources: 1, 2, 3, and 7

Agricultural and Forestry Resources Impact Discussion:

- a) **No Impact.** The City of San Rafael does not contain any prime or unique farmland, nor does it contain any Farmland of Statewide importance. Adopting the General Plan Amendment will not result in impacts to farmland or agricultural uses located within the City limits.

- b) **No Impact.** The City of San Rafael planning area does not contain any land that is zoned for agricultural use or is under a Williamson Act contract. No impacts beyond those identified in the General Plan EIR are anticipated, and thus the Project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
- c) – e) **No Impact.** The City of San Rafael does not contain any land that is zoned for forest land or is protected under the Timberland Production zone. Impacts to agricultural resources from future growth have been previously identified in the General Plan EIR. No lands in the General Plan area designated for agriculture, forestry or timberland will be rezoned or otherwise affected by the proposed General Plan Amendment. Thus, the proposed Amendment will have no impact to such resources.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7

Air Quality Impact Discussion:

- a) – c) **No Impact.** The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the agency with regulatory authority for air quality in the Bay Area region, including the City of San Rafael. BAAQMD has adopted the Clean Air Plan (CAP), which aims to attain air quality standards, reduce exposure to pollutants, protect public health and reduce GHG emissions. The CAP identified 55 control measures that are presented in order to reduce air pollution throughout the Bay Area and includes measures such as promoting mixed-use transit-oriented and

compact development, dust management, water conservation, VMT reduction, energy efficiency and waste management, among others.

The City's General Plan is considered to be consistent with the CAP since it supports the primary goals, includes control measures, and does not conflict with or disrupt implementation of control measures. Similarly, the proposed General Plan Amendment is also determined to be consistent with the CAP as there would not be a conflict with CAP implementation due to updates in proposed policies and programs set forth therein. The General Plan Amendment is broadly applied citywide and is not site-specific. The potential for conflict with Bay Area Air Plan may be realized or determined when the proposed policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review.

The proposed General Plan Amendment would not result in a potential for conflict with the adopted Clean Air Plan since the proposed policies and programs therein would not:

- Change density parameters for General Plan land use designations. The new "Water" land use designation, applied to certain parcels characterized by their location in the bay, is associated with a density of zero (0) residential units per acre.;
- Change residential land use projections that would result in new traffic generation or increased air pollutants from those levels projected under the currently adopted San Rafael General Plan 2020 or the Clean Air Plan.

In addition, the City recently adopted a GHG Reduction Plan that incorporates the implementation measures of the City-adopted CCAP, which includes recommendations such as improving the pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure (NTPP), promoting transit-oriented development (TODs), supporting transit services, and SMART station planning, which would reduce vehicle miles traveled, resulting in decreased air pollutants. The subject General Plan Amendment does not conflict with implementation of the Reduction Plan or the CCAP.

The potential to violate an air quality standard may be realized or determined when the proposed policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. No impacts beyond those identified in the General Plan EIR are anticipated. Thus, the Project will have no impact on the environment as a result of conflict with an adopted air quality plan and/or an individual or cumulative violation of applicable air quality standard.

- d) **No Impact.** The exposure of sensitive receptors would be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review.

The General Plan Amendment does not change or increase housing development projections for the planning area that would further expose potential housing to substantial pollutant concentrations beyond what has previously been analyzed. Increased density proximate to high transit areas could be exposed to elevated pollutant concentrations; however, site-specific analysis will be conducted at the project level in order to assess exposure of sensitive receptors.

Policies and programs provide for the protection of sensitive receptors and require site-specific analysis where concentrations may be elevated. As the plan areas are developed and more specifics on housing opportunities and recommendations are identified and formalized, a detailed assessment of exposure to pollutant concentrations will be prepared. At the time of environmental review, the technical studies will be required to address potential pollutant concentrations and health risk exposure.

The proposed General Plan Amendment does not introduce any policies or programs that would conflict with adopted standards to protect sensitive populations to air quality pollutants. One program to implement an ordinance on fireplace and wood burning stoves has been completed and is therefore deleted. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impact under this criterion.

- e) **No Impact.** The creation of potential, objectionable odors may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. Adopting the General Plan Amendments will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. No new or increased impact as a result of the General Plan Amendments will occur beyond what is already anticipated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the Amendment to the General Plan will have no impact associated with odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Formerly Fish and Game) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (formerly Fish and Game) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Sources: 1, 2, 3, and 7

Biological Resources Impact Discussion:

- a) **No Impact.** Adopting the General Plan Amendment will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a threatened, endangered, candidate, sensitive, or special status. Potential environmental impacts to special-status, sensitive or candidate species protected by regional plans, policies or regulations of California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impact to sensitive communities and their habitat.
- b) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment does not introduce any land use changes, zoning changes or policies that would conflict with the protection of sensitive natural communities including sensitive oak savannas and oak woodland communities. The goals and policies of the General Plan serve to protect wetlands, habitat for special-status species, native vegetation, wildlife habitat, and wildlife movement corridors. Additional biological and wetland assessments would be required as part of environmental review for future development. There are no changes to land use that would result from implementation of the proposed General Plan Amendment. There are no new or more severe impacts that would occur relative to what has previously been identified in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impacts to sensitive communities.
- c) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment does not introduce any new impacts to biological resources beyond those identified in the General Plan EIR. Adopting the General Plan

Amendment will not have a substantial effect on any federally protected wetlands or other sensitive water bodies. The creation of the new “Water” land use designation in the General Plan classifies parcels that are covered by the bay and are not intended to be developed. The amended policies and programs are broadly applied citywide and are not site-specific. Site-specific analysis of wetlands will occur at the time that development proposals are submitted and will be reviewed in accordance with adopted policies and programs.

- d) **No Impact.** Potential environmental impacts to movement of corridors for wildlife may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. Adopting the General Plan Amendment will not result in new or increased impacts beyond those already anticipated in the General Plan EIR. Depending on the attributes of each individual development proposal, future development will be subject to additional environmental review and compliance with all applicable policies related to wildlife species including movement and corridors. Therefore, implementation of the Amendment will have no impacts to migration or movement corridors.
- e) – f) **No Impact.** Potential conflicts with the Conservation Element policies and the zoning ordinance provisions and regulations may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. There are no adopted local, regional or state habitat protection plans that apply to the San Rafael planning area. Thus, the Amendment will have no impacts that conflict with an adopted policy, ordinance or Habitat Conservation Plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources: 1, 2, 3, and 7

Cultural Resources Impact Discussion:

a) – d) **No Impact.** Adopting the General Plan Amendments will not directly impact historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources at a site-specific or project specific basis. In compliance with State Senate Bill SB18 and State Senate Bill SB52, the City initiated Tribal Consultation with the Graton Rancheria, Tribal Heritage Preservation Office, by certified mailed letter (Notice to Initiate General Plan Amendment/Request for Tribal Consultation) which was sent on September 8, 2015. A request for tribal consultation was not received by the 90 day time period established for making such requests.

Amendments reflect completion of policies and programs in the Culture and Arts Element, including completion of cultural programs in policy CA-1, community arts contributions in CA-6, and cultural facilities in CA-8 and CA-9, leading to deletion of programs. In reviewing these impacts on site specific projects, the City will continue to rely on review of the City-adopted Historical/Architectural Survey and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 to determine the presence of historic resources.

The City-adopted Archaeological Resource and Protection Procedures, including: a) a review of the City’s Past Finder archaeological sensitivity maps and property priority ranking to determine proximity to potential resources; b) consultation with the Northwest Information Center and local Native American tribe representatives for direction on needed study; c) the preparation of an archaeological resource assessment when deemed necessary; and d) implementation of protective measures such as avoidance, capping or relocation of resources, will be utilized for review of impacts associated with future development proposal.

Adopting the General Plan Amendment will not introduce any new programs or policies that would conflict with the protection and preservation of cultural resources. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impacts to cultural resources (including Tribal Cultural Resources).

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

other substantial evidence of a known fault?
Refer to Division of Mines and Geology
Publication 42.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ii. Strong Seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Sources: 1, 2, 3, and 7

Geology and Soils Impact Discussion:

- a) **No Impact.** Adopting the General Plan Amendment will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides. The San Rafael planning area contains no earthquake faults delineated on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. Impacts to persons and property associated with seismic activity resulting from full build-out of the General Plan were addressed in the General Plan EIR. Potential environmental impacts associated with seismic ground shaking, ground failure including liquefaction, landslides and other direct and secondary effect of seismic activity may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied to a project or activity, on a site-specific or project-specific basis.

Depending on the attributes of each individual development proposal, future development will be subject to additional environmental review and geotechnical evaluation. Conformance with standard Uniform Building Code Guidelines would also minimize potential impacts from seismic shaking. There are no new or more severe impacts introduced as a result of the General Plan Amendment relative to what has previously been analyzed. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impact.

- b) **No Impact.** Adopting the General Plan Amendment will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Impacts to soils resulting from the anticipated growth and development of the City were addressed in the General Plan EIR. No new or increased impact will result beyond what is already anticipated and analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Future development will be subject to additional environmental review and compliance with all applicable policies related to erosion. Therefore, the General Plan Amendment will have no impacts due to soil erosion.

- c) – d) **No Impact.** Geologic impacts resulting from the anticipated growth and development of the City were addressed in the General Plan EIR. No new or increased impacts will result above what is already anticipated in the existing environmental documents. Future development will be subject to additional environmental review and compliance with all applicable policies related to landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse, expansive soils and other soil stability concerns. Therefore, adopting the General Plan Amendment will have no impact under this criterion.

- e) **No Impact.** The San Rafael planning area is served by the San Rafael Sanitation District and the Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District, which provide domestic wastewater/sewer service to all properties. Alternative waste water disposal systems are not permitted within the urban service area. All future development will be required to connect to the existing wastewater system. The proposed update does not increase demands or necessitate additional capacity beyond what has already been anticipated. Therefore, there would be no impact due to use of alternative sewer systems, as none are permitted.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Discussion:

- a) – b) **No Impact.** In 2009 the City of San Rafael adopted the Climate Change Action Plan 2009 (CCAP) in response to AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act. The CCAP includes strategies for transportation, waste reduction, land use, energy conservation and sequestration. The City also adopted a “Sustainability Element” to the General Plan and developed a GHG Emissions Reduction Strategy.

The General Plan Amendment does not conflict with implementation of the Sustainability Element nor does it interfere with implementation of the GHG Emissions Reduction Strategy. The Amendment proposes the merger of certain policies and programs between the Conservation and Sustainability Elements, ultimately leading to the deletion of duplicative programs in one Element so that they can be consolidated in the other Element; merged conservation programs include CON-17b. Green Business Program, CON-23a. City Carpool, CON-24c. City Vehicle Fleet, and CON-24d. Renewable Energy Sources in City Facilities. Other programs within Policies CON-17 to CON-25 are carried over to the Sustainability Element, unless they have already been completed.

Any new GHG emissions may be realized or determined when the proposed policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review by either: a) complying with the measures in the developed checklist; or b) through preparation of an individual GHG emissions assessment.

The GHG Reduction Plan incorporates measures of the City-adopted CCAP, which includes recommendations such as improving the pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure (NTPP), promoting transit-oriented development (TODs), supporting transit services, and SMART station planning, which would increase the performance and safety of public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The General Plan Amendment is consistent with all established State and local GHG reduction strategies and does not facilitate development that would conflict with the applicable GHG Plan or policies. Therefore, the General Plan Amendment will have no impacts associated with Greenhouse Gas emissions.

VIII. HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport of public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Sources: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7

Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact Discussion:

a) – h) **No Impact.** The proposed General Plan Amendment would not result in new or increased severity in the significant hazard and human health impacts beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. A revision of Policy S-21, Rise in Sea Level, identifies sea level rise as a hazard of local and regional concern requiring coordination. New programs S-21a. Local Hazard mitigation Plan and S-21b. Vulnerability Assessment – BayWAVE Program call for long-term mitigation planning and adaptation, highlighting efforts that are underway. Other changes include shifting the oversight body for hazardous materials from the San Rafael Fire Department to the Marin County Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA), but policies and programs regarding hazardous materials review and management have not changed except to acknowledge CUPA as the responsible agency. No new or increased severity of significant hazard impacts would occur beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the General Plan Amendment will have no impact to hazards and hazardous materials.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources: 1, 2, 3, and 7

Hydrology and Water Quality Impact Discussion:

a) and f) **No Impact.** The policies and programs are broadly applied citywide and are not site-specific. The updates do not change or revise current water quality standards. Further, potential environmental impacts from development and activities on a site that could violate water quality standards may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The General Plan EIR found that residential development will be located almost exclusively in urbanized areas, and that consistency with the 2020 General Plan, would ensure that no discernible effect on

water quality would occur. The General Plan Amendment does not introduce any new impacts or increase the severity of impacts to water quality beyond what was addressed in the General Plan EIR. The individual impacts of development will be assessed at the time of specific project review. Therefore, General Plan Amendment will have no impact to water quality.

- b) **No Impact.** The policies and programs would neither result in a conflict with groundwater recharge nor deplete groundwater reserves. Thus, there would be no new or more severe impacts to groundwater reserves relative to what was analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impact.
- c) – d) **No Impact.** The policies and programs would neither result in a conflict with groundwater recharge nor deplete groundwater reserves. Potential environmental impacts from future development may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review.
- e) **No Impact.** Amendments to General Plan policies and programs will not directly create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Potential environmental impacts from development and activities will be reviewed and considered on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. The General Plan Amendment does not result in any new or more severe impacts than what was previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR.
- g) – h) **No Impact.** Implementation of the General Plan Amendment will not involve the exposure of people or structures to an elevated flood hazard beyond what has previously been identified. The sites identified for potential residential development in the General Plan Amendment could be located 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. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. The General Plan Amendment does not result in any new or more severe impact than what was previously analyzed in the General Plan.
- i) – j) **No Impact.** Potential environmental impacts associated with a seiche or tsunami to development and activities on a site along the San Rafael bay front or within a FEMA flood hazard zone may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. Sea level rise and mitigation planning are being addressed in a revised Policy S-21. Rise in Sea Level and in new programs S-21a. Local Hazard mitigation Plan and S-21b. Vulnerability Assessment – BayWAVE Program. The General Plan Amendment does not result in any new or more severe impacts than what was previously analyzed in the General Plan.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7

Land Use and Planning Impact Discussion:

- a) - c) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment does not introduce any new or amended policies and programs that would divide an established community. Changes in the Land Use Element are consistent with established policies on land use and neighborhood character. Zoning amendments have been completed in policies NH-54, NH-75, NH-95, and NH-119. Programs in policy NH-118 have been updated to reflect progress in planning and development. Additionally, policy updates acknowledge the completion of the Canalfront Conceptual Design Plan and Downtown Station Area Plan. The General Plan Amendment proposes introduction of a “Water” land use designation for parcels covered by the bay to more accurately reflect parcels that are not expected to develop because of their location in the water. As development would not be expected on parcels under water, the applied “Water” land use designation would not cause a significant change. The project is compatible to applicable land use plans, policies and regulations. Therefore, the General Plan Amendment will have no new impacts.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources: 1, 2, 3, and 7

Mineral Resources Impact Discussion:

- a) - b) **No Impact.** The General Plan does not change any mineral resource designations, operations or mineral resource goals or policies for the San Rafael Planning area. Thus, there would be no impact to mineral resources.

XII. NOISE

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

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

Sources: 1, 2, 3, and 7

Noise Impact Discussion:

a) - b) **No Impact.** There are no physical improvements proposed as part of the update to the General Plan Amendment. All future development projects would be subject to applicable City noise standards. General Plan Amendment will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of established standard. The project proposes no changes to the current City of San Rafael Noise Ordinance that would impact current noise standards or limits. Potential environmental impacts from development and activities on a site that could expose persons to excessive noise levels may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis.

The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impacts due to excessive noise or vibration.

c) - d) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment will not result in a substantial permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the City above existing levels. Potential environmental impacts from future development and activities could be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. Impacts associated with temporary and permanent increase in ambient noise levels were addressed in the EIR for the General Plan. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impacts due to temporary and permanent increased in ambient noise.

e) - f) **Less than Significant Impact.** The General Plan Amendment will not result in an increased exposure of people residing or working proximate to a public or private airport beyond what is considered in the General Plan. There are no public airports in the City of San Rafael and there is one private airport, the San Rafael Airport, which is located in the Smith Ranch area. The General Plan Amendment does not propose any changes to the airport that would expose area residents to excessive noise levels. The individual impacts of future projects proximate to the airport will be assessed at the time of review for any specific projects. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impacts associated with noise exposure proximate to airports.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources: 1, 2, 3, and 7

Population and Housing Impacts Discussion:

- a) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment will not induce substantial population growth in the area. No change have been proposed that would require reconsideration of population projections, housing need, and development densities that were analyzed in the General Plan EIR. The policy changes proposed do not provide for any additional housing, businesses or population growth beyond what was previously analyzed. The General Plan Amendment does not propose changes to the Housing Element beyond reference updates to program numbers and other documents and does not change the analysis prepared in Addendum No.3 to the San Rafael General Plan EIR (SCH#2003052031) for the Housing Element Update (2015-2023). Therefore, the Amendment will have no impacts to population or housing.

- b) - c) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment will not result in the displacement of housing units or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The proposed policies and programs of the General Plan Amendment are broadly applied citywide and are not site-specific. Potential environmental impacts from development and activities on a site that could result in the displacement of existing housing or the need to construct replacement housing may be realized or determined when the policies or programs are considered and applied on a site-specific or project-specific basis. The individual impacts of these types of activities will be assessed at the time of specific project review. Therefore, there would be no impact from the proposed update.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sources: 1, 2, 3, and 7

Public Services Impacts Discussion:

a) – e) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment proposes changes in responsibility for hazardous materials oversight by adding the Marin County Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) in place of the San Rafael Fire Department in programs S-12a. Environmental Database, S-12b. Environmental History, S-13a. Potentially Hazardous Soils Map, S-13b. Hazardous Soils Cleanup, S-13c. Local Implementing Agency. CUPA is included as an additional responsible party for program S-16a. Safe Transport of Hazardous Material. No changes proposed would directly impact police protection. There are no changes proposed that would impact schools or result in the need for new school facilities. No parks or other public facilities would be impacted by the proposed General Plan Amendment. There are no new impacts to public services beyond what has been previously analyzed. Thus, the General Plan Amendment will have no impacts to fire and police protection, schools, parks and other facilities.

XV. RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Sources: 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7

Recreation Impacts Discussion:

a) – b) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment will not impact regional parks or recreational facilities. No changes are proposed to that would alter recreational amenities citywide. As no specific project or improvement is currently proposed, a site-specific impact cannot be analyzed. The individual impacts to parks and recreation will be assessed at the time of specific project review. There are no new impacts to public services beyond what has been previously analyzed. Thus, the General Plan Amendment will have no impact on parkland and recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7

Transportation and Circulation Impacts Discussion:

- a) – b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Updates to programs were required due to progress made in transportation funding, transit service implementation, and in response to Senate Bill 743 which introduces a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) methodology for analyzing impacts to traffic, as opposed to the traditional level of service approach. Program C-2a. Local Transportation Tax, which promoted local transportation improvements and passage of a county transportation tax, was completed with the passage of Measure A; as such this program was deleted.

The revisions to programs C-17a. SMART and C-17b. SMART Right-of-Way reflect progress made towards implementation of the SMART commuter rail service in Sonoma and Marin Counties. Amendments to these programs reflect the forthcoming commuter rail service along the SMART corridor and the maintenance of the right-of-way for this service. There are no modifications proposed that would result in a conflict with adopted plans.

Policy C-5.1 and Program C-5.1a introduces the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) concept as an alternative to Level of Service (LOS) that may be used in the future once a VMT model is created and approved. The program calls for the development and adoption of a VMT model and for the model to be incorporated into the General Plan EIR. Once developed, and prior to implementation, the VMT model will be evaluated separately to identify any environmental impacts. The introduction of this new policy is in accordance with State Law SB 743 and does not grant the authority to apply a VMT metric. Inclusion of the new policy regarding development of a VMT model does not introduce any new impacts nor does it establish new thresholds of significance. There are no changes proposed as part of the update that would result in elevated traffic trip generation beyond what was previously analyzed in the adopted General Plan EIR.

There are no physical improvements proposed as part of the General Plan Amendment. The traffic impacts of any future development will be addressed in separate site-specific studies. The General Plan Amendment does not introduce any new or more severe impacts relative to what was previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Future analysis will be performed on the VMT model. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan Amendment updated would have less than significant impact to transportation and circulation.

- c) **No Impact.** There are no changes to land uses that would affect air traffic patterns or introduce a safety risk. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impacts on air traffic patterns.
- d) – e) **No Impact.** No amendments are proposed to the San Rafael General Plan 2020 Circulation Element that substantially increase hazards or result in inadequate emergency access. There are no physical changes proposed as part of the General Plan Amendment. Potential impacts of any future development will be reviewed at the project level when specific site details are defined. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impacts associated with design hazards or emergency vehicle access.
- f) **No Impact.** There are no changes proposed that would conflict with the San Rafael Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Potential impacts of any future development will be reviewed at the project level when specific site details are defined. The General Plan Amendment does not introduce any new or more severe impacts relative to what was previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impact due to a conflict with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

XVII.UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Sources: 1, 2, 3, and 7

Utilities and Service Systems Impacts Discussion:

- a) **No Impact.** There are no activities proposed as part of the General Plan Amendment that would exceed wastewater requirements. The General Plan Amendment does not introduce any new or more severe impacts to water quality relative to what was previously analyzed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, implementation of the General Plan Amendment will have no impacts to wastewater treatment.
- b) **No Impact.** There are no changes to land uses that would alter the water or wastewater demands evaluated in the General Plan EIR. No expansion of capacity or new facilities would result from implementing the General Plan Amendment. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impacts to water and wastewater capacity.
- c) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment will not result in any physical improvements necessitating the construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities. There are no new impacts or more severe impacts due to stormwater relative to what was analyzed under the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impact.
- d) – e) **No Impact.** There are no changes to the General Plan that would alter water supply resources or require additional wastewater treatment capacity. The General Plan EIR evaluated water supply demand and wastewater treatment capacity and there are no new or more severe impacts relative to what was analyzed therein. Therefore there are no impacts to water supplies and waste treatment capacity.
- f) – g) **No Impact.** General Plan Amendment will not generate solid waste or conflict with solid waste disposal regulation as no physical development will occur. The Amendment does not increase demand for solid waste or landfill disposal beyond what has previously been identified. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impacts due to solid waste disposal.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE (CAL. PUB. RES. CODE §15065)

A focused or full environmental impact report for a project may be required where the project has a significant effect on the environment in any of the following conditions:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7

- (a) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment does not alter policies and programs in a manner that would degrade the quality of the environment, reduce habitat, or affect cultural resources. Therefore, the Amendment will have no impacts due to degradation of the environment.
- (b) **No Impact.** The General Plan Amendment is consistent with the City’s General Plan land use designations and does not result in any changes to land use or zoning that would affect cumulative conditions. The General Plan EIR previously analyzed potential environmental impacts from buildout of the General Plan and no new or more severe cumulative impacts would result from the proposed Amendments. Therefore, the General Plan Amendment will have no cumulative impacts.
- (c) **No Impact.** The General Plan EIR identified policies, program and mitigation measure to ensure that implementation would not result in adverse impacts to humans or the environment. The General Plan Amendment does not propose changes to policies and programs that would significantly change the analysis performed in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, the General Plan Amendment will have no impacts due to substantial adverse environmental effects.

F. SOURCE REFERENCES

1. City of San Rafael General Plan 2020, adopted November 15, 2004; as amended through December 2015.
2. San Rafael General Plan 2020, Environmental Impact Report, prepared by Nichols Berman Environmental Planning, August 2004; and as amended through December 2015.
3. City of San Rafael Municipal Code.
 - a. Title 14: Zoning, adopted September 1994, as amended May 1996
 - b. Title 8, Chapter 8.13: Noise, adopted 2002
 - c. Title 15: Subdivisions, adopted 2002, as amended 2009
4. San Rafael Climate Change Action Plan, adopted 2009; Implementation Program Update May 2011.

5. City of San Rafael Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan, 2011 Update; adopted 2011
6. FHA's Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program (NTPP); 2009
7. Draft San Rafael General Plan 10-Year Status Report prepared by Metropolitan Planning Group, January 2016
8. Draft Amendments to the City of San Rafael General Plan 2020. January 2016

G. PUBLIC REVIEW

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines [§15164(c)], this addendum to the 2020 General Plan EIR does not need to be circulated for public review, and shall be included in, or attached to, the certified and amended General Plan EIR.

Prepared By: Metropolitan Planning Group

Reviewed By: Paul A. Jensen